

**MINUTES OF BOARD WORKSHOP  
HORRY COUNTY SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY, INC.  
January 8, 2019**

The Horry County Solid Waste Authority, Inc. held a Board Workshop on Tuesday, January 8, 2019, at 2:00 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: Michael H. Hughes, Chairman; Bo Ives, Vice Chairman; J. Michael Campbell, Secretary; Pam J. Creech, Treasurer; and Board Members Samuel T. Johnson, Jr., W. Norfleet Jones and Carl H. Schwartzkopf.

Steve Gosnell, Director of Horry County Infrastructure and Regulation was present. Felix Hottenstein, from CP Group, Brad Goins and Rusty Angel, from Machine X, and Jeff Nella and Mark Neitzey, from Van Dyk Recycling Solutions represented the public in attendance. There were no members of the media in attendance.

The following individuals were also in attendance: Danny Knight, Executive Director; Esther Murphy, Director; Mike Bessant, Director; Jan Bitting, Director; and other staff to include Rodney Cannon, Nannette Powell, Richie Stetter, Cecil Terry, and Stephanie Todd.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Hughes called the workshop to order and rendered the invocation. Following the invocation, Mr. Ives led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Chairman Hughes asked for any revisions to the Agenda as contained in the Workshop Packet.

**Mr. Schwartzkopf moved to approve the Agenda as presented. There was a second by Mr. Campbell and the Motion was carried.**

Chairman Hughes then asked Mrs. Murphy to discuss the Recycling Grant Recommendations.

**SWA RECYCLING GRANT RECOMMENDATIONS**

Mrs. Murphy stated that during the month of December four SWA Recycling Grant applications were received. She indicated that the SWA Recycling Review Committee (Mr. Bessant, Mrs. Bitting, Mr. Knight and Mrs. Murphy) reviewed each application. Mrs. Murphy asked Chairman Hughes if the Board wanted to vote after each grant application recommendation or at the end of the overview. Chairman Hughes stated the Board would vote after all of the information was given.

**City of Conway** – Mrs. Murphy indicated that the City of Conway submitted a Recycling Grant application requesting \$10,000 in funding to purchase 65-gallon roll-carts. She explained that the City of Conway was replacing its existing 18-gallon recycling bins with 65-gallon roll-carts. Mrs. Murphy stated the grant would assist with the purchasing of approximately 198 additional 65-gallon roll-carts which would be used primarily for residential recycling.

**Town of Aynor** – Mrs. Murphy indicated the Town of Aynor submitted a Recycling Grant application requesting \$10,000 in funding to purchase 96-gallon roll-carts as a part of their efforts to initiate a curbside recycling collection program. She informed the Board that the Town of Aynor had discontinued their recycling program and had their containers removed. Mrs. Murphy stated the application met the criteria set forth by the grant but this was contingent upon the Town of Aynor securing a vendor to collect and haul the recyclables.

**Buck Creek Foundation** – Mrs. Murphy indicated that Buck Creek Foundation had submitted a Recycling Grant application requesting \$10,000 in funding. She explained this was to provide a place where the special needs community could establish a garden and/or greenhouse to promote organic and food waste composting throughout the community. Mrs. Murphy stated the Buck Creek Foundation was seeking assistance with obtaining compost, mulch, glass; purchasing of food waste and compost collection equipment and the installation of a fence. She commented that the Buck Creek Foundation had secured the location and property needed for this project.

Mr. Ives asked for more information on the Buck Creek Foundation. Mr. Knight explained this was a new group in the Town of Loris. He indicated that the Buck Creek Foundation helped special needs children. Mr. Knight commented the Foundation was clearing out the Clardy Nursery and had other property on Old Buck Creek Road for a garden and a food waste composting collection area. He indicated that the SWA had other material that could be used for raised beds.

**North Myrtle Beach Chamber of Commerce** – Mrs. Murphy indicated that the North Myrtle Beach Chamber of Commerce had submitted a SWA Recycling Grant application. She explained that the (NMBCC) was requesting funding for an educational outreach project for the business community. Mrs. Murphy explained the NMBCC wanted to encourage businesses to reduce the amount of single use plastics and that they were partnering with the Business School at Coastal Carolina University. She indicated the joint partnership would develop materials, posters and literature to be used to educate area business. Mrs. Murphy stated that the SWA would approve all the literature that was printed.

