

Report on Roane County Commission Hostile Takeover of Roane County Solid Waste Authority

Prepared June 29, 2020, by Chris Dalzell, Chair, RCSWA

Summary

Roane County Commission is attempting a hostile takeover of the Roane County Solid Waste Authority. There is reason to believe this will severely disrupt or end recycling in Roane County. In doing this the Commission may be seeking to make tipping fees, grant funds, vehicles, and other assets available for county use. This report seeks to inform and raise alarm about this Commission action, such that Roane residents, agencies which appoint Board members, and agencies which issue grants, may exert pressure on the Commission to not ruin recycling. Recycling operations are in a fragile condition, currently propped up by grant funds with work underway to increase revenues, but if this work is not completed before the end of the grant term then there will be a financial crisis, which will likely end recycling. The intent of this hostile takeover seems to be stopping this work on financial sustainability.

This document starts with basic background information, from organization reference, to current Board members and officers, to 2020 plans. Then proceeds through an arc from background on financial sustainability, through to analysis on this hostile takeover. The effects on grants includes recommendations. Current Damage and Lost Projects section focuses on the potential being squandered by the Commission in this shortsighted power grab. Finally, details on resistance efforts, now mostly public outreach.

Report Contents

Summary.....	1	Overview of RCC Hostile Takeover.....	10
Introduction.....	1	Analysis of RCC Hostile Takeover.....	11
Organization Reference.....	2	Expected Effects on REAP Grant.....	21
RCSWA Board Members.....	3	Expected Effects on SWMB Grants.....	24
RCSWA 2020 Plans.....	4	Current Damage and Lost Projects.....	24
Board Dispute on Financial Sustainability.....	5	Resistance Efforts.....	29

Introduction

Background information is here to help make this report more generally accessible to Roane County residents, and several organizations, who may not be familiar with Solid Waste Authorities.

Organization Reference

Several other organizations are referenced by acronym throughout this report, they either, appoint seats on the RCSWA Board, or provide grant funding.

- **Roane County Solid Waste Authority (RCSWA):** Created by WV§22C-4, this county-level local government entity is responsible for solid waste in Roane County, WV. With the state-wide monopoly granted to Waste Management and mandate for all residences & businesses to have trash service, the RCSWA primary areas of responsibility are mandated plans, recycling collection, litter control, and illegal dumping – Roane County does not have a landfill or trash processing facility. Most RCSWA activity focuses on operations of the Roane County Recycling Center, but recently there was renewed attention on litter control, and exploring expansion with a new thrift store, and new compost & biochar (retort pyrolysis) facility (USDA NRCS compost grant).
- **Roane County Commission (RCC):** Per WV§22C-4-3, RCC appoints two members to the RCSWA Board, referred to as the “RCC seats”. Per WV§22C-4-7-b, RCC shall provide operating funding for RCSWA after grants & fees, but does not. Last known RCC direct funding was in 2008 for a county cleanup public trash drop-off event. RCC provided administration of a REAP RA 2017 grant, but this resulted in a serious problem (details of criminal investigation are confidential) and incomplete work to be finished in REAP RA 2020. There was a \$3,500 bridge loan in January, which seems to have turned into preamble for a hostile takeover.
- **Department of Environmental Protection (DEP):** Per WV§22C-4-3, DEP appoints one member to the RCSWA Board, referred to as the “DEP seat”.
- **Little Kanawha Conservation District (LKCD):** Per WV§22C-4-3, LKCD appoints one member to the RCSWA Board, referred to as the “LKCD seat”. Note, there is some common confusion between LKCD and Little Kanawha Resource Conservation & Development (LKRC&D or LKRCD), these are two different organizations, in Roane County both are represented by Sam Sheets.
- **Public Service Commission (PSC):** Per WV§22C-4-3, PSC appoints one member to the RCSWA Board, referred to as the “PSC seat”.
- **Rehabilitation Environmental Action Plan (REAP):** DEP department dedicated to supporting litter cleanup and recycling operations, provides grants and technical support. RCSWA has an active REAP **Recycling Assistance (RA)** grant for 2020, had 2 RA grants in 2017 which paid for most of the new recycling center (1 grant held by RCC), had an application for 2019 denied (late audit report), and plans to apply for 2022, grant terms are biannual 14 months (so there is a gap year afterward). RCSWA had a REAP **Covered Electronic Devices (CED)** grant for 2019, failed to approve an application for 2020, and planned to apply for 2021, CED is an annual grant.
- **Solid Waste Management Board (SWMB):** State-level oversight of county and regional Solid Waste Authorities. Regulates aspects of landfill operations. Allocates a share, typically \$2,000, of landfill tipping fees to each county SWA every month, provides technical assistance and annual grants of up to \$25,000 (typically awards half). RCSWA receives annual grants, FY’19 funded operations, FY’20 was emergency funding for operations and insurance, FY’21 mainly requests funds for insurance.

RCSWA Board Members

This Board consists of five appointed members and one honorary member. There are offices for Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, and Treasurer.

- **DEP Seat:** Held by **David Goff Moore**, unofficially since 8/12/19, officially delayed due to lost nomination letter (October?), he serves as Treasurer, term expires 6/30/21. Previously held by Julie Greathouse, she served as Treasurer, but resigned 3/11/19 due to family health problems.
- **LKCD Seat: Vacant**, term expires 6/30/20. Previously held by Jennifer Sartor from early 2018, she served as Secretary, but resigned 1/9/20 due to work & family obligations, this coincided with increased Board workload for the REAP RA 2020 grant. Previously held by Travis Cullen, Chair, who resigned in late 2017 while being criminally prosecuted and later convicted for embezzlement.
- **PSC Seat:** Held by **Mark Bossert**, unofficially 10/14/20, officially in December, he serves as Vice Chair and Bookkeeper, his term expires 6/30/23. This seat was previously held by Donna May, she served as Vice Chair, when her term expired she wanted to remain on the Board and was reappointed in July 2019, but in August she took a new job and resigned on 9/9/19.
- **RCC Seat:** The seat taken by **Andrew Corkrean** on 2/14/20, he represents RCC, not considered for a Board office, term expires 6/30/22. Previously held by Reva Paxton, she resigned 1/12/20 due to health problems, this coincided with increased Board workload for REAP RA 2020 grant. Previously held by Andrew Hedges, he served as Chair, until his term ended 6/30/18.
- **RCC Seat:** Held by **Chris Dalzell**, serves as Chair, term ends 6/30/20, was drafted in 2016 after volunteering on electronics and learned of his Board appointment a few weeks later in the Roane Reporter. Term renewal by RCC was expected, but instead RCC appointed Jennifer Randolph, their Administrative Assistant on 6/13/20.
- **Honorary Seat:** Unofficial non-voting seat held by **Cathy Flashman**, Recycling Coordinator and prior Board member – this is not defined in bylaws.
- **Chair Notes:** Travis Cullen was Chair until late 2017. Andrew Hedges was the previous Chair, until 6/30/18. Donna May was next in line to be Chair but declined that role and nominated Chris Dalzell instead, this was unexpected, not prepared for, but accepted at the insistence of the rest of the Board. Chris Dalzell is the current Chair, see RCSWA 2020 Plans for transition details. Mark Bossert was considered for the next Chair until work on leadership transition ended due to a dispute over obstruction of work on financial sustainability. Andrew Corkrean claims he will be the next Chair.
- **Secretary Notes:** Office is vacant, Jennifer Sartor was Secretary from early 2018 until 1/9/20. Since then, some minutes were taken by Cathy Flashman, most minutes were lost or incomplete, and reconstructed from Chris Dalzell's notes weeks later. RCSWA bylaws say the Secretary is responsible for meeting agendas, including public postings, but in practice this is done by the Chair, Travis Cullen and Andrew Hedges regularly wrote the agenda just before the meeting started. When Chris Dalzell became Chair effort was made to correct this, Open Meeting rules were followed, but Jennifer Sartor refused to maintain agendas, so this has remained a Chair responsibility.
- **Treasurer Notes:** David Goff Moore technically became Treasurer on 1/13/20, but has not performed any duties of this office, provided no reports, and has been unable to contribute to a long list of financial

unknowns debated during Board meetings – this is a source of tension on the Board. Mark Bossert serves as bookkeeper, his reports only cover lists of individual expenditures and revenues for a month, and account balances, they do not and are not expected to provide financial analysis, or an assessment of financial health. Chris Dalzell tracks grant expenditures as the administrator of the REAP RA 2020 and SWMB FY2020 grants – and also does approximate tracking of finances, budgets, short & long term financial health, and expected shortfall for CY’21, for due diligence as Chair, but does not share that rough information as to maintain pressure for other Board members to contribute.

RCSWA 2020 Plans

Original Plan for 1/1/20 to 6/30/20: Complete most of the REAP RA 2020 grant work by early June. Start production of value added products sufficient to achieve financial sustainability through CY’21. Plan REAP RA 2022 grant projects to achieve ongoing long term sustainability without need of further grant subsidy, and unfinished work from RA’20. Prepare Mark Bossert to assume the role of Chair, with a leadership transition in late May or early June. Recruit a new Board member to fill the RCC seat held by Chris Dalzell.

Original Plan for 7/1/20 to 12/31/20: Coast along with existing plans. Chris Dalzell would remain available for support and guidance via email and phone.

Result for 1/1/20 to 6/30/20: REAP RA 2020 grant funds were 8 weeks late, RCSWA cash reserves were exhausted after 6 weeks, a \$3,500 bridge loan was requested from RCC to prevent a financial crisis, and Andrew Corkrean joined the Board. For most of 5 months Board members bickered and obstructed work on financial sustainability over personal biases of “traditional recycling” (or to avoid doing any work), while refusing to make an effort to understand what they were arguing against or the critical need for increased revenues, this delayed progress by months. That dispute ended work on leadership transition to Mark Bossert. Problems with a collection trailer refurbishment project delayed progress by 3 weeks and is still incomplete (may need another 4 to 5 weeks of work). Covid-19 delayed progress by 8 weeks. No candidate was found to fill the RCC seat held by Chris Dalzell. Then RCC started this hostile takeover.

