I. CALL TO ORDER
Jim Oddie, President, called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL
Jillian Buckholz, Recycling Programs
Bernie Camara, Recycling Materials Processing Industry
Nancy Deming, Environmental Educator
Dan Kalb (Interim), ACWMA
Sara Lamnin, ACWMA
Dianne Martinez, ACWMA
John Moore, Environmental Organization
Jim Oddie, ACWMA
Tim Rood, ACWMA
Matthew Southworth (Interim), Source Reduction Specialist

Absent:
Vacant, Solid Waste Industry Representative

Staff Present:
Tom Padia, Deputy Executive Director
Wendy Sommer, Executive Director
Meri Soll, Senior Program Manager
Meghan Starkey, Senior Management Analyst
Angela Vergara, Program Manager
Farand Kan, County Counsel
Arliss Dunn, Clerk of the Board

Others Participating:
Terry McDonald, DR3 Recycling
Jordan Figueiredo, Castro Valley Sanitary District
Barbara Lee, Livermore Valley Joint Unified School District
Natasha Neves, Oro Loma Sanitary District
Andreea Simion, Oro Loma Sanitary District
Arthur Boone
Toni Stein
III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT
President Oddie stated that he may need to leave at 4:30 and Board member Martinez had agreed to chair the meeting in his absence.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR
1. Approval of the Draft Minutes of July 12, 2018 (Tom Padia)
2. Board Attendance Record (Tom Padia)
3. Written Report of Ex Parte Communications (Tom Padia)

There were no public comments on the Consent Calendar. Board member Martinez made the motion to approve the Consent Calendar. Board member Moore seconded and the motion carried 6-0. (Ayes: Camara, Deming, Moore, Martinez, Oddie, Southworth. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Buckholz, Kalb, Lamnin, Rood. Vacant: Solid Waste Industry Representative).

IV. OPEN PUBLIC DISCUSSION
Arthur Boone provided public comments regarding the proposed mixed-waste processing facility at the Davis Street Transfer Station. Mr. Boone distributed a handout entitled “The Evolution of Mixed Waste Processing Facilities 1970-Today (copy of the handout is attached).”

VI. REGULAR CALENDAR
1. DR3 Mattress Recycling – Facility Relocation Support (Meri Soll)
   Provide a $57,500 one-time grant to The Society of St. Vincent de Paul (nonprofit entity operating as DR3) to offset facility relocation costs from Oakland to Livermore.

Meri Soll provided an overview of the staff report. A link to the report is available here: DR3-Funding-Request-08-09-18.pdf. Mr. Terry McDonald, DR3 Recycling, was present to answer questions.

Board member Kalb stated that the funds are intended for grants to non-profits and inquired about the status of DR3 Recycling. Mr. McDonald stated that DR3 Recycling is a dba of the Society of St. Vincent De Paul, which is a non-profit. Board member Kalb stated that he is concerned that the relocation to Livermore will create a decrease in the number of mattresses recycled in North County. Mr. McDonald stated that they are working with the Mattress Recycling Council (MRC) to locate a magnet facility in Oakland to mitigate any potential decrease in mattress recycling in North County. Mr. McDonald added it is difficult to find a warehouse processing facility near the 880 corridor and those that are available do not have sufficient yard space. Board member Kalb inquired about the timeline for the magnet facility in Oakland. Mr. McDonald stated that he is still working with MRC to locate a site. Board member Kalb recommended that Mr. McDonald reach out to the Oakland Department of Environmental Services to assist in finding a location. Mr. Padia stated that Steve Lautze, City of Oakland Economic Development, was assisting with attempting to find a location in Oakland. Mr. Padia added that he is pleased that they were able to find a location in Alameda County and there is another mattress recycler located in San Leandro. President Oddie stated the Mattress Recycling Bill was authored by Senator Loni Hancock and he is also concerned that Oakland would be losing the facility. He added that he is pleased to know that there are ongoing efforts to find another location in Oakland. Board member Moore stated that it is a
struggle to find facilities especially for industrial uses and inquired if there were suitable facilities but had zoning issues. Mr. McDonald stated there were no zoning issues but the building owners expressed concerns about fires and mattress deconstruction as an industry and required additional insurance and a policy in case of abandonment.

There was no public comment on this item. Board member Martinez made the motion to approve the staff recommendation. Board member Southworth seconded and the motion carried 7-0. (Ayes: Camara, Deming, Kalb, Martinez, Moore, Oddie, Southworth. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Buckholz, Lamnin, Rood. Vacant: Solid Waste Industry Representative).

