

AGENDA

LOUDON COUNTY SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL COMMISSION

July 8, 2014

6:30 p.m.

LOUDON COUNTY COURTHOUSE ANNEX

Loudon, Tennessee

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes – June 10, 2014
 - a) Correction - Chairman's re-statement about percentage of out of county waste
3. Items of Public Concern
4. Tate & Lyle Update
5. Cash Activity Report
 - a) Parsing out Poplar Springs Post-Closure Funds
 - 1994 LCSWDC board action to combine funds
6. Operations Report
 - a) Permit mod update
 - b) Air permit status
7. Operating Agreement Modifications
8. Investment Options
9. Attorney's Report
10. Chairman's Report
 - a) Tree blow-down estimate
 - b) LCSWDC Annual Financial Statements from 1993 to 2013 availability (missing 1996 and 1998) and web posting
11. Other Items of Commission's Consideration
12. Adjourn

MONTHLY CASH REPORT

June OF 2014

CASH RECEIPTS:

Landfill Host Fees	12,617.11
Closure/Post Clo. Security Fees	19,160.52
Interest Received	190.50
Tire Grants	1,686.00
Other: _____	

Total Monthly Revenue: 33,654.13

CASH DISBURSEMENTS:

Commissioner Meeting Pymts.	350.00
Commissioner Travel/Seminar	455.80
Meeting Expense	
Legal Services	3,369.40
Audit/Accounting Services	
Consultants	
Trustee's Commission	
Debt Service/Loudon - Water Lines	
Santek-Tire Grant	
Engineering Services	
Office Supplies	139.94
Building and Contents Insurance	
Other: _____	
Other: Contracted Svc-Mowing	800.00

Total Monthly Expense: 5,115.14

Change in Net Assets: 28,538.99

BEGINNING CASH BALANCE: \$ 2,832,359.30

CLOSURE RESERVES:	\$ 1,223,277.52
Total Closure Reserves and General Account	\$ 2,860,898.29
GENERAL ACCOUNT:	\$ 1,637,620.77

ENDING CASH BALANCE: \$ 2,860,898.29

CHANGE IN CASH POSITION \$ 28,538.99

CY 2013 Out of county waste to Matlock Bend

Source	Tons
Bradley	50.19
Knox	41692.83
McMinn	558.06
Monroe	459.25
Roane	7972.91
Blount	9.74
Rhea	28.95

50,771.93 Total tons out of county to Matlock Bend

Loudon waste going to Matlock Bend 200,897.84

Loudon County waste and out of county waste going to Matlock Bend	50,771.93 + 20,089.84 =	251,669.77 Total waste to Matlock Bend
---	-------------------------	--

Loudon County waste going to other out of county facilities	
Bradley County Landfill	3548.18
Chestnut Ridge Landfill	1552.61
McMinn Sanitary Landfill	116.8
Meadow Branch Landfill	11263.53
West Camden Landfill	403.06

16,884.18
Total tons from Loudon County to other facilities

Loudon County Waste generated CY 2013

Disposal at Matlock Bend	200,897.84
Disposal at other out of county landfills	16,884.18

217,782.02 CY 2013 Total tons Loudon County disposed

Percent out of county waste disposal at Matlock Bend	(50771.93/251669.77) x 100 =	20%
Percent Loudon County waste exported to other facilities	(16884.18/251669.77) x 100 =	7%
Net difference from out of county		13%

Monthly Operations Report

Matlock Bend Landfill

July 8, 2014

Presented by:

Santek Environmental, Inc.