Covid-19 Response: The week prior to the Stay-At-Home order, a staff meeting was held to give employees safety guidelines, and review PPE and cleaning supplies – preparing for and completing this delayed other work by a week. During the Stay-At-Home order, the Roane County Recycling Center closed and hourly employees were temporarily laid off. Chris Dalzell deployed and personally maintained a pair of collection trailers for 6 weeks, in rotation of, 1 week out for collection, 1 week in quarantine before emptying. In week 7, David and Mark helped Chris empty the trailers and prepare the center to reopen – this delayed other work by a week. When the Stay-At-Home order ended, the hourly employees were rehired, and operations resumed as normal. A new contagious disease safe policy was adopted at a special meeting on 5/8/20. About 8 weeks delay in total.

Overall, this is a bad year, and its likely to get worse before its over.

Board Dispute on Financial Sustainability

Summary: RCSWA recycling operations are not financially sustainable. Not only do the other Board members not understand this, and refuse to make an effort to gain that understanding, two reject being told this, and obstruct efforts to correct it. The REAP RA 2020 grant has bought RCSWA 12 months to deal with this problem, this Board has wasted near half of that. Now RCC seems determined to guarantee failure.

Background:

- After Travis Cullen resigned there was a lot of chaos, other Board members did not have a good understanding of operations or finances. Andrew Hedges, Chair, and Julie Greathouse, Treasurer, worked through this and resolved a lot of problems, including some enormous labor inefficiencies and problems with the new recycling center.
- When Chris Dalzell became Chair on 7/1/18, after a learning curve, this continued, more operations problems and inefficiencies were resolved, but he did not have a good understanding of the finances, that was Julie's area.
- The financial sustainability goals were direct sales and sorting to increase bulk materials revenue, but no work was done to see if that was still viable, presumably Travis did this in 2017 or earlier.

2019 Financial Crisis:

- After Julie resigned in March 2019, no one was willing to serve as Treasurer and no one understood the finances. Cathy Leahy, Bookkeeper, had a current month to next month view, and was able to alert the Board of problems as they were starting. Beyond that, the Board was financially blind.
- Bulk cardboard, the largest material revenue stream by tonnage, dropped from a 2017 high of \$195 per ton ($\times 75\% = \146.25) to an early 2019 low of \$12.50 per ton ($\times 75\% = 9.375$), year over year the collected tonnage increased, FY17 revenue was \$5,530.69, FY18 revenue was \$7,281.37, FY19 revenue was \$3,312.91. Bulk paper is similar. The Board was aware of this but not the urgency of the situation.
- By late May 2019 the SWMB FY20 grant application deadline had been missed, there were insufficient funds to pay payroll and insurance, Cathy Leahy alerted the Board to this at a regular meeting 5/13/19, and the need for a Treasurer.
- Chris Dalzell took on most of the duties of Treasurer, while maintaining pressure on other Board members to contribute.
- On 5/23/19, during a special meeting, a change to the SWMB FY19 grant budget was requested and approved to pay insurance, and the long running agenda item "Increase Revenue" started.

SWMB Emergency Funding, SWMB 6/24/19 Meeting:

- The SWMB FY2019 grant application was for \$25,000, only \$12,500 was awarded, RCSWA requested SWMB provide emergency funding of the \$12,500 balance to maintain recycling center operations through to REAP RA 2020 grant funds arrive in early January 2020. This request was denied.
- Instead SWMB Staff met with Cathy Flashman and Chris Dalzell in the SWMB offices on 6/24/19. Carol Throckmorton, Nicole Hunter, and Scott Norman provided guidance on how small recycling centers have become unsustainable. They recommended the Roane County Recycling Center cut back

to 1 day a month to maintain the RC EDA lease, 1 or 2 profitable materials, 1 employee, and sell off unneeded assets – later termed “semi-close” the recycling center. Cathy and Chris said most people would stop recycling, this would end recycling in Roane County.

- Instead Chris suggested production of value added products. SWMB Staff said this was very difficult, and usually failed when the Board members doing the work left and later Board members failed to maintain it. Chris personally committed to try production instead of closing the recycling center. Consensus was on production of 3D printer filament, multiple glass sifted sand products (blasting grit, filter sand reflective paint additive, etc), and cardboard mesh/net packing.
- SWMB Staff suggested changes to the RA 2020 grant application, applying for a SWMB FY2020 grant, and provided general feedback. They said SWMB would not bail out RCSWA again. The result of this meeting was an overall course correction.

Early Production Planning:

- The RA 2020 grant was rapidly rewritten before the 7/1/19 deadline, as a business plan focused on production of several products, this continued into July with research on equipment for grant quotes. At the July meeting, the Board voted to change paradigms, from “grant funded public service” to “grant subsidized business”, with a focus on finding ways monetize collected materials.
- David Goff Moore volunteered to join the Board to fill the DEP seat held by Julie Greathouse. Jackson Co SWA announced they would stop accepting glass. David suggested adding glass mulch as a product, the Board decided to investigate this. On 8/11/19 a request was made to Jackson Co SWA to borrow their unused glass crusher to produce cullet and mulch, they informally agreed to a loan on 8/27/19 (via email), and presumably the glass crusher could have been picked up soon after. At this time our Freightliner box truck was not operational, the recycling center was overflowing with materials, and there was insufficient funds to start production, but planning and research continued.

Future of Roane County Recycling Center:

- On 7/8/19, this long running meeting agenda item started as necessary planning to maintain operations for the next 6 months, plan for 2020, and sought to address Board member participation problems. That practical short term survival aspect was mostly resolved by August and SWMB funding arrived in September, but the deeper underlying issues remained.
- By October this *Future of Roane County Recycling Center* item morphed into a “*Board member participation item*”, basically something for anyone not doing something useful to work on, which stayed on the agendas month after month. The work was meaningful, necessary, could not be dismissed from the agendas, and if completed could have been beneficial (not “busy work”), but its not critical to operations, so not completing it was not disruptive. For the 1/13/20 meeting this was reorganized into sub-items, (a) Business Planning, (b) Program Development, (c) Community Participation. Still idle Board members did not participate, despite some lengthy discussion. In May, Chris tried to offer some inspiration, in a long overview, describing the work point by point, trying to show that it’s necessary, meaningful, and not particularly difficult, but there was still no effort from idle Board members (actually backfired in that it was suggested Chris do some work on it).

Loss of Plastic Filament:

- The REAP CED 2019 grant project failed, we were unable to find volunteers to work on electronics, that failure resulted in a large build up of potentially salvageable electronics in the RCSWA office.
- The RA 2020 grant application, item 7, was \$15,000 for plastic granulation and 3D printer filament production equipment, the main raw material for this was to be ABS plastic from disassembled electronics, from a program funded by a CED 2020 grant.
- At the 8/12/19 regular meeting, the Board considered the CED 2020 application, which would reboot the electronics program with a paid employee, and include additional items like a 3D printer for testing. Donna May led the Board in opposition to this grant and a continued electronics program, due to the electronics clutter in office, the grant application was not approved. In September, Chris Dalzell made an issue of Donna's poor meeting attendance record and she quit.
- In late November we learned the RA 2020 award did not include item 7. Why this was cut is unknown, not having the corresponding CED grant would certainly be a major factor, but it may not have been awarded anyway due to size of the grant, or REAP only funding one production experiment at a time.
- As of July 2019, 3D printer filament sells for \$4 to \$8 per pound online, depending on type and quality. The machine requested can produce 10 pounds per hour, \$40 to \$80 per hour gross, operating cost is estimated at \$30 per hour, for a net profit of \$10 to \$50 per hour, for 6 hours per work day, for 2 days per week, \$120 to \$600 per 12 hour week, \$1,560 to \$7,800 net profit per quarter. It is likely this project would have at minimum provided for financial sustainability, and at most relieved the need for future grant funding for operations.
- Current plan is to repeat this request for REAP RA 2022 and CED 2022, but this requires recruiting someone able to get production started, to replace Chris Dalzell.

Delays on Glass Products:

- Public notices and a tiny market survey for cullet and mulch was posted at the recycling center from 10/22/19 to 12/4/19, asking for interest and pricing, this received a weak positive response.
- The REAP RA 2020 grant application, item 14, was \$4,750 for a small glass pulverizer, in late November we learned this was not awarded. On 6/3/20 we learned Shepherd University received the same glass pulverizer machine, plus a sand sifter, REAP will provide technical assistance based on the outcome of that project.
- Using Jackson Co SWA's glass crusher roughly the same project can be accomplished, except that machine needs a dust containment modification and dust collection system, and needs to start with a cullet sifter and concrete mixer for tumbling mulch, with the sand sifter added later.
- On 1/17/20 the Board voted to "*find outlet/use for glass or stop accepting glass in 1 month.*" (2/20/20 deadline). On 2/5/20 an updated production and pricing analysis was done, and a "*last call for glass recycling & mulch*" notice was posted at the recycling center, for a second tiny market survey with pricing. This resulted in sales commitments of 1 ton cullet (maybe more), 1 ton mulch (maybe more), and 3 serious maybes for mulch (wanted to see it first) – \$700 of a \$2,000 sales threshold needed for

startup. If the maybes committed it would meet the startup threshold, this warranted doing a larger public survey around Spencer, rather than a few dozen recycling center regulars, but other Board members refused to help with this. Glass collection continued.

- February and March were busy with REAP grant project work, no April meeting due to Covid-19.
- Financially, starting production prior to May was only possible using a credit card, or a loan, so a \$2,000 sales commitment threshold was set so this debt could be paid off rapidly. After May ample cash reserves are available but the market is more uncertain.

Glass Products Disruptions:

- At the 5/18/20 regular meeting, Mark Bossert pushed through a surprise motion to use the Freightliner to haul 10 boxes of glass to Newary OH, 300 mile round trip, at an estimated loss of \$200 in REAP grant funds, or \$800 loss on the entire 40-box 14-ton inventory. This idea that had been discussed via email and dismissed as wasteful back in February. There is concern that box truck may not be able to do this.
- Chris Dalzell interceded, on the basis this is operationally reckless, and a waste of grant funds. First to offer the entire 14 ton inventory to the previously committed cullet buyer, for the non-grant production equipment startup cost of roughly \$1,093 (vs \$2,800 at \$0.10/lb), with grant funds covering production operating costs of roughly \$645 (wages, electric, fuel, supplies). This was declined due to poor economic conditions. Had it been accepted, expanding into more profitable glass mulch production was low cost and easy, for ongoing profits as more glass was collected.
- Then Chris sought and received quotes from Strategic Materials for \$341.70 for a tractor-trailer and Bradish Glass for \$360 for a 3-compartment roll-off dumpster (preferable due to weather ruined boxes). Then checked with REAP and received instructions to request a budget change to use funds from the fuel line item to pay for this. That effectively defunded Mark's plan to use the Freightliner, and Chris refused to consider requesting the budget change until market research was completed on glass products.

