

Committee Members

Dave Sadoff, **Chairperson**
Castro Valley Sanitary District
Shelia Young, **Vice Chairperson**
Oro Loma Sanitary District
Keith Carson, County of Alameda
Jim Oddie, City of Alameda
Susan Wengraf, City of Berkeley
Don Biddle, City of Dublin
Suzanne Lee Chan, City of Fremont
Laureen Turner, City of Livermore
Mike Hannon, City of Newark
Dan Kalb, City of Oakland
Deborah Cox, City of San Leandro
Lorin Ellis, City of Union City
Wendy Sommer, Executive Director

AGENDA

**ALAMEDA COUNTY WASTE
MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY MEETING
OF THE
PROGRAMS AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE**

**Thursday, March 10, 2016
9:00 A.M.**

**StopWaste Offices
1537 Webster Street
Oakland Ca 94612
510-891-6500**

1. Convene Meeting

2. Public Comments

An opportunity is provided for any member of the public wishing to speak on any matter within the jurisdiction of the Programs & Administration Committee, but not listed on the agenda. Each speaker is limited to three minutes.

Page

1 3. Approval of the Draft Minutes of February 11, 2016 Action

5 4. Mandatory Recycling Ordinance - Site Inspector Analysis (Pat Cabrera) Action
Staff recommends that the P&A Committee recommend to the WMA Board that staff continue engaging contracted services for MRO site inspections.

17 5. Product Decisions Targets Update (Justin Lehrer) Action
Staff recommends that the Committee review the proposed recommendations for the PD Targets and recommend to the WMA Board to direct staff to implement them in the FY 16-17 budget.

6. Member Comments

7. Adjournment

The Programs & Administration Committee is a Committee that contains more than a quorum of the Board. However, all items considered by the Committee requiring approval of the Board will be forwarded to the Board for consideration at a regularly noticed board meeting.

This page intentionally left blank

DRAFT

**MINUTES OF THE ALAMEDA COUNTY WASTE
MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY MEETING
OF THE
PROGRAMS AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE**

Thursday, February 11, 2016

9:00 A.M.

**StopWaste Offices
1537 Webster Street
Oakland CA 94612
510-891-6500**

Members Present:

City of Alameda	Jim Oddie
City of Berkeley	Susan Wengraf
Castro Valley Sanitary District	Dave Sadoff
City of Dublin	Don Biddle
City of Fremont	Suzanne Lee Chan
City of Newark	Mike Hannon
City of Oakland	Dan Kalb
Oro Loma Sanitary District	Shelia Young
City of San Leandro	Deborah Cox
City of Union City	Lorrin Ellis

Absent:

County of Alameda	Keith Carson
City of Livermore	Laureen Turner

Staff Present:

Wendy Sommer, Executive Director
Tom Padia, Deputy Executive Director
Judi Ettliger, Senior Program Manager
Patricia Cabrera, Administrative Services Director
Gina Peters, Chief Financial Officer
Justin Lehrer, Senior Program Manager
Debra Kaufman, Senior Program Manager
Arliss Dunn, Clerk of the Board

1. Convene Meeting

Chair Dave Sadoff called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2. Public Comments

There were none.

3. Approval of the Draft Minutes of January 14, 2016 (Wendy Sommer)

Action

Board member Biddle made the motion to approve the draft minutes of January 14, 2016. Board member Hannon seconded and the motion was carried 7-0 (Carson, Ellis, Kalb, Turner and Young absent).

4. Community Murals (Judi Ettlinger)

Information

This item is for information only.

Judi Ettlinger provided an overview of the project and presented an online “flipbook” of the murals. A link to the presentation is available here: [Murals-02-11-16](#)

Board member Chan inquired if StopWaste name is included on the murals. Ms. Ettlinger affirmed that StopWaste name is included on the murals. Board member Sadoff inquired if the grants are allocated per mural project. Ms. Ettlinger stated that initially the Melrose Academy grant in the amount of \$5,000 was an individual project through our community grants program. Subsequent to that project, staff collaborated with the Community Rejuvenation Project and awarded them \$30,000 to do additional murals through the grants to non-profits program. The money went to the artists. Board member Hannon commended staff on an excellent choice for grant funding as it beautifies the area. Board member Chan inquired if there are plans for more murals. Ms. Ettlinger stated staff is proposing to allocate an additional \$20,000 towards the program and invited Board members to provide information about their city’s interest in the mural project.

Chair Sadoff thanked Ms. Ettlinger for the presentation.

5. Annual Audit for Fiscal Year 2014/15 (Pat Cabrera & Gina Peters)

Action

Staff recommends that the P&A and the P&O Committees review and forward the audit report to the Waste Management Authority and Energy Council for acceptance and filing, and that the Recycling Board accept and file the audit report.

Gina Peters provided an overview of the staff report. The report is available here: [Audit Report-02-11-16](#)

Katherine Yuen, Maze & Associates, stated that the audit received an unmodified opinion and there were no internal deficiencies.

Board member Chan inquired about the recent payment approved by the Board towards the unfunded liability (UL). Ms. Cabrera stated the agency made a \$600,000 payment; however, the UL amount is a moving target. Staff will provide an update on our current position at the February 17 WMA meeting as well as staff recommendations on setting a funding percentage target for the UL. Ms. Yuen added that as of June 30, 2014 the OPEB (Other Post Employment Benefits) assets for the Agency were over \$2.2 million (and no unfunded liability).

