

Landfill Study Results
Public Input meeting
October 11, 2018

What are the biggest drivers causing the difference in the three options?

The largest contributor to the difference between the existing site and two new comparison sites is the cost of labor to operate the facilities. In each case, salaries comprise approximately 25 percent of the total estimated cost.

Bond holders report states a \$500,000 loss in the sanitation budget. So the difference in operating costs should be more like \$1.3 million and not \$1.9 million.

The sanitation budget includes other items besides landfill disposal operations. The existing landfill operation does not operate at a loss. See attached page from CAFR with explanation of landfill financials.

Twice a week garbage collection is expensive. Once a week collection would decrease costs.

Switching from collection twice per week to once per week would decrease costs. However, it was the City's intent in recently choosing to maintain twice per week collection so that the second collection would eventually switch to be the weekly recycling collection event.

Has there been any consideration on aesthetics? For example, building anything to screen the expansion.

Consideration has been given to aesthetics for both the potential expansion and the potential new landfill sites. Some of the options considered include vegetative screening such as trees, phased landfill construction to produce a finished appearance nearest the adjacent roadway as soon as possible, and other items.

What are the projected life spans of the other landfill sites?

The projected life of a new site would depend on how much land was purchased and how each site was developed. For comparative purposes, construction of disposal cells and associated items was based on the amount of waste disposal anticipated within the duration of the outlook period.

Study was presented to pay costs over 20 years. Why aren't they paid off over the life span of the new sites? If the life span was 40 years and only one facility was used, staffing costs would be less.

The study was not presented to pay costs over 20 years; the 20-year cost outlook was based on what anticipated expenditures would be for each site for each year for the next 20 years. All costs were calculated back to present-day value. Any bonding, extension of costs, etc., could be applied to each site, but to keep the cost comparisons direct, present value was used.

If the life span was 40 years and only one facility was used, staffing costs would be less. This holds true for only the potential expansion. For any new site, the existing site would remain in use for other waste operations, such as composting, appliances and tires, inert waste, and other items.

Hire out waste disposal.

The City of Minot is committed to providing the essential service of waste disposal.

The City used to contract with a private waste hauler for compost collection. When activity in Western ND started to pick up due to the oil boom, the private waste hauler stopped bidding our compost collection. This resulted in the City spending over \$300,000 on trucks, roll-off tanks and the need to hire additional employees to continue to provide this service to the residents.

When the new hospital is operating, and there is a bird strike, helicopter goes down, who will take responsibility for killing patient and staff?

Bird strike accidents most commonly involve waterfowl and migratory birds, which are prevalent in wetland areas such as exist in the vicinity of the new hospital site. These birds, as well as any birds present at the landfill, were present prior to the construction of the new hospital facility.

Does the projected \$111 million include money that will have to be paid back for the land that was already purchased?

No. It has not yet been determined whether or not the money spent on the land will have to be paid back.

Recycling would extend the life expectancy of the new facility.

Recycling would extend the life expectancy of any MSW disposal facility option selected. However, recyclables in the waste stream comprise a relatively small percentage of the total amount of MSW disposed. In addition, only a portion of the recyclables would actually be removed from the waste stream due to participation and efficiency considerations. Minot residential garbage is approximately 20 percent of the total waste stream. To have a measurable impact, recycling will need to be looked at with commercial haulers hauling from businesses and other communities.

What are other cities in the region kicking in when the current facility closes?

All waste generators bringing waste to the facility will continue to pay disposal fees. These disposal fees are set based on facility costs.

There is some liability in taking in other counties garbage.

Wastes brought to the facility are monitored for content. The liability for waste composition rests with the generator of the waste.

Implementing recycling? Where is the city at on that?

The City has implemented a cart-based collection system with twice per week collection. The City is currently undertaking a study to determine the best way to collect and sort recyclables for end use.

Split the cost of recycling with a bigger city like Bismarck.

Certain costs of recycling, such as local collection and hauling, have limited potential for cost sharing.

There is a bird problem. The flock is so huge for miles out town.

Birds are common in the area, especially during periods of migration.

What was the life span of the Superfund site?

10 years.

Isn't it time to just get the landfill out of town?

The existing landfill site is outside City limits, as are all other sites under consideration at this time.

Is the entire cost of moving the landfill site going back on the residents?