Increase Revenue Items:

- On 5/23/19 this long running agenda item was introduced with 13 sub-items, in the hope of generating enough revenue to sustain operations, including: electronics, plastic (sorting), filament (3D printer), books, compost, glass, cardboard (cat scratching boards, cut outs), metal (scrap), reuse stuff, crafts, cooking oil, TerraCycle, and equipment (unneeded items). Later added white goods and trash disposal.
- Filament is inaccessible due to equipment cost. Metal was implemented. Unneeded equipment was sold. Electronics implementation via CED grant with volunteers and schools failed, but should work with a paid employee. Book sales online via volunteers failed, but should work with a paid employee. Cardboard mesh packing is in progress but not expected to generate significant revenue, though may with collection of better quality cardboard. Cooking oil and TerraCycle were abandoned.
- Progress by 6/8/20, scrap metal yields maybe \$100 per quarter, electronics maybe \$50 per quarter, reuse items attracts small donations (unknown), and selling an old F-150 pickup yielded \$2,000 in November. Estimated CY'21 financial shortfall is a little under \$2,000 per quarter. The REAP RA 2020 grant acts as a time buffer to increase revenue, but this is wasting away without good progress.
- It seems like most of the Board members do not take this seriously, refuse to work on this, or obstruct it. When the RA 2020 grant ends, this will result in a financial disaster due to Board negligence.

June Meeting Disruption: At the 6/8/20 regular meeting, Chris Dalzell attempted to pressure other Board members to agree to a common cause of keeping the recycling center open and that in order to do so more revenue was required, irregardless of source, but Mark Bossert and David Goff Moore refused. In the ensuing debate Mark attempted to dismiss the *Increase Revenue* items by falsely claiming they were not viable, a waste of time, that glass products had no customers, and seemingly all of this should be abandoned. David supported this opposition, but didn't add much. Chris argued more revenue is needed, and if they don't like those projects then come up with something better, but they refused. This wasted half the meeting, and resulted in failure to address several other important agenda items.

Treasurer Responsibility:

- On 1/13/20 David Goff Moore became Treasurer, discussion on this included lengthy initial getting-started guidance on reports, budgets, analysis, and a standing offer of help if needed. Prior to this Chris Dalzell fulfilled Treasurer duties beyond the bookkeeping work done by Cathy Leahy. At around the same time Mark Bossert assumed bookkeeping duties from Cathy Leahy.
- After 1/13/20, there were no financial reports (beyond Mark's basic bookkeeping report), no profit & loss reports, no financial health assessment, no forecasts, no budgets for general funds, no analysis of individual programs, no participation in grant administration or reports, etc. Each regular Board meeting included some discussion of financial unknowns which would be up to the Treasurer to resolve, especially financial sustainability and related analysis for CY'21. To be fair, David did ask about the SWMB semi-annual report, a meeting was discussed but schedules didn't line up and there was no followup. Chris should have made an issue of this failure in responsibility in March.
- When David joined Mark to oppose work on financial sustainability this crossed over from, tolerated *typical Board member failure to participate* into, far more serious financial negligence and threat to sustainability. A plan was made to address this in July with either, group assistance in helping David to assume all Treasurer responsibilities as a functional member of this Board, or high pressure to resign from RCSWA for negligence. If David committed to this, there would be group effort on a detailed financial analysis of CY'21, revenue potential of direct sales and sorting of bulk materials, and of other potential revenue sources, like production of value added goods. It's assumed this would result in a course correction, in time to be financially sustainable through CY'21.
- Throughout 2020-H1 Chris quietly continued most Treasurer duties to ensure there were no problems from a failure to participate, but did not contribute reports to Board meetings.

Financial Sustainability Reality Check: Afterward 6/8/20, Chris implemented defensive procedures to prevent further disruption at meetings, including strict Roberts Rules adherence, and shorter specific agendas. A special meeting was planned to force Mark and David to deal with financial reality, or resign, to prevent failure of recycling operations due to their ongoing negligence – prepared resignation letters would be on hand for them to sign. On 6/13/20, RCC decided to not reappoint Chris, seemingly guaranteeing financial failure.

Overview of RCC Hostile Takeover

Summary: RCC is forcing a change in RCSWA leadership by removing Chris Dalzell. Andrew Corkrean intends to make himself Chair, *"to move the Authority in a different direction"*, and for Jennifer Randolph to manage finances, presumably as Treasurer. There is no indication Andrew has the capacity to takeover managing operations. Recycling operations are in a fragile condition, if revenue is not significantly increased by the end of the REAP RA 2020 grant term, then operations will almost certainly fail. There is no indication RCC will cover the nearly \$2,000 per quarter shortfall. It seems likely the intent is to cause financial failure, or otherwise end recycling operations, and the likely motive for this is to make resources available for RCC use.

Event Progression:

- On 2/14/20, at a RCC regular meeting, Chris Dalzell petitioned for funds to cover payroll and critical operating expenses until arrival of overdue REAP RA 2020 grant funds (expected first week of January). Initially this was requested as a grant, which would later be used for a litter program, this request was denied. Several rounds of denial and insistence later, a short term bridge loan was approved. Then RCC appointed Andrew Corkrean to the vacant Board seat, *"to get SWA finances in order"*.
- Andrew Corkrean attended 2/19/20 regular meeting (2/10/20 part 2), 3/2/20 special meeting (short), 5/18/20 regular meeting. In those meetings he was asked if RCC wanted RCSWA to work on or do anything, he said litter cleanup, so work started on a litter program. This program plan started with a request to turn the RCC loan into a grant, he was asked repeatedly if he thought RCC would agree to that, and for input on the draft litter program plans, but he didn't comment, other than to say he thinks they weren't worried about the loan. On 2/19/20 he agreed to tow back a collection trailer from Mineral Wells, and did so. He did not discuss or ask about RCSWA finances. He did not attend the 3/9/20 regular meeting, 5/8/20 special meeting, or 6/8/20 regular meeting. In the emails he sent, he agreed with deploying collection trailers and offered to help, argued for closing the recycling center during the Stay-At-Home order and no collection trailer deployment while closed, relayed some information about unemployment, commented on custom printed t-shirts, and commented on fire extinguishers & extinguisher signs. This seems to be the extent of his participation.
- On 6/12/20, at a RCC regular meeting, the Commissioners voted 2 to 1 to appoint Jennifer Randolph to fill the Board seat held by Chris Dalzell. The next week, Roane Reporter coverage indicated Andrew intends to become the next RCSWA Chair, and for Jennifer Randolph to take care of the finances.
- On 6/13/20, Andrew Corkrean emailed Chris Dalzell with notice he would not be reappointed, expressed an intent *"to move the Authority in a different direction"* then refused to go into details, an intent *"to serve as interim chairman while we transition and to continue the work the SWA is doing"*.
- On 6/14/20, Chris Dalzell replied with a list of good reasons for them to reconsider, that by removing him RCC would be responsible for creating \$8,000 in vehicle maintenance costs, and the loss of production equipment needed for financial sustainability. Chris replied again reaffirming he would not continue volunteering, and sought to get Andrew to disclose what RCC planned to do here.
- On 6/15/20, Andrew Corkrean replied that RCC's decision was final.
- From 6/15/20 to 6/22/20, there was a lot of email discussion, but ultimately it didn't make a difference. Chris asked about RCC's plans, offered a compromise, but received insults in reply. Chris asked other

Board members for feedback, no response. Chris asked Sam Sheets to request LKCD call special meeting to appoint him to their vacant RCSWA seat, this did not occur. Chris notified SWMB and REAP, and received replies expressing concern.

- On 6/22/20, Chris Dalzell sent an email version of the analysis below, it was directed at Andrew, items 1 and 2 were posed as lists of questions, confrontational. Merlin Shamblin replied some minutes later that Jennifer Randolph was appointed, time stamps suggest Merlin did not read the analysis. Chris replied that he is asking RCC to reconsider for good reasons, and if the concerns on continuing recycling cannot be resolved then it would be debated in public. There was no response. This went public shortly afterward, with emails to the Roane Reporter, various concerned citizens, and then posted online.

Analysis of RCC Hostile Takeover

The unknown here is, what does RCC want from or intend to do with RCSWA? RCC refuses to disclose their plans, or address any of these concerns. This analysis attempts to answer that question, based on RCC actions and available information.

1. Ostensibly Andrew Corkrean joined this Board to "get SWA finances in order".

If this were true then Andrew should have done any of the following:

- Detailed review of finances, or even looked at a single profit & loss statement.
- Presented any proposed financial changes to this Board.
- Worked on any of several projects to increase revenue.
- Suggested any changes to expenditures.
- Worked on grant applications to increase funding.
- Helped to secure additional funding, such as *shall* be provided by RCC per §22C-4-7-b.
- Come to a working understanding of how operations relate to finances such that suggestions could be made for operational improvements.
- Done anything at all to pursue the claimed purpose of joining this Board.

In Board meetings Andrew did not discuss finances, or ask questions during the financial reports by Mark Bossert. When asked for this report, Mark said Andrew did not ask any questions outside of meetings or discuss finances at all, and agreed it seems Andrew has no interest in finances. When confronted via email about joining this Board under false pretenses, Andrew did not respond.

Conclusion: It is reasonable to conclude Andrew did not join this Board to “*get SWA finances in order*”.

Alternate Explanation: Andrew failed to fulfill the purpose of joining this Board, for either lack of effort, or an inability to do so.

2. In forcing a change in RCSWA leadership and assuming the role of Chair, Andrew Corkrean assumes responsibility to manage RCSWA operations.

This fact is plainly evident in meetings, meeting briefing documents, and email discussion available to Andrew from mid February to mid June. Cumulatively this conveys how managing operations is a part time job.

If Andrew intended to maintain operations any of the following should be true:

- Worked to understand recycling center operations.
- Worked to understand the public education efforts.
- Spent a day at the recycling center during public drop off.
- Met with the Recycling Coordinator to understand her job.
- Met with the Recycling Foreman to understand his job.
- Met with Chris Dalzell to gain an understanding of the day-to-day general management role of Chair.
- Reviewed the binding commitments RCSWA has to SWMB and REAP.
- Reviewed the active SWMB and REAP grants.
- Done any research needed to plan "*to move the Authority in a different direction*".