Board member Oddie made the motion to forward the audit report to the Waste Management Authority and the Energy Council for acceptance and filing. Board member Chan seconded and the motion carried 10-0 (Carson and Turner absent).

6. Assessment Criteria for Product Decisions Activities (Justin Lehrer)

Action

Staff recommends that the Board review and approve the proposed criteria for evaluating targets and programs.

Justin Lehrer provided an overview of the staff report and presented a PowerPoint presentation. The combined report and presentation is available here: [PD Criteria-02-11-16](#)

Board member Hannon stated that it would be helpful to have a side-by-side view of the current measurements and the proposed criteria and to evaluate any possible environmental or economic impacts toward local businesses. Mr. Lehrer stated that the targets were developed as aspirational goals. Board member Ellis inquired if the criteria are intended as an internal tool. Mr. Lehrer stated yes and there’s potential to apply the criteria to other work that we are doing such as the grants we fund as well as the potential use of the organics processing development (OPD) reserve funds. Board member Ellis added it is a great starting point and commended staff for formalizing a process for evaluating projects. He added it

DRAFT

would be helpful to establish a numeric or value statement for measuring specific projects as appropriate. Mr. Lehrer stated that the criteria initially included a yes/no weighted scoring system and will continue to explore incorporating scoring criteria. Board member Chan recommended adding an additional criteria "Additional Information" where other influences may be considered but not included in the standing criteria. She added the City of Fremont staff that attended TAC stated their approval for the process. Board member Chan inquired if staff can do a mock project using the proposed criteria and Board member Ellis suggested doing sample yes/no projects using the criteria.

Board member Sadoff inquired as to what would determine a fatal flaw in a project that would signal elimination of a project. Mr. Lehrer stated that staff would definitely want to determine the fatal flaw early enough in the project phase and there are current projects where we know that we have reached a plateau or there are diminishing returns and staff will recommend a different approach or recommend sunseting the project. Board member Biddle stated his support for the project evaluation as it is important to determine how it fits with our mission and evaluating the projects effectiveness.

Board member Ellis made the motion to approve the staff recommendation. Board member Biddle seconded and the motion carried 10-0 (Carson and Turner absent).

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 7. Organics Processing Development Reserve Usage & Criteria (Debra Kaufman) | Action |
| Staff recommends that the Committee direct staff to budget OPD Reserve funds for organics diversion projects that go beyond in-county processing capacity, using the proposed product decisions criteria. | |

Debra Kaufman provided an overview of the staff report. The report is available here: [OPD Memo-02-11-16](#)

Board member Wengraf inquired about the timeline for the EBMUD facility. Ms. Kaufman stated that EBMUD is currently in the permitting phase and is expected to appear before the Board for a COIWMP amendment sometime in the next 3-6 months. Mr. Padia added the current agreement indicates a start date of July 1, 2016 however recent information indicates possibly the end of 2017. Board member Wengraf inquired if we have any programs that target the source i.e. farmers and not only the end users i.e. the residents. Ms. Kaufman stated that we mainly focus on Alameda County generators and we work at the State level on policy for best practices around agriculture and best uses for compost. Brian Mathews stated that most waste from farms do not end up in the landfill as they are tilled back to the soil and large distributors such as Safeway have a backhaul program. They backhaul bruised and spoiled food from stores to their distribution centers and then transport it to a composting facility. The food scraps that we see in the Waste Characterization Study are from restaurants, plate scrapings, etc. Ms. Sommer added we are working on the upcycle stream by working with food banks and other food producers to reduce the amount of food waste generated.

Board member Chan inquired if there is opportunity for some of the reserve funds to be allocated to member agencies to augment their organics programs. Mr. Padia stated we are currently doing a pilot project in Fremont to try and increase single family residential organics and the \$125,000 for the project is from the organics reserve. We will not have information from the pilot study until possibly in June. The Less Than Weekly pilot in Castro Valley is also funded from the OPD reserve. Both pilots are aimed at identifying "best practices" that member agencies could incorporate into their ongoing organics diversion programs.

Board member Cox stated that there are many residents in San Leandro with fruit trees and inquired about Urban Gleaning. Ms. Kaufman stated that the agency lobbyist worked on a bill this year with the LEAs (Local Enforcement Agencies) to make it easier for individuals to glean and then sell the materials to farmers markets and other places. Board member Sadoff stated that in Castro Valley the Girl Scouts gleaned neighborhood trees and donated the fruit to the Food Bank.

DRAFT

Board member Kalb inquired about EBMUD's response to staff when informed that they were not going to receive the \$1 million. Ms. Kaufman stated that they understood that they could not meet our criteria but welcomed the funding towards cleaning up the organics designated for the facility or some other supportive use. Ms. Sommer added there have been numerous meetings with the General Manager and Project Manager over the past 8 years asking them about alternative projects or other proposals and they have not responded to us.

Board member Wengraf made the motion to approve the staff recommendation. Board member Young made a friendly amendment to the motion to combine the \$1 million EBMUD reserve with the OPD Reserve funds for organics diversion projects that go beyond in-county processing capacity, using the proposed product decisions criteria. Board member Cox seconded and the motion carried 10-0 (Carson and Turner absent).

