

**MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING
HORRY COUNTY SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY, INC.
January 27, 2026**

The Horry County Solid Waste Authority, Inc. held a Board Meeting on Tuesday, January 27, 2026, at 3:00 P.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 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 Bo Ives and Dr. Albert G. Hayward. Board Member Wayne Fox was not in attendance.

Corporal Eric Zink from the Horry County Police Department, Horry County Attorney, Sam Graves, Highway 90 Liaison, Michael Hughes, Sherry and James Irvin, Amelia Wood and several other attendees represented the public in attendance. Members of the media in attendance included Adrianna Lawrence from WBTW News 13 and Kara Riskus from WPDE News 15.

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

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Kemp called the meeting to order and asked Dr. Hayward to render the invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Berry moved to approve the Agenda as presented. There was a second by Dr. Hayward and the Motion was carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Kemp asked for any questions on or amendments to the Minutes of the Regular Meeting held on December 11, 2025, the Board Workshop held on January 12, 2026, and The Board Workshop held on January 15, 2026. However, there were none.

Mr. Berry moved to approve the minutes of the December 11, 2025, Regular Meeting, the Board Workshop held on January 12, 2026, and the Board Workshop held on January 15, 2026. There was a second by Mr. Jones and the Motion was carried.

PUBLIC INPUT

Chairman Kemp noted that two individuals had registered to speak during Public Input and invited Mr. James Irvin to come forward.

Mr. Irvin inquired whether an area map was available. Chairman Kemp replied that there was not. Mr. Irvin said that his primary concern with the expansion was that the SWA had changed from a minor

landfill to a major landfill. He expressed concern that areas currently holding water would be filled and questioned where that water would go.

Mr. Irvin said that near his property there were two swamp cells, which he identified as Cells One and Two, and stated that if the SWA filled those areas, the water would flow into his backyard through a 24-inch tile that runs underneath the public road beside his home. Mr. Irvin stated that the SWA had a pipe that feed into the tile and indicated that it was fine now and was not an issue. He expressed concern that polluted water would run off from the landfill and stated that he had not seen any plans for buffers or containment measures to prevent contaminated water from spreading.

Mr. Irvin stated that the landfill expansion would be approximately 200 feet from his well and emphasized that it was his drinking water, as he does not have access to city water. He questioned the impact of heavy rainfall on Highway 90 and the SWA entrance.

Mr. Irvin stated that he believed there were better locations suitable for a major landfill and expressed concern that nearby areas, including housing developments, would be affected. He also stated the presence of numerous eagles on the east side of the property and questioned what would happen to them, stating that the area serves as their food source.

Mrs. Sherry Irvin asked whether any properties adjacent to the landfill would be affected by the expansion. She stated that not only her property, but also her neighbors' properties would be impacted. She stated that they were not connected to city services and were unaware of the proposed changes.

Mrs. Irvin stated that she would invite officials to visit her home in five to ten years and drink a glass of water from her faucet. She commented that municipalities often undertake projects such as electric or gas infrastructure and that it could take years to recover from past decisions. She expressed her belief that there could be a better solution, not only for the environment but also for the residents living on Mill Hill Road.

Mrs. Irvin stated that the expansion would affect her family and her property and questioned whether she should continue to grow fruit trees or plant a garden, stating that she relies on those vegetables to feed her family during the winter. Mrs. Irvin expressed concern about the long-term impacts on animals, wetlands, and residents, stating that the effects may not be evident today but could occur for 10 to 20 years in the future.

Mrs. Irvin stated that she should not have to purchase bottled water where she lived and expressed concern about the safety of her drinking water. She stated that there must be additional land available and said that a landfill already exists at the site, adding that additional cells were unnecessary. She concluded by questioning what options would remain for her family regarding their food and water supply.

Mrs. Irvin stated that she was a recycler, as are many people, and stated that some individuals do not recycle as they should. She questioned where that waste ultimately ends up and whether it was being dumped in the back of the SWA.

