

Underground Storage Tanks and Solid Waste Disposal Control Board Meeting Transcript – February 4, 2026

NOTE: While some errors were corrected, the text contained within this transcript was created using Adobe Premiere Pro and likely contains errors.

Okay. I have everybody's attention. It's 931. We've got a lot on our agenda today. So. So we'll get started. Loretta, would you like to have the roll call? Oh oh. Oh, sorry, Brianna. I'm sorry. I was just skipping right to the nuts about. So. Yeah, if you'd like to go through the details that of a pipe online, that'd be great.

Okay. Yeah. My name is Brianna Reeves. We have a few quick announcements for those that are attending the board meeting virtually. You have been muted upon entry into the meeting. Please remain muted unless you're called on to speak. And we'll have instructions for that later. To ensure the streaming of the video runs smoothly, we ask that you keep your cameras turned off unless called on to speak, and you want to turn them on.

At that time, the use of the chat feature is going to be minimal unless called on to speak. Please reserve any questions you may have for after the meeting. You can call Rex Division of Solid Waste Management to have a staff member answer those questions. For those who are online and would like to speak on one of the topics during the meeting, we will now take a minute to record your name and the topic that you would like to speak on.

We will then call on you when that topic is up for discussion and questions. Please note, however, that any comments on topics that do not require a vote by the board as listed on the agenda will be heard at the end of the board meeting. So if you would like to speak on a topic that doesn't require a vote, we will call on you towards the end of the meeting.

So there are two ways you can let us know that you would like to speak on a topic. We'll start by using the chat feature. So if you would like to speak on a particular topic, please type your full name and the item that you would like to speak on during the meeting. We will record this and your name will be called after the speaker finishes their presentation on that topic.

And we're ready for our public comments or towards the end of the board meeting. So we'll give you a second to add your name and the topic you would like to speak on in the chat feature.

Okay. Thank you. Jim, we have your name recorded.

And and comments are, set to three minutes, a maximum of three minutes.

Okay. The second option is, if you would like to unmute yourself. So if you're virtually joining us, please raise your hand if you're joining via the WebEx app. This feature is at the bottom of your screen. So once you raise your hand, we will unmute you and then you will be able to say your name and the topic that you would like to speak on.

If you're joining via the phone, please press star nine and that will also virtually raise your hand and we will unmute you. So we will give a couple of moments for that to happen.

Okay. Seeing no virtual hand raises please continue. If you would like to add your name into the chat feature, you can do so. Okay, so as a reminder, this meeting is being recorded. So board members, before you speak, please press the button in front of you. So your, voice can be on the record. Okay. Thank you.

Thank you. I'll now turn it over to Loretta Buchanan for the roll call. Official welcome, Miss Catherine. Present, Mr. Deane. Present, Mr. Floyd. Present. Doctor Gardner. Present. Mr. Giles here, doctor Hyfantis here. Mr. Leon here. Mr. McCormick, is that. Mr. OMB here, Mr. Perry. Mayor Riley here and present. Yes, miss Berry. Present. Mr. West here. And Mr. Williams here.

We have a quorum. Thank you. Thank you, everyone. At this time, if you would take a moment to review the minutes in your packet, we also received these earlier from Loretta. So if you just take a moment to review those, that would be appreciated.

Chairman, I'll make a motion to approve. Thank you. Do we have a second? Second? Thank you, Mr. Dean. Are there any comments? If not, we'll have a roll call. Vote. In part, yes, Mr. Dean. Yes. Mr. Floyd. Yes, doctor. Gardner. Yes, Mr. Giles. Yes, doctor. Hyfantis. Yes. Mr.. Leon. Yes. Mr. McCormick. Yes. Mr. OMB. Yes. Merrill. Yes.

Miss. Berry? Yes. Mr. West. Yes. And Mr. Williams, yes. Thank you. They passed.

Thank you. At this time on the agenda, you'll see we have a petition for a declaratory order. I'm going to turn it over to the board counsel, Bill Miller, at this time, just to sort of set up the logistics and the process for this. The city of Murfreesboro has filed a petition for declaratory order asking the board to convene a contested case hearing to determine whether or not the application of a rule is correct or incorrect.

While the board is deciding today is whether or not to convene a contested case hearing, and, if so, whether or not the board wants to sit with the ALJ when the contested case hearing happens, and also the date for that contested case hearing with the board is not today deciding any underlying, issues that may be involved with the petition for declaratory order.

It's just whether or not you want to have a contested case hearing to hear this matter. So, the parties that will be presenting, will first present after that will, because it is an actionable item, we'll offer the public an opportunity to, offer public comments. Again, those will be limited to three minutes. They will have to be germane to the agenda.

And so what is germane today is whether or not the board should convene a contested case hearing, relative to the application of that rule. And that specific rule, before we get going to in some individual consultations with some of the board members, it's my understanding that some board members will recuse themselves that won't affect quorum as long as the board members remain present for the meeting doesn't mean present in the room.

You could go to check playing, get a cup of coffee or something. Just don't leave the meeting so that quorum, can remain. Also, won't it? That, will not affect, a majority vote, a majority vote, a court of Robert's Rules of Order is just the majority of those members eligible to vote. So excluding, recused member.

So, at this time, really be appropriate for any members that are going to recuse themselves to say on the record, that they, would be recusing themselves. Okay. Thank you. Loretta, at this point in time, I will be recusing myself from from the the but noted. Thank you. Patrick flood. I, too, will be recusing myself.

Will be. I will be recusing myself. George. Hyfantis. I also will be recusing myself. Jared. Lynn I will be recusing also. Doug. Giles I will be recusing as well.

Thank you. Yeah. Sorry. At this point, Mr. Williams and I. You would be serving as chair and can, I guess you'd call the first person. It would be the city of Murfreesboro. Is there a petition? Thank you. Everyone. Is there. I was losing count there on people recusing themselves, but it looks like we had six. So, Bill, that means, how many do we have left?

And what will be the majority required for a positive vote? I think you have one absent. So you have 13 with six out. So that would leave you with seven. So a positive it would be more. Okay. Just wanted to confirm that for everybody. That's not that's not recused. It's sort of remind everyone of the process, as Mr. Miller mentioned, we've got, the city of Murfreesboro.

We'll ask them to present first. They're the petitioner. I would ask that, that any presenter keep their comments down to ten minutes, but there's no penalty if you want to take less time than that. So, and then, but we'll hear from the city of Murfreesboro first, then, from the deck. And then, as Mr. Miller mentioned, we'll ask for, public comment at that time.

And those who are registered can, we'll have up to three minutes to address the board on this particular issue. And I'll run back through that again as we get to that. As we get to that point in the meeting. So, first, I guess, city of Murfreesboro, miss Helton, is here representing the city, so we will hear from you.

Good morning. My name is Lisa Helton. I represent the city of Murfreesboro, along with my colleague Hannah Brandstatter. We submitted a petition for declaratory order to the board and to tech for consideration. We really appreciate the opportunity to address the board today and after last week. I'm very thankful to be here today with you. The purpose of our petition is to raise an inconsistency between the statutes governing regional control over the expansion of landfills, and regulations and website instructions.

The statutes at issue are TCA 68 to 11, 801, etc., which is called the Tennessee Solid Waste Management Act of 1991. This act establishes regional boards that have the authority to grant or deny applications for the expansion of a landfill. The act requires all expansions to be submitted to the regional board for consideration. Teaneck is not allowed to process or grant an expansion request without the applicant first going to the Regional Board with their expansion request.

In the Regional Board approving the application. So the problem that we raised in our petition is that Teaneck has created regulations and instructions on its website that essentially allow vertical expansions to bypass the regional board process. We did detailed this in our petition, but at a very high level. Summary. In its regulations, deck has narrowed the definition of application to only part one applications.

But then on its website, T that says that only horizontal expansions require a part one. So as a result, according to t Dex regulations and website, only horizontal applications have to be submitted to a regional board for the local review. But that's not what the statute says. It requires that all expansion requests be submitted to and considered by the regional board before anything can proceed for, and as a policy reason.

This makes a lot of sense. I mean, whether you're expanding horizontally or vertically, you're extending the life of the landfill and the amount of trash that will be transferred and disposed of there, those activities impact the community and the Tennessee General Assembly. Excuse me, saw it fit for the local regional board to evaluate whether it will allow this activity in its community.

So our petition seeks to in that invalidate those regulations and website instructions that are inconsistent with the act. We have a lawsuit pending over this issue, but we have submitted it to you for your review as well. And how this came up. Is that the Middle Point

landfill? There's been an application to increase it by 70ft into the air and add an additional 14 years onto that landfill.

But because of T-Rex regulations and its website, the landfill operator has not applied to the regional board for request to expand. So that's really how this came up. But we have submitted the petition to you and we really appreciate your time. Thank you. There we go. Gotta hit the button. Thank you. As, Elton was there, the board have any questions from his health in first before we'll come back to questions again in a minute.

But just while she's up there. Okay. If not, Let's see. I had Dennard, Mickens down for. Anybody here for. Tech. Well the Dennard is not here so I assume not okay. No. All right then we will move into is there anybody else representing any of the parties that would be here. Okay. Seeing none new board members once again.

Now have any questions for, I guess really for just for Miss Helton. Okay. If not, we'll move in to public comment again as, Mr. Miller said earlier, please keep in mind that, for those who do wish to make a comment, remember, the only question before the board today is whether or not to convene a contested case hearing.

The board's not making any decisions on the actual merits of the petition. At this point. So I would ask you to please keep your comment confined just to that issue of whether the board could, should or not. Convene a contested case hearing. So is there anybody present in the room who wishes to make a public comment on that issue?

Okay. Seeing none, Brando, was there someone online? We do. Yes, we have Jim Farley. So we're going to go ahead and unmute your mic now. And, Jim, if you could, you have three minutes.

