DEPARTMENT: Public Works/Solid Waste  BY: James J. Petropulos
PHONE: 966-5356

RECOMMENDED ACTION AND JUSTIFICATION:
Authorization to Terminate the Contract With Herhof and to Issue a Request For Proposal (RFP) to Design, Supply, Install and Test Composting Equipment, and Train Personnel for the Mariposa Compost Facility

The RFP will allow firms to provide proposals to the County for the above referenced products and services towards the development of an in-vessel composting facility.

Time is of the essence as the environmental and financing/grant aspects of the project are progressing rapidly.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF BOARD ACTIONS:
The Board originally authorized a Request for Qualifications and subsequently Request for Proposals in 1996/1997 for a mixed waste composting facility. As part of the process, the in-vessel composting method was selected after carefully reviewing a wide range of waste processing techniques as the most suitable for the type of waste generated by the entire County including Yosemite National Park.

Herhof was awarded a contract to provide the composting process along with certain components, control systems and technical expertise. Selection was based on Herhof's proven qualifications to design and construct certain composting elements of a mixed solid waste composting facility. Unfortunately, due to reasons beyond the County's control, Herhof has been unable to provide the required bonding in a timely manner. Though Herhof is continuing to attempt to acquire the bonding, staff believes that the County should terminate the Herhof contract for failure to provide the required bond and approve a Request for Proposal for equipment and a composting system. The building and site work will be the subject of a separate RFP once the system requirements are fully known.

ALTERNATIVES AND CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION:
Negative action will possibly result in delay of the project and may jeopardize the funding already in place for the project.

Financial Impact? ( ) Yes  (x) No  Current FY Cost: $  Annual Recurring Cost: $
Budgeted In Current FY? (X) Yes  ( ) No  ( ) Partially Funded
Amount in Budget: $  
Additional Funding Needed: $  
Source:  
Internal Transfer  
List Attachments, number pages consecutively
Unanticipated Revenue  
Transfer Between Funds  4/5's vote
Contingency  4/5's vote
( ) General  ( ) Other  3. Plasma gasification report with attachments (9 pages)
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CAO:  
Revised Dec. 2002
TO: JIM PETROPULOS, Public Works Director
FROM: MARGIE WILLIAMS, Clerk of the Board

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZATION TO TERMINATE HERHOF CONTRACT AND ISSUE A REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL TO DESIGN, SUPPLY, INSTALL AND TEST COMPOSTING EQUIPMENT, AND TRAIN PERSONNEL FOR THE MARIPOSA COMPOST FACILITY

Resolution No. 03-203

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF MARIPOSA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA,

ADOPTED THIS Order on June 3, 2003

ACTION AND VOTE:

10:15 a.m. Jim Petropulos, Public Works Director; Authorize Termination of the Contract with Herhof and Issue a Request For Proposal (RFP) to Design, Supply, Install and Test Composting Equipment and Train Personnel for the Mariposa Compost Facility

BOARD ACTION: Discussion was held with Jim Petropulos relative to the recommendation to terminate the contract with Herhof and issue a RFP. Jim advised that Herhof was unable to meet the bonding requirements of the contract.

Discussion was held.

- Ruth Sellers asked several questions relative to the project, process and consideration of options, and presented her letter for the record. She stated she is not in favor of building a compost facility, and she suggested that the County apply for the permanent rural diversion program, concentrate on a recycling program, transport the waste, and watch for new technology.

- Mike Bird asked whether the Board will answer Ruth Seller’s questions. Chairman Pickard stated he feels her concerns have been addressed, and he advised that he would be happy to meet with her to review any issues; and he advised that the staff report addresses the bio plasma issue.

- Knute Kirkeberg stated he feels the compost technology is outdated, and he referred to information he previously provided relative to the plasma gasification technology. He urged the Board to reconsider the direction it is proceeding in.

