

## GWINNETT COUNTY WATER AND SEWERAGE AUTHORITY Tuesday, May 31, 2022 - 4:00 P.M.

Department of Water Resources, Training Room 684 Winder Highway, Lawrenceville, Ga. 30045

Present: B. Martin, C. Thompson, B. Kerlin, JC Lan, W. Allick, Jr. (C. Thompson joined meeting after vote taken on Item III)

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Agenda

{Action: Approved: Motion: Martin; Second: Lan; Vote: 4-0 } (Kerlin-Yes; Lan-Yes; Martin-Yes; Thompson-Absent; Allick-Yes)

III. Approval of Minutes - May 9, 2022

{Action: Approved: Motion: Lan; Second: Martin; Vote: 4-0} (Kerlin-Yes; Lan-Yes; Martin-Yes; Thompson-Absent; Allick-Yes)

IV. Approval/authorization of a Resolution authorizing Gwinnett County to apply for, and if approved, accept a loan from the Georgia Environmental Finance Authority (GEFA) State Revolving Loan Funds and authorizing the Chairwoman to execute all necessary documents to apply for and accept the GEFA loan. Subject to approval as to form by the Law Department.

{Action: Approved: Motion: Lan; Second: Martin; Vote: 4-1} (Kerlin-Yes; Lan-Yes; Martin-Yes; Thompson-Yes; Allick-No)

- V. Comments
- VI. Adjourn

{Action: Unanimous approval}













## **Problem Statement**

Every week the F. Wayne Hill Water Resources Center produces over 1,250 wet tons of biosolids that must be disposed of in an environmentally sound and cost-effective manner.

Disposal in a municipal landfill was the solution of choice for many years. The cost of landfill disposal has greatly increased and landfill space for wet solids, like biosolids, is being significantly reduced.

We need to determine the most reliable, environmentally sound and cost-effective way to dispose of biosolids both now and in the future.

C Gwinnett

















Non-	Economi	c Screening			+ more adv - Less adva	antageous ntageous	
Criteria	Criteria		Incine	ration	Dryer	Composting	Eliminated composting
Disposal Cost		•	+		+	+	option due to space constraints and odor
Reliability (Long-term Viability)			+		+		issues
Ease of O	Ease of 0 & M					-	Eliminated incineratio
Safety / Odor		+					due to difficulty
Reusable	Reusable End Product Permitting		+	+	+	permitting and negative public perception	
Permittin			+ ·		+		+
CONVERSE     Achieves the macrown reduction in the r     of the product for disposal (produces an     inet ad)     Complexe perform destruction	A "Anomaly and a strateging or a strateging of strateging		Table 6-2 - Advantages and Disadvantages of Retary AdvANTAGES III High quality and antioentry of the and product. The finished manufactured manufactured		5 with high maintenance	Table 4-8 – Advantages and disadvantages of ADV/ANTAGES	of Compositing DISADVANTAGES
Potential for energy recovery	Public perception can be a problem for incidenation Resides	Control of the Stream. The product start can be sensed in meridement, for thy product start can be been as a sense of the memory, for the product (first to the 3-4 millimeters (stream) in discussions are discussed as the sense of the sense of the sense of the sense of the sense of the sense of the sense content of durating during product landout.		System needs to operant continuously for an endo to appear to extinuously and and the system of the second second second and the second second second second second second be regardly on the fixed second second second second for regional processing if the second second second second second second second for regional processing if the second second second second second second second second for regional second second second second second second second second for regional second		Potentially high-quality, saleable product suitable for agricultural use	Requires an amendment, which increases materials handling and truck traffic
	Permitting of new facilities is expected to be extremely challenging     The process can generate adors					Relatively simple process that can also be used to manage yard waste and other carbonaceous wastes	Requires either forced air or turning
	If the process has a long start up time to such operating temperature and needs to be run constantly for exanded time periods.					Compatible with anaerobic digestion; digestion helps to reduce overall odor from the process	High operational cost; can be power and labor inte
	If the process requires a relatively underse denotered webbilities.						Requires significant land area



## Conceptual level cost estimate: Biosolids dryer

Construction	\$72,122,818
Contingency	\$12,622,943
Ingineering/Inspection	\$12,994,201
Administrative/Legal	\$2,260,039
Total Project Cost	\$100,000,000
total Project Cost This is a very conservative cost estimate assuming costs will significan duration, actual estimated cost was \$88M in 2022.	\$100,000,000 tly increase over project

