

**INTEGRATED SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANNING PROJECT
WESTERN WYOMING PLANNING GROUP**

SUMMARY OF THE JANUARY 30, 2009 REGIONAL PLANNING MEETING

The following information is a general summary of the issues discussed at the January 30, 2009 regional planning meeting that was held at the BLM office in Pinedale. Several attendees participated by conference call. The meeting began at 10:00 AM, and concluded at approximately 3:30 PM.

Attendees

Rick Hoffman, Sublette County
Bill Cramer, Sublette County Commission
Joel Bousman, Sublette County Commission
John Linn, Sublette County Commission
Marti Seipp, Sublette Citizens for Recycling JPB
Caroline Sulenta, Sublette Citizens for Recycling JPB
Susan Cramer, Sublette Citizens for Recycling JPB
Melanie and Morrell Woffinden, Tri-Town Recycling JPB
Tammy and James Martinz, Tri-Town Recycling JPB
Dustin Taylor, Tri-Town Recycling JPB
Jonathan VanDyke, Pinedale Roundup
Kirk Johnson, Sublette County Solid Waste Department
Steve Story, Teton County Engineering
Andy Schwartz, Teton County Commission
Heather Overholser, Jackson Community Recycling JPB
Tammie Archibald, Lincoln County Commission
Kent Connelly, Lincoln County Commission
Mary Crosby, Lincoln County Solid Waste Manager
Jodi Dillree, Kemmerer Area Recycling Effort
Celeste & Guy Jacobson, Star Valley Disposal
John Woodward, Lincoln County Planning
Maureen Meagher, Western Wyoming R&CD
Ryan Lyman, Lincoln County Landfill Department
Scott Wakeman, Lincoln County Landfill Department
Betsy Wagner, Uinta Recycling Inc. Board
Jon Turner, Uinta County Solid Waste Department
Dan Robinson, Uinta County Solid Waste Department
Craig McOmie, Wyoming DEQ
Ken Schreuder, Trihydro Corporation
Marge Bedessem, Trihydro Corporation
Sam Hartpence, Trihydro Corporation

Following introductions of attendees, a slide presentation was provided to guide the group discussion. The following discussion headings correspond to those used in the slide

presentation. A copy of the slide presentation is available on the project website at www.westernwyomingiswm.com/Documents.aspx.

ISWM Project Schedule and Tasks

Following introductions and review of the meeting agenda, an overview of the ISWM planning project schedule and tasks was provided. It was noted that the project is currently in “Phase 3 Draft Plan”.

ISWM Planning Process Requirements and Realities

An outline of the legislative planning requirements and several realities of the planning process were highlighted. The following points were discussed:

- Although ISWM plans are due July 1, 2009, implementation of the ISWM plans is optional.
- There may be no single alternative that will solve everyone’s solid waste issues, so some planning partners may prefer different alternatives.
- The purpose of the ISWM planning process is to provide local decision makers with the information they need to make good decisions. Final decisions about which alternative to implement (or not) and the subsequent timing of any implementation are up to the local decision makers.

What Do Existing Systems Look Like?

Summaries of the existing facilities and regionalization activities were provided. The following points were discussed:

- The costs provided represent the annual life-cycle cost of the facilities, including development, operating, and closure/post-closure costs. In most cases, operating costs dominate the annual life-cycle cost of facilities.
- Unlined landfill costs are deceiving because in many cases, it may not be an option to continue without liners.
- The transfer station costs provided do not include tipping fees at the landfills.
- Some regionalization within counties, across county lines, and across state lines is already occurring.

What Alternatives Are Being Considered?

General descriptions of each of the three alternatives were provided, including the assumptions associated with each. The following point was discussed:

- The alternatives considered are based on the recommendations identified by the planning group at the March 2008 regional planning meeting in Kemmerer.

Alternative #1 Issues

After highlighting the major issues associated with Alternative #1, the following points were discussed:

- Existing landfills in Evanston, Marbleton, and Kemmerer would be constructed with engineered containment systems (i.e., liners) for municipal solid waste (MSW).
- Efforts would be made to segregate at least 20% of the incoming waste stream as construction/demolition wastes (CDW) so that it can be managed as clean fill, recycled, composted, or disposed in unlined cells.
- Existing recycling programs would be expanded to capture higher percentages of the waste stream, with the goal of making these programs more cost-competitive with transfer and disposal systems.
- Public demand for recycling services may be considered in the same light as public demand for other services such as libraries and parks, which do not generate enough revenue to offset the costs of these services.