Great. Thank you. My name is Jim Farley, and I live in Murphysboro. And I appreciate the opportunity to address the the meeting this morning regarding the board. You can be a contested hearing. As Miss Helton said, the people are nervous and very concerned of the nature of the of the application request. It's been submitted in terms of the nature of the request to reopen, close the zoom and draw cells, which are potential hazard, and the procedural aspects, that have been bypassed regarding not to move this first to the regional board.

And I would just like to let this meeting know that we're watching this closely and find this request, quite audacious. And we hope that the there's consistency is maintained, with procedure and making sure the proper process is, is completed. And if there's any question to whether this request is a permanent modification, as has been suggested or whether it's an expansion, I think we should only need to refer to the Webster's Dictionary.

I think it's quite clear that this request would constitute an expansion, and it would increase the capacity from 37 million tons, to additional capacity to keep the landfill open for another 14 years, I estimates. And as this people in Weatherford County, we've been subjected to the environmental pollution this landfill for 30 years, and having another 14 years of this stuck with the same contract that was negotiated, in, almost 30 years ago, and which many people feel was a big mistake by the community.

Subjecting this for another 14 years seems unconscionable. And at this point, I would like to say that as a, resident of Rutherford County and Murfreesboro, we're watching this, this situation closely. And thank you for your time and attention. Okay. Thank you. Brianna, is there anybody else online? There is not. Okay. So, I guess at this point from the board standpoint and Mr. Miller, you can correct me or confirm for me if, what the board's options are.

It seems to me the board, can do nothing, take no action, in which case that would allow the, the parties to proceed on to Chancery Court. The board could elect or could, vote not to create or to convene a contested case hearing in which case the parties could move on to Chancery Court, where the board could convene a contested case hearing, with an ALJ here, where the board hears and makes the decision that way.

Or the board could convene a contested case hearing and assign it to an administrative law judge to hear and make a decision. And then, in which case, I think under either of those cases, Bill, it would still this board would have the opportunity to review the ALJ decision and decide whether to, take it up themselves or a party could, appeal that decision to the board and ask the board to, to hear it as well?

Yeah. That's correct. Just like an initial order, like we had at the last meeting. A few of those, it'd be the same. A party could appeal to the board, to have you here. Or decide on the decision. The ALJ or the board on its own motion could decide to, review the ALJ decision from there.

Ultimately, it can always end up, in, Chancery Court and the Chancery Court would hear the matter, de novo or or like it's new again. So they would have to present everything all over again to a chance record if it gets appealed. Yes, you're correct. Your thing to more needs to do is set a, hearing, hearing date.

And you don't have to have the hearing date within 30 days of the petition being filed, but you have to set the date within that hundred 80 days. So as long as you set a date today, then you'll meet the 180 day requirement. Okay. So I guess at this point, for those who have not recused themselves, we need to, decide my my personal thought is that, taking no

action or not convening a contested case hearing is probably not the best because there are rules.

And I've. And at least in my opinion, the board should make an initial decision, whether it's through an ALJ or, directly or a hearing on its own of what the board's rules mean and say, rather than just putting it to, to the Chancellor. Because if you do that, I kind of wonder, what's the point of the of the board a little bit.

Right. So if we're going to promulgate the rules, we need to be able to, at least take the first stab at, at interpreting them. So, if anybody has any comments or motion, Mr. West, my thoughts at this time, I'm open to discussion. I'm not opposed to hearing the contested case. It appears that most, if not all, of our solid waste experts on the board have recused themselves.

So I don't see an advantage of us hearing it versus an ALJ. And like I said, my mind's not fully made up. I'm open to discussion. But at this point, I'm leaning towards let it be heard by your.

Okay. Thank you for that. Any other, and I'm certainly not opposed to that either. I've kind of waded that in my mind a little bit. Also just as, because this board does have the opportunity to review that order from an ALJ, and decide if the board doesn't agree with what the ALJ decides. The board could, take it up on its own.

Greg. Mr. Miller, and here at that point. That's correct. So, that may be simpler for the parties rather than correct. And then getting all the trying to get everybody together. But I'm certainly not opposed to hearing it either way. Can I ask for Doctor Gardner? Sorry. Can I ask for clarification between ALJ and Chancery Court? I'm new to this space.

So just understanding those two different ways to here. Sure. Petition. Can you say your name please? Oh, sorry, Doctor Gardner I apologize. Sorry. So administrative law judges, I think they actually renamed administrative judges, a year or so ago. So the administrative judges, they're assigned through the Secretary of State's office. They're not article three judges. The Chancery court or circuit court.

So those are considered courts of record. And so, appeal from an administrative judge, it's almost like an appellate sort of works like an appellate court, an administrative theater, so to speak. So the administrative law judge would make a decision. The board makes a decision, and then that's appealable to a court of order. Court of record. Sorry.

Like to the Chancery Court is, how the statutes draw that out. So it's just it's a layer above the administrative law. Judge. So the if the board took no action or voted not to take it up at all, the parties could go straight to the Chancery Court to file this petition, or an action.

Otherwise it stays at the administrative level, whether the assignment of renewal J or the board, with or without the board, that sort of thing.

That answers your question. Yes it does. Thank you. And this is Doctor Gardner again. I do think even though, like you said, a lot of solid weight people have recused, recused themselves from this. There are still, like myself, solid waste, people that are still, able to listen. And I do think we do need to hear it.

I, in my opinion, just because if there is an issue with this, that there's a clarification needed, having the ALJ see that and then us also hearing it, I think is important for also consistency across the state and future, solid waste decisions. So that is, you know, kind of my \$0.02 on it. Okay. Thank you for that.

Anyone. Else have any comment? If not, is there anyone that wants to make a motion? Chairman Bob round? I'll make a motion. We hear this. The board hear it with an ALJ sitting or board decided to an ALJ. No. Us with ALJ sitting okay. Is there a second I second Doctor Gardner okay. So we've got a motion by Mayor Riley and a second by Doctor Gardner for the board to, to hear the contested case, to convene a contested case hearing and hear the matter sitting with an administrative law judge or an administrative judge.

Excuse me there, is there any other discussion on that motion?

Okay. If not, Loretta, you want to call the roll, and if it passes, then we'll see about a date. Yes, sir. Mr. Dane. Yes, doctor. Gardner. Yes, Mr. McCormick? Yes. Merrill. Yes, miss Berry? Yes. Mr. West? Yes. And Mr. Williams. Yes. It carries. Okay. Thank you. So now, we need to see about a date. So if everybody's got their calendars available.

Loretta, is that something you've got some options on, or know what? What rooms would be available or to help schedule that? Or we have, rooms reserved in case we need to have a meeting on March the 4th, April 1st and second, which is when our regularly scheduled, board meeting would be. And also, May the 6th.

Okay, I know that, March the 4th, I will be out of town. I'll be unavailable that day. So. But let me look at April and May, if everybody can look at those two.

And, let's see, Mr. Miller, question on that for the contested case hearing with, the people who have recused themselves, would we still need to have people present to have a quorum of the board and then have them recuse themselves at that meeting, or, how to how to how will that work? That's a good question.

Well, you have to have a quorum to start the meeting, to start that meeting. So you're going to have to have at least eight, to start the meeting. So. I'll have to get back to you on that one, to be honest, because I'm not sure off the top of my head how we would go about that.

You sure we have a quorum to start that meeting? It may be that some of the members of recuse themselves have to come and then just not participate and recuse themselves at that point. Again, for that actual, yeah. Yeah, it would be a normal board meeting or a special called board meeting, and you still have to have a quorum for it.

So I think that's right. But I'll double check that.

Chair Williams yes, ma'am. The dates may be dependent as well on what I can schedule with the ALJ and those other participants. I'm also aware that the first week of April is, Good Friday week. So in case there are people on spring break or out, that is a consideration for your calendars as well. And I can certainly circle back with additional dates if we need a special called.

Okay. And I'm available both the April and the May dates. Is that something? Bill, do we need to actually physically set a date today, or is that something that could be coordinated? And, and circulated and announced and, or should we tentatively, I guess, maybe set a date and release that and then generally set a date, maybe you can provide some range, a couple of dates, and then when I contact APD, we can get someone assigned a can that has availability on that date.

Okay. Mr. West, Jimmy West, I'm unavailable. The first week of April. Okay. So we've got also got May the 6th. Was that did you say that was our regular meeting day? Yes. It's regular, reserved for the regular business meeting of the board. We can have May 6th or seventh if you all are available for those dates.

So maybe we should tentatively set for one of those days if, if somebody wants to. Do we need a motion to do that, to set a call, a special call meeting to hear the contested case. And, unless you said it at your regularly scheduled meeting and you could do that and just said at the end of the agenda as opposed to the beginning, go through the other stuff and then do the contested case hearings.

Sorry, at the end. That might be a good way of doing it, because everyone's calendars should be open for that. Okay, that works for me. Would we, do we need a motion to do that, to set it for that day? I believe you do. Okay. And is that date okay with, the parties?

Is held. Yes. Thank you. It is. Okay. So City of Murfreesboro is available that day. If anybody wants to make a motion to that, we set it to be heard on our regular called, meeting day of May the 6th.

Chairman Bob Riley. I'll make that motion. Okay. Is there a second, Doctor Gardner I second. Okay, we've got a motion by Mayor Rail and a second by Doctor Gardner to

convene the case on, May the 6th at our regularly scheduled, meeting. Is there any discussion on that? Right. If not, Loretta, if you'll call the roll, please miss Carson.

Yes, yes. Does she the. I think you only call the people that are voting on this. Is that correct? You have a full quorum that day over that. So because we're just we've recused ourselves from that part of it. We can still vote on this park. No, no, just just the members that are that voted. The recused members wouldn't vote on this either.

Okay. Thank you for clarifying. I'm sorry.