In Board meetings Andrew did not discuss operations or ask questions. In discussing this with Staff, no one had talked to Andrew, about this nor anything else. Mark Bossert indicated Andrew had not discussed operations either. Chris Dalzell had no indication Andrew had any interest in operations or the management role of Chair prior to June 13, and afterward Andrew did not respond to emails raising these concerns.

Conclusion: It is reasonable to conclude there is no evidence Andrew is qualified for this role, nor making any effort to become qualified, and that Andrew will not be able continue operations without significant disruption.

What are likely reasons for this? Goal is not to continue recycling operations, or lack of effort, or inability to fulfill this role.

What is the likely outcome of this? Operations are ended, or are severely disrupted then ended.

Is it reasonable to conclude that result is intentional? Yes, inferred goal from stated intent "*to move the Authority in a different direction*" (6/13), and refusal to discuss these concerns when raised via email.

Is there a reasonable alternate explanation? Yes, negligence.

3. Andrew Corkrean demonstrated a lack of interest in current RCSWA operations, which he is seeking to control, and expressed an intent "*to move the Authority in a different direction*" (6/13). Lets explore the possible directions available, and analyze the likelihood of success.

Is it possible to sustain current recycling operations without additional revenue?

No, detailed analysis is a goal, but this can be seen in available information. For example, using figures from 2020 bookkeeper reports to construct a more typical quarter, expenses are (excluding insurance): wages \$4310,

salary \$1392, electric \$345, water \$45, natural gas \$150, Suddenlink (new) \$292, fuel \$150, vehicle maintenance \$225, equipment maintenance \$225, operating supplies \$300, Paycor \$210, QuickBooks \$105, office supplies \$75, building payment (1.5mo) \$1650, total quarter expenses \$9,474. Typical quarter revenues are, Jackson Co SWA brokered sales payment \$1330.38, tipping fee assessment \$6000, other recycling revenue \$300, total quarter revenue \$7,630.38. Quarter net loss \$1,843.62, this is rounded off to “near \$2,000”.

Future Expenses Note: Additional wages of 14 hours per week was approved June 8th, and hiring a second worker is expected in August, each change increases wages by roughly half to \$6,465 with total expenses of \$11,629 for a net loss of \$3,998.62, and both changes doubles wages to \$8,620 with total expenses of \$13,784 for net loss of 6,153.62. These increases provide labor to start production of value added products and deploy collection trailers to schools, both can be sustained by RA 2020 funds until the end of term, then adjusted as needed for sustainability. The corresponding revenue increase is unknown, so these higher expenses figures are not used in these arguments. Also missing, costs of regular equipment and vehicle maintenance previously performed by Chris Dalzell, this work is reported but the value is not tracked.

Future Revenue Note: Covid-19 related economic effects have caused a lot of price fluctuations, increases will not last but drops will be much slower to recover. For reference see:

https://resource-recycling.com/recycling/2020/06/16/average-occ-price-drops-30-in-one-month/?utm_medium=email&utm_source=internal&utm_campaign=June+16+RR

Is it reasonable to conclude current strategic goals for production of value added products CANNOT be achieved after this change in leadership?

Yes, Chris Dalzell is the only person involved with the ability to build the required equipment, insufficient funding is available to purchase this equipment, insufficient funding is available to pay someone else to build this equipment, it is unlikely RCC will fund the purchase of this equipment due to high cost, no other funding sources are known. Items in question include, dust containment modification of Jackson Co SWA's glass crusher, glass dust collection system, glass cullet sifter, glass sand sifter, cardboard cutting table with electric cutter on a precision gantry, cardboard strip cutting machine.

What is the result of abandoning production of value added products?

Recycling operations will not be financially sustainable through CY'21, unless another revenue source can be found, if there is none then in effect the plan is for operations to fail. This would also violate or void the SWMB FY2021 grant application (A. Purpose and Objectives, WV§54-5-8.1), a new plan would be required for an updated grant application to SWMB. Expected failure to maintain recycling operations during the grant period is also expected failure to maintain or comply with the RCSWA *Comprehensive Litter and Solid Waste Control Plan*, which could be a failure to comply with WV§22C-4-8, which could make RCSWA ineligible for SWMB grant funds per WV§54-5-4.4, and WV§54-5-7.

Is it likely Andrew Corkreak has a new plan to make current recycling operations sustainable?

No, there are no known alternatives practical within 12 months with available funding, and it is highly unlikely RCC will provide the required funding, despite WV§22C-4-7-b saying they *shall* do so. Likely outcome of failure to develop a plan is SWMB denies the FY2021 grant (per above item).

What is this SWMB FY2021 grant and result of not receiving it?

This grant is primarily intended to cover liability insurance and workers compensation for \$11,484 (expected), but the total grant budget with other operating costs is \$18,674. Award of the full budget is not expected due to limited overall grant funding pool of \$400,000 shared among SWA applicants state-wide. Without this grant funding to cover insurance, BRIM FY21-Q1 is paid, if RCC refuses to pay for their vehicle maintenance budget hole then there will be insufficient funds to pay BRIM FY21-Q2, if RCC pays then likely accumulated cash reserves can pay FY21-Q3 but not FY21-Q4. Recycling operations would cease without insurance coverage.

Is it possible to cover revenue shortages with direct sales?

No, this is easy to see in the CY20-Q1 payment from Jackson Co SWA, their tally with percentage reductions is \$1,330.38, without percentage deductions is \$1,963.37, or a difference of \$632.99. Realizing that extra revenue may add additional operating costs, including wages for loading trucks, wages to bale paper, increased freight cost to Spencer (versus Jackson Co Recycling Center nearer to I-77), and additional work to find bulk material buyers. This added revenue would help, but at most covers a third of the shortage, or probably far less.

Note, Jackson Co SWA accepts and sells RCSWA bulk materials, they pay 75% of sale price for baled materials (cardboard, plastic, shredded paper), and 50% of sale price for boxed materials (paper). They stopped accepting glass in August 2019, RCSWA continued accepting glass and now has an inventory passing 14 tons, 40+ boxes.

Is it possible to cover revenue shortage with material sorting?

No, this needs research, but is highly dependent on the public sorting their own materials, participation is expected to be low for a long time, with "opportunistic collection" (e.g. sorting occasional bags of water bottles or small boxes of office paper). Paper is guessed to increase by a quarter without added labor, via extra collection boxes. Plastic is believed to be slightly better than revenue neutral without a granulator due to either, high labor costs on baling, or decreased collection tonnage if only a single type of plastic is accepted. For 2020-Q1 this would amount to an additional \$142.15 for paper. With a granulator and direct sales, plastic revenue could increase significantly, maybe double, but we won't have \$5,000 for a granulator until REAP RA 2022.

Is it possible to cover revenue shortage with glass products?

Yes, initial processing on current 14 ton inventory will cover startup and equipment costs, allowing for higher profits during ongoing production throughout CY'21.

For example, mulch at-startup production costs \$0.19/lb, post-startup costs \$0.11/lb, sells for \$0.25/lb bulk or \$0.30/lb bucket. After startup, with average net profit of \$0.15/lb and typical 4 tons per quarter, the total profit is \$1,200, which combined with direct sales of materials and sorting paper, should make operations sustainable. If 1 ton of that 4 tons is sand blasting grit, produced for \$0.20/lb, sold for \$0.60/lb bulk or \$0.80/lb bucket (vs TSC retail at \$0.90/lb), with \$0.50/lb average net profit, that quarterly profit increases to \$1,900. Profit potential of the 14 ton inventory is unknown, new market research is needed, but a profit of \$0.05/lb is a total of \$1,400. Maximum example, 5 tons of sand blasting grit, startup cost of \$0.35/lb, sold for \$0.80/lb, profit \$0.45/lb, could yield \$4,500, increasing the 14 ton total to \$5,400. This can establish a cash reserve.

What about the other "additional revenue" items?

This is an area of ongoing research, it is unknown how much profit these would generate, but yes, it might be possible to cover the shortfall if almost all of this is implemented.

- **Cardboard Mesh:** Has a higher than anticipated labor cost in removing tape/stickers from boxes prior to processing, no significant profit is expected. This may improve with collecting better materials from area businesses, or opening up the cardboard converter cutter assembly for thorough cleaning at regular intervals (voids warranty, maybe worthwhile).
- **Cardboard Cut-outs & Tri-Fold Panels:** Has high labor requirements, small profits are expected. This is part of the REAP RA'20 grant but Chris Dalzell is the only person involved able to build the cutting table with precision gantry electric cutter, there are insufficient funds to buy it or pay someone.
- **Cardboard Cat Scratching Boards:** Small to medium profit potential, requires a cardboard strip cutting machine, Chris Dalzell planned to build one. Two biggest unknowns are the supply of good cardboard and market to sell hundreds of boards per quarter, and a local supply of dried catnip. In theory, with ample good cardboard and a large online market, this could easily cover the shortfall. See section *Current Damage and Lost Projects* item 3-b-iv for a more realistic meager example.
- **Books:** Small profit potential, efforts with volunteers failed, need employee to do online sales. Use of books as crafts material is another possibility, needs further research.
- **Magazines:** Small profit potential, with a donation jar on a magazine swap table, and skimming off full sets, special, rare, old issues to sell online.
- **Electronics:** Small to medium profit potential, with sales of desktop PC's and other items easily refurbished by volunteer techs. This item was mostly lost with removal of Chris Dalzell, no other volunteers are available, but receiving a REAP CED 2021 grant could allow for hiring a tech.
- **Reuse Items:** Small to medium profit potential, depending on volume of good items, volunteers are unreliable, needs employee. If this is carefully managed it should turn into a significant revenue stream.
- **Crafted items:** Feedbag totes, wind chimes, and maybe others have small profit potential, production by consignment or commission seems unreliable, need a paid employee to do it.
- **Trash Disposal:** Small profit potential, could ask Calhoun Co Recycling Center about their revenues.

Doing all of this will require serious Board effort, but it is the second best way to attain sustainability, after glass products. Adding glass will guarantee long term sustainability, but still requires annual SWMB grants.

Is it possible to find the needed revenue in other grant programs?

No, there are not enough grants which would make a meaningful difference directly to existing operations. RCC was eligible for a REAP RA 2021 grant but the application deadline is July 1st. REAP CED 2021 may help offset a little from general operating expenses, especially if the tech hired can also do equipment maintenance. USDA NRCS compost grant, which has a June 26 application deadline, has a 25% cost share that negates benefit to overall operations, except that product sales would increase revenue, and the biochar aspect should yield some profits (research ended with this RCC inflicted chaos).