Mrs. Murphy indicated the application did not request a specific amount of funding so the SWA Recycling Grant Committee recommended that the NMBCC be granted \$5,000. She stated this would assist with the development of an education outreach project for the business community and encourage their customers to reduce the amount of single use plastic being generated.

Mr. Campbell asked if the North Myrtle Beach Chamber of Commerce partnered with the City of North Myrtle Beach. Mrs. Murphy commented that nothing on the application suggested any connection or ties to the City of North Myrtle Beach. Mr. Campbell asked if the City of North Myrtle Beach had asked for a grant. Mrs. Murphy replied yes that the City of North Myrtle Beach had applied for and received a grant from the SWA. Ms. Creech commented this was very encouraging that the NMBCC to have an educational outreach program to discuss recycling with hotels and restaurants.

Chairman Hughes inquired if the City of Conway was requesting funding to purchase 65-gallon roll-carts. He asked Mrs. Murphy if there was a criterion that decided if the programs were new and innovative. Mrs. Murphy stated that every application goes through a review process and stated the SWA Recycling Grant has certain criteria that must be met based on the grant application. She stated the grant application has 15 questions that the applicant must respond to. Mrs. Murphy indicated there are project descriptions on how will this program improve upon what is currently in existence. She commented that each applicant goes through this process. Mrs. Murphy indicated that the City of Conway is anticipating approximately a 20% increase in recycling because of the use of the 65-gallon roll carts. She stated that the City of Conway currently offers 65-gallon roll-carts; however, some residents still have 18-gallon bins but the City was trying to convert all residents into using 65-gallon roll-carts.

Chairman Hughes asked if the Town of Aynor would be a new program. He asked Mrs. Murphy if the grant would be contingent upon the town securing a vendor to collect their recyclables. Mrs. Murphy stated that was correct and said once the Board approved their application staff would contact them to let them know their grant had been approved contingent upon the Town of Aynor securing a vendor to collect their recyclable material. Mrs. Murphy stated the Town of Aynor would inform the SWA when they had secured a vendor. Chairman Hughes asked when would the Town of Aynor receive funding. Mrs. Murphy commented once the Town of Aynor had secured a vendor and had purchased the roll-carts, then they would be reimbursed.

Chairman Hughes agreed that the Buck Creek Foundation was a great idea to help special needs children. He commented that the North Myrtle Beach Chamber of Commerce educational outreach program was a great idea. Chairman Hughes said Ms. Creech had a good idea suggesting that the hotels get involved with the recycling efforts with the public education. Ms. Creech mentioned that staff should make sure that the Buck Creek Foundation knew what would be reimbursed. Ms. Creech indicated she did not want Buck Creek to spend money on project that did not meet the requirements.

**Mr. Schwartzkopf moved to approve staff recommendation for each of the grants. There was a second by Mr. Jones and the Motion was carried.**

#### **MRF UPGRADE AND RETROFIT – VENDOR PRESENTATIONS**

Chairman Hughes asked Mr. Bessant to give an overview of the MRF upgrade and retrofit. Mr. Bessant explained that this process had been ongoing for the last six-months. He stated that the bids or RFQ's were received in October. He informed the group that the recycling material or composition had changed since the MRF's construction in 2008 and so had the equipment. Mr. Bessant explained since 2008 the equipment at the MRF has been on an equipment replacement schedule and was due for replacement in FY19. He indicated the funding was currently available for the MRF equipment upgrade and retrofit. Mr. Bessant stated that \$3Million was in the capital budget account and \$600,000 was budgeted in E funds for the optical sorters. He indicated the "E" funds are in the designated accounts which means the MRF must have the Board approval in order to use these funds.

Mr. Bessant commented that staff discussed the refurbishment cost of equipment which would be around \$3 to \$4Million to upgrade and retrofit the whole system and this would take a four to five months shut down. He indicated this would refurbish the current system. Mr. Bessant

commented staff reviewed the RFQ's and with the current funds the MRF staff would do some of the upgrades during the refurbishing of the facility. He indicated that he and staff members visited seven facilities along the east coast to determine which equipment would best suit the needs of the MRF. Mr. Bessant commented this was the final version of what was needed for the MRF facility.