One more time, Mr. Dean. Yes, miss. Gardner. Doctor Gardner. Yes. Mr. McCormick. Yes. Merrill. Yes. Miss. Berry? Yes. Mr. West? Yes. And Mr. Williams. Yes. Excellent. We will convene the contested case, assuming the judge is available on that day as well for the regularly scheduled board meeting on May 6th. Thank you. Okay. Thank you. Is there anything else, related to this item that we need to hear?

Mr. Miller? I don't believe so. Okay. If not, we thank you for your participation and for coming today. And, I will yield the chair back to Miss Catherine. Thank you. Thanks to everyone. We'll get back on our regular agenda at this time. And next item on the agenda is Stan Boyd will be giving us, staff report on underground storage tank fund balance report.

Stan.

Good morning. Board. I'm Stan boyd. I'm the director of the division of Underground Storage tanks. And to find my report and stack stuff. Our balance carried forward into this fiscal year was \$68,753,000. So far this year, total revenue has been \$6,086,000. Our total payroll has been \$3.13 million. Our total operational expenses has been 3.993. Million dollars, and total expenditures have been \$7.12 million.

At the end of, October, we had 128 outstanding applications that accounted for another \$2.471 million for a difference between, when we started the year on July 1st until the end of end of October, \$3.5 million decrease for just a little over 5%. The total projected revenue in the current fiscal year is \$27,127,000, which is the same as last year since it was only October when we got this report for that was, not much projecting that could be done at that point.

Our total expense budget for the year is \$28,753,000. Which does project a difference from June 1st to June 30th of \$3.3 million, or 4.8% decrease. Our obligations versus our balance versus our unobligated balance. As far as required, reserves for the fund is \$34,139,000. Expected payments in one year would be \$45,691,000.

Thank you. Stan, is there any questions for Mr. Bowie? No. Okay. Thank you again. Thank you.

Next on the agenda is Christopher Lewis, and he'll be giving us a UST complaint response report update. Good morning everybody. It's Christopher Lewis. The underground storage tanks out of the Knoxville field office for the next slide. Within this is for July 1st through December 31st, 2025. Overall, we had 34 citizen complaints received, which is higher than last time and higher since I've been doing this, primarily been driven by, as I discussed last time, the Department of Agriculture, the water complaints that we started getting from them that is risen and pulled up the rest of them as well.

I'd like to highlight that we got 35.3% of them done the same day that we completed, and also none of them were late or outside of policy guidelines. Next up, as stated, water in USDA is by far the largest contributor to citizen complaints that we're getting right now. And that's what, referrals, as per usual, water resources, is the recipient of the largest amount of referrals that we've given to other agencies.

We were on a downward trend until December. Then we jumped back up again. I can't really figure out any reason as to why. It's just when stuff comes up. I guess you, in a difference from usual. Memphis is not the highest number of complaints that we've got. It was actually tied between Knoxville and Chattanooga once again, it's just kind of where people find things.

And our two examples are, Mapco express, which is around Nashville, a tanker, at least 200 gallons into a storm drain that flows into the Cumberland. We got out there, did a full compliance inspection within nine days of the incident. And currently, there's a director's order drafted also Arnold Brothers Oil Company, which is down in the Columbia region.

We got a complaint from, the local municipality about a site. Their, drain discharge was draining it to a nearby site where they were doing construction. We went out there that day, found out they were registered to us, removed in 1988. We looked all around, found evidence of discharge, but couldn't find anything that there was any unregulated used and anything that was related to us.

And the complaint was a utility superintendent, and we were actually able to go over to his office, follow up with him in person, make sure everything was taken care of for his liking, make sure all the information was transferred to him, and that would be in. Thank you. Is there any questions for Mr. Lewis? Great. Thank you very much.

Next on the agenda is Stacy Clark. And she will give an give us an update on the annual US statewide inspection quality Assurance report. Good morning. My name is Stacy Clark. I'm with the Division of Underground Storage Tanks, and I am the compliance shack coordinator. And I work out of the Columbia field office. Just some background on our QCD program.

It was developed to address some long standing needs that were identified by both our stakeholders and senior management to bring more consistency and accuracy to compliance inspection statewide. The thought being that, oh, I'm sorry, can you hear me? The thought being that tank owners in Memphis should get the same quality of inspection as a tank owner in Johnson City.

So we built on the foundation of our standard inspection process, our standardized inspection manual and our mobile inspection application, all of which have helped us to modernize and formalize how our inspections are conducted and how that data is collected and reviewed. The timing of our program development, aligned with the implementation of the 2018 federal USDA rule changes, allowing us to immediately begin monitoring the effects of those updates.

So, finally, the division has adopted a tiered training structure to ensure that compliance inspectors across the state have access to the same training and share the same standards and expectations.

The shack manager position was created in September of 2021 as a dedicated role to strengthen, inspection, quality and consistency across the state. This position reviews inspection data and staff correspondence to monitor accuracy and identify opportunities for improvement. A major component of this is field auditing, observing inspectors in the field to ensure that their procedures match our established standards.

The QK program also plays a key role in onboarding and training of new staff and providing ongoing training for experienced inspectors. Together, we do hope that these promote statewide consistency and improve the reliability of our inspection data that's used for compliance and enforcement decisions, likely so during fiscal year 2024 2025, the QK program, focused very heavily on training staff development and improving field documentation consistency.

Right along inspections were completed, with every inspector in the state providing direct observation as well as one on one feedback. Our new inspectors also successfully completed both our level one and our level two training. While every member of the compliance field staff earned the API Work Safe Contractor Training certification this year also included, a pretty significant partnership with major automatic tank gauge console manufacturers, which culminated in a three day division lead ATG operability training.

So each member of Compliance Inspector staff now holds a V to Root Operability Training certificate. Finally, we did expand our micro training sessions. Those are internal and we offer short targeted refreshers on critical tools like using GPS time and date stamped

photos, standardized site map templates, as well as updates to enforcement and funded termination processes under 0.096.

The division has also been engaged in public outreach with our largest tank owners, which are those who have ten or more facilities. We also provide customized scorecards that summarize their inspection outcomes and performance trends. Along with that, we send data spreadsheets that show which inspections are complete, which are still open, and which facilities have inspections scheduled within the next 12 months.

We also try and analyze common compliance issues to offer more targeted recommendations for repeat violations. And finally, we we try and maintain feedback, engaging with owners, just share what's working and what could be improved overall. The goal is partnership for compliance outcomes.

Looking across the previous four years of data, you can see that inspection activity remains stable, averaging around 2000 inspections per year. To keep up with our three year inspection commitment. That's in the gray. Operator. Retraining violations have steadily declined over the past three years. Those are violations by compartment in blue. And during the same period, we've also seen a steady decline in enforcement referrals from a high of 517 in fiscal year 2022, 23 to the low of 357 in 2024 2025.

That's a 30% drop. These trends, we think, indicate a stronger early compliance with fewer major violations, meaning that more facilities are addressing their violations and returning to compliance before formal enforcement is necessary. And we think that might be likely due to the second inspection cycle following the 2018 updates. As well as new operator retraining processes and more effective communication.

Sorry, just one second. Over the past fiscal year, we've also placed a strong internal emphasis on timeliness and accountability. We work closely with our supervisors and inspectors to ensure that data entry, correspondence, and document reviews are completed within established timeframes. To reinforce this expectation, those deadlines were incorporated into the individual performance plans for inspectors, and this change help includes that time ensure that timely communication and accurate data entry are a priority across all regions.

So we are seeing improved timeliness across the entire inspection process from initiation through completion.

Finally, looking forward, our focus is on strengthening the division's long term capacity. We'll continue developing training that directly addresses the needs that we're identifying through the shack reviews and field observations. Another key priority is cultivating subject matter experts across the program, ensuring that we have a depth of knowledge that

supports the division's succession plan. We'll also maintain a strong onboarding process for new hires and formalize comprehensive training curriculum.

So a structured approach that promotes consistency, confidence and long term stability. And that's me. Thank you. Is there any questions for Miss Clark? Madam chair, I have a question. Yes, ma'am. This Daphne Berry. On the portion where you're talking about tank owners scorecards, is that an internal tool or is that also shared with the tank owners themselves?

It's shared with the tank owners themselves. Okay. And is that shared by the inspector or is that it's at a higher level? So our deputy director of field offices convenes meetings, with certain staff members as well as whoever the tank owner deems necessary to be there. And we have sit down meetings as well as follow ups if, if they like.

And you have those regionally? No. Well, we tend to have them more in a centralized location that fits everyone's schedule and and driving distance. Okay. Thank you. Doctor I have banter. Yes George, I fancy this is just a, a general question and more of an opinion from you. Do you think that all of the training and the meetings that you've had, do you think it's led to improve consistency of application of the regulations across the state?

I would soon a better job. I would certainly hope so, especially with the development of the mobile inspection application, which is the tool that we use on the tablets when conducting compliance inspections instead of a paper form. It's, an interactive report that an inspector will complete during the inspection, doing a records review, as well as a visual audit of the equipment on site.

And from that they then they generate their violations that go into a letter. So I'd say that we have improved. I wouldn't say that we're perfect, but we're working on it. Excellent. Yeah. I don't remember. In the past we've had quite a few complaints about, application in different regions being different. Okay. And I haven't heard any complaints lately, so congratulations.

Thank you. Are there any other questions for Miss Clark? Thank you. Thank you for your time. Next on the agenda, we will have Mr. Brad Harris give a hazardous waste permitting report. Mr. Harris. Hello, I'm Brad ayers. I'm the hazardous waste program manager. Now by Tennessee. This for the second quarter for October to December. But next slide.

We got three part applications. We got one from Oak Ridge Reservation. We got that on a 2216. We got the, you know, the, one 2326. We got one from Ireland Corporation. We got that on nine through 25. We had the, you know, they issued for it on 123, 26 as well. And then we had another one come in from mount our ammunition plants.

11 seven. And we have no actions on it at this time, but we have until five. And the last ones. All right. So we've had nine last ones come in. Two of these for our incorporation. Four of them are to them for Y-12. Two of them were for diversified scientific. And then one come in for a or no.