Is it possible to cut back recycling operations to sustainable levels?

Not easily, this was examined in detail and debated at length in May & June 2019. It was believed operations were optimal for current public participation and collection tonnage, and that cuts may not result in net savings. Flatly cutting labor while maintaining collection makes the work untenable. Cutting unprofitable products starts a downward spiral in tonnage and revenue of other profitable materials as people stop recycling. Pay rate cuts are likely to cause employees to quit or slow operations causing problems. Cutting a day off public drop-off collection and labor makes the remaining day untenable. Reductions in overall tonnage collected reduces the scoring values for consideration in future grant funding (less tonnage less funding).

However, addition of the 24/7 collection trailers in front of the recycling center has noticeably increased tonnage collected, and thereby increased labor efficiency (more weight per hour of work, trailers are cleaned out during lulls in public drop-off), this needs further analysis. Saturday collection needs research on break-even. The new work day is needed for production of value added products and to keep up with other work at the center, also reflects decreased rates of volunteer help. Collection by trailers deployed at schools is usually cut, the labor for that is the second worker to be hired in August, which is not part of the financial shortage estimate.

Can SWMB offer guidance or technical assistance to help?

SWMB Staff, with decades of experience in regulatory oversight of SWA's and recycling centers, concurred with, or provided, the main points of this operations sustainability analysis when it was discussed during a meeting in their office on June 24, 2019. Generally, recycling centers like ours have become unsustainable, they advised us to "semi-close" our center – open 1 day a month, 1 employee, accept 1 or 2 profitable materials, liquidate unneeded assets. This same guidance will probably be given to RCC as a default for failure to come up with a plan for sustainable operations, which again makes the end of recycling in Roane County the likely outcome here. RCSWA has a standing commitment to SWMB, from that 6/24/19 meeting, the FY2020 grant text, and the FY2021 grant application text, to make operations sustainable through production of value added products. Violating that commitment and disrupting financial sustainability efforts with this senseless hostile takeover attempt, while RCC failed to provide funding per WV§22C-4-7-b, is unlikely garner SWMB support.

Considering the above information, which narrows down the viable options available for this intent "to move the Authority in a different direction", while somehow still achieving sustainable recycling operations: Is it likely Andrew Corkrean has a secret plan to improve recycling operations, which no one else has thought of?

No, and RCC is very unlikely to provide sufficient funding.

So then, what is the likely outcome of this intention "to move the Authority in a different direction", which starts with removal of the person who understands this best and is doing the majority of the Board's work to achieve financial sustainability?

Three variations of the same outcome differing by intent, either (a) recycling operations are ended rapidly, or (b) recycling operations are intentionally kept in an unsustainable state until financial failure forces it to end, or (c) a rolling financial & operations disaster which results in RCC giving up on recycling.

There is a fourth far less likely possibility, that the rolling disaster causes sustained public complaints which cause RCC to provide additional funding to temporarily prop up operations until RA 2022 (2/1/22). From available information, the \$8,000 in new vehicle maintenance expenses created by RCC, and increased machine maintenance costs, its likely no cash reserves will exist at the end of the RA 2020 term. Based on current Board member disposition towards increasing revenue, its likely only direct sales and paper sorting will be implemented with a quarterly increase of maybe \$600, leaving a quarterly loss of roughly \$1,300. Assume SWMB can be convinced (conned) to award grant funds for insurance. Then it is likely a financial crisis will start in April and continue into February, until RA 2022 funds arrive. That is 3.5 quarters, a shortfall of roughly \$4,550. After RCC exhibited a casual indifference for unnecessarily creating an \$8,000 expense on vehicle maintenance, Andrew may consider another \$4,550 next year to be feasible, but this depends on the RCC budget and support of the other Commissioners. Considering this is self inflicted, unnecessary, and the other Commissioners are on record at public meetings saying recycling is a waste of money and effort, its more likely they would move to shutdown recycling operations, yielding the same end result.

4. Given that based on the above analysis, there is an apparent lack of interest and an inability to continue recycling operations without significant disruption, the next step is analysis of whether an end to recycling operations is the purpose of this intent "to move the Authority in a different direction".

Has RCC demonstrated an interest in recycling?

No, RCC has provided no apparent support or funding to recycling over the past decade, perhaps longer. The loan in February came with a string attached that apparently threatens to end recycling. Administration of grants from third-parties is excluded due to other motives to provide this service, primarily that many grants include line items for administrative expenses (i.e. profit), and there is a history of benefiting from contracts awarded from grant work (i.e. profit to family & friends). The trash drop-off event in 2008 was not recycling.

Has RCC demonstrated an aversion to recycling?

Yes, Merlin Shamblin and Randy Whited are on record at public meetings stating they believe recycling is a waste of money and effort, and Randy indicated he wanted RCSWA funds to go to RCC.

Is there a likely motive for RCC to attempt to take control of the RCSWA Board?

Yes, control over RCSWA assets, funds, grants, tipping fee allocation, and other resources.

Is it possible to fulfill that motive while recycling operations are ongoing?

No, all RCSWA resources are fully committed to recycling operations.

Is there a likely motive for RCC to attempt to end recycling operations with control of the Board?

Yes, to free up funds, assets, and other resources for use by RCC.

Has RCC demonstrated an interest in gaining control over the REAP RA 2020 grant funds?

Yes, Tanya Hicks surprisingly shows up at the REAP grant award meeting in Canaan Valley Resort to accept the grant award, saying she was told to attend by Jennifer Randolph and otherwise didn't know anything about it. It is possible this was an attempt to claim control over the grant award, although that meeting was purely ceremonial (no check), had Chris Dalzell not attended its possible other RCC interference may have followed.

Is there a way to get residents and businesses to accept the loss of recycling service without significant backlash?

Yes, disrupt efforts at sustainability now so that failure becomes inevitable after the REAP RA 2020 grant term ends, then gradually cut back operations. At the end, this engineered failure can even include misleading claims of transparency in making end-state finances available for public review and feedback for ideas to save recycling, which would be intentionally hopeless. Meanwhile RCC can easily claim it cannot afford to help.

Is it likely that intentional disruption of sustainability work is part of the purpose of this change in leadership?

Yes, that seems the more likely case, but negligence is possible too.

5. Given that based on the above analysis, an end to recycling center operations is the expected outcome here, the next step is analysis of what RCC is likely to attempt to do with RCSWA's mutilated carcass.

This would seem to branch in two directions, whether if this result is premeditated, or arrived at through negligence, but ultimately the likely outcomes are the same, differing only in timing and chaos. This is motive.

What would be the likely uses of RCSWA tipping fee allocations?

Funding of expenses externalized from RCC onto RCSWA. Funding some portion of Tanya Hicks pay, or maybe that of another RCC employee. Funding county cleanup events. Funding a litter collection program.

What would be the likely uses of the new Ram 2500 pickup truck from the REAP RA 2020 grant?

Probably be driven by Tanya Hicks, or another RCC employee.

What would be the likely disposition of all other RCSWA assets?

Liquidation.

What would be the likely disposition of the recycling center building?

Perhaps for some use by RCC or released to RC EDA to lease to another business.

6. But that is not the likely outcome here, and if that was the intent then it's very shortsighted...

Is it likely RCC will actually be able to assume control of the REAP RA 2020 grant funds, new Ram 2500 pickup truck, and related assets?

No, the grant is for recycling, ending recycling to gain control of these resources would violate the terms. Without this report and analysis, its likely RCC would have been able to gain control over this grant, make budget changes, and make use of the new truck. Now it is likely this grant will be frozen to prevent abuse. Funding of recycling operations may be allowed to continue with significantly increased oversight and some sort of binding plan for sustainable recycling operations. Failing that, it is likely the grant will end, with the remaining funds returned, and the new pickup will go to WV Surplus Property.

What happens if a sustainable recycling plan is implemented then abandoned later, or cannot be implemented at all?

REAP is likely to repossess the pickup truck, and go after RCSWA assets and tipping fee allocations, for years, until the grant funds invested in the new building are repaid.

Will REAP reclaim grant funds if recycling is scaled back to "semi closed"?

Yes, anything not needed by that scaled back program which was purchased by grant funds within the past 5 years. It is believed REAP has a lot of discretion here, it is likely they would leave enough funds to maintain that minimal recycling program. Note, "semi closed" is 1 day a month, 1 or 2 materials, 1 employee.

Can RCC actually profit from this takeover of RCSWA and a "semi closed" recycling center?

Probably not for a long time, it depends on REAP disposition, which after this report isn't likely to be cuddly.

7. Considering between 10% and 15% of Roane residents utilize the recycling center on a monthly basis, it is likely there will be public concern, complaints, and opposition to the destruction of recycling.

What is the likely outcome of a RCSWA public awareness campaign to caution people of this hostile takeover and expected end to recycling in Roane County?

Hopefully people will attend RCC meetings to complain, write letters, and call.

Is it likely RCC will attempt to dismiss, explain away, or discredit the messenger to end this public outcry?

Yes.

What could make dismissal, explaining away, or discrediting the messenger more difficult?

Press releases, public notices, and transparency. Post extensive amounts of information online, along with analysis, details on ongoing programs, goals, expected public benefits which would be lost under RCC control, and how the public can help by complaining.

What might the public demand of RCC and the new RCSWA leadership to ensure accountability?

Ongoing transparency, public updates on progress of any plans, and public reporting of any problems.

Could this be done now to help fend off an RCC takeover?

Yes.

Is it possible public backlash will cause RCC to reconsider this change in leadership?

Yes.

Is there reason not to try?

No.

8. County cleanup events are a potential benefit of tipping fee allocation not being consumed by recycling operations.

This was examined last year, attempts were made to plan an event, estimated cost was \$6,000, RCC refused to fund it, RCSWA was unable to fund it, though a little CED funding was available for support of elections collection.

When was the last county cleanup event?

In 2008, cost \$4,457 in Waste Management fees, RCC paid \$2000, remainder paid by grant.

Would it be possible to fund cleanup events without destroying recycling?