He indicated the goal was to reduce maintenance cost, have less wrapping of plastics in the machinery, resolve electrical issues at the plant currently, completely rewire the facility and install a new control system, process more tonnage with less rejects and reduce the labor cost.

Mr. Bessant stated prior to 2015 and the receiving the Charleston County material, the MRF processed 8-9 tons of material per hour with a 40-hour week. He commented in 2018 the MRF processed between 10-11 tons of material per hour. Mr. Bessant indicated due to the increased recycling tonnage in Horry County the MRF would need to process 12-13 tons per hour with a 40-hour work week. He stated that when Myrtle Beach Recycling closed its facility the MRF tonnage increased 600 tons per month.

### **CP GROUP**

Mr. Bessant introduced Mr. Felix Hottenstein with CP Group. Mr. Hottenstein gave an overview of the RFP from CP Group. A copy of the presentation is attached to and made a part of these minutes.

Mr. Ives asked if the system would eliminate the problem with the plastic bags wrapping around the parts. Mr. Hottenstein replied the diameter of the shafts and the wide surface of the machine would make it harder for the plastic bags to wrap around the equipment. He commented since the flow of the material was constant no wrapping would occur until the end of the surface.

Mr. Bessant asked Mr. Hottenstein to explain about the life of an optical sorter. Mr. Hottenstein indicated that the MRF facility was constructed in 2008 and now its 2019. He said the projected life of a MRF facility was 12-years and this was the average life span of the separation equipment. He commented that some optical sorters were still in use beyond this timeframe and the maintenance concerns of these were that they are fast moving conveyers sensors. Mr. Hottenstein indicated that the sensors had no maintenance issues because it was a halogen light with windows that had to be cleaned. He commented some optical sorters were 15-years old and were functional. Mr. Hottenstein stated the system had free software updates. He commented once the system was installed the operator would interface on a Windows based system through an ethernet connection. Mr. Hottenstein indicated any problem the system had could be easily accessed remotely for any troubleshooting or problem solving. Mr. Bessant asked if there was a cost. Mr. Hottenstein replied there was no cost for the update or troubleshooting of the system.

Mr. Jones commented that he was a Board Member when the MRF was built in 2008. He said they were told what the replacement discs would cost but over the years the cost and replacement have exceeded the original quote. Mr. Jones stated over the last 10 years the cost to replace the discs has been considerably more. He commented the MRF was still working with the same product but a better system. Mr. Jones asked Mr. Hottenstein what would be the discs cost replacement per year on this equipment.

Mr. Hottenstein indicated he was not the expert on this, but he was told this question would come up. He stated the cost of the replacement discs should be at least 70% less than the current system. Mr. Jones said someone should be able to tell him that this system has been tested and knows exactly how many times this equipment would need replacement discs and the cost. Mr. Hottenstein stated he was not involved in the beginning when this system was sold or what numbers were provided at the time but he felt safe with the numbers proposed and the savings.

Mr. Knight told Mr. Jones that staff would get the information to his question if Mr. Hottenstein did not know. Mr. Hottenstein commented that Richie Stetter had emailed him to ask for the cost of the service support as opposed to service and labor over the last three-four years. He indicated that a discussion on the replacement discs were a part of the email. Mr. Hottenstein commented he did not review the information to discover the cost of the discs. He stated he should be able to provide the information.

Mr. Ives commented the purpose of doing an RFQ rather than RFP was to have the vendor determine what our needs are; however, the SWA chose the timing, the budget, and already have an existing facility that we are trying to adapt. He said those were the three requirements that were outside of the vendors ability to change. Mr. Ives asked was there technology on the horizon that would revise the proposal if the SWA were asking CP to give a proposal a year from now. Mr. Ives asked if the current line function was still the best way of configuring the equipment. Mr. Hottenstein commented that with a lower volume system, such as the SWA MRF and the general flow of material, the concept of the plant was still state of the art.