If the landfill site is relocated, residents would pay a higher cost for collection due to the longer transport distance. The operation of both the existing and new landfill sites would be supported by disposal fees, which are currently not charged to City residents unless they haul garbage to the facility themselves in addition to the garbage collected by the City on its regular collection schedule.

Wouldn't reducing the number of collection days cut costs? Then we could move the landfill outside of Minot.

Reducing the number of collection days would cut collection costs but would not be anticipated to affect disposal costs. In addition, it is the City's intent to eventually implement once per week garbage collection and once per week recycling collection.

Does the long haul cost breakdown include outlying cities, commercial costs, and residential costs?

No. For the long haul option, other entities would need to transport their waste either directly or to a local (Minot) transfer facility. The long haul cost includes hauling the waste to a remote facility.

Does the city even have a legal responsibility to accept trash?

The City has a responsibility to its residents to provide essential services, including garbage disposal. This may be through another entity legally. The City Council has elected to provide this service directly.

Are the numbers projected with a static population?

The waste tonnages are projected based on historical trends in waste amounts disposed. These historical trends were affected in part by population trends, but this is not the only contributing factor to the historical trends in waste amounts.

The previous landfill was moved out of town, and now the city has grown up around it again. The landfill should be moved further out. The city has lost control of sanitation.

The existing landfill site remains outside City limits. By offering the service directly, the City retains control of garbage collection and disposal.

Why does the city want to run the trash? It would be cheaper to hire it out.

Existing options for external disposal are limited and are more expensive due to the cost of hauling waste a much longer distance.

Landfill right next to the hospital will not be aesthetically pleasing, and you cannot grow trees tall enough to block it out.

The existing landfill site is more than a mile from the new hospital site.

Taking the city out of the landfill business. This option was not presented.

Existing options for external disposal are limited and are more expensive due to the cost of hauling waste a much longer distance. If the City does not provide this service directly, costs may fluctuate unexpectedly beyond the control of City government. In addition, an outside provider may simply choose to suspend this service without notice, leaving the City with even fewer and much more costly options.

Thinking in the short term (20 years) does not make much sense.

Industry cost projections beyond a 20-year window become much less realistic due to the potential for regulatory, industry, and operational changes. It was the intent of the cost estimates to choose a window for which reasonable expectations of consistency could be applied.

Poll was conducting by citizen in the room of who was in favor of expanding. Minot residents have no pride in this city.

A show of hands was requested in this regard by an attendee of the recent public input meeting. Many Minot residents, including but not limited to all those who took valuable time from their schedules to attend this meeting because they care about community issues, do take pride in their City and its dedication to provide essential services to its residents.

The study appears to have been done quickly and incompletely in order to get it council vote quicker.

The study was performed to include a designated scope of work, which will be completed as requested.

With the new hospital being nearby, what about the air quality? The air has to be cycled through the new hospital constantly. And those on the 6th floor will not have an aesthetically pleasing view. And there will be birds in the flight path.

Landfill operations affect air quality by generating dust, typically from roadway travel, which is minimized by application of water during dry periods, and from generation of landfill gas, which is minimal at this facility based on actual gas generation testing

The expanded landfill site will comprise a miniscule amount of the panoramic view from the 6th floor and would not affect views from all sides of the hospital.

Who else out in the country is going to want the landfill?

It is typically difficult to secure a new landfill site, typically due to the “Not In My Back Yard” philosophy. However, as a potential economic and commercial site, there may be affinity for its development.

Did the focus group talk about zoning?

Yes. Any of the sites considered would involve a change in zoning to implement landfill disposal.

Did focus group talk about other communities requirements?

Other communities’ requirements differ widely. These requirements were not discussed in detail.

If the hospital can invest in a new facility, then the city can.

The City is considering the available options, including a new facility.

Explanation of the loss on balance sheet.

The balance sheet is itemized and available for viewing as public record. The balance sheet for sanitation includes much more than landfill disposal, which does not operate at a loss.

Will the new sites be expandable?

The expandability of any new site depends on how much land area is purchased. Current cost estimates are based on purchasing one section of land, not all of which may be used for disposal due to the necessity for related facilities such as stormwater treatment, wastewater treatment, buffer, and soil borrow.

Why did the study not include hauling the solid waste to the Clean Harbors Landfill in Sawyer?

Clean Harbors Landfill in Sawyer is a hazardous waste landfill and does not accept MSW.