Chairman Kemp stated that those were all of the individuals who had signed up to provide comments for Public Input. He stated that he could assure the public that any development at the SWA would be conducted in accordance with federal and state requirements. He said that there would be several

opportunities for public comments and input during the permitting process and encouraged individuals to participate during those periods. He thanked the Mr. & Mrs. Irvin for their comments.

Mr. Ives stated that he wished to clarify that the SWA holds a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and was not permitted to create additional runoff from any projects. He explained that increasing runoff would prevent the SWA from obtaining the necessary permits and stated that these permits kept the SWA in compliance. He stated that stormwater retention systems were in place to control runoff and emphasized that the SWA was not attempting to be a bad neighbor. An audience member stated that they had never attended one of the meetings before and asked whether they could ask questions. Chairman Kemp responded that the agenda was lengthy and stated that only those who had signed up were permitted to speak.

Mr. Ives provided an additional clarification, stating that media reports indicated there would be a discussion regarding the permit. He said that while the SWA would not be addressing the matter again during the meeting, it would be discussed in the future. He stated that individuals who signed up would be contacted by staff when the topic was scheduled for discussion.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS/ UPDATES

Recycling and Corporate Affairs Mrs. Murphy offered an update of various projects in the Recycling and Corporate Affairs Division that were included on pages 43-52 in the Board Packet.

Statement of Economic Update – Mrs. Murphy reminded the Board that it was time to file their Statements of Economic Interest electronically through the State Ethics Commission. She informed the Board that the filing deadline to avoid penalties was 12 P.M. on March 30, 2026, Mrs. Murphy informed the Board that a copy of the filing instructions had been included in their packets and advised members to contact Ms. Katherine Bell if they needed assistance.

North Myrtle Beach (Wampee) Recycling Center Relocation – Mrs. Murphy provided an update on the North Myrtle Beach Recycling Center Relocation project. She reported that the County received two construction bids last fall and awarded the contract to King Asphalt last week. Mrs. Murphy stated that the project was anticipated to be completed by July and that work had begun within the past week. She informed the Board that staff would continue to provide updates as the project moved forward.

Upcoming Events – Mrs. Murphy informed the Board that their Board Packet included a list of Upcoming Events. She stated that the Carolina Recycling Association Annual Conference was scheduled for the week of March 16th at the Embassy Suites. Mrs. Murphy advised the Board that the agenda had not yet been released, but once it becomes available, she would forward it to the Board.

Caught Green Handed Update – Mrs. Murphy informed the Board the December “Caught Green Handed” recipient was Mr. Eric Johnson. She stated Mr. Johnson was a recycler at the Aynor Recycling Center and he was thankful to be recognized.

Finance and Administration Update – Mrs. Cooke offered an update of the following items which were included as pages 53 – 69 in the Board Packet.

Monthly Finance Reports – Mrs. Bitting reported that overall tipping fees had increased 21% over

last year at the same time. Mrs. Bitting said that Solid Waste revenue was 52.38% of budget, Mixed Construction revenue was at 55.02% of budget projection and Yard Waste revenue was at 56.46% of budget.

Mrs. Bitting said that Recyclable Sales were at 48.82% of budget. She said the C&D Processing Facility saved 19 days of airspace. Mrs. Bitting reported that the Material Recycling Facility saved 49 days of airspace.

Mrs. Bitting reviewed the Income Statement and reported revenues were at 49.29% of budget and expenses were at 42.77% of budget for the month and revenue over expenses was \$349,517.33. She said the SWA's year-to-date revenue over expenses was \$2,903,059.81.

Mrs. Bitting gave an overview of the landfill tonnage and reported that Solid Waste increased by 2.08%, Yard Waste increased by 14.34%, and Mixed Construction increased by 19.03%.

Mr. Ives stated, regarding page 69, that there was no report for the month of December before the financial statements were completed. He also observed that, based on the tonnage graph on page 69, the SWA did not experience as deep a decline in September as it typically does. Mrs. Bitting indicated that was correct.