Ms. Creech asked if the MRF wanted to go into robotics in five or six years would that equipment fit into the existing equipment. Mr. Hottenstein stated in his professional opinion the MRF was not quite ready but the goal was to be retrofittable. He commented the equipment could be modified and conveyors could be moved around. Ms. Creech asked if the optical sorter could be programable to sort polystyrene or other material. Mr. Hottenstein commented the machine was programmable to sort one material at a time so there would be no cross contamination. Ms. Creech asked if there was a sorter that could sort different material separately. Mr. Hottenstein answered yes but would require another silo or conveyor and the cost would increase tremendously.

Mr. Campbell asked what kind of payment schedule would CP Group require and when would it become due. Mr. Hottenstein commented he was not involved in the original RFP to review the payment schedule but normally the down payment would be 15% to 20% to start the project. He indicated the engineering portion would start first and that would take four to six weeks to design. Mr. Hottenstein commented that SWA staff would review and sign off when the project would begin.

Mr. Bessant indicated the contract would have the financial agreement specified as well as the start date of the project. Mr. Schwartzkopf asked about the downtime of the facility and what would happen to the material that accumulates while the MRF was not in operation. Mr. Bessant commented the MRF has a small sortline with an American baler and staff would process the fiber. He indicated the commingle material would be baled at the MRF at least 1,600 tons over a four-week period.

Mr. Ives commented that Mr. Hottenstein said there were 250 MRFs around the country and asked what percentage has the SWA's type of technology. He asked what volume of material would take the SWA MRF to the next production level. Mr. Hottenstein commented at least 25 tons or 200 tons per day. Mr. Bessant stated staff reviewed the increasing tonnage at the MRF and the downside was the facility has limited space.

Chairman Hughes asked Mr. Bessant when the final proposal was received could he have the information available for the Board to review. He asked Mr. Knight for information on the replacement cost. Mr. Campbell asked about the warranty on the equipment. Mr. Hottenstein indicated the equipment would have a warranty of 12-months or 4000 operational hours as part of the contract.

Mr. Hughes thanked Mr. Hottenstein for his presentation. The Board then took a brief break.

### Machine X

Mr. Bessant introduced Rusty Angel and Brad Goins with Machine X. Mr. Angel gave an overview of the RFP from Machine X. A copy of the presentation is attached to and made part of these minutes.

Mr. Bessant asked Mr. Angel to explain the life of the newer optical sorter and over time what maintenance was required for the cost and upkeep for this equipment. Mr. Angel commented that Machine X built their first machine seven-years ago and it was still going strong. He commented that industry wide optical sorters last for 12 years or longer and were still operational. He explained that the typical things that go wrong were bulbs, camera replacement, and the hard drive on the computer. Mr. Angel commented that Machine X offers programs that will do the quarterly or bi-annually maintenance. He indicated the cost for repair depends upon the maintenance issue. Mr. Angel stated the repair costs for minor problems would be as low as \$2,000 and upwards and as high as \$8,000-\$10,000.

Mr. Ives asked if there were programming changes. Mr. Angel commented there were software updates. He said Machine X has the ability to dial into the machine via ethernet. He stated that Machine X will have a standalone internet that will provide WIFI. Mr. Angel indicated the Machine X's technicians will be able to log into the machine from Canada and diagnose any problems the machine might have. He commented he would check to make sure this was done through the software updates.

Mr. Johnson asked how many grease points were on the sorter. Mr. Angel indicated that the machine has many grease points and should be serviced every 40 hours of operational time. He commented that it takes at least 45 minutes to one hour to service the machine at least once a week. Mr. Angel indicated the grease points were under the machine. He stated most customers wanted a manifold installed for the grease filling but Machine X wanted the customer to service their machines manually to detect any abnormalities or defects. Mr. Angel commented that not properly servicing the machine would cause maintenance issues in the long run.

Mr. Johnson asked if the MRF wanted to install a manifold system could staff use an automated system. Mr. Angel replied yes once the equipment had been paid in full that could be installed. He commented he would check with his staff, but he did not think it would be a warranty issue only the serviceability of the machine.