Following discussion, (M)Balmain, (S)Parker, Res. 03-203 was adopted approving the recommended action/Ayes: Stetson, Balmain, Parker, Pickard; Noes: Bibby.

cc: Ken Hawkins, Auditor
    Jeff Green, County Counsel
    Mary Hodson, Administrative Analyst
    File
Memo

To: J. Petropulos, Director of Public Works
From: Fred S. Solomon
Date: April 2, 2003
Re: Compost Project Status Report

Status of contract with Herhof

The contract with Herhof required Herhof to provide the County with a performance bond in the amount of 100% of the contract amount within 60 days of execution of the contract. Herhof has not provided the required bond as of this date. It appears the Herhof is continuing to pursue securing the required bond. It should be noted that Herhof, at no cost to the County, has provided preliminary plans for their work.

Request For Proposals

It is in the County’s best interest to solicit another firm to provide and install the elements related to the composting process. In the event Herhof is unable to provide the County with a performance bond, the project team will meet on April 4, 2003 to prepare a Request For Proposal to be distributed to interested firms in the event the County terminates its contract with Herhof. It is the intention of the project team to maintain the same process for composting and to merely substitute vendors. It is hoped that the RFP will be ready for consideration by the Board of Supervisors at its meeting of April 15, 2003.

Compost facility building design

Pending resolution of the bond issue with Herhof, the building design work of Concept Design has been suspended. This is to assure that, in the event another vendor is substituted and equipment layout changes, work will not have to be changed at additional cost. While a delay in the design work will likely result in some additional costs, they will not be of the magnitude of costs associated with design changes.

EIR

Comments to the draft EIR, which were due by March 7, 2003, have been reviewed by URS and they are preparing responses for incorporation if the final EIR. The final EIR is scheduled for completion at the end of May.
USDA Grant/Loan
The application process has been on-going. I have provided USDA officials with additional information as required. At the present time we contemplate a grant of $1,800,000 and a loan of $3,200,000 for capital costs. The loan will be for a term of 40 years at the USDA's lowest interest rate of 4.5%. Officials of USDA have been very cooperative in providing technical assistance and the best terms available.

Gasification
I have provided an update report on the gasification issue. This appears to be technology which could resolve the waste disposal problem shared by communities throughout the Country. It is however, technology which is in limbo at the California state level and is expensive. It may be that larger jurisdictions with particular geographical constraints which inflate their landfill problems, may be able to consider gasification. In the coming years I can envision smaller jurisdictions outside of California, which has such restrictive environmental concerns, entering into Joint Powers agreements which may make employment of gasification technology for treatment of MSW economically feasible.
Memo

To: Jim Petropulos, Director of Public Works
From: Fred S. Solomon
Date: April 1, 2003
Re: Gasification

In response to your request for an update on information related to the gasification process, I am attaching a copy of my memorandum to you of January 8, 2003. The information contained in that memorandum has not changed and therefore my conclusions, which I will summarize herein, remain the same.

George Eowan has been in communication with an official of the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) and has presented the County with written information, copy attached, regarding the State's position on gasification. In essence, the State refers to AB 2770 and the fact that regulations have not yet been established for the gasification process. The State also points out that AB 2770 requires that the technology (gasification) removes all recyclable materials and marketable green waste compostable materials from the solid waste stream to the maximum extent feasible prior to the conversion process and that these materials be recycled or composted.

Testimony was given at the Planning Commission hearing on the EIR that contact was made with a firm which could construct a gasification plant in Mariposa. The cost of such a plant was estimated to be $29,000,000. This figure lends credence to the analysis I presented in my report of January 8, 2003.

Summary

It is my opinion, supported by John Larson, URS and George Eowan, IRI, that gasification is not feasible for implementation in Mariposa for the following reasons:

1. State regulations are in a "study" mode and lends to the uncertainty of future requirements for these facilities.
2. AB 2770 requires recycling or composting to the maximum extent feasible, defeating our purpose in considering gasification.
3. Final State regulations and implementation of plans for gasification would take years and in the meantime the current landfill cell is diminishing in capacity. The cell is likely to be filled by the time we get a permit for a gasification process.
Opening a new cell pending operation of a gasification plant will add millions to the County's costs.

4. The cost to implement a gasification plant for Mariposa is cost prohibitive. Unlike larger plants, which generate sufficient electricity and by-product for sale as to offset debt service on capital cost, a plant designed for Mariposa's small waste stream would not generate electricity and by-product in sufficient quantities to offset debt service on capital cost.