8. Member Comments

Ms. Sommer inquired if Board members had received the Closed Session materials via hard copy mail. They were mailed on Tuesday. Board Clerk Arliss Dunn asked Board members to inform her if they do not receive the materials. Ms. Sommer reminded the Board that the WMA meeting this month is on the 3rd Wednesday, February 17.

9. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:20 a.m.



DATE: March 10, 2016

TO: Programs and Administration Committee

FROM: Wendy Sommer, Executive Director

BY: Pat Cabrera, Administrative Services Director

SUBJECT: Mandatory Recycling Ordinance - Site Inspector Analysis

SUMMARY

In October 2015, the WMA Board based on the recommendation of the Programs and Administration (P&A) Committee directed staff to conduct an analysis as to the feasibility of hiring Agency employees to perform Mandatory Recycling Ordinance Implementation (MRO) site inspections compared to the current use of contract positions. At the March P&A meeting staff will discuss the results of this analysis and recommend continuing with contract positions at this juncture.

DISCUSSION

At the October 18, 2015 WMA Board Meeting, the Board approved the recommendation from the P&A committee for staff to conduct an analysis regarding the feasibility of hiring Agency employees to conduct MRO site inspections as opposed to the current use of contract positions. The staff report discussing this issue can be found at [Total Compensation Study](#). Staff engaged the service of Koff & Associates (who have performed past compensation and classification analysis for the Agency) to perform this assessment. The results of their study are attached.

As part of the study Koff & Associates interviewed key staff from the MRO program including Deputy Director Tom Padia and Senior Program Manager Brian Mathews. In addition, Koff & Associates provided and analyzed a detailed position description questionnaire in order to determine a classification specification. Based on that information a job description for a Site Inspector was developed. As further indicated in the report the consultant conducted a market compensation study for similar positions and determined that meter readers and parking enforcement officers were similar in job duties and minimum qualifications.

Based on these findings and using just the median monthly compensation for this class, the compensation cost (salary plus benefits) for an inspector would be approximately \$100,000 per year. This does not include projected salary increases or increased cost for benefits, nor does it include the costs for training, transportation, insurance, etc. which we conservatively estimate would total at least an additional \$20,000 per inspector per year. The current contract for three inspectors is \$320,000. Therefore, the equivalent cost of three in-house positions would be at least \$360,000 per year. This does not include one-time costs for furniture and equipment that would range from \$15,000 - \$20,000. Furthermore, as the MRO program is just now entering the enforcement stage for Phase 2 and just recently began issuing initial citations for Phase 1, it is not yet an appropriate time to evaluate long term staffing needs for enforcement. Oakland and Fremont, the two largest cities in the county, have not yet implemented the Phase 2 addition of organics, and we will not have a full year of countywide enforcement experience under the full ordinance until the end of 2018. That is about when we could expect to have better metrics and indicators of ordinance effectiveness at reducing “good stuff in the garbage” and also when we might expect to have experienced some reduction of current staffing levels due to attrition. For all of these reasons (better basis for forecasting long term enforcement workload, better grasp of ordinance effectiveness as currently written and implemented, and greater chance of having somewhere to put new staff), approximately three years from now would seem the most opportune time to revisit the issue of converting contract inspectors to in-house positions.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the P&A Committee recommend to the WMA Board that staff continue engaging contracted services for MRO site inspections.

Attachment: Koff & Associates report with job descriptions and market data

To: Pat Cabrera, Administrative Services Director
From: Katie Kaneko, Project Manager
Date: February 23, 2016
RE: Classification Study – Recycling Site Inspectors

In December 2015, the Alameda County Waste Management Authority (Stopwaste) contracted with Koff & Associates (K&A) to conduct a classification and compensation study review of the contract positions performing recycling site inspections. Stopwaste desired a review of the positions to capture the duties and responsibilities within a classification description and to survey the market for comparable bodies of work to determine whether it was feasible to convert the contract positions to Authority employees.

Classification Study Process

K&A conducted a classification study through generally accepted human resources practices and by means of several tools and instruments. We reviewed and analyzed the Position Description Questionnaire (PDQ) submitted to our office and conducted an interview with the Authority employees responsible for oversight of the contract function.

Classification Analysis and Findings

A review of the information supplied by Authority staff enabled us to create a class description for a Recycling Site Inspector. Our assessment of the classification is that the inspection work is performed under close supervision and within clearly prescribed routine and procedures. Direction was requested when encountering unusual or unique situations thereby requiring limited judgment by incumbents in the execution of tasks.

It was our assessment that this work could be performed by an individual who had a high school education and customer service experience. The range of duties and qualifications are captured within Appendix I of this report.

Compensation Review

Stopwaste requested that we conduct a market compensation study, identifying classifications within other public agencies that perform a similar level body of work. We perused the classification system of Bay Area agencies to identify similar classifications. We found that classifications such as meter readers and parking enforcement officers were most similar in that they performed data collection and compliance inspections within prescribed procedures and had similar minimum qualifications. We reviewed classification descriptions to ensure that the descriptions did not include other duties that can be required of meter readers such as repair and maintenance of meters, shut offs, account collections, etc. thereby limiting the scope of work to data collection and reporting. The parking enforcement officers did differ slightly in that they had enforcement duties such as writing tickets, but since judgment was limited to decision such as whether parking meters had expired or that vehicles were parked within appropriate parking spaces, the responsibility level seemed comparable.