SANTEK



WasteServices

650 25th Street, N.W., Suite 100
Cleveland, Tennessee 37311
(423) 303-7101

Email: mail@santekenviro.com
Internet: www.santekenviro.com

I. OPERATIONS

- A. Tonnage Report
- B. Customer Report
- C. Materials Classification Report
- D. Tire Report

II. ENGINEERING

- A. Remaining Airspace Utilization Schedule
- B. Status of Major Permit Modification & NOD
- C. Tier II Testing Results

III. HOST & SECURITY FEES

LANDFILL TONNAGE VOLUME
MONTH ENDING -
JUNE 2014

MATLOCK BEND LANDFILL

MONTH	2013	2014	2013 TO 2014
JANUARY	21183.26	18181.51	-3001.75
FEBRUARY	18784.45	18827.30	42.85
MARCH	21164.32	19821.19	-1343.13
APRIL	23808.40	21488.87	-2319.53
MAY	24577.63	19160.50	-5417.13
JUNE	21643.84	15228.14	-6415.70
JULY			0.00
AUGUST			0.00
SEPTEMBER			0.00
OCTOBER			0.00
NOVEMBER			0.00
DECEMBER			0.00
TOTAL	131161.90	112707.51	(18,454.39)

**DAILY AVG FOR ANY
 RUNNING 30 DAY
 PERIOD** **507.61**

CITY OF LOUDON

MONTH	2013	2014	2013 TO 2014
JANUARY	361.29	326.75	-34.54
FEBRUARY	303.30	322.26	18.96
MARCH	348.14	355.95	7.81
APRIL	427.14	380.93	-46.21
MAY	429.42	383.29	-46.13
JUNE	367.47	402.25	34.78
JULY			0.00
AUGUST			0.00
SEPTEMBER			0.00
OCTOBER			0.00
NOVEMBER			0.00
DECEMBER			0.00
TOTAL	2236.76	2171.43	(65.33)

LOUDON COUNTY

MONTH	2013	2014	2013 TO 2014
JANUARY	453.60	413.74	-39.86
FEBRUARY	384.82	391.37	6.55
MARCH	436.97	444.91	7.94
APRIL	479.58	436.44	-43.14
MAY	474.49	463.42	-11.07
JUNE	452.76	451.76	-1.00
JULY			0.00
AUGUST			0.00
SEPTEMBER			0.00
OCTOBER			0.00
NOVEMBER			0.00
DECEMBER			0.00
TOTAL	2682.22	2601.64	-80.58

LENOIR CITY

MONTH	2013	2014	2013 TO 2014
JANUARY	297.14	255.87	-41.27
FEBRUARY	261.57	256.28	-5.29
MARCH	270.08	307.30	37.22
APRIL	355.37	380.93	25.56
MAY	332.94	363.48	30.54
JUNE	295.24	333.05	37.81
JULY			0.00
AUGUST			0.00
SEPTEMBER			0.00
OCTOBER			0.00
NOVEMBER			0.00
DECEMBER			0.00
TOTAL	1812.34	1896.91	84.57

WASTE SERVICES OF TN

MONTH	2013	2014	2013 TO 2014
JANUARY	4596.48	5007.47	410.99
FEBRUARY	5069.18	4363.83	-705.35
MARCH	4998.69	4318.51	-680.18
APRIL	5925.28	4920.17	-1005.11
MAY	5132.10	4482.69	-649.41
JUNE	5270.28	4005.97	-1264.31
JULY			0.00
AUGUST			0.00
SEPTEMBER			0.00
OCTOBER			0.00
NOVEMBER			0.00
DECEMBER			0.00
TOTAL	30992.01	27098.64	(3,893.37)

TENNESSEE TRASH

MONTH	2013	2014	2013 TO 2014
JANUARY	1525.76	1509.64	-16.12
FEBRUARY	1358.88	1560.54	201.66
MARCH	1520.34	1778.92	258.58
APRIL	1821.18	2067.49	246.31
MAY	1860.16	2020.17	160.01
JUNE	1683.06	2012.92	329.86
JULY			0.00
AUGUST			0.00
SEPTEMBER			0.00
OCTOBER			0.00
NOVEMBER			0.00
DECEMBER			0.00
TOTAL	9769.38	10949.68	1,180.30

LANDFILL TONNAGE VOLUME
MONTH ENDING -
JUNE 2014

KIMBERLY CLARK - PAPER WASTE

MONTH	2013	2014	2013 TO 2014
JANUARY	6856.77	7846.43	989.66
FEBRUARY	5851.74	7663.61	1811.87
MARCH	7687.65	8275.51	587.86
APRIL	7018.70	8218.88	1200.18
MAY	8293.00	6458.22	-1834.78
JUNE	7282.70	3128.27	-4154.43
JULY			0.00
AUGUST			0.00
SEPTEMBER			0.00
OCTOBER			0.00
NOVEMBER			0.00
DECEMBER			0.00
TOTAL	42990.56	41590.92	(1,399.64)