5. The CIWMB will not allow the County to abandon its current plans for meeting its diversion requirements.

6. In discussions with John Larson he has advised that URS has just been given a contract related to the process of gasification. Mr. Larson advises that such plants are a pollution source, and are subject to the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Control District.

7. The County is qualified for a $1.8 million grant and a $3.2 million long term, low interest loan from the USDA. The County has received $250,000 in planning funds and a capital contribution of $1.712 million toward construction of a compost facility from the National Park Service. These fund sources could be seriously jeopardized by a change in direction at this time, a change in direction to a process which is likely to be found to be economically infeasible, cannot be implemented in a timely fashion, and may not meet CIWMB diversion requirements.

8. The County has, in its' well thought out pursuit of a composting facility, expended considerable effort and dollars. These efforts and dollars would be lost if we abandon plans for a compost facility.

9. While gasification plants are operating in some context, they are an unproven technology in the processing of mixed solid waste.

10. Lastly, little is known about the land requirements for a gasification plant and indications are that they are not esthetically pleasing structures. The maintenance and operation characteristics are unproven.

Attachments:
Solomon report of January 8, 2003
Eowan email period 3/6-7/03
Copy AB 2770
Memo

To: Jim Petropulos, Director of Public Works
From: Fred S. Solomon
Date: January 8, 2003
Re: Gasification

There has been some inquiry on the subject of gasification which is a process that uses heat, pressure, and steam to convert waste materials into a gas which can be used as a fuel to generate electricity or steam. The California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) previously classified gasification plants as transformation facilities and regulated them as large volume transfer/processing facilities.

The issuance of a permit for these plants has been subject to a number of conditions, the most critical to Mariposa being:

♦ The project's proponents were required to guarantee more than sufficient quantities of waste to maintain the project's economic feasibility. In my discussions with George Eowan, I am told that 150,000 to 200,000 tons of waste annually is the threshold for economic feasibility. Mariposa generates 12,000 to 13,000 tons of waste annually. Given the small waste stream and this requirement, the gasification system was deemed infeasible.

♦ The project was required to include front-end methods or programs to remove all recyclable material prior to transformation to the maximum extent feasible.

♦ State statutes also limited the amount of diversion credit for transformation. The 50 percent diversion requirement could include no more than 10 percent through transformation and only when several additional conditions were met. These additional conditions required front-end methods to remove all recyclable materials to the maximum extent feasible and that the jurisdiction continues to implement all feasible source reduction, recycling, and composting measures.

Recent legislation excluded gasification from the definition of transformation (AB 2770) and directed the CIWMB to prepare a report for submittal to the Legislature by March 1, 2003 on gasification. The legislative process which will result in regulation of gasification will be a long-term process and the requirements which will be placed on gasification are unknown. In brief discussions with CIWMB staff, there seems to be little sentiment for allowing substitution of gasification as the sole method of achieving the 50 percent diversion requirement.
Accordingly, I am led to conclude that Mariposa does not generate sufficient waste by a long shot to make inclusion of gasification economically feasible, a gasification system is too costly for the County of Mariposa, State requirements for permitting are an unknown risk factor, and finally the number of years to implement such a project would likely exceed the remaining life of the current landfill module raising additional cost and regulatory concerns. Putting aside issues of economic feasibility and regulatory risk factors, I would doubt the CIWMB would tolerate a change in direction for Mariposa.

In an attempt to demonstrate economic feasibility, I obtained an economic analysis of constructing a gasification plant in a jurisdiction which generates 200,000 tons of waste annually. The plant would cost $140,000,000 resulting in an annual debt service of $10,628,000 and annual operation and maintenance costs (O&M) of $8,000,000. This equates to a $100 per ton cost and does not include costs for front-end separation requirements estimated at $20 - $40. This project may prove economically feasible because it will allow for creation of sufficient electricity for sale to the grid and because a significant stream of recyclables will generate additional revenue. Revenues are projected to equal the debt service and O & M costs reducing the per ton cost to $20 - $40. The jurisdiction is further motivated by its strong community environmental issues involvement, its lack of landfill capacity and lack of availability of additional landfill space within its boundaries. The community is also financially strong. I am led to believe Mariposa, with its small waste stream, would experience much higher per ton costs, insufficient revenue generation to offset costs, and does not have the same geographical or economic conditions.