Yes, establish a formal "Roane County Cleanup" program under RCSWA, managed by a committee of volunteers, with several small funding streams, a checking account, and a savings account (or safe investments). A portion of tipping fees could be allocated, profits from accepting trash for a fee at the recycling center (e.g. half of \$0.20/lb), do fund raisers, and RCC could contribute something too. Grant funds maybe available too. When the savings account reaches an estimated event cost, plus a safety margin, hold an event.

9. Conclusion

Based on the available information and this analysis, there are two possibilities, either:

- (a) RCC as a whole is seeking to acquire RCSWA assets and funds for county use, and will attempt to end recycling to facilitate full use of those resources.
- (b) Andrew has blundered into something he doesn't understand, is about to create a large expensive mess for RCC to cleanup after grant funds run out, and the resulting financial disaster will bring about an end to recycling.

In either case public awareness and local news coverage may stop this.

10. Recommendations to RCC

Note: This is from the original email version of this analysis, it is retained here to show what RCC refused.

- (a) RCC reverses its decision and reappoints Chris Dalzell to RCSWA.
- (b) Andrew resigns from RCSWA.
- (c) Jennifer does not join RCSWA.
- (d) RCSWA and RCC make a joint appeal for a resident who is supportive of recycling, and has free time to contribute something on a regular basis, to join RCSWA, via the normal process of RCSWA making the appointment recommendation to RCC (i.e. RCSWA determines interest and competence first).
- (e) RCC and RCSWA will agree to make regular reports to each other about relevant issues.
- (f) No embarrassment, neither RCSWA nor RCC make detailed public statements about these events, and Chris Dalzell will accept blame in a minor way. For example, Chris could say *“I didn't communicate that Covid-19 disrupted finishing my work to put RCSWA on a glide path to sustainability and on preparing a good transition to new leadership. Covid-19 also ended my plans to roam the country this summer using my Prius as a camper, while working online, so I will stay until next spring to finish my work here.”*

RCC was given and refuse this offer: If they do the above, Chris Dalzell would personally guarantee placing RCSWA on a clear path to sustainability by next spring, to put in place new competent leadership, to prepare detailed plans for the remainder of 2021, write the RA 2022 grant, and write some detailed long term guidance.

Expected Effects on REAP Grant

The following is an item by item review of the REAP RA 2020 grant. Note that no funding makes items optional, technical assistance would still be available, some progress could result in funding (albeit unlikely).

1. **Wages, \$25,000:** Plan failure likely. The likely intentional disruption of work to achieve financial sustainability of recycling operations for CY'21 undermines or negates the purposes of this item. Direct abuse by RCC is also likely, via externalizing a RCC employee to be paid by these funds, which has nothing to do with recycling or this grant (e.g. Animal Control and Litter Control Officer, Tanya Hicks).
2. **Driveway & Parking Area Improvements, \$17,212:** Plan failure likely. Bid criteria prepared by Mark Bossert are believed to require \$19,212 to complete, this was sent to REAP for review on 5/26/20, this is dependent on use of some leftover funds from item 9, which may not be available due to RCC hostile takeover ending work on trailer refurbishment project.
3. **Bulk Materials Storage Area (roof add-on), \$6,000:** Plan failure likely, same as item 2. Bid criteria prepared by Mark Bossert are believed to require at least \$8,000 to complete, submitted 5/26/20, the \$2,000 needed may not be available from item 9 due to RCC actions.
4. **Pickup Truck, \$27,000:** Suspended, the Ram 2500 is at the dealer, ready for pick up, but due to expected RCC abuse, the dealer was instructed to hold onto the vehicle until REAP can review this situation, the dealer put the vehicle into their retail inventory (it may be sold).

5. **Yard Ramp, \$12,750:** Plan failure likely. When budget needs for items 2 and 3 changed, consuming the surplus from item 9, this plan was changed to similarly purchase a “fixer upper” to yield a surplus to be returned to item 9, which may not be possible due to RCC actions.
6. **Recycling Trailer to Baler Conveyors:** Not funded. Plan failure likely. BSM, a neighboring business on Oak Drive, has offered technical assistance to Chris Dalzell with purchasing and reconfiguring low cost industrial surplus light-duty conveyors. Likely cost under \$1,000 each, all volunteer labor, two conveyors needed, cost was to be covered by surplus from other line items with budget change, and/or longer term savings on worker wages. It is unlikely this can be completed due to RCC actions.
7. **Plastic Granulation & Filament Production:** Not funded. Unattainable due to equipment cost.
8. **Cardboard Product Production, \$4,000:** Partial plan failure likely. Cardboard converter purchased, marketing of mesh packing in progress. Building the cardboard cutting table with precision gantry with electric cutter was to be completed by Chris Dalzell – it is unlikely this can be completed due to RCC actions. Building a cardboard strip cutting machine for production of cat scratching boards, and similar laminated cardboard products, was to be completed by Chris – this is also unlikely due to RCC actions.
9. **Large Collection Trailer, \$7,000:** Plan failure likely. A used collection trailer was purchased for \$2,200 and a refurbishment project was started on 4 collection trailers, with \$800 from this line item, and remaining cost from vehicle maintenance. Chris Dalzell was doing almost all of this work, this was delayed due to Covid-19, the first trailer is almost done, second trailer is started, other two have not been touched – it is unlikely this work can be completed due to RCC actions. Expected cost to have this work completed commercially is \$3,000. The \$4,000 surplus from this line item was originally to be used to purchase another collection trailer (or two), then changed to add \$2,000 to each items 2 and 3. Later, it was hoped a surplus from item 5 could be returned to item 9, to purchase another collection trailer(s).
10. **Vehicle Maintenance, \$3,500:** Near depleted, crisis risk. When RCC dismissed Chris Dalzell the 2008 GMC Savana small box truck was up on jack stands with a major brake job just started, work on this stopped, budget was \$800 for parts, expected cost at a local auto shop is at least \$2,000. That vehicle needs at least an additional \$3,000 worth of work for a radiator, heater core, related coolant system work, rear differential cover plate replacement, and extensive rust abatement. Additional vehicle maintenance is needed on the forklift and Freightliner.
11. **Equipment Maintenance, \$3,000:** Funds low, crisis risk. Chris Dalzell was doing equipment maintenance at parts cost, without him the additional cost of service visits by professional techs will deplete remaining funds before the end of the grant term. Two balers need hydraulic service which Chris cannot perform on a professional level, this was planned for late in the grant term to reserve funds for any emergent problems, due to RCC actions it is unlikely needed funds will be available. Near the end of the grant term, it is unlikely funds will be available to repair any serious equipment problems.
12. **Utilities, \$3,050:** Nominal. Phone usage will include broadband service, when available (eta August).
13. **Newspaper Advertising:** Not funded. Efforts to submit regular press releases has failed, for lack of follow through and poor Board member participation.
14. **Glass Product Production:** Not funded, plan failure likely. This project can be completed using a glass crusher available for loan from Jackson Co SWA. Market research on cullet and mulch prior to

Covid-19 seemed promising, startup costs can be covered by available general funds, this revenue is critically needed for financial sustainability after this grant ends. It is expected the Board will decide to dispose of the glass inventory and stop accepting glass, abandoning this potential revenue source without due diligence, while knowing this is likely to bring on a financial crisis in CY'21.

15. **Operating Supplies, \$1,000:** Nominal.
16. **Office Supplies:** Not funded. Printing not budgeted from general funds but is affordable with salvaged printers on hand, also a lack of follow through by people assigned to do pamphlets and fliers.
17. **Fuel, \$1,500:** Under utilized, anticipate budget change later in grant term. May request change for glass disposal (e.g. Bradish Glass bid of \$360), but abandoning glass products risks being financially unsustainable after this grant term ends (recommend denying any such budget change without proof of financial due diligence).
18. **Signage:** Not funded. On 5/8/20, Chris Dalzell insisted on replacing the old rotted sign frame at a general funds cost of \$31 in lumber (three 4by4's), sanding and painting the sign board white with automotive paint from the trailer refurb project (no cost), and recruiting a volunteer to hand paint a new sign (materials cost) – David and Mark refused, David argued for hiding the sign instead, later Chris attached a *“please complain about this sign”* notice. Currently the recycling center does not have posted public drop off hours due to obstruction by David and Mark, previous hours posting was destroyed by high winds in April. This item was also requested in SWMB FY2021 grant but award is not expected.
19. **Promotional Items:** Not funded, cannot afford items.
20. **Conference Attendance:** Not funded, cannot afford to attend. Conference canceled 6/23/20.

RA 2020 Q2 Report: Expect this to be very late, due to negligence by the new leadership.

Recommendations to REAP:

- (a) Immediately suspend the RA 2020 grant, require the new Board leadership to provide plans for financial sustainability through CY'21, a binding agreement for continued recycling operations, and updated plans for how to complete grant items.
- (b) If possible, require RCC to guarantee recycling operations via WV§22C-4-7-b budget commitments to ensure this grant funding is not abused, recycling is not ended or severely cut back (thereby negating the purpose of this grant), and that RCSWA is not pillaged..
- (c) Mark Bossert and David Goff Moore have exhibited financial negligence as Board members, expect the worst and require firm binding commitments from RCSWA. If possible, also required personal guarantees from these Board members to make them liable for ongoing negligence. If either serve as Treasurer require a bond per WV§22C-4-7-d.
- (d) Due to Jennifer Randolph's history with two previous problems (details of criminal investigations are confidential), and the RCC expectation she will serve as Treasurer, it is strongly recommended to require a bond be set per WV§22C-4-7-d, and prohibit her from administering this grant. Also recommend strict oversight, very detailed grant reports, independently verifying report details, and site visits.
- (e) During CY'21 check on operations, regularly, to ensure RCC has not shutdown the recycling center to pillage RCSWA resources.

Expected Effects on SWMB Grants

SWMB FY2020 Grant Effect: Expect failure to submit final grant report, or for the report to be incorrect.

SWMB FY2021 Grant Effect: Expect inability or unwillingness to fulfill project Purpose and Objectives, thereby violating the grant terms. Expect recycling operations to become financially unsustainable in CY'21, due to disruption of needed work now to increase revenue, or negligence, a likely end of recycling would negate the purpose of this grant project. The current application can easily be denied under WV§54-5-8.1, and maybe under §54-5-4.4, and WV§54-5-7 for expected failure to maintain or comply with the RCSWA *Comprehensive Litter and Solid Waste Control Plan*.