If we go to the next slide or sorry, one more.

It's the, the pie chart and seven of these came in for emergency coordinator changes as a class one. One of them from Allen was the update of a closure plan. And then we had one come in as monitoring well, abandonment.

So all of these were made in a timely manner. The class twos. We had no class two applications come in this quarter and we had the next one. We had no class threes as well. That's the updates for Q two for hazardous waste. For many activities. Thank you, Mr. Harris. Are there any questions Mr. Lang? Thank you, chairman.

Jared Lynn, I know Lisa probably is going to touch on it, in her business, but I would like to tell Brett, you know, good job on the, rolling out the electronic hazardous waste reporting. I said on that training yesterday, it looks like it's, something I've been asking for a long time to get away from the paper forms, so it's very appreciative.

Glad we're moving towards that. I know they'll probably be some bugs to work out, but so far, so good. Look like it's set up and thought through. So thank you. All right. Thank you. And doctor painters and George painters I'd like to add my comments and positive comments. I sat in on the training yesterday also and I thought was extremely well done.

So your staff did a great job. Thank you. Yes. The opening day did a wonderful job at the. Are there any other questions? Make a comment. I believe there's going to be, a section at Chattanooga at the conference. There's also current. Yes, it was proposed. I don't know if it was finalized or not.

Okay. Yeah. Pat flood, if, all six of the ones that proposed sessions you sent me were, picked up and will be, doing them in Chattanooga. It was on the list. So. So, I look forward and thank y'all for doing that because that gives an opportunity for some people who may not have been able to do it online that attend the conference, that they'll be able to attend that workshop.

So so thank you. Good job. And, Madam Chair, probably an appropriate time to put in a plug for the conference. Because that is exactly the purpose of the conference is to, train people and, help ensure compliance while we got everybody together in Chattanooga. So thank you for that. Absolutely. Thank you. Any other questions for Mr. Harris?

Okay. Thank you. All right. Thank. Next on the agenda is Amber green. And she will be giving a materials management program update. Good morning. My name is Amber green. I'm the materials management program administrator. Go to the next slide I can go to the next slide. So we welcome Maria Ramirez to our team. She is going to be on the technical assistance team as an environmental scientist.

So we are excited to have her because we have been shorthanded. So we are still working on the 2025 2035 Solid Waste management plan. Everyone knows it's a her staging framework guide, to develop and support solid waste management across the state. Recycling, composting. So we are continuing work on that right now. This is our timeline on the plan.

Tentatively we are, January, February. We are implementing the commissioner's changes and doing internal reviews. So that's kind of our point at where we are right now. So we are working on the landfill economic model contract and live bond and financial assurance on the plan right now.

These are the objectives in the plan. And they can be found on our website too if you want to read those objectives. There's also a paragraph under each objective. And there will be a link that you can go online on our website to read all those, all those, So will each county have to rewrite their ten year plan?

Yes. So we are working on a guidance document for counties to work on their plan, across the whole state. We highly recommend counties rewrite their plan, especially if they're using an 81, 95 or 2000 plan. And we will be a proven are denying those plans internally as TCI requires us to study, we will be providing a grant for every county that is going to rewrite their plan, \$25,000 for rural counties and \$50,000 for larger counties.

And it's approximately \$2 million for grants for this purpose.

This is the timeline for the grant application to come out for the ten year plans. Tentative September 4th. It is a tentative time on it is just to give us an idea of when we need to roll the grant out and when we will be done with our plan. At Dec and then October 14th, the grant application will close, and then February 1st of 27, we will execute the contracts for those counties that applied.

Are the regions that applied for the grant after the next one?

So we're working on a private sector review committee. The goal is to let industry have feedback. So we will set up calls with them and be reaching out to different people in different industries across the state so they can give us feedback on our plan.

So we have workshops across the state. We just finished is the annual progress report workshops. We also have public hearings coming up. Tentative. Chattanooga, is TBA. We are working on a location for it, but we have confirmed all the other locations and times, and we will be sending those out. And then we will also be sending out the virtual WebEx link as soon as we have it set up and ready.

This is where you provide feedback on the plan. This is the website link and this is also our contact information. If you have any questions, you're welcome to email us.

So we've worked on the dashboard and Recycle bin. And I know I talked about this last time at the last meeting, but it's really helpful tool across the state. It shows convenient center totals in every county. It shows solid waste totals. It shows recycling diversion. Right. So if you haven't looked at that, get online and look at it, because it's been a great resource for a lot of our counties and development districts across the state.

So our household hazardous waste events are coming up. We start those in March of this year. Last year we did 49 events. This year we have 67 events, which we're excited about. So we have a lot of counties that are participating in those events. And the new schedule is online for residents to stay. And I forgot to say as well.

So we received a EPA grant. It's the Swiffer grant for waste characterization studies across the state. So we are finishing that up in February. We have ours, Glen Lane Field next week that our consultant team is going to be doing. We have a couple more hours left, and then we finish those at the end of February.

And in March and April, the consulting company is working on the data, and that will be on the website soon for everyone to see, because we've been doing the sorts for a year now. We did spring and summer and fall seasons. So it's.

Next slide.

So our grants program, they have done a phenomenal job getting grants out to all our counties that need grant. FY 25 was 3.8 million. And you can go to the next slide, FY 26. And the remaining the awarded total and remaining allocation is 10.3 million.

So we have been working on the Hilling grant. We received that from the EPA. It is going to help the 14 counties that were impacted by Hurricane Helene. We have had those workshops with them, and this opens in March for them to start a plan. So we are excited because I know they need the infrastructure there for solid waste and recycling, because I know a lot of their convenience centers were washed completely off the area that they were on, so we they are all going to apply for that starting in March.

So next time anyone have any questions? Is there any questions for Miss Green? Amer I have several, but I could. So if you'll go back to the slide, the ten year solid waste plan for counties. I know that now an ongoing issue has been that when counties or regional boards develop their plans, a lot of them are very old.

Some of them have never been updated, but some of the plans that have been updated were submitted to today. But it was just in the past. It's been a checkmark that it was received and not a true review. The plan matches like the state plan or what happens to take place. And I'll use, you know, an experience with our Southern Service class three landfill that, we went for an expansion.

It was denied. We went to Chancery Court. It was denied. And the denial at Chancery Court was because that the plan that Metro Davidson County had submitted was approved by today. But the plan that that metro Davidson County submitted to today had that there was plenty of capacity at Middle Point. There was plenty of capacity at Southern Services, and that there was plenty of capacity at a sandy recycling facility in Laverne that doesn't even exist anymore.

So so my hopes are that will receive feedback of when these new plans are submitted. What is the plan to make sure that they do match up? And it's just not random information provided that that they need to make sure the information they're providing will actually work. Or in the end, you may not know the answer yet. So yeah, I don't know the answer.

That's why we have a tentative timeline. And if they apply for the grant, because most counties are going to need help, because it's going to be really expensive to do their plans and to rob them, because if they're working off a 91 plan, they've been updating it yearly on Apr. So it's definitely time for a new, because it is a ten year plan and it does need to be updated every ten years.

But TCI does it request. That's right. And that's something, you know, that needs to happen because I mean and they are very expensive. I know Shelby Davidson County, I think they've allotted \$500,000. I'm just calling to delay their plans. So but but anyway, I just wanted to bring that up that that's really important down the road that we look at that.

Yes. Lisa. Lisa Huie director for the Division of Solid Waste Management, this is a conversation we've been having internally with the commissioner's office and with our office of General Counsel on how we're going to be able to review all these plans that come into us. And luckily, they'll come in over a period of two years, but we're going to sit down and go through these.

But it won't just be our staff. We're going to be relying also on, potentially having to get outside consulting firm to help us. And we'll be relying on our office, the general counsel,

for their input also. And and thank you because I know it's an ongoing issue. And I know we're looking at some other regional plans and they have never been updated.

So so that's that's an important. Okay. Sorry. I've got a couple more questions. And then under under the regional plan timeline. So it would if a regional, a county municipality, say the regional board decides not to rewrite their plan.

I don't have an answer. I'm Lisa Lisa Huie, director for division Solid Waste Management. If they decide not to rewrite their plan, and when they have to submit their plan to us annually, we will review it compared to the new 2035 plan. And if it does not address all the items in that new plan, and they have not addressed financial assurance, they haven't addressed, all the different objectives that were that Amber showed previously.

They will receive a letter that says they fail. Okay, good. So okay. And that's this is another issue that keeps coming up. So I'm just bringing these up and then I'm sorry. On the slide on the screen is the process for the 90 day review for tech internal. And then we kick it back to the county. And they have 60 days to fix whatever we requested.

They fix. Perfect. So and then under the grants awarded can you supply to us like who received those grants and individually. And then and that way I know, I know, I'm a broken record here, but, you know, I'd like to know, are they shipping their material, this municipality, are they shipping their material out of state or they're in state?

Are they paying into the fund or are they not paying into the fund? So I mean, if we know what county it is, we would know that. So I yes, Lisa Huie we keep track of that, Stacy. And we can show it to you at the next board meeting. Okay. We've, I think we showed it to you.

Maybe not the last meeting, but the one prior to that. And when we do review grant applications, if a county is not disposing of their waste in Tennessee and paying into the fee, there is a, during the writing process, there is a certain number of points that are deducted, because we by TCA, we have to give out these grants, but we realize, what you've brought it before and what other grantees have noted that if you're not paying into the fine but you're getting the money, it's unfair to counties that are paying into it.

So that's how we're addressing that. But we can show you those numbers and we can show you the counties. We review that at least, every two weeks to every month within our division. Great. Thank you. That's all I had. Anybody else? Oh, yeah. Mr.. Madam chairman, Doug Giles. So it says there's a \$25,000 grant for small counties, \$50,000 for rural.

Do you have an expectation of how much that would cover for on these consultants? One and two. What what's the delineation between small and rural? How are small and big?