Mr. Johnson asked about the OCC screen and how often does it clog. Mr. Angel commented it does occasional happen but not often. He indicated when that happens the screen will shut down. Mr. Angel asked Mr. Bessant how often does this happens at the MRF. Mr. Bessant stated the screens are cleaned after each shift at the MRF.

Chairman Hughes stated as Board Members they were looking at different kinds of equipment to determine how efficient this new equipment is. He commented that all equipment will have some equipment maintenance and some downtime. Chairman Hughes indicated he did not think the SWA would find a piece of equipment that was infallible. He stated at the end of the presentation he would inform Mr. Bessant what information that the Board wanted to know from each presenter. Chairman Hughes commented he wanted the Board to see the different types of equipment and the process in which they operate but said they do not need to get too technical.

Mr. Ives commented the purpose of doing an RFQ rather than RFP was to have the vendor determine what our needs are; however, the SWA chose the timing, the budget, and already have an existing facility that we are trying to adapt. He said those were the three requirements that were outside of the vendors ability to change. Mr. Ives asked was there technology on the horizon that would revise the proposal if the SWA were asking Machine X to give a proposal a year from now. Mr. Ives asked if the current line function was still the best way of configuring the equipment.

Mr. Angel commented there was nothing he was aware of or currently working on in the research and development area that would significantly impact the system design. He indicated that Machine X was reviewing its OCC screen and constantly looking to improve on their ballistic separator and constantly looking to improve their optical sorter. Mr. Angel stated there was no magic wand on the horizon but the biggest problem was the plastic bags and plastic film. Mr. Angel stated that Machine X had tried to minimize the issues with the plastic and have done so with the ballistic separator.

Chairman Hughes commented when he visited Cherokee there was a presentation on new technology from robotic arms to optical sorters. He indicated there was no exact science and it would be at least five-to-ten years before technology would be advanced enough to be helpful. Chairman Hughes commented that the robotic arm was expensive, costly to maintain, and staff would not get the precision of the optical sorters.

Mr. Ives asked Mr. Angel if there was something outside the box in the near future that might be helpful. Mr. Angel stated that Machine X had built a new robot called the Samurai. He indicated this was on their website and on a Youtube video and at Lakeside plant in Chicago. He did not consider one for the MRF facility because of the cost of installation and maintenance. Mr. Angel indicated if the MRF had a 20% increase in budget then Machine X could propose the additional equipment.

Mr. Stetter stated there have been electrical issues at the MRF Facility and asked Mr. Angel to explain how he would intergrade Machine X's system into the current system. Mr. Angel stated that Machine X would not use anything out of the existing system except for the baler and baler controls. He explained those were standalones but the rest of the system from the infeed system

all the way to the residue conveyor presort would be replaced. Mr. Angel stated this would be replaced with brand new wires, conduits, the control, all new software and bring all wiring up to code.

Mr. Ives asked about the power consumption. Mr. Angel replied that there would not be a significant change except when the compressor was in use. Mr. Goins commented the main power consumption would be the optical sorter and the panel.

Mr. Hughes thanked Mr. Angel and Mr. Goins for their presentation. The Board then took a brief break.

### **Van Dyk**

Mr. Bessant introduced Mr. Jeff Nella and Mark Neitzey with Van Dyk. Mr. Nella gave an overview of the RFP from Van Dyk. A copy of the presentation is attached to and made a part of these minutes.

Mr. Ives commented the purpose of doing an RFQ rather than RFP was to have the vendor determine what our needs are; however, the SWA chose the timing, the budget, and already have an existing facility that we are trying to adapt. He said those were the three requirements that were outside of the vendors ability to change. Mr. Ives asked was there technology on the horizon that would revise the proposal if the SWA were asking Van Dyk to give a proposal a year from now. Mr. Ives asked if the current line function was still the best way of configuring the equipment.

Mr. Nella replied that this was a narrow scope in which to work within. He commented it does not give you the creativity and design aspects that you are paying for. Mr. Neitzey commented on the thoroughness of the RFQ process. He said if Van Dyk had a blank slate the design would be something different; however, he said it was a balancing act considering the capital you would spend verses the output of material verses the number of sorters. Mr. Neitzey believed this was the best retrofit process for this size system and felt confident about this. Mr. Nella stated that the facility could fit an optical sorter in a different configuration after the main fiber screen without interfering with the existing sort line.