Recommendations:

- (a) Meet with new RCSWA leadership and require they either, provide details on how they plan fulfill the existing grant application, or require they submit a new grant application which includes a plan for financial sustainability of recycling operations.
- (b) If possible, require RCC to guarantee recycling operations via WV§22C-4-7-b budget commitments to ensure this grant funding is not abused, and RCSWA is not pillaged. Or at least not done so under false pretenses of grant funding to support recycling operations that end or are cutback during the grant term.
- (c) Due to Jennifer Randolph's history with two previous problems with RCSWA (details of criminal investigations are confidential), and the RCC expectation she will serve as Treasurer, it is strongly recommended to: (i) require a bond be set per WV§22C-4-7-d, (ii) maintain a high level of oversight, (iii) prohibit her from administering this grant, and (iv) require very detailed grant reports, and (v) independently verify those reported details.

Current Damage and Lost Projects

The following is a list of damage and losses caused by the RCC hostile takeover, these are likely unrecoverable.

1. **USDA NRCS Community Compost Food Waste Reduction (CCFWR) Project FY2020 (aka "Compost Grant"):** Grant award minimum \$45,000, maximum \$90,000, term 2 years, required 25% match (very flexible). Proposed project was two parts, first compost for plant-derived waste, second biochar for animal-derived waste, each as small light-industrial facilities located at the recycling center. Would create one part time job, for a Compost Coordinator, and add to RC Worker jobs. This required partnering with other organizations, which would include local NRCS for projects with local farms, Roane WVU Extension for technical assistance to local farms, Master Gardeners for volunteer support, Farmers Markets, RC Public Schools, RC Committee On Aging, and area grocers and restaurants. Deadline was June 26, this RCC hostile takeover disrupted work on completing the grant application. This compost project is consistent with RCSWA *Comprehensive Litter and Solid Waste Control Plan*.
 - (a) **Biochar Expansion:** Project plan included requesting REAP or SWMB funding to add two more adams retorts, gasifier, condenser, and some related equipment. This would expand the program to include buying high quality saw mill scrap, and accept woody yard waste, construction debris, storm debris, road kill, and other biomass. This program would produce a diversified range of valuable

charcoal products, including food grade, cosmetic grade, water filtration grade (e.g. for Spencer water plant), fuel grade, biochar for soil, inoculated biochar for soil, premium terra-preta compost, pollution cleanup products, and material to bury for carbon sequestration credit. Secondary products including heat, wood vinegar, pyrolysis oil/tar, syngas. That sounds complicated but output products depend upon input material quality & type processed at a given temperature & time (like cooking). This was to be modeled after Living Web Farms biochar facility (see biochar videos on <http://livingwebfarms.org/> for an overview, can skip the small steel drum demo), except this would use newer higher-efficiency adams retort equipment from New England Biochar. One retort should be smaller higher temperature (2200~2400°F) for activated charcoal and high quality products, and the other retort larger for bulk lower quality materials (850~950°F). This expansion would need a change to the RCSWA *Comprehensive Litter and Solid Waste Control Plan*.

(b) **Cooking Oil Expansion:** Food waste drop-off or pick-up from various local commercial kitchens would make it easier to also collect used cooking oil. This has bulk resale value, or could be processed on-site into bio-diesel, or pyrolyzed into low grade carbon black. This was explored in June 2019, but abandoned due to small volume and collection difficulty. This expansion *may* need a change to the RCSWA *Comprehensive Litter and Solid Waste Control Plan*.

2. **Ongoing Vehicle Maintenance:** Chris Dalzell was working on several repair and refurbishment projects, which ended with RCC's hostile takeover, RCSWA cannot afford to complete this work.

(a) **Small Box Truck, \$5,000:** Full brake job, all four are rust seized, calipers may not be salvageable but even if they are it that may not be cost effective with paid labor, expect at least \$2,000 at a local auto shop. Rear differential cover plate is rotted out and leaking, replacement required, local auto shop cost maybe \$200. Replace radiator, heater core, coolant lines, and flush the rest of the coolant system, Main Street Auto quoted \$2,500. Rust abatement, some hours with an angle grinder (brush), and primer & paint brush, local auto shop cost unknown, at least \$300, probably more.

(b) **Collection Trailers, \$3,000:** Four collection trailers, strip rust, prime, paint, paint again, paint on labeling, check/repair electric brakes, check/repair lights & wiring. One trailer is nearly done, one is barely started, two are untouched. This doesn't include the big green rust heap, work needed on that has not been assessed. Expected one or two additional trailers to be purchased, and refurbished.

(c) **Freightliner:** Needs basic service in a few months, cost unknown.

(d) **Forklift:** Needs basic service now, cost unknown. Needs professional hydraulic attention.

3. **Production Equipment:** Production of value added products is the only known direct way to accomplish financial sustainability of recycling operations, both in general without need of a grant subsidy, and specifically for CY'21 until any REAP RA 2022 grant funds arrive, with a quarterly loss of nearly \$2,000. This is/was the top priority of RCSWA, to do this with available resources, someone needs to find or build several pieces of equipment, and get production started. Chris Dalzell was responsible for doing this, no one else involved is capable of doing this, RCSWA cannot afford to pay someone to do it or to purchase rather than build that equipment.

(a) **Glass Products Equipment:** In the RA 2020 grant, we requested an Expleco GL Sand glass pulverizer, and planned to custom build a sand sifter based on the Expleco GL V Screen, this was not awarded, but can still be done with available resources and a glass crusher on free loan from Jackson

Co SWA. Later we learned Shepherd University received an award for both machines (maybe REAP decided to fund one glass production experiment in WV at a time, and Shepherd was the better candidate), REAP will provide technical assistance based on the progress of that project.

- i. **Jackson Co SWA Glass Crusher:** Safe usage of this machine requires a dust containment modification, with rubber skirting such that dust physically cannot escape, and added mount points for dust collection air ducts on the conveyor and mill output.
 - ii. **Dust Collection System:** Custom built, with a variable speed HVAC blower on intake-side, and on output-side a modified heavy duty woodshop centrifugal dust collector vacuum system, with HEPA filter bag and collection into a steel barrel. This would be configured to be easily attachable to the glass crusher, cullet sifter, sand sifter, or possibly other machines.
 - iii. **Cullet Sifter:** Custom built, consisting of a heavy wood frame with automotive springs to mount a stack of sifting trays, wood frame trays with heavy steel mesh, trays arranged in a tight stack, outlet ports from each tray to collection bins, concrete vibrator motor to facilitate sifting action, and removable panels with duct connections for a dust containment enclosure. This would be sized to fit to the glass crusher output, but could be operated independently.
 - iv. **Sand Sifter:** Custom built, similar to Expleco GL V Screen machine, but with a plastic barrel for a dust containment enclosure plus air duct connections to dust collection system, and may have more than 5 sifting trays (TBD). The GL V Screen machine is basically a tight fitting stack of five mesh sand sifting trays with output ports on the sides, the tray stack is locked down to a metal base, which is mounted on stocks, and sifting is facilitated by a vibrator motor. For reference see <https://www.expleco.com/>, for spec sheet, manual, video (note, this uses roll formed steel tray rims and bands to lock trays together to make a dust tight stack, which is difficult without roll forming machines, a plastic barrel provides for dust containment instead).
 - v. **Glass Washer:** Salvaged commercial kitchen 3-basin sink, with wire mesh wash baskets, gantry to maneuver wash baskets, water pump, water tank/buckets, water filtration system, on casters, with a GFI power cord. This is used to sanitize cullet and mulch, and wash off debris (food residue, paper label bits, glass dust, tumbling sand). Note, this was dropped from production startup funding requirements, it would be added later via reinvesting profits to increase the labor efficiency of mulch production and to add a higher quality washed cullet product. Until then cullet would not be washed, and mulch would be washed by hand in wire baskets with a garden hose to recover sand used for tumbling.
 - vi. **Glass Dryer:** Wood shelving frames (2-by-4) on casters, with tightly spaced wire mesh shelves with air ducts, and salvaged HVAC blower (or multiple box fans). Note, this was dropped from production startup funding requirements, it would be added later via reinvesting profits to increase labor efficiency. Until then mulch would only be washed when its sunny out, and then be dried on tarps laid out on the concrete driveway.
- (b) **Cardboard Products Equipment:** The RA 2020 grant includes a custom built cardboard cutting table, to produce various sizes of cards, cutouts, and tri-fold panels. Cat scratching boards, and possibly other laminated cardboard products, were also going to be produced.

- i. **Cardboard Cutting Table:** Heavy duty 4ft by 8ft work table built of 2-layer 2-by-4's and MDF surface (consumable), mounted on 2 point center pivot on the short sides with corner locks (6 points), attached to a 36-inch high 4-by-4 frame, able to fold into a 2-by-8 foot footprint, with casters. Aluminum rails mounted to the long sides of the table would carry a gantry, a tool mount on the gantry would carry a rotary electric cutter. Measuring tape, markings, and locking points would allow for quickly setting up common cuts. Would also feature work lights.
 - **CNC Upgrade:** This table would be built to CNC cutting table specifications for a later upgrade when funding was available. This would consist of a set of 3 pinion rails, 3 motors, motorized tool holder (z-axis), track-end switches with wiring, CNC controller, desktop PC (salvaged), replace the MDF sheet with a vacuum bed (use with shop vac), rotary cutter replaced with a laser cutter, and add an overhead shroud with a vent fan with duct (clip to open garage door track). This upgrade would save labor, paying for itself with sufficient production volume and time, cost unknown but can be custom built at lower cost with volunteer labor. This upgrade would also allow for a wider range of CNC laser cut or engraved products, and other tools could add still more products, from recycling materials.
- ii. **Cardboard Strip Cutting Machine:** This machine design is inspired by printers and a Klindex cardboard converter considered as an alternative to the HSM machine we purchased, but uses rotary razor blades instead of heavy die cutter rollers. Consists of a heavy metal frame, of two sideways "U" shape steel plates, with an opening 18 inches wide by 1 inch high, the plates are bolted to 3 pieces of steel box tube, which mount two pairs of light axle bearings for the cutter shaft above and feed shaft below. The cutter shaft carries a gear wheel, spacers, and rotary razor cutting blades. The feed shaft carries a gear wheel, spacers, and rubber rollers arranged to be opposite each rotary blades above. A salvaged motor with chain linkage and control box power the machine, with a warning power-on light, and work light. Machine would be mounted on a 2-by-4 stand, with in-feed table, out-feed bin, casters, and able to fold up for storage.
- iii. **Cardboard Laminated Product Work Table:** This table would be used to make various laminated products, its a dedicated table primarily due to extensive use of glue applied with a sprayer. Table consists of simple 2-by-4 frame with 3-by-6 foot 5/4-inch plywood top coated with polyurethane, polished smooth, and folding legs, with casters.
- iv. **Cat Scratching Boards Production:** Clamp frames and folding jigs would also need to be built, for example in production usage: Strips would be laid out as a sheet, sprayed with a light water-base glue, stacked into a non-stick clamp frame, set on a shelf to dry (reuse of glass dryer shelf), later removed and cleaned. Cardboard trays for scratching boards would be cut to a template on the cutting table (in batches), then placed in a frame with a folding jig, glued, set on a shelf to dry, later removed, cleaned, and a scratching board inserted with glue. A product instructions sheet and small zip-lock bag of locally sourced dried catnip would round out the product, worth about \$8 to \$12 at retail depending on size, costs maybe \$5 to \$6 to make depending on size and worker speed, and time required to sort & prep collected cardboard. At 10 minutes labor each, 36 boards per work day, hour for lunch plus hour for cleanup (\$20), that's \$288 to \$432 worth of product a day, at a cost of \$200 to \$236, for a profit of \$88 to \$196, before any sales costs. Production 2 days a month is \$528 to \$1,176 per quarter, for 216 boards. Higher levels of production is unlikely due to a limited quantity of good quality cardboard collected.