Small and large County. It's the top five counties with population on our grants in our contract that get the 50,000. So it's going to be Knoxville, Nashville, Memphis.

And then 25,000 goes to rule. And then on your other question, I'm sorry, what was your first question? So do you have an expert? I mean, what does it cost to for a consultant develop one of these plans. So you're telling me that 90, 90 counties in Tennessee, you're going to get the 25 and five are going to get the 50 for those other 90?

Some of them are going to be big enough that it costs just as much as what it does for one of those five largest. So how much does that 25,000 cover in that plan? Probably not enough. I remember when I wrote one at Chester County, we spent the \$25,000 and we had to work with C task, and C task was able to work with us on that.

But if you're using a consultant company, they're probably going to charge more, but it's based on what's in that county. Do they have a landfill? Do they have a murf? So I don't really know how to answer your question. Okay. I was just getting an expectation. I can add to that Lisa Hewitt. But, what I would suggest, if possible, for counties to work together and maybe hire the same consulting firm, because once you get one, plan down, you may be able to take that into massage it to make it work for an adjoining county.

But you would have to work together, to combine your services and get your best value there. I would think also to I. Oh, are we sure? Absolutely. We are looking at working with the county technical Assistance Service and the development district. So if we can pull some of the data that we already have in our dashboard and, you know, all their tonnages and everything on Apr and give that to those counties, maybe that will help if they have to hire a consultant company on the amount of money that they have to spend.

If we already pre have the data for them, and those consultant companies aren't having to look for that info on landfill tonnages, recycling energies, all of that. So we are looking at partnering with the development districts and say task and task if needed for that. Okay. Thank you. And Stacy go out there. And again this brought up another question on the 50,000 for the larger counties.

I know in the statute that it references Shelby Davidson, Knoxville, Hamilton and Rutherford County. So they get a recycling rebate money and then so would this 50,000 be in addition to that money that they are able to obtain? Yes. Okay. Yeah. All right. Thank you.

Any other questions?

Lisa I would Lisa Hewitt I would like to say I'm hoping that the legislature sees fit to appropriate some funding. To help the counties, with writing their plans. So I will add to that. We're looking at an EPA grant, and we are telling the counties this if we can apply for a

grant to get them additional funding, because I know it's going to be more than the amount we have allotted.

We're working on that internal as well. So we're trying to make sure we fund any revenues we can to add to that our money for grant funding. So for them thank you. Amber, is there any other questions. All right. Thank you. Thank you.

Okay. Next on the list is Mr. Nick Lytle. And he will be giving us solid waste permitting report.

Good morning. Board. My name is Nick Lytle. I'm the, solid waste permits manager. Today I will be giving an update on, all major modifications to full permits or new applications. The following list as I, state every time, is not a comprehensive list of all applications in the House, but just those that have recent activity, let's say in the last, last 5 to 6 months that we don't consider somewhat dormant.

This list does not apply to any permit by rules. Next. What has been off the list for some time and has been dormant but has come back to life is, something we've been working since 2023 with a major modification for some contour revisions of the Marion County Class one landfill. This stems back from a compliance agreement.

When we started getting in the annual engineer reports, we noticed a deviation in construction, a legacy that happened a very, very long time ago where they constructed liner, slightly less than one acre deviation from their original permit. We process this as a major modification. There is a slight, acreage swap involved, very minute.

Again, less than half an acre involved. And, that public comment ended on, January 26th with no public comments received in that permit. Will or has been issued. I'm not quite sure at this moment. Next. Just came in, on December 1st is, another, lateral expansion of the white County classical landfill in Sparta, Tennessee, recently acquired by Waste Management Corporation.

We did issue a preliminary public notice on that on, January 6th. And then I got a brief, depiction of where that next proposed phase occurs in relation to the existing class one. Next, in house is, of course, the BFI middle point, contour revisions. We received this engineer reports, back in November, seventh.

This does not increase acreage to acreage. Stays at 207.3 acres. And that part two was deemed incomplete on, December 10th. It was like many applications, was just lacking some components such as, a complete closure post closure care plan and some phase development work that need to be done next. And, this is a rough depiction, of, existing versus future where those contours are revised next.

Next is the by county, class one lateral expansion. It's been a moment since we've received anything on that, but we've been in constant contact with the consultants and the applicant, and we are expecting a complete part to, in-house by probably the end of March. And, this is quite a substantial expansion. On your on your slide there or page in front of you, the existing class one facility is, to the west or to your left, and, it's going to, increase to the north, and then, future phase will, add another class one cell adjacent to the existing class, three to the east or to your right.

Next. I've got a couple here that are kind of, stalled out, adjacent to each other. We've got the Hamblen County class one lateral expansion. It's on its third notice of deficiency. We've gone through several reviews with the applicants, and we're having, difficulty receiving a complete or correct part two application, on that.

And, we're we're still in negotiations, still in talks, trying to get a technically accurate and complete application on that one. And next.

And you see, this creates, distinct new, class one cell adjacent to the existing landfill there in Hamblen County. Morristown, Tennessee, next, kind of the same story with the Jefferson County. This is a, a contour revision and also a partial closure. There was some deviations from the permitted activities there, and we are trying to solve that through a major modification and some contour revisions.

And again, we're having a really hard time getting a complete and accurate, submittal to us. And we're also on a third notice of deficiency, despite many meetings. And, consultations with, with the committee and consultants.

And, yeah, this is, this is hard to depict of exactly what's going on here, but, it's a, deviation of some benches and, some, different phase development going on next. Not exactly a major modification, but it is noteworthy as it's getting a lot of press and interest out there in the state of Tennessee.

We have the Roberta Phase two landfill, the existing landfill permit, that was issued in two, 2010. We began working with, consultants and a new permit to group, in January 2025. This permit requires, aquatic resource alterations permit or a rap, that was submitted to us in November. Deemed, incomplete or deficient in December, revisions were received in, January.

A second notice of deficiency was issued in, January 23rd Division Water Resources is meeting with the consultant group and applicants, next Friday to see if any of that could be resolved. And, and also there is a, proposed change of ownership and process for that one. And that is, kind of wedged between Oneida Winnfield, Tennessee.

Next slide, class two facility, the old and brine sludge class two landfill. This is a permit that we almost issued several years ago, but the applicant, for technical reasons, withdrew that application. This is being resubmitted to us. We've got part one deemed complete on January 16th. This middle as probably pretty much completely been approved.

And we expect this to be updated and approved very soon, barring, new information. Next. And, this was done, by candlelight on a hot spot. So, it's the best map I could find.

Next slide. Jefferson County class three. Not to be confused with the Jefferson County class one. We have a third notice, a deficiency on that one. And, that includes, contour vision on that one. Next slide. So nothing new to report there.

And, it's just some brief and some contour to the western side. Riverside landfill, Meridian Corporation. We just issued a lateral expansion of this permit on January 21st, I think, while last I spoke to you guys, we were scheduling the public hearing. Next slide.

And next slide. Over in Shelby County, we've got the Frazier Business Development Center. We've received, engineering back in August 29th. That facility is undergoing that changes in operator ownership. So we have a permit in house with incorrect ownership. And, people signed off on it. So we're just looking to get those revisions and we'll start review again.

There's the location of that again, just, contour revisions on that one. No additional acreage. Next slide. We've got the Caraway Hill landfill, commonly to called the City of Minden landfill because that's what it was until a couple of years ago. We're working on a lateral expansion of that. We had to pause that review because it, too, went under a change of ownership.

We just got that, new submittal in-house. Notice of deficiency was issued in November. We have the responses received. I believe we've got permit review meeting in house tomorrow, the next day to go over that next slide. You can see this is, substantial expansion to the south, I believe that is, north is to the right of that one.

Look, North is to the left. Next slide. We've got the Fayette County environmental, class three lateral expansion, working with them to get complete part one in-house. Engineering was received before the part one back in November. Next slide.

This is to create a class three landfill over an existing yet, constructed class one area. Next slide. And, I'll add, we do have a part two in-house for Birchwood Landfill, Hamblen County. And we received a, we did note incompleteness on that one. And, I believe yesterday I received, hydrologic determination that looks favorable, that we may be able to continue forward a review of that part two application.

Again, apologize. Hotspot on a tiny little screen. Thank you. Nick, are there any questions for Nate?

So I have one next. So, the the by county site if you want to go back to it. On the on the map, you go to the map. The next one. Yep. So that's to the to my left. That would be the expansion of the class one. Class one is to your left. And it's a lateral expansion to the north okay.

And a additional lateral expansion over the existing what we call the Woodlawn, a class three facility. Those will be done under the same permit. Under the same permit number. Common practice for us to allow the same permit number to be used, for adjacent landfill phases that are disconnected on the same parcel but share common resources.

Okay. How many acres is there? A lot, a lot is on the previous slide. Brianna, I put the number on there. No, I did not. It's, it's already out of your. That's fine. I was just and then it's, you can see it's be. Yeah. Absolutely. Yes. And then if you would go to the BFR, proposed map.

Okay. These are the the map or the drawings? The drawings. I'm sorry. Yes. A quick snippet off of the legacy scan of the original permit versus the. So, so the whole area is, is was the 207.3 acres. That's the whole area waste. And then the, the highlighted pink area is what they're proposing to expand. No, no, it's it was really hard to get sometimes in these permit applications.

There's just a nice clear. I've only been doing this for the last couple meetings. As far as the depictions, oftentimes on the cover sheet, there's a real good depiction that kind of shows you what's going on. With this one, the drawings were delivered to us with many, many page turners, a phased development of, peeling off temporary cap, adding cap, peeling off cap, adding cap added up.

So this was one of the last depictions that showed the final light blue contours. The pink just depicts that final phase. Every phase was color coded a pastel color. Okay. That that. Thank you for the clarification. Okay. Great. Thank you. Any other questions? All if, all of these are probably available, our data viewer that you can peruse and do a page turnaround.