The base salary, benefits, and total compensation data can be found in Appendix II of this report. The median market base and total compensation salary findings for the class is listed below.

Classification	Median Monthly Base Salary	Median Monthly Total Compensation
Recycling Site Inspector	\$5,269	\$8,325

Market *base salary median* results show that the proposed hourly wage of the classification would need to be approximately \$30 in order to pay competitively to similar classifications found in other public agencies.

Market *total compensation* results suggest that approximate hourly pay would increase 60% to \$48 if the cost of benefits were factored in.

Recommendations

It is difficult to fully advise without out having detailed costs related to your current service contract but based on our knowledge of the labor market, the public sector pay structure for similarly skilled positions experiences higher compensation costs than the private sector. This analysis only considers compensation and not other program costs that the Authority would have to assume such as risk management, equipment, vehicles, staff management time, etc. There are alternative employment arrangements, such as part time staffing, which could help to curtail costs of benefits.

It was a pleasure conducting this classification and compensation study for Stopwaste. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can provide any additional information or clarification regarding this summary of our analysis, findings, and recommendations.

SITE INSPECTOR

DEFINITION

Under direct supervision, performs site inspection fieldwork of commercial and multifamily accounts to determine and report on compliance with the Alameda County Mandatory Recycling Ordinance (MRO); identifies non-compliance and other irregularities; and performs related work as required.

SUPERVISION RECEIVED AND EXERCISED

Receives general supervision from an assigned Program Manager. Exercises no supervision of staff.

CLASS CHARACTERISTICS

This classification performs the full range of duties related to compliance inspection services. Responsibilities require the use of tact and frequent interaction with the public. Positions at this level operate within prescribed instruction and request assistance as new or unusual situations arise. This class is distinguished from the Program Services Specialist classification in that the latter participates in coordinating, implementing, and promoting assigned waste management/resource conservation programs, projects, and initiatives.

EXAMPLES OF TYPICAL FUNCTIONS (Illustrative Only)

Management reserves the right to add, modify, change, or rescind the work assignments of different positions and to make reasonable accommodations so that qualified employees can perform the essential functions of the job.

- Inspects multifamily and commercial accounts based on daily assignments; organizes and schedules routes to ensure timely completion of inspection schedule; gains lawful entry to site locations.
- Observes, photographs, and reports site conditions and provides relevant details related to compliance or suspected non-compliance through a handheld computer tablet; provides thorough documentation of non-compliance or unusual conditions; contacts supervisor if clarification or guidance is needed.
- Attends monthly training activities to promote understanding of ordinance requirements and inspection techniques.
- Drives assigned vehicle and performs safety and service inspections as needed.
- Reads and interprets maps and diagrams in the performance of the work.
- Initiates contact with and represents the District in account interactions; provides account representative with printed reference material and information related to inspection findings; answers account inquiries and refers on questions and issues as needed; refers inquiries to the appropriate resource within or outside the Authority.
- Performs other duties as assigned.

QUALIFICATIONS

Knowledge of:

- Basic operation of computer equipment and applications related to work.
- Safety equipment and practices related to the work, including safe driving rules and practices.
- English usage, spelling, vocabulary, grammar, and punctuation.
- Techniques for providing a high level of customer service by effectively dealing with account representatives, the public, and Authority staff.

Ability to:

- Deal tactfully with the account representatives, the public and others in providing information and answering questions.
- Complete assigned inspections within established guidelines.
- Report data accurately and prepare accurate records.
- Read and interpret street maps.
- Operate a motor vehicle safely.
- Learn and apply applicable Federal, State, and local laws, regulatory codes, ordinances, and procedures relevant to assignment.
- Maintain accurate logs, records, and basic written records of work performed.
- Follow Authority policies and procedures related to assigned duties.
- Understand and follow oral and written instructions.
- Organize own work and meet time deadlines.
- Use English effectively to communicate in person, over the telephone, and in writing.
- Use tact, initiative, prudence and judgment within general policy, procedural, and legal guidelines.
- Establish, maintain, and foster positive and effective working relationships with those contacted in the course of work.

Education and Experience:

Any combination of training and experience that would provide the required knowledge, skills, and abilities is qualifying. A typical way to obtain the required qualifications would be:

Equivalent to the completion of the twelfth (12th) grade and one (1) year of customer service experience.

Licenses and Certifications:

- Possession of, or ability to obtain, a valid California Driver's License by time of appointment.

PHYSICAL DEMANDS

Must possess mobility to operate a motor vehicle and to work in the field visiting multiple sites; strength, stamina, and mobility to perform light to medium physical work and to operate varied hand tools and equipment such; vision to read printed materials and a computer screen; and hearing and speech to communicate in person and over the telephone. The job involves fieldwork requiring frequent walking in operational areas to identify problems or hazards. Finger dexterity is needed to access, enter, and retrieve data using a computer keyboard or calculator and to operate above-mentioned tools and equipment. Positions in this classification bend, stoop, kneel, reach, and climb to perform work and inspect work

sites. Employees must possess the ability to lift, carry, push, and pull materials and objects weighing up to 10 pounds.

ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

Employees work in the field and are exposed to loud noise levels, cold and hot temperatures, inclement weather conditions, dust, fumes, and/or allergens, chemicals, and hazardous physical substances and fumes which require the use of protective clothing and equipment such as gloves and vests. Employees may interact with upset staff and/or public and private representatives and contractors in interpreting and enforcing policies and procedures.

**Alameda County Waste Management Authority
Top Monthly Salary Data
February 2016**

Inspector						
Rank	Comparator Agency	Class Title	Top Monthly Salary	Effective Date	Next Salary Increase	Next Percentage Increase
1	East Bay Municipal Utility District	Meter Reader	\$5,841	07/01/15	Unknown	Unknown
2	City of San Francisco	Meter Reader	\$5,555	10/10/15	7/1/2016	2.25 - 3.25%
3	City of Hayward	Water Meter Reader	\$5,330	12/15/15	7/1/2016	2.5%
4	City of Berkeley	Parking Enforcement Officer	\$5,207	12/20/15	6/19/2016	1%
5	City of Alameda	Meter Reader	\$5,063	01/11/15	Unknown	Unknown
6	City of Oakland	Parking Control Technician	\$4,498	07/01/15	Unknown	Unknown
7	Alameda County Waste Management Authority	Inspector	Proposed			
Average of Comparators			\$ 5,249			
% Alameda County Waste Management Authority Above/Below			N/A			
Median of Comparators			\$5,269			
% Alameda County Waste Management Authority Above/Below			N/A			
Number of Matches			6			
NOTE: All calculations exclude Alameda County Waste Management Authority						

N/C - Non Comparator

1 - The City of Alameda is in the process of labor negotiations; the data pulled is their most current data prior to negotiations.

**Alameda County Waste Management Authority
Benefit Detail
February 2016**

Benefit		Alameda County Waste Mgt Authority	City of Alameda	City of Berkeley	City of Hayward	City of Oakland	City of San Francisco	East Bay Municipal Utility District
Class Title			Meter Reader	Parking Enforcement Officer	Water Meter Reader	Parking Control Technician	Meter Reader	Meter Reader
Top Monthly Salary	Proposed	\$5,063	\$5,207	\$5,330	\$4,498	\$5,555	\$5,841	
Employee Retirement								
PERS Formula		2.5%@55	2.7%@55	2.5%@55	2.5%@55	2.1%@61	2.6%@62	
Enhanced Formula Cost		\$251	\$419	\$264	\$223	-\$169	-\$178	
ER Paid Member Contribution		\$95	\$417					
EPMC Reported as Special Comp			\$33					
12 Month Highest Salary		\$68	\$70	\$72				\$79
Social Security						\$344		\$362
Other								
Insurance								
Cafeteria								
Health		\$1,860	\$1,651	\$1,941	\$1,941	\$1,692		\$2,776
Dental		\$133	\$151	\$129	\$113	\$177		\$224
Vision				\$14	\$29			\$24
EAP		\$3	\$2	\$7	\$2			\$5
Life		\$8	\$2	\$5	\$5			\$1
LTD		\$10	\$9			\$22		\$23
STD/SDI								
Other								
Leave								
Vacation		\$302	\$300	\$308	\$260	\$320		\$337
Holidays		\$263	\$320	\$297	\$225	\$342		\$337
Administrative								
Auto Allowance								
Uniform Allowance			\$1,400		\$329			
Deferred Compensation			\$181					
Other								
Longevity								
Benefit Cost		\$2,992	\$4,956	\$3,037	\$3,127	\$2,728		\$3,991
Total Monthly Comp.	Proposed	\$8,055	\$10,163	\$8,367	\$7,625	\$8,283		\$9,832

Note: Total Monthly Compensation number may vary slightly from the sum of its components due to cell formulas & rounding.

**Alameda County Waste Management Authority
Total Monthly Compensation Data
February 2016**

Inspector						
Rank	Comparator Agency	Class Title	Total Monthly Comp	Effective Date	Next Salary Increase	Next Percentage Increase
1	City of Berkeley	Parking Enforcement Officer	\$10,163	12/20/15	6/19/2016	1%
2	East Bay Municipal Utility District	Meter Reader	\$9,832	07/01/15	Unknown	Unknown
3	City of Hayward	Water Meter Reader	\$8,367	12/15/15	7/1/2016	2.5%
4	City of San Francisco	Meter Reader	\$8,283	10/10/15	7/1/2016	2.25 - 3.25%
5	City of Alameda	Meter Reader	\$8,055	01/11/15	Unknown	Unknown
6	City of Oakland	Parking Control Technician	\$7,625	07/01/15	Unknown	Unknown
7	Alameda County Waste Management Authority	Inspector	Proposed			
Average of Comparators			\$ 8,720			
% Alameda County Waste Management Authority Above/Below			N/A			
Median of Comparators			\$8,325			
% Alameda County Waste Management Authority Above/Below			N/A			
Number of Matches			6			
NOTE: All calculations exclude Alameda County Waste Management Authority						

N/C - Non Comparator



DATE: March 10, 2016

TO: Programs & Administration Committee
Planning & Organization Committee/Recycling Board

FROM: Wendy Sommer, Executive Director

BY: Justin Lehrer, Senior Program Manager

SUBJECT: Product Decisions Targets Update

SUMMARY

In February the Board approved Assessment Criteria (Attachment A) for use as an internal tool for evaluating the efficacy of current and future Agency projects. The Product Decision targets were recently assessed through this new process, and staff has developed recommendations for inclusion in the FY16-17 Budget.