TATE & LYLE - SLUDGE

MONTH	2013	2014	2013 TO 2014
JANUARY	2186.05	2088.33	-97.72
FEBRUARY	2377.30	2387.03	9.73
MARCH	2382.90	2292.99	-89.91
APRIL	2766.65	2601.69	-164.96
MAY	1879.97	2050.17	170.20
JUNE	2381.90	1700.20	-681.70
JULY			0.00
AUGUST			0.00
SEPTEMBER			0.00
OCTOBER			0.00
NOVEMBER			0.00
DECEMBER			0.00
TOTAL	13974.77	13120.41	(854.36)

PSC METALS INC

MONTH	2013	2014	2013 TO 2014
JANUARY	5100.02	1136.94	-3963.08
FEBRUARY	3992.14	1834.26	-2157.88
MARCH	3842.74	2139.46	-1703.28
APRIL	5550.21	2915.74	-2634.47
MAY	5413.60	2571.44	-2842.16
JUNE	4102.91	2708.47	-1394.44
JULY			0.00
AUGUST			0.00
SEPTEMBER			0.00
OCTOBER			0.00
NOVEMBER			0.00
DECEMBER			0.00
TOTAL	28001.62	13306.31	(14,695.31)

TATE & LYLE - ASH

MONTH	2013	2014	2013 TO 2014
JANUARY	771.87	933.76	161.89
FEBRUARY	884.91	567.17	-317.74
MARCH	943.56	90.20	-853.36
APRIL	1235.12	218.21	-1016.91
MAY	1205.39	356.37	-849.02
JUNE	1166.92	237.06	-929.86
JULY			0.00
AUGUST			0.00
SEPTEMBER			0.00
OCTOBER			0.00
NOVEMBER			0.00
DECEMBER			0.00
TOTAL	6207.77	2402.77	(3,805.00)

Materials Classification Report
Matlock Bend Landfill
Monthly Tonnage Summary June 2014

Material	Tonnage	2011 Sludge %		2012 Sludge %	
MSW		January	xx	January	6%
		February	xx	February	8%
MSW	<u>7,183</u>	March	16%	March	8%
Special Waste		April	12%	April	9%
		May	13%	May	8%
Other	5,852	June	12%	June	8%
Ash	373	July	11%	July	11%
Sludge	<u>1,820</u>	August	8%	August	10%
Total Special Waste	<u><u>8,045</u></u>	September	6%	September	10%
		October	6%	October	12%
		November	6%	November	10%
		December	7%	December	10%
Total MSW & SW	15,229				
Tires	39				
Total Material	<u><u>15,267</u></u>				
% MSW	<u>47%</u>				
% Special Waste	<u>53%</u>				
% Sludge	<u>12%</u>				

2013 Sludge %		2014 Sludge %	
January	11%	January	12%
February	13%	February	13%
March	12%	March	12%
April	12%	April	13%
May	10%	May	12%
June	13%	June	12%
July	11%	July	xx
August	9%	August	xx
September	12%	September	xx
October	10%	October	xx
November	12%	November	xx
December	13%	December	xx

**2013-2014 Matlock Bend
Landfill Tire Report**

Month	Tonnage
Jul-13	21.05
Aug-13	15.02
Sep-13	39.75
Oct-13	57.56
Nov-13	16.91
Dec-13	21.67
Jan-14	37.05
Feb-14	38.06
Mar-14	40.58
Apr-14	34.29
May-14	30.69
Jun-14	50.7
Total (tons)	403.33

Matlock Bend Landfill - Module H 2014 Airspace Projection / Construction Schedule