All right. Thank you.

The question here.

I'm just was checking in with you. Would would this be a good time for us to have a quick. Okay. Good. I kind of saw some lake shaking, so. All right. At this time, we'll take a, quick

ten minute break. Would that be okay? And come back at I let my five, so that would be great. Thank you.

Stein. One. Two. Three. Okay, I think we're back in business. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, everyone, for your patience. At this time, we're going to we're going to make some movements on the agenda to accommodate some, meeting. So at this time, we're Steve Sanders with the Division of Remediation is going to give his update. Thank you.

Good morning, Steve Sanders, division of our mediation director. I don't have much today. I just want to give a couple of quick updates. One, we've had, some organizational change. We have shifted Justin Meredith to the deputy director of field operations role and shifted Evan Spann to a, operations advisor role. So he'll be assisting me, with some of our larger initiatives.

The other thing I wanted to address the board on is our sole role that was passed, goes into effect on February the 9th. So that's gotten through all the processes. And we're just wrapping up the, the white period. That's really all I've got today. And if there's any questions from the board for DLR, are there any questions for Mr. Sanders?

Okay. Okay. Thank you. Stay. Have a good day. Thank you. Yeah. Okay. We'll move back to our regular agenda. Christina Perez will be giving a presentation on the waste hauler rulemaking adoption consideration. And it looks like Christina is now turned into Nick Lytle. Yeah. Good morning again. Board. Nick Lytle, as always, permits manager, foster, parent of the, waste tire hauler program.

So, Christina is, away today. She's actually, assistant coordination with that team out on some of this cleanup is going on out there. Come to you today to, ask for, adoption of the, waste hauler rule package that was, out for public comment back in July. Next slide, do a quick, recap here.

Believe me, in this room and the public has seen this presentation many times, so we just did a high level over side and showed the changes that we've made to the rule package for your consideration. This was, rule packages that went out. It was, went out July 1st, 2025. Apologize to the board. We think we missed presenting this to you by like two days.

Getting clear to present this to you on the last board meeting. Next slide. Just, to talk about where we think we will be, assuming the board, votes to adopt this rule package. We hope this can be adopted into regulations, and we can start implementing and registering people by summer to early fall of 2026 and get this program going.

And hopefully solve some of the tire issues out there for our rural residents. Next slide. All right. I'm not sure if I should go over every single comment, but we'll do a high level here

and let me get the work off of my local copy so I can see better. There was a comment, that, had concerns about exemptions for people hauling their own tires and farmers.

So we clarified that, language. Next slide. And the tire count. There were some concerns about who, needed to fill out and who was responsible for making sure the tires arrived in the correct count. There was concern that, the waste tires received at the receiving facility, that waste tires could not be removed for reuse.

So we clarified language to allow for additional manifest to be created and for waste tire accounts and comments to be created to allow for waste tires to be removed from the waste stream. As long as we knew where they're going and they weren't, ended up on the side of the road. Next slide.

Just some very nuanced language here. There was, concerned about, about, I'm sorry if I fill in for Christina here, and I did review this last night, but I'm struggling to remember what this comment, corrected. It's, written out for you there, and, I think we have to read the whole thing. Next slide.

The next couple, changes were concerns about the waist high receiver. The waist high receiver was thought to be too narrow to only include permitted facilities such as rum puffs, solid waste processors, landfills, other facilities can legally receive waste tires without needing necessarily a permit or registration, and rules were clarified to allow for that.

Again, this, is a clarification of that waist high receiver that takes out specific language of this permitted landfills and just defines it as a waist high receiver.

Again, changes to make that consistent at the waist high receiver throughout, not limit to a permit storage facility, waist high processor or landfill. Next slide.

There was concern about out-of-state waste haulers, having to, have a manifest for announced a generator. Language was clarified to solve that problem. Next slide. What? That, we worked with, Wayne Gregory and office general counsel. The changes created here, nuances of language were deemed not significant enough to necessarily warrant going out for public comment.

Again. With that, the core intent of this, program and this rule package is consistent with what the board saw back in February, with just a few tweaks here and there for our commenters and, unless we have any questions, we asked for your favorable adoption. Are there any questions from the board for Mr. Lighter, Mr. Dane?

Thank you, Madam Chair. Will. Dean. Nick, I believe I asked you this the last time we were here, but seeing this, the comment requesting the farmer elaboration. This entire program

does not apply for, example, I'll just give an example for a tire dealer who is hauling their own tires to the landfill. Or I it was my understanding that this was primarily targeted at your third party haulers.

So as we stand now, as regulations are written and, there was testimony to the contrary, but the regulation says this applies to anybody commercially hauling tires. It is the waste tire hauler program is contention today, that that if ABC tire is has ABC employee hall and ABC receive tires to a destination they are engaging in a commercial activity.

Thus they are hauling commercial tires. The exclusions should only apply to, deny people hauling around tires in the back of their own trucks that belong to them for their own purposes, and with exemptions also for farm activities. But I, I would deem if, your employees hauling your tires in commercial setting. That's still a commercial operator. That's commercial hauler.

Understood. Thank you. If not, we would have significant gaps within our tracking system. Are there any other questions for Mr. Lytle? Okay. At this point, you know, we would. We're asked to either adopt or or not approve the the room. Is there anyone that would like to make a motion? Yeah. Madam chair, I would present that, we make a motion to present to approve these rules as presented.

Is there a second? I would second that, Madam Chair. George, Hyfantis. Thank you. Doctor. Hyfantis. If there's no other questions, we'll have a roll call. Vote, Miss Catherine. Yes, Mr. Dane? Yes, Mr. Flood? Yes, doctor. Gardner. Yes. Mr. Giles. Yes, doctor. Hyfantis? Yes. Mr. Leon. Yes, Mr. McCormick. Yes. Thank you, Mr. OMB. Yes, mayor. Riley.

Yes, miss. Berry? Yes. Mr. West. Yes, Mr. Williams. Yes. Thank you. The vote is unanimous. Thank you. Nick.

Okay, next item on the agenda, and Nigel Luther will be providing, information on the US te revised reimbursement rates. This is not for a now on our agenda. It says it's for adoption consideration, but we're not there yet. It's just going to be a presentation today. Yeah. It's just an update. To to a reimbursement rates.

So the comment period ends on February the 8th. So we still have a few days for public comment. So I wanted to go through here and give the board, a little bit more detail on the proposed rates, the amounts. Oh. All right. So, Nigel, we introduce yourself. Sorry. Yes, I'm Nigel Luther, and with the division of underground storage tanks, out of the Chattanooga field office.

So, next slide. So, kind of a basic overview. This is just to refresh. Refresh everybody's, memory on this document. This establishes our reimbursement rates for USG Corrective

Action Fund, that are USG correct. Contractors are reimbursed through it categorizes reimbursable work under various tasks, that are sent to our reimbursement group for approval and payment from our USG fund.

This has been revised in the past. Previous revisions were in April of 2014 and May of 2022. And then we look to keep this document updated every two years moving forward. So next slide. Just, kind of an overview again on how we established these new rates. We looked at Bureau of Labor Statistics, existing EPA region four states, how their program rate structures, our previous submitted invoice, reimbursement invoices, contractor quotes.

We got feedback from our state contractors and corrective action contractors and stakeholders and also internal, feedback from our reimbursement committee. Next slide. Again, I'm not sure if anyone's actually looked at this document, but, it's over 200 pages long, so it's kind of hard to put all that into, you know, a 5 to 10 minute presentation.

So going through this, You can see kind of the, the overall, rates, across the different tasks, the increases, personal rates are up 19% with these new changes. Tank closures are up 33%. Hazard management 29 release investigation 36. Risk management corrective action 33. Final tank closure 40. And then documents, reports. These are the the reports of the corrective action contractor sent into us to review our, 37% from their current established rates.

The next slide. Okay. Future, these are new additions. And, I just noticed this presentation is actually the one that I gave last board meeting, but we'll we'll work through it. So new additions to changes. There is a \$5,000 deductible, per suspected release. Rule and implementation goes into effect January 15th. So this, eliminates the the sliding deductible amount and we'll have a 5000 set deductible per suspected release.

We will still be conducting our non six inspections. The fund application still must be submitted within 6090 days. We also have rolled in the non six inspection costs. Will be reimbursable. So I'll go from memory here on what was in my other presentation. So over the last year we've had about 247 non six compliance inspections conducted.

So with the reimbursement impact to the fund that works out to about a additional \$160,000 to provide contractors, to be reimbursed for opening up samples, being present at those inspections. Oh. Thank you. Here we go. So, \$60,000, for those and these numbers, we've never done this before. So these numbers, I've had to, pull out of gas log and kind of, applause.

So they're they're projections. They're they're just trying to to show an impact of what, you know, incorporating these non six inspections. What type of impact they'll have to the fund. Over the last year we've had a relative around 100 tank tightness tests, that were

conducted in response to A96 inspection. Looking at the average cost of those, that's going to work out to around \$50,000 a year.

We've had 75 on tightness tests, that were done in response to these, suspected release, not six inspections. It works out to about 20 to, \$23,000. And then hydrostatic testing, where we test the integrity of sumps that may have fuel and, we had 65 of those related to, suspected releases that we asked tank owners to perform.

Over the last year. So all this kind of communitates into about \$160,000 per year, additional that would be coming out of the fund to, help investigate these suspected releases, that are found kind of at the compliance level. I want to reiterate these tank tightness tests, these inspections, they're not reimbursable for normal compliance activities.

These are only to investigate suspected releases. So either a failed ATG, some type of detector, failed test, things of that nature. So moving on to the next slide. The document has been out. Like I said, the public comment period ends February 8th. I also provided the document to, it's on our website, also provided the document to TCA for comments and also out to our corrective action contractors.