DISCUSSION

A key objective of this effort is to consider the value of the activities we engage in and whether those activities are the most effective way to support agency priorities and work toward our goals. Some efforts have been effective and successful, and we can consider next steps or advance to new goals. Others have encountered technical hurdles, or other factors outside our influence; in those cases we should not hesitate to adjust the strategy to reflect current needs, conditions, and where we can have the greatest beneficial impact.

Although there are changes proposed for some projects, the purpose of the Product Decisions (PD) work remains intact – to influence decisions about what to manufacture, offer for sale, or purchase in Alameda County. PD emphasizes strategies closer to the top of the reduce, reuse, recycle and rot hierarchy, preventing generation of waste and supporting markets for products developed with recycled content materials.

When the criteria were introduced to the Board for discussion in February, three focus areas were called out as priorities: Organics, Packaging, and Built-Environment. Most PD projects naturally fit into one of the three, and we realize operational efficiencies while also aligning our work with US EPA’s priorities for Sustainable Materials Management, which could increase future opportunities for external funding.

Attachment B outlines the key findings and recommendations for each of the seven projects assessed through this process, presented within the relevant priority area. Central themes have to do with recognizing some limits to our reach and influence with certain audiences, consolidating some packaging-related activities, and investing more in effective strategies targeting organics and food – the largest single component in the waste stream, specifically:

- Organics: continue to invest, and expand our efforts on food waste prevention and recovery and use of compost and mulch in the County.
- Packaging: Consolidate Reusable Packaging, Food Service Ware, and Package labeling into one Packaging project for greater efficiency and lower cost.
- Built-Environment: Halt efforts to achieve the current recycled content building materials target and re-focus on support for member agency climate action planning/implementation and continued research on recycled content feedstocks.
- Household Hazardous Waste Alternatives: Move this work into the HHW Facilities Discards Management project in order to focus on attracting more residents to the drop-off facilities.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Committee review the proposed recommendations for the PD Targets and recommend to the WMA Board to direct staff to implement them in the FY 16-17 budget.

Attachments: Attachment A - Project Assessment
Attachment B - Product Decisions – Key Findings & Recommendations

ATTACHMENT A



PROJECT ASSESSMENT

Project/Concept Name (incl. Project #): _____

Priority Area:

- Organics Packaging Built Environment (Green Building, Landscape, Energy, C&D)

Impact Area:

- Landfill Conservation (Prevention or Diversion) Energy Conservation
 Hazardous Waste Climate Mitigation/Adaptation Recycled Content /
 Market Dev Other (Soil, Water, etc.)

Place in Hierarchy:

- Reduce Reuse Recycle Rot

Criteria	Response <i>Yes, No, Maybe</i>	Assessment/Comments
<p>Influence/Geographic Scale Are we positioned to effectively influence the target audience? Can the project be achieved within Alameda County or is broader geographic reach needed (i.e. would this be better pursued via partnerships or a regional, state or federal initiative)?</p>		
<p>Technical Feasibility Aside from cost or other factors, can it be done? Is the technology available and the pieces in place to make it work? (e.g., if goal is recyclable/compostable food service ware, are these products acceptable and processable in local facilities?)</p>		
<p>Timeliness & Leverage Is the project timely given the current societal and political environment and/or internal considerations? Are stars aligned, are there funding or other opportunities to leverage?</p>		

<p>Member Agency, Partner & Funder Alignment</p> <p>Does the project align with or support goals/initiatives of our Member Agencies and other potential partners (e.g., water agencies)? Is there opportunity to collaborate? Is it equitable?</p>		
<p>Innovation & Leadership</p> <p>Is the Agency in a unique position to influence policy, markets, or behavior with this project? Is the project innovative; does it experiment with a new concept/idea? Seed for future funding?</p>		
<p>Measurability</p> <p>Practically speaking, can progress be measured? Note the metric/method.</p>		
<p>Budget</p> <p>Is current project budget sufficient, or is adequate funding readily available? Is there a plan for funding? Ask the same questions of staffing.</p>		
<p>Environmental Impact & Cost Effectiveness</p> <p>Consider the overall magnitude of impact of the project, along with costs to determine the overall "bang for your buck." When feasible, use metrics such as cost per ton (or other).</p>		
<p>Community/Social Impact</p> <p>Consider social and economic impacts on the community. Job creation, other community benefits? What does the community think of the effort? Is public stakeholder effort needed?</p>		
<p>Questions:</p>		
<p>Recommendation:</p>		

ATTACHMENT B

Product Decisions – Key Findings & Recommendations

For the mid-point assessment, each project team considered progress toward the original target, conducted a qualitative review of the project using the assessment criteria (Attachment A), and developed recommendations for a path forward. Below, key findings and recommendations are outlined for each of the seven projects assessed through this process, presented within the relevant priority area (Organics, Packaging, and Built Environment).