DATE	REMAINING AIRSPACE ¹ (CY)	MONTHLY TONNAGE	ACTUAL / PROJECTED ²	UTILIZATION FACTOR	MONTHLY VOLUME CONSUMED (CY)	ENDING MONTHLY REMAINING AIRSPACE (CY)
		18,626		1.07		
Sept. 20, 2013	576,461	-	-	-	-	-
Sept. 21-30, 2013	-	7,424	A	1.07	7,944	568,517
October	-	21,656	A	1.07	23,171	545,346
November	-	17,454	A	1.07	18,675	526,670
December	-	19,297	A	1.07	20,647	506,023
January '14	-	18,195	A	1.07	19,469	486,554
February	-	18,828	A	1.07	20,146	466,408
March	-	19,821	A	1.07	21,209	445,200
April	-	21,489	A	1.07	22,993	422,206
May	-	19,162	A	1.07	20,503	401,703
June	-	15,228	A	1.07	16,294	385,409
July	-	18,626	P	1.07	19,930	365,479
August	-	18,626	P	1.07	19,930	345,549
September	-	18,626	P	1.07	19,930	325,619
October	-	18,626	P	1.07	19,930	305,689
November	-	18,626	P	1.07	19,930	285,758
December	-	18,626	P	1.07	19,930	265,828

¹ = Remaining airspace based on Sept. 20, 2013 aerial survey.

Full Date

February-2016

² = Projected tonnages are based on a 3 month average per Matt Dillard on 6-2-09.

³ = Utilization rate based on the annual utilization rate per October 27, 2008 construction meeting (Avg. Utilization = 1.32 cy/ton)

Tonnage for Past 3 Months

April	21,489
May	19,162
June	15,228
Average	18,626

cc: Matt
Rob
Cheryl
Ron
Chris
Levi
Jason





650 25th Street NW, Ste 100
Cleveland, TN 37311

Phone: (423) 303-7101
Toll Free: (800) 467-9160
www.santekenviro.com

July 7, 2014

Loudon County Solid Waste Disposal Commission
100 River Road
P.O. Box 351
Loudon, TN 37774

Dear Steve:

Pursuant to Section 10.6 and 10.7 of the Sanitary Landfill Operation Agreement between Loudon and Santek as of July 1, 2007, Santek agreed to pay the Commission a host fee and security fee as defined in the Agreement. The following recap reflects the calculation for the period June 1, 2014 to June 30, 2014:

Host Fees (Greater of below) –	
Total Tip Fees Billed	\$260,574.07
Host Fee Percentage	4.00%
	<u>\$ 10,422.96</u>
Minimum Fee	<u>\$ 10,652.00</u>

Security Fees (Greater of below) –	
Total Tonnage Received	15,228.14
Rate per ton	\$ 1.00
Total	<u>\$ 15,228.14</u>

Total Tip Fees Billed	\$260,574.07
Security Fee Percentage	5.00%
	<u>\$ 13,028.70</u>

Our checks in payment of the above fees have been remitted to the above address for the Commission. Should you have any questions or need additional information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Andrew Kandy".

Andrew Kandy
Regional Controller

Memorandum

Date: 8 July 2014

To: Steve Field – Loudon County Solid Waste Disposal Commission

Copy to: Kevin Stevens - Kennerly, Montgomery & Finley, P.C.

From: Robert Bachus and Dave Heitz- Geosyntec Consultants

Subject: Comments Regarding Tier 2 Testing Report
Matlock Bend Landfill

BACKGROUND

At the request of the Loudon County Solid Waste Disposal Commission (LCSWDC), Geosyntec Consultants (Geosyntec) reviewed the May 2014 document prepared by Santek Waste Services (Santek) titled *2014 Tier 2 Testing and NMOC Estimates Report for Loudon County (Matlock Bend) Landfill, TDEC Solid Waste Permit No. SNL 53-103-020* (Tier 2 Report). A copy of the Tier 2 Report was provided to Geosyntec by LCSWDC for this review. The remainder of this document is organized to provide Geosyntec's review comments.

GEOSYNTEC REVIEW COMMENTS

This section provides Geosyntec's comments to the Tier 2 Report, which concludes that the NMOC calculations are significantly lower than the threshold that would trigger installation of a landfill gas collection system and flare. These results indicate that it will be more than five to seven years before a landfill gas management system is needed at the Matlock Bend Landfill. While this is good news from the perspective of being "required" to install a landfill gas management system, Geosyntec believes that there are a few items in the report that may trigger a response from TDEC. The following comments are provided.