18



Item	Conservative Scenario	Best case Scenario	Notes	
NPV Landfill Costs	\$171M	\$271M	4% discount rate vs 0.07% discount rate	
Capital Cost	\$100M	\$90M	Engineer's estimate + addl. contingency vs Eng. Estimate	
Cost of Capital (Interest + Underwriting fee)	\$41M	\$1.4M	20-Yr GO Bond @ 4% vs 15-Yr GEFA @ 0.07%	
0&M Costs – First Year (2026)			4% discount vs 0.07% discount rate	
Natural gas	\$790k	\$412k	50% NG + 50% Biogas vs 25% NG + 75% Biogas	
Power	\$99k	\$103k	4wk downtime vs 2-wk downtime	
Labor	\$650k	\$650k	5.75 FTEs @ \$54/hr	
Maintenance	\$484k	\$403k	3% of Equipment Cost vs 2.5% of Equipment	
Product Disposal	\$2.2M	\$281k	100% dried solids landfill vs 0% landfilled 4wk of wet solids vs 2 wk of wet solids to landfill during shutdowns for maintenance	
Dryer NPV	\$166M	\$128M		
NPV of cost savings	\$5M	\$143M		
Simple Payback (Years)	15	10	Inc. \$15M ARPA Grant	
Cash Flow Positive Year	9	1	Inc. \$15M ARPA Grant, 20-Yr vs 15-Yr loan compared to continuing to landfill	

ROI Analysis Assumptions									
	DDS-80 dryer (Alt 4a)								
Item	Conservative Scenario			Best Case Scenario					
	Current (2022) Costs	First Year Operation (2026) Costs	Annual Escalation	Current (2022) Costs	First Year Operation (2026) Costs	Annual Escalation			
Landfill disposal cost	\$95.57/wet ton	\$111.80/wet ton	4%	\$95.57/wet ton \$111.80/wet ton		4%			
% dried solids to landfill	100% of dried produced		n/a	0% of dried product		n/a			
cake to landfill during shutdown	4 weeks/year		n/a	2 weeks/year		n/a			
Natural gas (% of total demand)	50%		n/a	25%		n/a			
Natural gas cost	\$10.00/mmBTU	\$10.82/mmBTU	2%	\$10.00/mmBTU	\$10.82/mmBTU	2%			
Labor cost	\$50/hr	\$54/hr	2%	\$50/hr	\$54/hr	2%			
Power cost	\$0.040/kWh	\$0.043/kWh	2%	\$0.040/kWh	\$0.043/kWh	2%			
Maintenance cost	3% of equipment cost		2%	2.5% of equipment cost		2%			
Revenue from dried product	\$0/wet ton		n/a	\$0/wet ton		n/a			
Project capital cost	\$100M (total project) - \$15M (grant) = \$85M		n/a	\$90M (total project) - \$15M (grant) = \$75M		n/a			
Loan interest rate	4%		n/a	0.07%		n/a			
NPV of cost savings	\$5M		n/a	\$143M		n/a			
Simple payback (with ARPA grant)	15 years		n/a	10 years		n/a			
# of Years to Positive Cashflow	9 years		n/a	1st year		n/a			

# Key Recommendations

#### Dryer is preferred technology

- 10-to-15-year payback period
- Reliable, long-term disposal option
- Provides potential for beneficial reuse
- Produces highest quality (Class A) product
   Diverts 116,000 yd<sup>3</sup> waste from landfills
- Equivalent to trash from 110,000 residents

Build dryer at F. Wayne Hill sized for both Yellow River and FWH solids



22

# **Project Scope**

- Dryer system
- Two dried solids storage silos
- Dryer building with odor control



🜔 Gwinnett









**Project Cash Flow** Spend Schedule 2023 2024 2026 2025 ARPA Funds \$7,500,000 \$7,500,000 GEFA Funds\* \$30,500,000 \$40,000,000 \$9,500,000 \$5,000,000 Total \$38,000,000 \$47,500,000 \$9,500,000 \$5,000,000 \* GEFA agreed (May 12<sup>th</sup> meeting) to increase annual borrowing maximum from \$25M to match project cashflow. GEFA approved an annual maximum borrowing of \$50M for Clayton County's Dryer project in 2021. C Gwinnett



28