To date, I've only received two public comments which are listed here. One from our state contractor that that noted that, Shelby County has increased their their annual monitoring will, permit fee from 150 to \$600 and then has decreased their their maintenance fee from \$150 a well down to \$50 per well. So, I updated that in the draft document, because, looked in and yes, that that is correct.

Those changes have been made. A other comment that we received from a corrective action contractor, was saying that they're in spite of the 2% total amount of reimbursement approved, that there should be a \$50 minimum no matter what, put in and so looking at that, and looking at just the general, normal reimbursement amount, most of our reimbursement applications are well over \$2,500, which would be the 50, you know, \$50 or more, 2% total of that reimbursement amount.

And additionally, we also offer a 10% markup, which the 2% is on top of, of many of our reimbursement cost. And that 10% markup is to help with this administrative, you know, reimbursement claims, things of that nature. So, you know, our our response to that is that, you know, we really don't see that that \$50 is necessary.

It's just going to complicate things and that we've got, you know, adequate, coverage of ministrations, work already built into our current structure. Next steps. And, and I do think there was some confusion on, on approval of the board. And, but, you know, I'm here today to kind of go over where we're at, but, you know, the comment period is ending and that we would like to, you know, implement this, this policy as soon as possible.

You know, working it out. I know a lot of state contractors have been waiting on this, and we want to make sure that we can pay them that or quit rates that they, they need with inflation, and things of that nature. So we will since this is, our state contractors use this policy, and we're in the middle of a contract period.

We'll need to go in front of the Government Ways and Means Committee. Since we're implementing a rate change during active state contracts. And then we will also need to update our reimbursement software, speaking with our staff that do this, the last rate change back in 2022, it took them about two months, 2 to 3 months to be able to get all these new rates into our, program and to work out all the bugs and the kinks and things of that nature.

So I would like to go back and kind of cover the part that, skipped here. On the overall increases based off of those, percentages. So, these are additional per year increases, based off of these present activity. So, you know, you're looking at an average of about \$4.6 million a year. Additional, with these rate increases across the board.

And as you can see here, here is how that kind of breaks out. Monetarily, kind of per task throughout the document. So with that, I'll ask the board if they have any questions. Yeah. Are there any questions for Nathaniel? Oh, yes. Sorry. Real quick to make sure everyone understands where we're at so that you can ask the appropriate questions.

My name is Austin Moore. I'm an attorney with Teaneck in the Office of General Counsel. So, as Mr. Luther pointed out, we are two days away from the ending of the public comment period. We would like to move forward with implementing this policy prior to the next board meeting. To be clear, this is not something that requires board approval.

We're not changing a rule. We're not changing the statute or anything like that. We're here to present it and ask for your blessing to make sure everyone's on the same page. But just to be clear, what we are asking the board or telling the board what we'd like to do is at the ending of that, final two days for the public comment period, we'd like to move forward with implementing this prior to the April board meeting.

The effect of that, if we were not, if the board were to ask us to hold off, is that all of our contractors would not get reimbursed at the higher rate, which they're very anxious to do. So I just want to make sure everyone understands what we asking for. Again, it's not something that we need technically from a legal standpoint that we need your all's permission to do.

But we're obviously asking for your blessing. So just wanted to clarify that if anyone has any questions, I'm more than happy to answer those. So I'll ask a question. And Bill, you can hop in also. But we we do not need to take a, roll call vote for this to proceed. Just to be

clear, regarding no approval policies and things like that, nature or something that's under the authority of the board.

Okay. It's more like to advise the board of what the division is doing and receive feedback you may have. Okay. Thank you. Is there any questions? Doctor have painted it sounds like this towards our event. It sounds like we don't need a vote on this, but I would offer my support for what it is you proposed. And, yes, corrective action contractors do need an increase in reimbursement.

Okay. Just want to point to double check. Claire. Boss. Okay. Any other questions for Mr. Luther?

Okay. Thank you. Thank you. George. Thank you. Also. Next on the agenda is Mark Jordan. And he will be presenting the Solid Waste Management Enforcement update.

Yes. Good morning. Board and attendees, this is Mark Jordan. I am remote today. I hope you can hear me. I will be giving you a brief update on the enforcement activities in the Division of Solid Waste Management since the previous board hearing. So next slide please. Since the previous hearing, the Division of Solid Waste Management has issued one hazardous waste order and two solid waste orders.

And from the previous board hearing, there is one order that, I can update you on. Next slide, please. First of all, the two solid waste orders, there was, excuse me, a director's order issued.

December 16th to Carbon Rivers Incorporated. They had two sites, one in Knox County and one in Roane County. And this order was issued for the failure to manage recovered materials as a viable commodity, a failure to minimize the potential for releases to the environment, a failure to demonstrate a viable market for the processed materials, and conducting processing activities without a permit.

The civil penalty of 10,450 was contingent upon the removal of all the materials from both sides. The damages of \$2,530 were assessed, and currently the respondent is working with two personnel to try to, reach an agreed order regarding the removal of the materials from the sites. The second Solid Waste Order was issued to the Perry County Demolition Landfill in Perry County.

It was signed December 19th, 2025, and it was issued for the failure to conduct. I believe that's a typo. I must, apologize for that. It was a failure to comply with the permit conditions and disposal of solid waste not permitted for that designated facility and operating outside of the permitted boundary. And again, this is a demolition landfill.

They do have some issues. The civil penalty of \$9,000 is contingent on ceasing operations outside of the permitted boundary. And implementing some corrective measures to comply with the permit conditions, as well as the regulations. Damages of \$1,725 were paid January 12th. This order is final and I believe the division is awaiting further actions. From the site.

Next slide please. And the hazardous waste order was issued. This was to Tenneco Automotive in DeKalb County, signed January the 8th, 2026. And this was, for hazardous waste container labeling and handling and maintaining containers in good condition. There were some issues with the weekly inspections, and there were also universal waste labeling and handling issues and failure to notify for a waste stream, civil penalty of \$4,200 and damages of 3371 and \$0.10.

This order is still just barely within the 30 day response window. And, as of this morning, the division has not heard from the facility. So next slide, please. And we do have an update, issued, the director's order of du Terrapower in White County. It was signed October 31st, 2025 for hazardous waste determinations, weekly inspection, documentation, excess waste accumulation and storage, waste stream reporting, and lack of a contingency plan.

The original civil penalty of \$18,200 and damages of 51, 21 and \$0.38. An agreed order was proposed by the facility's attorney and it was issued January 15th, 2026. Resulted in a negotiated payment of \$11,660, which included, all of the damages. That payment was received January 20th. So this case is now closed. Next slide please. And that is it for for this update.

Are there any questions or comments regarding this. Are there any questions, Mr. Lang? Madam chair, thank you. Jared. Lynn. Hey, Mark. Just quick question. Carbon rivers, was that the wind turbine recycling? Yes, it was, the my understanding from from, talking with, solid waste staff, central office and field office is that the facility was simply never able to achieve the.

Type, let's say, of materials that they were trying to, on a scale that would make it viable. Basically, the turbine blades are of such a construction. It's almost impossible using the purely mechanical methods to achieve any meaningful value out of the material. And again, they were the two sides. The main one there in Roane County, part of the old, Doe Reservation.

And there was another facility in Knox County, but they have agreed to remove all those materials. It's, now to the point of, cost and logistics. Okay. And and the, terrapower, that's lithium batteries offline. That was solar panel recycling, solar panel. Okay. Very, very similar

process or very similar outcome. You could process down to a certain thickness of these panels and then it became, a game, if you will.

I don't I mean, that is, of course, as it sounds, became a cost benefit between continuing to try to reclaim additional layers, of materials in these panels versus the amount of, lead contaminated glass that was being generated. So. Okay. Okay. Thank you. You're welcome. Anything else? Any other questions for Mr. Jordan? Thank you. Mark. You're welcome.

Next time, I hope to in present, but, weather dictated otherwise on this one.

Thank you. Next on the agenda, we have Lauren Haney. And she will be given the UST enforcement update.

And non-current.

Debt. I'm sorry. Oh. She's. She. She'll be back in a moment. She's on WebEx. Oh, she's on WebEx. I'm sorry. So.

This is Christine. Lauren. You're unmuted now. Neil. Consultant with the Division of Underground Storage. Thanks. I'll be filling in today for Mrs. Rhonda Key and going over the divisions. Enforcement update for October 1st through December 31st, 2025.

Next slide please. During that time period, the division issued 30 enforcement orders. 14 of these were fund orders and 16 were compliance orders. Of the 14 fund orders, five are currently in final status, one is in final. Final remediation status. Two have been appealed. Two were closed. Two are in sign status, meaning they've already been served to the respondents and two are in sign pending service of process status.

Of the 16 compliance orders, three are currently in final status, five have been appealed to are in sign status and six are signed pending service of process. Next slide please. During this time period, the division assessed \$385,000 \$385,840 in civil penalties. And the remaining slides go into detail on the specific orders. We have slides on the final remediation, appeals and closed orders from October 1st December 31st, 2025, as well as final and appealed orders from the previous quarter.

All right. Next slide. This is and the next one, please. This is one of the final orders for this time period. This is a fund deductible amount. Order signed October 31st, 2025 for Snappy Mart in Memphis.

I won't go over all of these specific violations unless anyone has, specific questions. But if you will turn to the next slide. The application for fund eligibility was approved with a deductible of \$30,000. The total, civil penalties amounted to \$27,400. And the order became final December 6th, 2025.

Next slide please. For this fund deductible amount, order for Murphy USA and Knoxville. The order was signed October 30th, 2025 with total fees and penalties of \$4,000, and the application for fund eligibility was approved with a deductible of \$30,000, and this order became final on December 4th, 2025.

The next order is another fund deductible amount order. This one was signed November 17th, 2025 for another Murphy USA facility in Cookeville. The application for fund eligibility was approved with a deductible of \$30,000, as shown on the next slide, with total fees and penalties of \$11,200, and this order became final in December. On December 21st, we. The next order is, for snappy Merlot and Memphis.