- The report indicates that 49 samples were obtained in areas that had waste in place for longer than two years. Twenty six (26) samples were taken from active areas and 23 samples were obtained from closed areas. By regulation, samples should be collected in proportion to the respective size of the active and closed areas. Figure 1 in the Tier 2 Report provides a plan view of the site that shows the respective open/closed areas that

were used as the basis for sample selection. TDEC may want to see a more definitive delineation/confirmation of the sampled areas.

- According to information in Figure 1, two samples (i.e., Samples 45 and 34) appear to have been taken in a portion of the active area that contains waste that is less than two years old. If this is the case, then an inappropriate number of samples was obtained (i.e., only 47 samples were obtained in areas of the landfill that had waste that was at least two years old). TDEC may require that additional samples be obtained in the active area of the landfill.
- Regulations require that calculations be performed *“using the average NMOC concentration from the collected samples [40 CFR 60.754(a)(3)(i)].”* Technically, Geosyntec does not believe that this was done, as the report indicates that the NMOC concentrations of the canisters were “averaged.” This type calculation would be strictly correct only if all the canisters had equal quantities of composited samples. It appears that this was not strictly the case. However, if calculations are performed giving equal weight (but different concentration) to each sample in the composite, the difference in calculation results is relatively insignificant. Specifically, Santek calculated an average NMOC concentration of 82, while Geosyntec calculated an average NMOC concentration of 83. Under the *“Tier 2 Sampling Results and NMOC Emission Estimates”* section, the Tier 2 Report states, *“...the results of the analysis were averaged in accordance with 40 CFR 60.754”* Strictly speaking, this statement is not accurate and TDEC may require that additional clarifying information be provided regarding the method used for averaging the results.
- In all cases, sampling probes were installed at least 1 meter (i.e., ~3 feet) below the waste cover as required by the regulations. At five locations, the sampling probes were installed at depths ranging from 15 to 35 feet to obtain waste that was at least two years old. In these cases, there was new (i.e., young) waste over the old waste. Geosyntec does not interpret the regulations to mean that you have to insert probes that deep and is not aware of other operators doing this to access old waste. However, Geosyntec notes that it can be difficult to advance probes to those depths and that sampling these old waste zones may yield lower NMOC concentrations compared to samples obtained from the more moderate depths of “old” waste. This may, in fact, be of concern in that it potentially introduces a bias to the data. Having noted this, however, Geosyntec did not see any evidence of a bias in the reported data. Nevertheless, TDEC may inquire about the sampling depths.

- When compositing multiple samples into one canister, it is necessary to have at least 1 liter of each sample. Santek appears to have composited up to five samples into one canister. This represents acceptable practice as long as a 6 liter (minimum) canister is used, because it is very difficult to collect a sample comprising exactly 5 liters. Geosyntec could not confirm the size of the canisters used for the sample collection and compositing. TDEC may request additional information regarding canister and sample size.
- The procedures identified in the regulations for composite sampling in part reads “...*For each composite, the sampling rate, collection times, beginning and ending cylinder vacuums, or alternative volume measurements must be recorded to verify that composite volumes are equal. Composite sample volumes should not be less than one liter unless evidence can be provided to substantiate the accuracy of smaller volumes.*” [40 CFR60.754(a)(3)]. The Tier 2 Report only includes sampling rate and beginning and ending cylinder vacuums, but not the times. The chain of custody has the start and end time for each cylinder, but not each sample in the composite. TDEC may question this procedure regarding strict compliance with the regulations.
- The biggest potential problem noted by Geosyntec regards two of the composite samples that were included. According to Method 25C (see excerpt in Table 1 below), the sample is valid if the concentration of nitrogen is <20% OR if the concentration of oxygen is <5%. From the text in Section 8.4.2 of Method 25C, “*Use Method 3C to determine the percent N₂ in each cylinder. The presence of N₂ indicates either infiltration of ambient air into the landfill gas sample or an inappropriate testing site has been chosen where anaerobic decomposition has not begun. The landfill gas sample is acceptable if the concentration of N₂ is less than 20 percent. Alternatively, Method 3C may be used to determine the oxygen content of each cylinder as an air infiltration test. With this option, the oxygen content of each cylinder must be less than 5 percent.*”[Method 25C 8.4.2] . The reported lab test results indicate that composite Sample 4 had 22% nitrogen and 6.7% oxygen, while composite Sample 6 has 29% nitrogen and 8.9% oxygen. Geosyntec interprets the regulations to imply that the sample is valid if either nitrogen is <20% OR oxygen is <5%, but if both concentrations exceed these limits the samples may not be considered “acceptable.” If TDEC takes this view, this implies that ~40% (i.e., 2 of 5) of the canisters should not have been used for the Tier 2 testing. There is no indication that TDEC would allow for this type of allowance. In a subsequent conversation between Santek and Geosyntec during a visit to the Matlock Bend Landfill, Santek indicated that they were aware of this potential problem and reported that the field testing results