Alternative #2 Issues

After highlighting the major issues associated with Alternative #2, the following points were discussed:

- Alternative #2 is similar to Alternative #1, with one exception. The Kemmerer Landfill would not be constructed with an engineered containment system, and the MSW from Lincoln County would be managed at the Marbleton Landfill, which was determined to be a cheaper alternative than the Evanston Landfill.
- For Alternative #2, the Evanston Landfill was originally selected in lieu of the Kemmerer Landfill as one of the two potential regional landfills because it is relatively new, has significant permitted capacity, and provided better geographic coverage of the planning area.

Alternative #3 Issues

After highlighting the major issues associated with Alternative #3, the following points were discussed:

- Alternative #3 represents the most significant change with respect to how wastes are currently being handled in the planning area.
- Teton County wastes would be disposed at the unlined Circular Butte Landfill near Mud Lake Idaho, and MSW generated in Lincoln, Sublette, and Uinta Counties would be disposed at the Rock Springs Landfill, which is expected to be lined.
- Alternative disposal facilities in Utah were considered, but the facilities that were closest to the planning area are currently prohibited from taking wastes from outside their current service areas. The current cost of these larger out-of-state lined facilities are in the range of approximately \$22 to \$26 per ton.

Alternative #1 Costs

The annual life-cycle costs of the existing facilities and Alternative #1 were summarized. In addition, the initial capital costs associated with implementing Alternative #1 were highlighted. The following points were discussed:

- The initial capital costs are included in the annual life-cycle costs of the alternatives (i.e., they are not additional costs).

- The estimated costs for Lincoln County are based on observations of the incoming waste stream rather than scale data, and suggest relatively high segregation and diversion rates. If the assumptions regarding the nature of the incoming waste stream are incorrect, the estimated life-cycle costs may be higher or lower.
- The annual life-cycle cost of Alternative #1 is the lowest of the three alternatives for Lincoln County.

Alternative #2 Costs

The annual life-cycle costs of the existing facilities and Alternative #2 were summarized. In addition, the initial capital costs associated with implementing Alternative #2 were highlighted. The following points were discussed:

- The annual life-cycle cost of Alternative #2 is the lowest of the three alternatives for Teton County. This is due to the fact that the economies of scale of the Marbleton Landfill improve due to the increased tonnage from Lincoln County, which lowers the cost of managing each ton of waste at the Marbleton Landfill.
- Although the annual life-cycle cost of Alternative #2 is higher than the annual life-cycle cost of Alternative #1 for Lincoln County, the initial capital costs associated with implementing Alternative #2 are approximately \$3.5 million less than the initial capital costs associated with implementing Alternative #1.
- The costs provided for the existing facilities, Alternative #1, and Alternative #2 represent the gross cost of facilities in each county. If revenues associated with tipping fees for wastes from Teton and/or Lincoln County are considered, the net cost of the existing facilities, Alternative #1, and Alternative #2 for Sublette County decrease to \$1.12, \$1.27, and \$1.29 million, respectively.

Alternative #3 Costs

The annual life-cycle costs of the existing facilities and Alternative #3 were summarized. In addition, the initial capital costs associated with implementing Alternative #3 were highlighted. The following points were discussed:

- The annual life-cycle cost of Alternative #3 is the lowest of the three alternatives for both Sublette and Uinta Counties. However, under Alternative #3, all of the cost of operating the Sublette County facilities is incurred by Sublette County because the Marbleton Landfill is no longer generating revenue from the disposal of wastes generated by other counties.
- For Uinta County, the initial capital costs of Alternative #3 are approximately one-half the initial capital costs of the other two alternatives.
- The cost analyses were based on fuel prices in early 2008, and were increased by approximately \$1 per gallon to accommodate concerns regarding the future increases in fuel prices. Analysis of the impact of fuel prices on the cost of alternatives involving transportation of wastes suggests that variations in the cost of fuel do not significantly affect transportation costs, which are dominated by wages and hourly equipment rates.

Public Input

The methods implemented to solicit public input were summarized. The following points were discussed:

- With the exception of input provided by the stakeholders that have attended the public meetings, very little public input has been provided.
- Additional outreach efforts are planned once the Draft Plan is ready for distribution.

Local Stakeholder Issues and Recommendations

Local stakeholders were asked to break into small groups to discuss the pros and cons of each alternative, rank the three alternatives, and identify any other ideas that may be worth considering based on what they know about the existing alternatives. The following summaries were provided at the conclusion of the small group discussions:

Lincoln County

- Based on correspondence provided by the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality (WDEQ), engineered containment systems (i.e., liners) will be required if the Cokeville and Kemmerer Landfills continue to accept MSW. Therefore, continued operation of the existing facilities “as-is” does not appear to be a viable option.
- Alternative #1 is preferred over the other alternatives because it allows Lincoln County to retain local control and limit transportation issues. Lincoln County is currently taking steps to construct an engineered containment system at the Kemmerer Landfill, and accept MSW from Thayne and Cokeville. The local stakeholders also indicated that Lincoln County may be willing to accept MSW from generators outside of Lincoln County.
- Support for Alternative #2 is limited due to concerns regarding the transportation routes to the Marbleton Landfill. Both the northern and southern routes are unreliable in the winter. Hauling wastes to the Evanston Landfill and the Circular Butte Landfill may be preferable, although the associated transportation routes are also unreliable in the winter. It was noted that similar concerns were identified when the Horsethief Canyon Transfer Station in Teton County was initially proposed, but that these concerns were able to be addressed by the design and operation of the facility.
- Support for Alternative #3 is limited due to the fact that the remaining unlined capacity of the Kemmerer Landfill is expected to be consumed by November of 2010, and the amount of time that may be necessary to implement Alternative #3. It was noted that the required permitting issues could be addressed by submitting a request to change the service area of the receiving facilities, and then completing a 45-day public comment period. Local stakeholders also raised concerns that Alternative #3 could increase Lincoln County’s corrective action liability (beyond that associated with the existing Lincoln County facilities). However, if Lincoln County is unable to implement Alternative #1 in a timely manner, it may be necessary to consider limited use of Alternative #3.

Uinta County

- Uinta County has not yet received a final determination regarding the need for engineered containment systems at either the Bridger Valley Landfill or the Evanston Landfill.

- Support for Alternatives #1 and #2 depends on whether or not the WDEQ determines that an engineered containment system will be necessary at the Evanston Landfill. If an engineered containment system is not required, Uinta County may choose to continue operating the Evanston Landfill “as-is” (i.e., unlined). If the Bridger Valley Landfill is required to install engineered containment systems, it may be appropriate to consider a transfer station for MSW.
- Alternative #3 may be considered for either Evanston or Bridger Valley, but it may be preferable to haul to the Kemmerer Landfill instead of the Rock Springs Landfill to limit transportation costs and concerns regarding the frequent closure of I-80 in the winter.
- Regardless of which alternative may be pursued, Uinta County is interested in making their existing recycling program more effective and efficient. Curbside collection and more public education and marketing are being considered to support this goal.

Sublette County

- It appears likely that the WDEQ will require an engineered containment system at the Marbleton Landfill. If this happens, continued operation of the Marbleton Landfill “as-is” may not be a viable option.
- Current regionalization efforts between Sublette and Teton Counties are working well, and have the potential to lead the two counties to a common preferred alternative.
- There are pros and cons to all alternatives, but Alternative #1 appears to have the most support. Sublette County has a significant investment in the Marbleton Landfill, which has approximately 60 years or more of remaining site life. Alternative #1 is also attractive because it has the lowest net annual life-cycle cost of the three alternatives.
- Alternative #2 could be considered, but based on the comments provided by Lincoln County stakeholders it appears unlikely that Lincoln County will pursue Alternative #2. There may also be some local opposition to accepting wastes from more counties, as well as the resultant increase in local traffic. However, Sublette County may be willing to accept wastes from LaBarge at the Marbleton Landfill.
- Sublette County support for Alternative #3 is limited because the net annual life-cycle cost of this option is the highest of the three alternatives.
- Regardless of which alternative may be pursued, Sublette County is interested in making their existing recycling programs more effective and efficient.

Teton County

- The stakeholders for Teton County were unable to stay for the small group session, but indicated that they would meet with Sublette County at a later date to discuss common concerns and opportunities.
- Preliminary feedback from Teton County stakeholders suggested several concerns regarding Alternative #3. Although Teton County has already shipped limited amounts of waste to the Circular Butte Landfill, the majority of Teton County wastes (and potential environmental liabilities) are currently at the Marbleton Landfill. It may be preferable, therefore, to continue use of the Marbleton Landfill where Teton County has an opportunity to participate in the management of the facility. In addition, the round-trip mileage to the Circular Butte Landfill may prohibit drivers from making more than one trip per day, which could adversely affect the efficient use of drivers and vehicles.

Regional Stakeholder Issues and Recommendations

The following recommendations were formed based upon the issues and feedback provided by the local planning partners:

- Sublette and Teton Counties may be supportive of Alternative #1 as a preferred alternative.
- Lincoln and Uinta Counties may be supportive of a revised Alternative #2, which would utilize the Kemmerer Landfill in lieu of the Evanston Landfill as a regional landfill. Based on the comments provided, it may be appropriate to consider the economics of the Kemmerer Landfill accepting wastes from either the Bridger Valley Landfill (Alternative #2A), or the Bridger Valley Landfill and the Evanston Landfill (Alternative #2B).

What's Next?

Trihydro will compile the information and feedback provided by the stakeholders, and complete further analysis of Alternatives #2A and #2B, as described above.

One or more follow-up meetings will be scheduled to discuss potential implementation strategies prior to the issuance of the Draft ISWM Plan.