Mrs. Bitting informed the Board that staff were in the process of preparing the budget. She stated that she would email the tentative budget calendar to Board Members. She added that staff were currently working on both the operating and capital budgets and was assembling the information so it could be distributed.

Operations and Planning Update – Mrs. Todd presented the following updates which were included on pages 70 – 89 in the Board Packet.

Landfill Update – Mrs. Todd reported the landfill had its monthly inspection on Monday, January 5th. She stated that all evaluated areas had been inspected and found to be satisfactory.

Household Hazardous Waste – Mrs. Todd reported that the fifth HHW pack-and-ship event with MXI resulted in the collection of 26,445 pounds of material. She said that this brings the total collected to date to 142,603 pounds (70.30 tons).

Driver of the Month Update – Mrs. Todd said the January Driver of the Month was Mr. Randall Jordan who works for Kirton Homes.

C&D Recycling Update – Mrs. Todd reported that material processed at the C&D Recycling Facility in December 2025 decreased by 2.07% as compared to December 2024.

MRF Update – Mrs. Todd reported a 3.39 % increase in the amount of recyclables received at the Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) in December 2025 as compared to December 2024.

Mrs. Todd reported that demand for paper and cardboard remained steady, though margins were tight due to energy and transportation costs. She stated that a positive development in that regulatory pressure for increased recycled content in packaging continued to rise.

Mrs. Todd reported that OCC sold for \$110.10 per ton in January, compared to \$102.00 per ton in December 2025. She stated that small price increases were expected through the spring, even though a large supply remains available.

Mrs. Todd reported that the SWA continued to exceed national averages for recyclable material pricing. She reported, for example, that the national average for PET was \$107.60 per ton, while the SWA received \$190.60 per ton, for HDPE-N, the national average was \$1,042.60 per ton compared to the SWA's price of \$1,170 per ton. She reported that UBCs averaged \$1,568.80 nationally, while the SWA received \$2,300 per ton, and Steel Cans averaged \$158.00 nationally compared to the SWA's price of \$236.60 per ton.

Chairman Kemp stated that Mrs. Todd reported the SWA was able to sell several materials at prices above the national average, which he credited to the hard work of the staff. He said that the employees do an excellent job at separating and protecting materials, and that the SWA was recognized for producing high-quality recyclables. Chairman Kemp added that maintaining this standard required significant effort from the staff, and he expressed his appreciation for their work.

Mr. Ives added that the SWA solicited bids each month for these prices rather than accepting a single price for the entire year. He stated that this monthly process helps ensure the best possible return and recognized Mrs. Cindy Keith for her outstanding work in securing favorable pricing. He emphasized that producing quality recyclable material was a team effort and remarked that recycling does not pay for itself.

Mr. Knight reminded the Board about Household Hazardous Waste (HHW), saying that many people assume it referred only to common household items found under the kitchen sink that can be disposed of in the landfill. He explained that in 2024, HHW collected 71 tons, with an estimated disposal cost of \$100,000 for the SWA. He said that items such as paint and batteries, particularly the many small batteries collected, not including car batteries, required extensive sorting, as larger batteries must be separated. He said that managing these materials involved a significant amount of work.

Ms. Creech said she was amazed that Mrs. Todd continued to get approval through DES, stating that the agency closely monitors the SWA's operations and that the organization consistently passes all inspections. She added that most people were not aware that inspections resulted in either a pass or a failure there was no middle grade. Ms. Creech stated that for staff to maintain this level of performance was remarkable.

Executive Director Update – Mr. Knight provided an update, which was included on page 90 of the Board Packet.

General Discussions on Projects and Budget Overview – Mr. Knight reported that staff had addressed the primary issues and they consistently did an excellent job. He thanked the Board for participating in the two workshops in preparation for the upcoming budget process. Mr. Knight stated that another workshop was upcoming to discuss the capital project and said that he believed it would be educational. Mr. Knight explained that the enterprise fund operated differently from most other county departments, with the exception of the airport. He reminded the Board that the landfill must be maintained for 30 years after closure and stated that staff was already ahead of schedule in planning for closure and post-closure needs. Mr. Knight indicated that the financial report was good and that staff looked forward to continuing the budget process.