Gasification, on a technological level, is feasible. It does not appear feasible for Mariposa on economic or political (State regulatory uncertainty) levels.

I am attaching information prepared by Brightstar Environmental, a firm involved in gasification. They describe a plant in Australia which is initially funded by the Commonwealth’s Australian Greenhouse Office, the NSW Government’s Sustainable Energy Development Authority and the Wollongong City Council to get a 30,000 ton/year facility off the ground by fiscal year 2003. The plant will be expanded to accept 150,000 tons/year the following year.

A copy of a description of waste to energy paper prepared by a commercial firm and an issue paper developed by the CIWMB staff as well as a copy of AB 2770 is enclosed.
Hi Steve,

Thanks for your reply to my request for clarification.

With specific reference to subdivision "g" below, it appears that Mariposa would have to "reduce, recycle or compost its solid waste to the maximum extent feasible" before there would even be a possibility of diversion from gasification depending on your Board's deliberations this year. Of course this assumes that such a gasification facility could meet all of the stringent technical requirements you have presented below.

For Mariposa this means it must continue with its diversion programs and plans as approved by the CIWMB through the SB 1066 process, and complete the proposed Mariposa Compost Facility in order to meet all the conditions of AB 2770 before it could consider additional diversion from gasification. I believe your response provides confirmation to the Board of Supervisors that this is the current reading of the law. I believe your response provides confirmation that this is the current reading of the law.

As you know this is important for the County as a few local residents are advocating for a gasification facility instead of the compost facility.

Let me know if I have this right.

Thanks again for your help.

Regards,

George Eowan
Currently, the waste materials targeted for the process you are analyzing are presumably disposed in a California Integrated Waste Management Board (Board) permitted landfill. This is important to remember because when the diversion rate is calculated, disposal tonnage to landfill is compared to currently measured or estimated diversion to determine diversion rate. Disposal reduction obviously increases the diversion rate. If, however, you are conducting a generation study and want to count the waste material as diversion, the statute is silent on that issue at this time.

In addition to the question of diversion credit, the technology must also meet the criteria in AB 2770 to qualify as gasification [see below].

Assembly Bill (AB) 2770, chaptered on September 20, 2002 added Public Resources Code Section (PRC) 40117 that defines gasification as "a technology that uses a noncombustion thermal process to convert solid waste to a clean burning fuel for the purpose of generating electricity, and that, at minimum, meets all of the following criteria:

(a) The technology does not use air or oxygen in the conversion process, except ambient air to maintain temperature control.
(b) The technology produces no discharges of air contaminants or emissions, including greenhouse gases, as defined in subdivision (g) of Section 42801.1 of the Health and Safety Code.
(c) The technology produces no discharges to surface or groundwaters of the state.
(d) The technology produces no hazardous waste.
(e) To the maximum extent feasible, the technology removes all recyclable materials and marketable green waste compostable materials from the solid waste stream prior to the conversion process and the owner or operator of the facility certifies that those materials will be recycled or composted.
(f) The facility where the technology is used is in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, and ordinances.
(g) The facility certifies to the board that any local agency sending solid waste to the facility is in compliance with this division and has reduced, recycled, or composted solid waste to the maximum extent feasible, and the board makes a finding that the local agency has diverted at least 30 percent of all solid waste through source reduction, recycling, and composting.

This year, the (Board) will be examining the permitting requirements for facilities using gasification and other "conversion" technologies. However, the legislation did not provide specific guidance on whether materials sent to such facilities would qualify as diversion. Instead, AB 2770 directed the Board to study the lifecycle environmental and public health impacts associated with development of conversion technologies in California and the impacts on composting and recycling of such development. I would recommend that you follow and/or participate in the Board's work on this issue during 2003.

Please contact me at (916) 341-6254 or at ssorelle@ciwmb.ca.gov if you have any further questions.