4. **Thrift Store Project:** Last February, The Closet was forced out of business by their out-of-town owner so she could liquidate & retire, and this created a void in the local economy which was considered as a means for RCSWA to expand its reuse program. Raleigh Co SWA operates a thrift store, Last Chance Mercantile, which could also serve as a reference business model. Profitability is fairly clear, The Closet was successful and their staff were looking to expand, but a RCSWA venture would have lower operating costs and grant funds significantly reduce the usual difficulty of starting a store.
 - (a) Plans include constructing a new building 3 to 4 times the size of The Closet, out of timber frame, straw bale, and salvaged materials (maybe disassemble an old barn), in a similar "old country store" style, this approach has a significantly lower cost than conventional stick build. It would include an office, storage with light duty loading dock, tool library, crafts work area, and other community resource features. Could include a barn/shed-like area for construction materials and appliances, like a small Restore Store. This should be located along a main road, not the end of Oak Drive.
 - (b) Significant focus is on creating jobs, especially now with the bad economy. It would help to hire some experienced people from The Closet, even if only short term to help get clothing collection and sales started. The Closet ignored online sales, entirely, the people involved had no experience with it (or computers), would need to find someone else experienced to help get it started. Another job would be managing the tool library, construction materials, and general building maintenance.
 - (c) Starting point for startup is financial sustainability of recycling operations, and growing the reuse program into a significant revenue stream while at the recycling center. REAP RA grant funds could cover part of the property and new building costs, remainder would need to be financed similar to the recycling center building. Timber frame needs to be professionally put up, but the straw bale part could be done by volunteers as a community work day followed by a dinner.
 - (d) Revenues from this store would primarily go back to the local economy, in the form of wages, creating numerous small easy part-time jobs, which would be beneficial to the county during a poor economy. Profits after any RCSWA critical needs, would be reinvested in programs with public benefit (e.g. classes, events, craft equipment, tools, etc). If there are significant profits, which seems readily possible, these would be disposed of via small grants to help with public problems around the county, or to local non-profit organizations for benefit to Roane residents.
5. **Wood Salvage, Utility Furniture:** For the REAP CED 2019 grant, Chris Dalzell salvaged a large amount of 2-by-4 framing wood from a nearby office interior demolition project, and built a heavy duty workbench. With a combination of good design, decent skill, decent tools, and a decent workshop setup, salvaged 2-by-4 furniture can be extremely durable, not great looking yet not ugly, built at a low cost, and sold for a small profit. The recycling center could accept salvageable wood and make a variety of products. This goes well with a biochar facility, to skim off the good stuff coming in on a regular basis.
6. **Solid Waste Authority as Economic Engine:** Roane County is economically depressed, every job helps, so long as its sustainable. A lot of ideas were explored throughout the course of looking for ways to increase revenues, many had potential for break-even, but not enough to help sustainability. Still other ideas for break-even projects could be facilitated by the production projects. Cumulatively these may increase economy of scale to become profitable, but great care and management skill is needed to make sure it doesn't turn into an untenable mess. These also decrease the county solid waste tonnage, keeping the value of that waste in the local economy.

7. **Lobby For Tipping Fee Rate Increase:** Double the tipping fee rate. Allocate 20% to support SWA recycling operations on a monthly basis, 20% to SWMB grant funds pool, 20% to annual (12mo) REAP RA grants, 20% to improve the recycling industry in WV, 10% to state wide advocacy, and 10% to administration with a more effective state-wide management of the recycling economy. Require all SWA's to have a recycling program and to make efficient use of these resources. Require WM to keep residential trash service prices flat with half the number of bags (decrease from 6 to 3), add fees for collection of more bags, and encourage people to recycle to avoid the fees. Encourage county SWA's to deploy collection trailers around their counties, collect from businesses, produce value added products, and hire people. Businesses with dumpsters should follow cost efficiency to recycle more. Push WV EDA to either recruit more recycling mills to come here or start cooperatives to fill market voids around the state, by with opening mills in economically depressed small towns with vacant industrial buildings (some owned by the county EDA's). Require WV DOT to use crushed glass when possible, and to purchase crushed glass products from local recycling centers, before going to other commercial sources, e.g. brown/green cullet for asphalt mix to fill pot holes, clear sand for road paint, sand blasting grit, etc.

Resistance Efforts

1. **Email Debate with RCC:** Three email exchanges:
 - (a) **Notice from RCC** (subject "SWA"): Andrew Corkrean to Chris Dalzell, notice that Chris would not be reappointed to RCSWA. Chris replied with a lengthy argument on how this was shortsighted and expensive, and RCC would need to cover the cost of repairs Chris was working on. Chris replied again, reaffirming an intent not to do any further volunteer work, hoping RCC would disclose what they had planned. Andrew replied RCC's decision was final. Note, this email was saved to pdf and eml formats, circulated via email, including to the Roane Reporter, and then posted online.
 - (b) **RCSWA - RCC Plans, Compromise:** Chris Dalzell to RCC, email sought to try to figure out what RCC wanted. Andrew Corkrean replied with insults to Chris' management skills. Chris replied that attack was baseless but addressed the points, said Andrew dodged the question with a personal attack and asked again what RCC wants from RCSWA. Chris replied again, inviting other Board members to comment on any concerns over management or leadership, asked Andrew why he hadn't raised those concerns earlier, and asked again what RCC wants from RCSWA. Jennifer Randolph replied, with another personal attack claiming things she had no first hand knowledge of (only 2 RCSWA meetings she attended Chaired by Chris, were nearly 2 years earlier, both inquiries into her misconduct on administering the REAP RA 2017 grant). Chris replied, he did not believe her, the first and only complaints in 2 years had come from her and Andrew during this hostile takeover. Note, this email offers little of substance to this debate, it was not saved or distributed, but could be.
 - (c) **RCSWA - RCC Plans, Analysis:** Chris Dalzell to RCC, email version of the "Analysis of RCC Hostile Takeover" section of this report, it was directed at Andrew, items 1 & 2 were all posed as questions challenging Andrew's capacity to manage RCSWA, this 7 page email took 3 days to write. Merlin Shamblin replied "*Chris we as the commission have appointed Jennifer to replace you your term ends June 30 thank you for your time and effort but at that time your job will be over Merlin*", based on email time stamps it is likely he did not read the analysis. Chris replied, "*Yes, and I'm asking you to reconsider, for good reasons. If you cannot resolve my concerns on continuing*

recycling, and you prefer to debate this via newspaper and online, that's fine, but this is your last chance to keep this private.” Note, this email was saved to pdf and eml formats, circulated via email, including to the Roane Reporter, and then posted online.

- Note, RCC stopped responding to emails after the analysis.
- 2. **Report on Roane County Commission Hostile Takeover of Roane County Solid Waste Authority:** This report will be distributed to DEP, LKCD, PSC, REAP, and SWMB early on 7/8/20. To RCC and other RCSWA Board members early on 7/9/20. Posted online on 7/10/20, with email notice to Roane Reporter and a few dozen concerned Roane residents. This was started on 6/28/20, took longer than expected to write, refine, and polish, despite a large part of it be based on earlier work.
- 3. **RCSWA Official Website, RoaneRecycling.com:** This domain and hosting is provided by Chris Dalzell, when this was created the RCSWA Board was asked to pay for it, they declined, multiple times. Now it will be used to host a webpage version of this report, inform the public of any problems or abuses by RCC, and maintain pressure for Andrew Corkrean and Jennifer Randolph to resign, and for RCC to leave recycling alone.
- 4. **RCC Watchdog Website, RoaneWV.org:** In discussing this hostile takeover with other Roane residents, there seems to be significant concern about other RCC actions too. This website will gather complaints about RCC, document county problems, do in-depth analysis, seek expert feedback, and inform the public. If some people get involved, it may be able to bring people together to solve problems too. URL: <https://www.roanewv.org> Note, RCC official site is .com, the .org and .net were wreckage leftover from a county broadband cooperative project, started by Chris Dalzell early in 2017, and ruined by RCC and RC EDA, depriving Roane residents a very good chance at excellent broadband.
- 5. **Public Notice Fliers:** Every week fliers will be posted around Spencer, and hopefully spread around Roane County by volunteers, to inform people of these websites, recent issues, and to ask they contact RCC to demand that Andrew Corkrean and Jennifer Randolph resign from RCSWA.
- 6. **Roane Reporter, Letters to the Editor:** Weekly letters from concerned citizens, about any problems at the recycling center or resulting from other RCC actions.

Closing

Thank you for reading, your feedback is welcome, please send an email to support@RoaneRecycling.com. Please share this with anyone interested in recycling in Roane County. Please contact RCC and ask Andrew Corkrean and Jennifer Randolph to resign. The best of my knowledge the information contained in this report is true and accurate. If you would like additional information please ask. -Chris Dalzell.

Copyright: 2020, Chris Dalzell

License: Permission is granted to distribute this among Roane County residents, DEP, LKCD, PSC, RCC, REAP, SWMB, RCSWA, and other WV SWA's. For all other distribution, please contact Chris Dalzell.