Mr. Ives remarked that the workshops were highly beneficial and expressed his appreciation to staff for organizing them.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no Committee Meetings held during the month.

OLD BUSINESS

Records Storage/Contractor Building Update – Mrs. Murphy reported at the December Board Meeting that the records storage building may require repair or replacement in the near future. She clarified that the SWA records storage building was part of a shared structure, with one-third used for records storage and the remaining two-thirds functioning as a contractor trailer, which served as a home base during landfill construction or maintenance projects.

Mrs. Murphy stated that she and Mr. Stetter met to discuss the facility, and that he inspected it and found it to be in good condition. She also stated that she consulted with the SC State Archives, which oversees the standards for maintaining permanent records. She said according to their requirements, the facility must be climate-controlled, free of leaks and mold, and properly secured. Mrs. Murphy stated that the facility meets these standards.

Mrs. Murphy reported that if the SWA continued to meet these standards as it does at this time she and Mr. Stetter do not foresee the need for major changes. She added that staff would continue to monitor the facility over the next few years and would notify the Board if alternative options needed to be considered.

Mrs. Murphy explained that, based on their discussions and clarification from the SC State Archives, any off-site secondary storage was voluntary at this time, and the SWA was not required to maintain off-site secondary storage.

SWA Landfill Road Entrance – Mr. Knight provided an update on the SWA Landfill Road Entrance. He explained that the entrance road was concrete and that the project would be challenging, as the road cannot be closed and the landfill cannot be shut down for four to five months. He stated that trucks and other vehicles must maintain access to the recycling center. Mr. Knight said staff considered reducing the road to one lane, but that option was not feasible.

Mr. Knight stated that the coming year would serve as a planning year and that changes to the landfill road network and retention ponds were expected. He stated that the recycling center may need to be moved back and that a temporary road would likely have to be constructed. Mr. Knight added that the temporary access road may be necessary to allow traffic in and out while the concrete road is being repaired.

Mr. Knight said staff may recommend funding for planning and design in the upcoming budget. He also stated that he believed paving the road could be postponed for another year.

Chairman Kemp asked Mr. Knight to keep the Board updated of the progress.

Mr. Berry asked whether this year would be used for the planning stages, and Mr. Knight confirmed that it would. Mr. Berry then asked how long it would take to pave the road, and Mr. Knight responded that he believed the paving would take four to five months.

Ms. Creech asked Mr. Knight whether the road that was used and repaired during the hurricane would be available again. Mr. Knight responded that he did not believe so, as he does not think Mill Hill Road would be able to handle the traffic. General discussion ensued.

Proposed Transfer of Designated Funds – Mrs. Bitting informed the Board that, a couple of months ago, she presented the recommendation for the Designated Funds Transfer. She explained that at the end of each year, the SWA followed an unrestricted funds transfer policy requiring staff to maintain at least 15% of the SWA’s estimated annual revenue. She said based on the year-end figures, the SWA had more than \$5 Million available for transfer.

Mrs. Bitting stated that the first fund reviewed was the MRF contingency account. She stated that because the MRF generated revenue this year, staff was able to recommend transferring \$566,578 into the designated MRF contingency account. Mrs. Bitting indicated that this was the first time in many years that staff had been able to add funds to that account.

Mrs. Bitting recommended that the following designated funds be transferred:

- MRF Contingency Fund: \$566,578
- Landfill Construction Designated Account: \$1,053,628
- Equipment Replacement Fund: \$2,000,000
- General Construction Development Fund: \$1,500,000

Mr. Ives moved to approve the transfer of \$566,578 to the MRF Contingency Designated Account, \$1,053,628 to the Landfill Construction Designated Account, \$2,000,000 to the Equipment Replacement Designated Account and \$1,500,000 to General Construction/Development Designated Account. There was a second by Mr. Berry and the Motion was carried.

SWA Purchasing Policy – Mrs. Bitting reviewed the Purchasing Policy, saying that it had been presented to the Finance Committee and the full Board for approval. She explained that, due to current economic conditions and rising costs for equipment and services, several purchasing limits needed to be increased.