indicated that the nitrogen and oxygen levels were within their respective acceptable range, implying a potential problem related to the laboratory procedure. Santek indicated that they were prepared to defend the sample validity to TDEC if requested.

- Geosyntec notes that there are procedures identified in the regulations that allow the use of the collected samples in cases where the nitrogen or oxygen concentrations exceed the allowable range. The Tier 2 Report does include text that states the results “*were corrected using the nitrogen concentrations.*” However, the laboratory report does not show the raw data, adjusted data, or the conversions used in its adjustments, so there is no way for Geosyntec (or TDEC) to confirm the corrections or to assess whether the samples should have been used.

Table 1. Excerpt from Text of Method 25C

Section	Quality control measure	Effect
8.4.1	Verify that landfill gas sample contains less than 20 percent N ₂ or 5 percent O ₂ .	Ensures that ambient air was not drawn into the landfill gas sample.
10.1, 10.2	NMOC analyzer initial and daily performance checks.	Ensures precision of analytical results.

CLOSURE

Geosyntec appreciates the opportunity to assist LCSWDC in this review of the Santek's Tier 2 Report. If LCSWDC has any questions regarding information presented in this memorandum, please do not hesitate to contact Geosyntec.

Memorandum

Date: 8 July 2014

To: Steve Field – Loudon County Solid Waste Disposal Commission

Copy to: Kevin Stevens - Kennerly, Montgomery & Finley, P.C.

From: Robert Bachus - Geosyntec Consultants

Subject: Comments Regarding Closure and Post-closure Care Funding
Matlock Bend Landfill

BACKGROUND

At the request of the Loudon County Solid Waste Disposal Commission (LCSWDC), Geosyntec Consultants (Geosyntec) reviewed a document prepared by Santek Waste Services (Santek) titled *Proposal to Restructure Matlock Bend Landfill Closure Post-closure Obligations (Santek C/PCC Proposal)* that is scheduled to be presented to the LCSWDC at the scheduled 8 July 2014 LCSWDC meeting. A copy of the Santek C/PCC Proposal, annotated by Geosyntec, is attached. The remainder of this document is organized to provide Geosyntec's review comments.

GEOSYNTEC REVIEW COMMENTS

This section provides Geosyntec comments to the Santek C/PCC Proposal. In general, Geosyntec believes that the spirit of this document addresses the long-term needs of the LCSWDC. With reference to the numbered annotations on the attached Santek C/PCC Proposal, Geosyntec provides the following specific comments and recommends that details regarding these comments should be addressed in subsequent submittals from Santek. In the remainder of this section, specific text from the Santek C/PCC Proposal is identified in italic-type font, followed immediately by a Geosyntec's comment/response in regular-type font.

Santek Item 1. To create a financial mechanism that accrues sufficient closure/post-closure funds throughout the life of the Matlock Bend Landfill...To close portions of the landfill as part of Santek's contractual obligation...

Santek Item 4. Create a Control Agreement to perfect the Commission's security interest in the Financial Assurance Account and to protect funds as they're deposited into the account...