Mr. Johnson asked what was the time frame to retrofit the facility. Mr. Neitzey commented he did not review the bid but thought it was eight months from the time the order was placed. He indicated a site crew would be at the facility for 40-days. Mr. Neitzey stated the facility could start the retrofit during long weekends. He indicated there would be a great deal of mechanical work that would not effect the facility's operation within the 40-day window.

Mr. Schwartzkopf asked how much of the machinery was manufactured by Van Dyk or was it purchased from a supplier. Mr. Neitzey commented their company was the master distributor of the best in class technology from around the world. He commented most of their suppliers were in Europe. Mr. Neitzey stated that the optical sorter, conveyors and screens were made in Europe. He informed the group that Van Dyk intergrades the systems and supplies the server after the sale but work directly in concert with the factories.

Mr. Ives asked was there a charge for the software upgrades. Mr. Neitzey replied there was no charge for software updates or a charge for telephone support. He commented that the more trained the MRF technicians were would help with diagnosing most of the problems. Mr. Neitzey indicated that Van Dyk does have a support help that can dial into the machine if help was needed.

Mr. Ives asked if 99% of the parts were available in North Carolina. Mr. Nella replied all parts were stocked in Norwalk, Connecticut. He indicated that Van Dyk was able to ship overnight or courier. Mr. Nella commented that Van Dyk offered 12 different methods of delivery.

Ms. Creech asked if the optical sorter that Van Dyk used had rubber or star discs. Mr. Neitzey explained the screen was the 4/40 screen. Ms. Creech asked if this was a ballistic separator screen. Mr. Bessant commented that their 4/40 screen and OCC screens had rubber discs. Mr. Neitzey asked Ms. Creech if she was referring to the replacing of the rubber discs which was a problem for most MRF facilities. He explained on their screen there were 128 stars and the life span was longer than the traditional screens. Mr. Neitzey stated the 128 stars were only changed once a year rather than every few months.

Mr. Nella indicated that material wrapped around the star points and the material continued to wear down the rubber decreasing the life of the star. He commented that 15,000-20,000 ton of material was processed on the screen before the stars start to wear down. Mr. Nella explained by reducing the wrapping of material with a new design of the screen it gives the stars at least a year's life expectancy.

Ms. Creech asked how Van Dyk was going to intergrade their system with the SWA system, with the electrical included. Mr. Nella commented that they were asked to provide an estimate or quote to replace all controls, replace all the wiring, replace all conduits for the entire system. Mr. Bessant asked Mr. Nella to explain the life expectancy of the optical sorter. Mr. Nella explained that some optical sorters have been in operation for 15 years and were still operating today. Mr. Neitzey commented that the optical sorter should operate for years if well maintained. Mr. Bessant asked if there had been any maintenance issues and what were the cost. Mr. Neitzey commented his main concern would be the equipment needed compressed air or one that generated clean dry air.

Mr. Hughes thanked Mr. Nella and Mr. Neitzey for their presentation. The Board then took a brief break.

Mr. Bessant stated a lot of good information was given from the three vendors. He commented he liked some better than others. Mr. Bessant indicated he had a budget to work within and staff will do its best to stay within budget. He commented that staff would get the best system with the current funding.

Mr. Campbell asked Mr. Bessant if he would have the recommendation for the January 22, 2019 Board Meeting. Mr. Bessant replied he would have the recommendation for the meeting. Chairman Hughes expressed his concerns to Mr. Bessant and asked that he and his staff forward the following information to the Board:

1. How does the equipment react to down time and uptime?
2. Maintenance and repair costs of equipment?
3. Efficiency of equipment based on presentations given.
4. Manpower replacement – how equipment may or may not replace manpower.
5. Quality of material after processing –is it equal or better?
6. Longevity of the equipment – how many years; proclamation of how long equipment will last.
7. What equipment is the best fit for the existing building.
8. Future technology – Is there anything the company has that may be available in 1 or 2 years that will be better?
9. Capacity – No one addressed what equipment will do now and how it will perform in the future.
10. Installation time – how long will the plant be down and how will it affect operations?
11. Accessory Services – i.e. software updates, guaranteed maintenance time
12. Cost – How does it fit into the existing budget?