Mrs. Bitting stated that a general purchase allows staff to make purchases of \$5,000 or less using a purchase order or P-card. She said that the informal bid threshold for general purchases had been raised from \$5,000 to \$20,000. She stated that the threshold for requiring a formal bid process was being increased to \$20,000 or more.

Mrs. Bitting stated that the SWA attorney had reviewed the Purchasing Policy and offered several recommendations on minor items. She added that staff was open to any changes the Board considered appropriate.

Chairman Kemp distributed a copy of his comments on the proposed SWA Purchasing Policy to the Board, which is attached to and made a part of these minutes. He stated that one of his basic suggestions was to align the policy more closely with Horry County’s Purchasing Policy, particularly regarding spending limits. He recommended raising the general purchasing limit from \$5,000 to \$10,000, setting the informal bid currently at \$10,000 to \$50,000, and requiring a formal bid process for purchases exceeding \$50,000. Chairman Kemp said that these changes would align with the County’s limits.

Chairman Kemp suggested adding a requirement under Section I of the Purchasing Policy to ensure contractors have experience working on the SWA landfill. Chairman Kemp stated that given current cost staff should be provided as much flexibility as possible and that the policy should remain consistent with the County's practices.

Mr. Berry asked Chairman Kemp whether the SWA was following the County's approach. Chairman Kemp responded that it was. Mr. Ives stated that it was not a requirement and that the SWA did not have to follow suit. Mr. Berry said that he understood, and Chairman Kemp reiterated that they were not required to follow suit.

Mr. Jones asked what following the County had to do with the discussion and why it was part of the conversation. Chairman Kemp responded that it did not directly relate but indicated that the County recognized the need for staff flexibility. Chairman Kemp said given current costs, he felt the limits originally proposed were too low. Mr. Jones commented that he was not stating whether he supported it or opposed it. Chairman Kemp responded that he was simply trying to remain consistent with the County.

Ms. Creech asked how often, in theory, staff would encounter difficulties purchasing needed items under the current bid limits. Mrs. Bitting responded that it had not been a frequent problem; however, with the formal bid threshold set at \$20,000, it had become difficult to purchase many items. She said that equipment such as a light tower, which previously cost around \$5,000, now costs the SWA approximately \$20,000 and as a result, staff were required to initiate the formal bid process based on the existing policy.

Mrs. Bitting explained that raising the limit would allow staff to purchase needed items in a more streamlined manner, without having to go through the full formal bid process. She stated that the formal bid process should be reserved for larger purchases and major equipment, not items such as light towers or lawn mowers.

Ms. Creech said that she believed Item 3 of Chairman Kemp's document needed to be included with the landfill, liners, quality and checking backgrounds. Mrs. Bitting stated that it could be included and that it would not be a problem.

Ms. Creech stated that she had no concerns with Item 1 in Chairman Kemp's document. However, regarding Item 2 of Chairman Kemp's document which raised the amount to \$50,000 she stated the Board had not experienced issues with the current amount in the past and that the increase would simply provide a little more flexibility. Mrs. Bitting confirmed that it would.

Mr. Jones asked whether the Board would vote on the matter as a whole or vote on the two items separately. Chairman Kemp responded that they could proceed in whichever manner the Board preferred and that he was simply sharing his thoughts on what had been presented.

Ms. Ives asked for one more clarification, stating that the SWA was not required to follow the County's purchasing program. Mrs. Bitting responded that this was correct. He asked whether they were required to follow the State's limits for when bids must be solicited. Mrs. Bitting replied that she would need to verify that information. She added that the SWA was permitted to establish its own purchasing policy, subject to Board approval.

Mr. Berry asked Chairman Kemp if this matter could be put into the form of a motion so the Board could

vote and move on. Mr. Jones then asked how Mr. Berry intended to vote, and Mr. Berry responded that he supported all three items.