And this is although it says a fund deductible amount order. Actually a fund eligibility denial order. Signed November 3rd, 2025. The application for fund eligibility was denied. The total fees and penalties amounted to \$11,200. And this order became final on December 6th, 2025.

The next order is, for the PFG health facility in Knoxville. This is another fund eligibility denial order signed December 1st, 2025.

It assessed total fees and penalties of \$12,800 and became final on December 21st.

The next order is for 41 Market in Columbia. This was signed. This is a director's order signed November 5th, 2025. It assesses fees and penalties of 2020 \$400 and became final on December 11th. The next final order, is for West Jackson, BP and Cookeville. It assessed total fees and penalties of \$2,160 and became final on December 8th, 2025.

The next order is for Wooten Oil in Memphis. There is a slight typo on this slide. The the actual civil counties assessed for this one were \$15,360. And this particular order, has a fuel incompatibility issue. The order became final August 18th, 2025. We'll move on to the final remediation order from this time period.

And that is FDA 26 0115. For Roberts. Gibson Inc. signed December 2nd, 2025. This had a funded optimal amount. Of \$30,000. Total fees and penalties of \$3,200. It became final in January and, some closure remediation activities are still ongoing, which is why it's in remediation status for appealed orders. FDA 25 0056 is for the circle K Store in Memphis.

It has, total fees and penalties of \$4,000. The application for fund eligibility was approved with a \$30,000 deductible, and the order was appealed on November 20th.

The next appealed order is the 26 001 from Johnson City. This had all total fees and penalties amount of \$5,200. The application for bond eligibility was denied and the order became final December 7th, 2025.

The next field order is USD 25 0034 for neighborhood, Market and Deli in Jackson. This has total fees and penalties of \$2,400, and the order was appealed. On October 31st.

The next appealed order is USD 25 007 for for Ripley Express in Jackson. The order itself was signed October 20th, 2025 and appealed on October 31st, and the total fees and penalties are \$2,400.

Next is USD 25 0101 flash market number 160, in Memphis. The order was signed October 20th, 2025. The total fees and penalties amount to \$86,800, and the order was appealed. On November 24th.

Next is order USD 25 0106, in Knoxville. This has total fees and penalties at \$4,800 and was appealed on November 10th.

And finally, order USD 20 501 23 for Lila's quick stop in Chattanooga. The order was signed October 28th, 2025 with penalties of \$9,200, and it was appealed on November 25th, 2025.

Now for the closed orders. FDA 26 0005 for three J's Food Mart in Jackson. This is a fund deductible amount. Order signed October 3rd, 2025 with a deductible of \$10,000 and the case was closed on November 11th, 2025.

Next FDA 26 0006, in Knoxville. The fund deductible amount order was signed November 25th, 2025. It had a \$30,000 deductible and the case was closed December 30th. Now, for orders that are final or appealed from the prior quarter. FDA 25 005 to a circle K store in Nashville. It was a fund deductible amount order signed July 28th, 2025 with a deductible at \$30,000, and the case was closed on December 2nd, 2025.

And finally, USD 25 0056 circle K and Nashville, with total fees and penalties of \$2,400, was closed January 6th of this year. So I'm happy to try to answer any questions if anyone has any. But that's the enforcement update from the last quarter of 2025.

Thank you ma'am. Is there any questions for Lauren? If not, thank you very much. Thank you. Okay. We've got already heard Steve. So next on the agenda. Stay in. We'll have Boyd will come back and give us a UST progress report.

Hello. I'm back. And I'm still Stan Boyd, director of underground storage tank division. Updates, I guess, a couple of things. With all the recent weather. We didn't have any weather related emergencies. I'm sure some of the fuel stations, probably were without power. I expect there were probably some spot shortages, but as far as any weather related calls to us, we didn't receive any.

So that's that's a very positive thing from, from my point of view. Another very positive thing from my, my outlook is so far we haven't had any bills filed that, are affecting us. That's

always a nice thing to be able to say. That could change today, but, so far, so good. We also, we continue trying to fill all our vacancies just like any other divisions trying to right now.

We've had some struggles, in our Memphis field office with cleanup staff. We've been turned down twice for a position. One fella, accepted the position until his until his firm found out, and they counter offered, which is only natural. You know, we get that. So, you know, no bridges were burned or anything, but, he decided not to come to work for us.

And then another fellow just turned us down on the initial job offer. I think that's a signal that, he needs to be looking, you know, at our positions across the board to lift people up. You know, if we're going to ask them to move to a location or take a job with us somewhere, we ought to be paying them to do the job.

Thank you. Also, off the top of my head. Thank you for your flexibility with Nigel today. I know it's a couple of days left in the comment period, but it is important to get the tank owners and their contractors paid at these increased rates. It's important to, you know, get this contract amended. Which takes, you know, a meeting across the street and, those types of things.

So it's, very helpful to us. And we're glad, to move forward with it. Other than that, are there any questions of me? Me? Any at all? Any questions for director Bowie? Okay. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. Next on the agenda is solid waste. Director Hewitt giving us a solid waste. Update. Is it morning or afternoon?

Still? Morning. Good morning. Board. Just give you a quick update. Unlike UST and Stansbury, we were impacted by Ice Storm Farm. All the counties in West Tennessee and middle Tennessee. We've been reaching out to them asking their needs. That relates to, emergency debris staging areas. Right now. And I'm, I'm canning because we've had some come through while we've been sitting here.

We're at 34 approved sites and we've got others in the works. Those include Davidson, Dickson, Giles, Harden, Henderson, Hickman, Murray, McNairy by Sumner Wayne and Will Williamson County. So we know we'll get some more. Christina is at Tema working with him closely on this, like she did with Hurricane Helene. So she'll be there until she goes on vacation on the 14th of this month.

So we appreciate everything that our staff are doing out in the field offices. And if there are counties that need approvals, we're working to find and approve locations that are appropriate. I can only think of one, suggested site that a county had for a location, and it was actually at a landfill that has an order on it.

So we will have to work through that because it's probably not the best location for their debris staging area. Appreciate the the kind words about the, electronic annual waste reporting. I know you guys will remember back, when Pat was the director. It probably goes back to 20 1516 timeframe. We worked with, internal to track, staff doing this kind of reporting.

Our staff or Ised group, and they could not get it accomplished. But working with EPA and using their Rec grant info online system. I'm excited about it. And I think, like you said, Jared, the regulated community is going to be excited about it. So there will be some little things we have to work out, but but it'll all smooth out.

Tin says, like Pat said, it's good to be in Chattanooga. Looking forward to it to be May 13th through 15th. I hope everybody puts that on your schedules. We have had, five bills assigned this year to us. So, staff will be busy evaluating those. I think one of the most interesting ones we got, today was the potential for our human composting.

Bill. Yeah. So, anyway, so just just be aware that that is out there. Someone was suggesting that, Anyway, so, Okay. Does anybody have questions for Lisa about that? Further?

No. Anyway, so that, we will be coming to you guys in the near future to discuss fees for both our solid waste and has waste programs. As you guys are aware. It's been since about the early to mid late 2000 for both programs. It's we've talked about fee increases. So that's something that we'll be working with you guys on.

We're evaluating what we think would be needed, on that. So and especially on the solid waste side of the house with more waste going out of state. It reduces the amount of revenue coming into our program, and, but we still have to do inspections on landfills, convenience centers and everything like that and address complaints in a timely manner.

So thank you. Okay. Are there any questions for Director Healy? Madam chair? Yes. I would like to recommend Doctor Bast, his team in Knoxville, if there would be any need for recommendation for human composting. I think UT has a pretty good program there. It might help. Yeah, they they have a potter's field that they have up there.

Yeah. Thank you. Are there any other questions? Oh, doctor enters. This is not so much a question. I understand that, Madam Chair. You sit on the solid waste task force that's been appointed by somebody higher up in the government and in us, and others on the on our board serve on that. Would it be possible, to get a report from them?

The reason I ask that is, listening to Ambers, presentation this this morning. Talking about regional solid waste plans. We've got this bigger deal going on with the solid Waste task

force that's addressing some of these issues. I hope. So my question is, would it be possible to get a presentation to this board kind of on the status of what's going on there?

Yeah. And Lisa and Pat Giles sits on the solid waste task force also. My recommendation would be Jeremy Hooper to make a presentation at our next board meeting. And he's made two excellent presentations to the task force. That is a great overview of what's going on, what's happening now and what's going what, what the future looks like. So I would recommend if we could have Jeremy Hooper present at the next board meeting.

I'll get with him and and talk to him about that. Okay. Great. Thank you. Okay. Is there any other questions or comments? Yes. I'll turn it over to Loretta to discuss next meeting's. Some of you will have in the back of your folders, your travel forms to sign. If you haven't given those to me yet. It looks like our next meeting is going to be set for Wednesday, May 6th, 2026.

Here in this building and of course, I will keep your prized of the details as they become available once we confer with the law judge. We look forward to seeing you there. And with that, I'll turn it back over to the chairman. Is at this time, is there a motion to adjourn? I think we still have. Oh, sorry.

Bail. Start the public comment section at the end. The generic one for. Oh, yes. Is there any additional comments?

There is no one listed online. Okay. Thank you. Okay, I'll try it again. Is there a motion to adjourn the meeting? Madam chair Mark Williams, I'll make a motion to adjourn. And certainly. And we'll second. Okay. Thank you. We'll have a roll call. Vote at this time.

Miss Catherine. Yes. Nadine. Yes. Mister flood. Yes. Doctor. Gardner. Yes. Mr. Giles. Yes. Doctor. Hyfantis. Yes. Mr. Leon. Yes. Mr. McCormick. Yes. Mister OMB. Yes. Mayor Ryan. Miss Berry. Yes. Mister West. Yes. And Mr. Williams. Yes. Thank you. We are adjourned. Thank you. Everyone. It was a weather update for you also. For some of we know this is the owners of the news.

You have to.