Generally, staff recommendations can be summarized as follows:

- **Organics:** continue to invest, and expand our efforts on food waste prevention and recovery and use of compost and mulch in the County.
- **Packaging:** Consolidate Reusable Packaging, Food Service Ware, and Package labeling into one Packaging project for greater efficiency and lower cost.
- **Built-Environment:** Halt efforts to achieve the current recycled content building materials target and re-focus on support for member agency climate action planning/implementation and continued research on recycled content feedstocks.
- **Household Hazardous Waste Alternatives:** Move this work into the HHW Facilities Discards Management project in order to focus on attracting more residents to the drop-off facilities.

I. Organics Priority Area

Supports the Agency Discards Goal of no more than 10% “good stuff” in garbage by 2020 by reducing the overall volume of food waste generated in Alameda County (the largest remaining recyclable component of MSW), and driving demand for recycled compost and mulch. Areas of emphasis include:

- Increasing the availability, access and quality of local, recycled bulk compost and mulch
- Promoting sheet mulch to home gardeners, landscape professionals, cities, and schools
- Preventing food waste and donating edible food generated in institutional kitchens and other high volume food service operations
- Working with food service providers to reduce pre-consumer food waste through tracking technology and training

A. Food Waste Prevention Emphasis

Existing 2020 Target:	Institutional kitchens and high volume food service operators located in Alameda County that participate in technical assistance or other support services from the Authority, reduce food and other inputs by an average of 25% or more from an established baseline.
Progress:	<p>Preventing pre-consumer food waste and donating edible surplus food generated by institutional kitchens / high volume food service operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Launched Smart Kitchen Initiative – food waste tracking and technical assistance to 18 large food service operators • Developed Oakland Unified School District food donation guide, now adapted for Livermore Valley (LVJUSD) • Grant funding for food recovery groups
Key Observations	+ Timeliness – broad awareness of wasted food issue; regional and

from Criteria Review:	national goals, media campaigns to leverage in county + Innovation & Leadership – public/private partnership with LeanPath and Food Service companies to influence kitchen norms in this sector
Recommendation:	Prioritize efforts to reduce food waste, which also supports the Agency’s discards goal. Expand reach and work with businesses and consumers to reduce wasted food. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand audiences; on the ground tactics targeting households w/children • Augment commercial food waste prevention efforts; focus on recovery of surplus edible food through government & community partnerships • Develop county-wide prevention outreach campaigns; leverage broader efforts to change social norms
Revised Goal:	Reduce wasted food and recover edible surplus food generated by commercial food service operators, school districts and households resulting in a 25% reduction in food waste going to landfill from 50 kitchens; recovering edible surplus food from 4 school districts; and reaching 42,000 households with food waste prevention media and outreach targeting families with children.

B. Recycled Content Compost and Mulch Emphasis

Existing 2020 Target:	90% of permitted landscape projects in Alameda County use locally produced or sourced compost and/or local, recycled mulch.
Progress:	Increasing the availability, access and quality of local, recycled bulk compost and mulch and on using it in new large-scale landscape construction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met the target through policy and advocacy • Bay Friendly Basics require 1” compost, 3” mulch for permitted projects • CA Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO) requires statewide: 4cy/1000 sf compost and 3” mulch for all new construction over 500 sf
Key Observations from Criteria Review:	± Impact: Organics are a priority, but original target had narrow audience + Timeliness: We can leverage the drought and community support to promote sheet mulching + Leadership: we helped raise the bar statewide
Recommendation:	Continue this work with a revised goal to include all StopWaste core audiences: at home, at work, at school. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote sheet mulch to home gardeners, landscape professionals, cities, and schools • Expand other uses of compost: sedimentation control, biotreatment for stormwater, carbon ranching
Revised Goal:	Apply compost and/or mulch to 1M square feet in Alameda County.

II. Packaging Priority Area

In order to improve internal efficiency, three projects—Reusable Transport Packaging, Food Service Ware, and Packaging Life Cycle Analysis and Labeling—will be combined into one new Packaging project offering education, technical assistance, and financial support to organizations for their efforts to prevent, reuse, and improve the recyclability of packaging materials manufactured, sold, and discarded in Alameda County. Areas of emphasis include:

- Increasing use of reusable transport packaging in the commercial/industrial sector.
- Reducing use of hard to recycle single use disposables at food service establishments.
- Adoption of package labeling best practices for recyclability by Alameda County brand owners.
- Engagement with industry and other stakeholders to support policy and standards development in support of sustainable packaging.

Packaging Project			
Existing 2020 Packaging Targets:	Reusable Transport Packaging	Institutional and Commercial Food Service Ware and Packaging	Packaging Life Cycle Analysis and Recyclability Labeling
	90% of businesses in Alameda County with appropriate shipping and receiving circumstances are utilizing reusable transport packaging when economically advantageous	90% of customers (institutional and commercial) with separate organics collection purchase and use readily recyclable/ reusable/compostable food service ware and packaging.	90% of Alameda County brand owner/manufacturers will incorporate life-cycle metrics into their packaging design process and utilize accurate recyclability labeling (How2Recycle label).
Progress:	<p>Assistance and funding to expand adoption of reusable transport packaging to replace single-use pallets, corrugated boxes, and pallet wrap.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reached 500 businesses, implemented 25 projects, preventing 5,000 tons of waste (tracked) • Launched new website, www.UseReusables.org featuring 30 success stories, vendor database and cost calculators • Estimated 46% adoption 	<p>Assistance and funding to food service businesses and school districts for source reduction of food service ware and related packaging, and use of reusable alternatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implemented “Rethink Disposable” campaign reaching 430 businesses which led to 50 sites that reduced 7.5 tons of single use disposable food ware products. • Developed Compostable Food Ware Purchasing Guide available on www.RecyclingRulesAC.org and adapted by other 	<p>Assistance and funding to brand owners to adopt package labeling best practices for recyclability and incorporate life cycle assessment into product packaging decisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed and published Package labeling guide: http://guides.stopwaste.org/packaging • Provided assistance to locally headquartered national brands for adoption of How2Recycle label on their packaging, and for