Mr. Berry made a Motion to include all three items included in Chairman Kemp's document in the Purchasing Policy. There was a second by Dr. Hayward. Ms. Creech said that she could support Items 1 and 3 of Chairman Kemp's document but she could not vote for Item 2, and she would be voting in opposition. **The Motion was carried** with Mr. Ives, Mr. Jones and Ms. Creech voting in opposition.

NEW BUSINESS

Roundtable Discussion – Mr. Jones asked Chairman Kemp whether it would be proper to bring back the motion to consider Item 3 separately. Mr. Jones stated they would make a motion to that effect. Chairman Kemp suggested that if the Board was to recall and reconsider the matter that they vote on Items 1, 2, and 3 of his document individually. Mr. Jones agreed.

Mr. Jones moved to recall the previous Motion to include all of the items in Mr. Kemp's document in the Purchasing Policy. Ms. Creech seconded the Motion, and the Motion was carried.

Chairman Kemp stated the first item of consideration would be to change the limit in Section C of the Purchasing Policy, General Purchase Process, to \$10,000.

Mr. Jones made a Motion to change the limit in Section C of the Purchasing Policy, General Purchase Process, to \$10,000. Dr. Hayward seconded the Motion, and it was carried unanimously.

Mrs. Bitting asked Chairman Kemp to confirm that under Section C, the General Purchases Process, if the limit would increase to \$10,000 or be \$5,000. Chairman Kemp clarified that the limit in Section C, General Purchase Process was currently at \$5,000 but would now be raised to \$10,000.

Mrs. Bitting further asked whether Section D, the Informal Bid Process, would be left at \$10,000. Chairman Kemp stated that the next proposed change being considered was to Section D and would raise the upper limit to \$50,000 instead of \$20,000; however, the Board had voted on that proposal yet.

Chairman Kemp indicated with the proposed change, Section D would then read "All purchases between \$5,000 and \$50,000". Mr. Berry clarified that would change the upper limit from \$20,000 to \$50,000 and Chairman Kemp stated that was correct. Mr. Berry commented that he had no problem with the change, but he was not the only one on the Board.

Chairman Kemp asked if there was a motion for the proposed change to Section D, Informal Bid Process; however, there was none.

Chairman Kemp then stated the third recommendation was to add the phrase "experience working on solid waste landfills" to the third bulleted item in Section I of the Purchasing Policy.

Mr. Jones moved to add the phrase "experience working on solid waste landfills" to the third bulleted item in Section I of the Purchasing Policy. There was a second by Mr. Berry and the Motion was unanimously carried.

Chairman Kemp reiterated that no changes had been made to Section D of the Purchasing Policy.

Ms. Creech commented that it was discouraging to see the rate of recycling decline by 2%. She stated that if businesses and the community were not going to recycle, it would put the SWA in the position to seek additional permits.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Board, **Mr. Berry moved, seconded by Ms. Creech, to adjourn the meeting. The Motion was carried,** and the January Board Meeting was adjourned at 4:00 P.M.

Minutes approved on February 24, 2026.

HORRY COUNTY SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY, INC.

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

ATTEST:

W. Norfleet Jones, Secretary (L. S.)

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

Pam J. Creech (L. S.)

Wayne Fox (L. S.)

Dr. Albert G. Hayward (L. S.)

Bo Ives (L. S.)

Kemp's comments concerning Proposed SWA Purchasing Policy Update

1. Section C GENERAL PURCHASE PROCESS:
 - a. **Should the amount in this paragraph be increased to \$10,000?**
(The higher amount would mirror the current Horry County purchasing policy for small purchases¹ and would give staff slightly more flexibility for general purpose purchases.)
2. Section D. INFORMAL BID PROCESS:
 - a. **Should the upper limit for informal bids be increased to \$50,000?**
(Again, the higher limit would mirror the current Horry County purchasing policy pertaining to determining price reasonableness for smaller purchases² and would give staff more flexibility for small purchases.)
3. Section I PROCUREMENT PROCESS
 - a. 3rd bullet item: Suggest the phrase "**experience working on solid waste landfills**" or something similar be added after the word "quality".