-----Original Message-----
From: George T. Fowen [mailto:geowen@pacbell.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2003 10:49 AM
To: SoRelle, Steve
Cc: Lee, Natalie; Jeffrey G. Green; Jim Petropulos; fred solomon;
Susan Avery; Jim Greco
Subject: Diversion Credit
Assembly Bill No. 2770

CHAPTER 740

An act to amend Sections 40194 and 40201 of, and to add Sections 40117 and 40507.1 to, the Public Resources Code, relating to solid waste and making an appropriation therefor.

[Approved by Governor September 20, 2002. Filed with Secretary of State September 20, 2002.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

AB 2770, Matthews. Solid waste: conversion technologies.

Existing law, the California Integrated Waste Management Act, requires the California Integrated Waste Management Board to administer state programs to recycle solid waste, plastic trash bags, plastic packaging containers, waste tires, newsprint, and other specified materials. Existing law provides for an external scientific peer review process to review the scientific basis of a regulation or policy proposed by the agencies, boards, and departments within the California Environmental Protection Agency.

This bill would define the term "gasification" for purposes of the act. The bill would revise the definition of the term "solid waste facility" to include a gasification facility, and would revise the definition of the term "transformation" to exclude gasification. The bill would require the board to include, as part of the annual report required to be submitted by the board to the Legislature on or before March 1, 2003, a report on new and emerging conversion technologies, including, but not limited to, noncombustion thermal technologies, including gasification and pyrolysis, chemical technologies such as acid hydrolysis or distillation, and specified biological technologies. The bill would require the report to be subject to a specified external scientific peer review process and to consult with the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission and other state, federal, or international governmental agencies in preparing the report.

The bill would appropriate $1,500,000 from the Integrated Waste Management Account to the board to prepare the report.

Appropriation: yes.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 40117 is added to the Public Resources Code, to read:
40117. "Gasification" means a technology that uses a noncombustion thermal process to convert solid waste to a clean burning fuel for the purpose of generating electricity, and that, at minimum, meets all of the following criteria:

(a) The technology does not use air or oxygen in the conversion process, except ambient air to maintain temperature control.

(b) The technology produces no discharges of air contaminants or emissions, including greenhouse gases, as defined in subdivision (g) of Section 42801.1 of the Health and Safety Code.

(c) The technology produces no discharges to surface or groundwaters of the state.

(d) The technology produces no hazardous waste.

(e) To the maximum extent feasible, the technology removes all recyclable materials and marketable green waste compostable materials from the solid waste stream prior to the conversion process and the owner or operator of the facility certifies that those materials will be recycled or composted.

(f) The facility where the technology is used is in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, and ordinances.

(g) The facility certifies to the board that any local agency sending solid waste to the facility is in compliance with this division and has reduced, recycled, or composted solid waste to the maximum extent feasible, and the board makes a finding that the local agency has diverted at least 30 percent of all solid waste through source reduction, recycling, and composting.

SEC. 2. Section 40194 of the Public Resources Code is amended to read:

40194. "Solid waste facility" includes a solid waste transfer or processing station, a composting facility, a gasification facility, a transformation facility, and a disposal facility.

SEC. 3. Section 40201 of the Public Resources Code is amended to read:

40201. "Transformation" means incineration, pyrolysis, distillation, or biological conversion other than composting. "Transformation" does not include composting, gasification, or biomass conversion.

SEC. 4. Section 40507.1 is added to the Public Resources Code to read:

40507.1. (a) As part of the annual report required to be submitted by the board to the Legislature pursuant to Section 40507 on or before March 1, 2003, the board shall include a report on new and emerging conversion technologies, including, but not limited to, noncombustion thermal technologies, including gasification and pyrolysis, chemica
technologies such as acid hydrolysis or distillation, and biological technologies, other than composting, such as enzyme hydrolysis. The board shall only evaluate those conversion technologies that provide demonstrated environmental benefits over the transformation and disposal of solid waste.

(b) The report required by subdivision (a) shall contain all of the following:

(1) Specific and discrete definitions and descriptions of each conversion technology evaluated.

(2) A description and evaluation of the life-cycle environmental and public health impacts of each conversion technology in comparison to those environmental and public health impacts from the transformation and disposal of solid waste.

(3) A description and evaluation of the technical performance characteristics, feedstocks, emissions, and residues used by each conversion technology and identification of the cleanest, least polluting conversion technologies.