	<p>rate for reusables countywide (2014)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed 4 year, \$500,000 EPA grant 	<p>jurisdictions and counties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Produced five videos with Clean Water Fund highlighting business and school success stories 	<p>conducting life cycle analysis of packaging materials</p>
Key Observations from Criteria Review:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Influence – slow adoption process with limited influence, grants are key - Measurability – hard to measure progress; survey based and/or case-by-case approach to determine “appropriateness” which is time intensive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Feasibility – unresolved technical issues with collection, sorting and processing (recycling or composting) single use food service ware are fatal flaw - Influence – purchasing and manufacture of single-use products happens across county lines + Timeliness – leverage mandatory and TA to incentivize; impact of disposables on local watersheds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact – overall impact efficiency is low due to small universe of target businesses and very slow adoption rate - Influence – low influence over brand owners, who are not likely to alter packaging refresh schedules for our purposes
Recommendation:	<p>Identifying and converting 90% of businesses is impractical and would require substantial additional funding. Adjust scope to reflect reduced funding after the EPA grant, and focus on sectors with a proven opportunity for reusables for improved efficiency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leverage new website as primary education and outreach tool • Focus on local opportunities with small manufacturers and food production 	<p>The target is not achievable without a consistent solution for recycling or composting food service ware. Keep project costs low and continue to encourage adoption of reusable food ware and waste prevention practices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate in policy and technical discussions working to address compostability/recyclability issues with food ware • Continue to promote and incentivize waste prevention and reusable food service ware as preferable alternatives 	<p>The target as written is not realistically achievable by 2020, but it is worthwhile to offer support for those businesses that are motivated to improve their packaging.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue participation in state and national policy development and industry dialogs related to sustainable packaging • Offer technical assistance as needed to engaged brand owners
Revised Goal:	<p>Assist a minimum of 150 businesses in switching to reusable transport packaging, reusable food service ware, and/or more sustainable packaging, resulting in at least 6,000 tons of measurable waste prevented.</p>		

III. Built-Environment Priority Area

Address the impacts of materials management by influencing the design, construction and maintenance of the built environment. Areas of emphasis include:

- Advocate for greater recycled content in green building codes and standards
- Provide member agencies with innovative policy assistance and support local climate action planning/implementation.
- Support development of market transformation tools (e.g., GreenPoint Rated)
- Research and technical advocacy on topics related to recycled content feedstock for building materials. (e.g., Healthy Building Network)

Note: Additional PD projects, including all Energy Council projects fall within the Built-Environment priority but are not discussed here as they are externally funded and not part of this assessment process.

Recycled Content: Building Materials

Existing 2020 Target:	90% of building material supply centers will stock and promote recycled content building materials.
Progress:	<p>Driving the demand for recycled content product purchases in Alameda County. Retailers are stocking recycled content products (e.g., insulation, decking) but are not interested in actively promoting the recycled content attributes alone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided information and convenient tools for the purchase of recycled content products • Encouraged retailers to supply products via an outreach strategy in conjunction with other agency projects • Advocated for recycled content building materials in green building codes and standards
Key Observations from Criteria Review:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Influence - limited with retailers - Geography - requires regional/national focus to affect change - MA Alignment - Not directly useful to member agencies
Recommendation:	<p>Given limited influence within the retail sector, a shift in approach is recommended. Agency resources are better spent on activities where we can have greater impact and support Member Agencies. Sunset this project and shift resources to 2 new projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Codes and Standards</u>: Continue codes and standards development and technical advocacy efforts, to support policy changes that result in increased use of recycled content and broader green criteria. • <u>Building Services & Partnerships</u>: Provide technical and policy assistance to member agencies and support strategic building industry partners.

IV. HHW

Household Hazardous Waste: Point of Purchase Alternatives

2020 Target:	90% of stores that sell products destined for HHW facilities will stock and promote non-toxic/less-toxic HHW alternative products.
Progress:	<p>Promotes the message of “Buy Smart,” appropriate use of products and proper disposal at Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership with Our Water Our World in 40 stores to provide HHW alternatives information • Partnership with PaintCare in 24 stores to provide leftover paint collection and HHW information • Outreach & promotion in support of events and expanded facility hours has been effective
Key Observations from Criteria Review:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Influence - limited with retailers - Feasibility – alternatives are still technically HHW + Member agencies are seeking more info and access to collection events for their residents
Recommendation:	<p>Since less-toxic alternatives are still HHW, funds are best used to educate the public about what is HHW and where they can dispose of it properly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue external partnerships and alternatives messaging • Combine with HHW Facilities project for administrative efficiency