Ms. Creech asked about the configuration of the equipment. Mr. Bessant indicated the last presentation was right about the ballistic separator having a per ton restriction it needs to be redesigned in order to process more material. Ms. Creech asked how would the work be guaranteed. Mr. Bessant indicated that a portion of the final payment is withheld until the work is completed to our satisfaction. He commented the equipment must meet certain standards in order to receive the total payment.

Mr. Campbell asked Mr. Bessant about the two vendors who submitted proposals stating a processing time of 16 tons of material per hour which was less than what was specified in the RFP. Mr. Bessant commented that was corrected in the second proposal request. Mr. Campbell asked what was the tonnage in the second proposal. Mr. Bessant said 18-20 tons.

Mr. Jones commented that one vendor was making everything new while the other two were mixing old with the new together. He indicated he preferred the all new proposal and the fact that one has no stars or rubber discs to replace. Mr. Schwartzkopf commented he was interested in the support system or policy. Mr. Bessant indicated that every vendor had free telephone support but one vendor had a charge by the hour for telephone support. He commented that two vendors had telephone support and one vendor had additional training capability. Mr. Bessant stated there were costs to consider along with the warranty.

Mr. Campbell asked if the warranties were one year, 18 month or additional hours. Mr. Bessant answered they were all one year and there was an additional charge for the 18 months. He commented that Mr. Stetter had reviewed that information. Mr. Johnson commented there were different systems one vendor had system had all stars and rolling rubber discs; the second vendor had two ballistic sorters and the third had roller discs with a ballistic separator. He asked Mr. Bessant if staff had a preference. Mr. Bessant commented he preferred one with less long-term maintenance cost. He stated he and staff would review each vendor.

Chairman Hughes asked staff to also determine what is the return on investment. He commented Mr. Bessant also needed to determine how to reduce the maintenance, the manpower and improve the efficiency of the equipment. Chairman Hughes wanted Mr. Bessant

and staff to ensure the MRF was getting the same quality of equipment or if the SWA should look for a better piece of equipment to give a better return on investment.

Mr. Johnson commented Mr. Ives asked each vendor about what new technology may be available in a year. He asked Mr. Bessant if it was feasible to wait and purchase the equipment next year. Chairman Hughes stated that staff has spend time traveling up and down the east coast looking at equipment at various plants. He indicated that Mr. Bessant and his staff have determined that this type of equipment was what was requested in the RFQ.

Chairman Hughes commented he would leave this task to Mr. Bessant and his staff to make the recommendation for the Board on January 22, 2019. Mr. Knight indicated that staff would review and discuss the information then give their recommendation.

**Roundtable Discussion** – Chairman Hughes was informed that Horry County Council would have a council meeting on the same night as the SWA January Board Meeting. He asked the Board Members if they wanted to attend the Council meeting. Mr. Knight commented the SWA might be on the Horry County Council’s agenda regarding the draft Solid Waste Management Plan and staff and some of the Board Members needed to attend.

After general discussion ensued it was agreed that the meeting time for the SWA January’s Board Meeting would be 2:00P.M. Mr. Ives inquired about changing the meeting date for the February meeting so as to attend the Southeast Recycling Conference in Florida. Chairman Hughes stated that would be discussed at the January 22, 2019, Board Meeting.

**MOTION TO ADJOURN**

There being no further business to come before the Board, **Mr. Schwartzkopf moved, seconded by Mr. Ives to adjourn the meeting. The Motion was carried** and the Workshop was adjourned at 3:42 P.M.

Minutes approved on January 22, 2019.

**HORRY COUNTY SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY, INC.**

BY: \_\_\_\_\_(L. S.)

Michael H. Hughes, Chairman

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_(L. S.)

J. Michael Campbell, Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_(L. S.)

Pam J. Creech

\_\_\_\_\_(L. S.)

Bo Ives

\_\_\_\_\_(L. S.)  
Samuel T. Johnson, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_(L. S.)  
W. Norfleet Jones

\_\_\_\_\_(L. S.)  
Carl H. Schwartzkopf