(4) A description and evaluation of the impacts on the recycling and composting markets as a result of each conversion technology.

(c) The board shall require that the report be subject to an external scientific peer review process conducted pursuant to Section 57004 of the Health and Safety Code.

(d) The board shall consult with the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission and other state, federal, or international governmental agencies in preparing the report required by this section.

SEC. 5. The sum of one million five hundred thousand dollars ($1,500,000) is hereby appropriated from the Integrated Waste Management Account to the California Integrated Waste Management Board for purposes of preparing the report required by Section 40507.1 of the Health and Safety Code.
June 3, 2003

Ruth Sellers
5661 Lillian Lane
Mariposa, Ca. 95338

Robert Richard, Chair
Mariposa County Board of Supervisors
P.O. Box 7845
Mariposa, Ca. 95338

Dear Supervisor Richard,

I question the Board's decision to consider action to certify the Environmental Impact Report for the Composting Facility on June 10, 2003, since Mariposa was delayed til June 17, 2003 to accommodate the amendment of Section 2.04.010 of Chapter 2.04 of the County Code adopted on May 13, 2003 to become effective in thirty days.

I would suggest this decision merits a delay until the legal issue is resolved rather than risk validity due to technicality.

Sincerely,
Ruth Sellers
Robert Pickard, As Chair  
Mariposa County Board of Supervisors  
P.O. Box 784  
Mariposa, Ca. 95338  

June 4, 2003

Ruth Sellers  
5661 Lillian Lane  
Mariposa, Ca. 95338

Dear Supervisor Pickard,

In reference to the Board of Supervisors meeting on Tuesday, June 3, 2003, I wish to memorialize the statements I made regarding agenda item number 4, authorize termination of contract with Herchel.

My statements were primarily inquired to information contained in the packet provided by the Board regarding the issue of request for Public Notice to cancel Mariposa County’s contract with Herchel for the design of their composting facility.

A memo dated April 2, 2003 from Fred Solomon raises the question: Has Herchel provided a letter to Mariposa County releasing the County of liabilities for use of their preliminary plans?

Is there documentation giving Mariposa
June 4, 2003

County the Herkof plans? Is Herkof cognizant of the County's intention?

In reference to this same memo, I am perplexed by the contents of the memo. It contradicts the agenda items.

Same memo in reference to the Project Team meeting April 4, 2003. What does this request for proposal look like? My understanding is the E.I.R. for the Herkof facility would be presented to the Board of May 27, 2003. This memo dated April 4, 2003 suggests the County has already considered terminating the contract with Herkof. Why are you spending all this money on the E.I.R. when you have apparently pre-determined another design will be provided? Who is qualified to design this facility?

Where are the results of this Project Team? Who makes up this Project Team? Where is the “Request for Proposal”?

Has the project team, including Mr. Joel Solomon provided a Conflict of interest statement to the County of Mariposa? How may they benefit from this decision? What are the qualifications of this team?

I am not in favor of building a...
June 4, 2003

I am however very concerned with the legal issues this team could entangle Mariposa County with.

My suggestion is for Mariposa County to apply for the permanent exemption from diversion requirements, which the county is eligible for, concentrate on a recycling program in conjunction with expediting solid waste to another facility and set your goals on new technology which is at the horizon awaiting decisions of diversion credits at the California Integrated Waste Management Board.

This is the most offensive venture this county has undertaken. Let's not encumber Mariposa County with possible lawsuits over design infringements of an obsolete method. When the entire perception of waste disposal will no doubt take a new direction in the next two years.

In conclusion I would like to add to and state in reference to the recent completion of the Mariposa County Landfill E.I.R.

This E.I.R. represents very little...
June 4, 2003

Substance relating to another facility. It cites a proprietary situation based on the superior alternative of Herof technology. Herof technology is seemingly no longer being considered for use by Mariposa County.

I am requesting a prompt response to the questions I have posed since the analysis was forthcoming by the Chair at the time of my inquiries.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Ruth Sellers

C.C.
Supervisor Lee Stettem, Dist. 1
Supervisor Doug Balmer, Dist. 2
Supervisor Janet Bibby, Dist. 3
Supervisor Leroy Torkel, Dist. 4
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