Geosyntec Comment No. 4: Geosyntec agrees with this concept and recommends that legal counsel for LCSWDC prepare/review the necessary documents to assure that the C/PCC funds are protected and that the funds are adequate to cover the anticipated costs for all C/PCC responsibilities.

Santek Item 5. Increase the closure/post-closure dollar amount to \$1.04 per ton, and review and adjust the amount annually based on various factors including:

- *Remaining Airspace & Density Factor*
- *Existing Closure/Post-closure Reserves*
- *Anticipated Closure/Post-closure Liabilities (including expansion area)*
- *TDEC Inflation Factor*
- *Remaining Closure/Post-closure Liabilities...*

Geosyntec Comment No. 5: Geosyntec is not aware of the specific calculations that were used to arrive at the suggested amount of \$1.04, nor is it aware of specifically how the rate would be adjusted annually. Geosyntec recommends that the algorithm for making this assessment/calculation be reviewed and agreed upon by all parties. It is likely that the Santek calculation assumes some type of interest on the invested funds or other type of return on investment (ROI) from the accrued/invested funds through (and beyond) the life of the current Santek contract. Geosyntec recommends that there be provisions established and agreed upon to incrementally make adjustments (and subsequent deposits) to assure that the C/PCC is adequately funded at all stages of the contract and throughout the life of the landfill, being careful not to "rear load" the financial accruals. Again, Geosyntec believes that it is necessary for all parties to agree to the all interim assessment/funding steps and actions.

Santek Item 6. Amend Section 8 of the Landfill Management Agreement to reflect a phased closure approach as well as the establishment of the Financial Assurance Account and Control Agreement...

Geosyntec Comment No. 6: Geosyntec agrees with this in concept but recommends that all parties agree on the interpretation of “phased closure.”

Santek Item 7. Determine the amount to be deposited into the Financial Assurance Account...

Geosyntec Comment No. 7: Geosyntec recommends that LCSWDC decide on the specific amount that will be transferred from its existing C/PCC funds and deposited into the account that will now be managed by Santek. Geosyntec notes that some of the “fees” provided to LCSWDC from operations of the Matlock Bend Landfill consider normal operations and other “host fees” that are used at the discretion of LCSWDC (e.g., buying land for buffer, soil, storm water management, etc.) and explicitly not intended to be part of the C/PCC fund.

CLOSURE

Geosyntec appreciates the opportunity to assist LCSWDC in this review of the Santek C/PCC Proposal. If LCSWDC has any questions regarding information presented in this memorandum, please do not hesitate to contact Geosyntec.

PROPOSAL TO RESTRUCTURE MATLOCK BEND LANDFILL CLOSURE POST-CLOSURE
OBLIGATIONS

Presented to Loudon County Solid Waste Disposal Commission
July 8, 2014



650 25th Street, N.W., Suite 100
Cleveland, Tennessee 37311
(423) 303-7101

Email: mail@santekenviro.com
Internet: www.santekenviro.com

- Intent:**
- To create a financial mechanism that accrues sufficient closure/post-closure funds throughout the life of the Matlock Bend Landfill. (1)
 - To close portions of the landfill as part of Santek's contractual obligations. (2)
- Mechanism:**
- Establish a joint, interest-bearing account in which a dollar amount per ton will be deposited solely for the purpose of funding closure and post-closure care. The account will be established in conjunction with Santek securing a major permit modification for a vertical and horizontal expansion of the landfill. (3)
 - Create a Control Agreement to perfect the Commission's security interest in the Financial Assurance Account and to protect funds as they're deposited into the account. (4)
 - Increase the closure/post-closure dollar amount to \$1.04 per ton, and review and adjust the amount annually based on various factors including: (5)
 - Remaining Airspace & Density Factor
 - Existing Closure/Post-closure Reserves
 - Anticipated Closure/Post-closure Liabilities (including expansion area)
 - TDEC Inflation Factor
 - Remaining Closure/Post-closure Liabilities
 - Amend Section 8 of the Landfill Management Agreement to reflect a phased closure approach as well as the establishment of the Financial Assurance Account and Control Agreement. (6)
 - Determine the amount to be deposited into the Financial Assurance Account. (7)