2. Municipal Panel: Member Agency Schools Programs (Meghan Starkey)
   This item is for information only.

Meghan Starkey provided an overview of the staff report and introduced the panelists: Jordan Figueiredo, Castro Valley Sanitary District; Barbara Lee, Livermore Valley Joint Unified School District; Natasha Neves, Oro Loma Sanitary District; and Andreea Simion, Oro Loma Sanitary District. The panelists shared their experiences and insights on the opportunities and challenges of implementing recycling and organics programs and other waste reduction efforts in their schools. Staff Angelina Vergara provided comments on the agency’s efforts regarding the schools program. (Board members Rood and Lamnin arrived during the presentation). A link to the staff report and the CVSan PowerPoint presentation is available here: Municipal-Panel-Schools-08-09-18.pdf

A link to the StopWaste Schools Program Overview is available here: http://www.stopwaste.org/recycling/schools

An audio link to the presentation and discussion is available here: Municipal-Panel-Presentation-08-09-18

VII. OTHER PUBLIC INPUT
Toni Stein expressed her concerns regarding the proposed anaerobic digester at the Davis Street Transfer Station in San Leandro. Ms. Stein stated that the potential air quality and high odor issues are significant. Ms. Stein stated that Zero Waste Energy Development located at Zanker Road, has contracted with Davis Street to do the anaerobic digestion and since 2014, has received over 3,000 complaints regarding odors that have not been addressed. Ms. Stein stated that she is concerned about the odor impacts when transporting the materials.

VIII. COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS
There were none. Board member Buckholz arrived during member comments.

IX. ADJOURNMENT
The meeting adjourned at 4:53 p.m.
Recycling Industries Coalition Policy Position

The Recycling Industries Coalition represents industries and companies that are concerned about the potential degradation of recyclable materials when they are mixed with solid waste. Our experience, along with that of thousands of American communities and businesses, shows that separate collection of recyclables continues to be the most effective and cost-efficient method of maximizing the collection of clean recyclable raw materials. Simply put, collecting recyclable materials in the same bin as garbage degrades the quality of those collected materials.

Preserving the quality of recyclable materials, from collection through production into new products, will ultimately expand both the supply and the demand for recyclable feedstock for the world's manufacturing industries. Coalition members know that a facility processing waste and recyclables mixed together, known as a Dirty MRF, may harm recycling. When processing recyclables mixed with solid waste, it can result in the recyclable materials being reduced to being reprocessed into lower quality products. Mixing these valuable recyclables with food, diapers, and other contaminants will severely degrade them.

The private and public sectors have invested billions of dollars in infrastructure enabling citizens and businesses to reduce, reuse and recycle efficiently. The $270 billion dollar recycling industry supports hundreds of thousands of direct and indirect jobs. Maintaining the current large job base in the overall recycling network as well as the creation of new well-paying jobs in the recycling and manufacturing industries in the United States is critically important. Recycling conserves non-renewable natural resources, helps numerous industries reduce their energy use and significantly reduces the amount of waste sent to landfills and incinerators. Products made from recycled materials can be recycled many times, whereas recyclables converted to energy, burned or landfilled are lost forever. Finally, recycling is sustainable and results in a significant reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

Recyclables aren't waste, let's keep it that way.
Recycling Industries Coalition opposes “dirty MRF” concept

A newly formed group of recycling organizations and stakeholders is weighing in on the effects of mixed waste processing on recycling.

“Coalition members know that a facility processing waste and recyclables mixed together, known as a dirty MRF, will not improve and may harm recycling,” the policy statement from the newly formed Recycling Industries Coalition (RIC) reads. RIC is made up of recycling stakeholders from across the country and initially formed to combat an Indianapolis project centered around a mixed waste processing facility, or dirty MRF.

While that facility was eventually approved by city officials, RIC "continues as a way to educate policy makers, local officials and the community about the potential negative consequences of multi-material processing facilities," the group writes in an official release. Mixing solid waste and recyclables, according to RIC’s official policy statement on the approach, “will severely degrade them to the point that they will only be usable for incineration, landfilling or energy recovery, which is not recycling.”

RIC members include a number of large industry groups and stakeholders, including: American Forest & Paper Association, Glass Packaging Institute, Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, Knauf Insulation, Newark Group, Owens-Illinois, Inc., Paper Recycling Coalition, the Steel Recycling Institute and Waste Management.

The group’s position has been supported by the National Recycling Coalition (NRC) as well.

“NRC supports the policy adopted by the RIC in highlighting concerns with the implementation of dirty MRFs,” an NRC post states. “The NRC agrees with concerns with dirty MRFs that RIC highlighted and other concerns, instead of relying on dirty MRFs, NRC urges communities to implement best practices for the separate collection of recyclables.”

While the mixed waste processing approach is not new, it has seen a resurgence in interest among some U.S. cities looking to boost relatively low recycling rates. Beyond the Indianapolis project, a $35 million mixed waste processing facility for residential waste opened earlier this year in Montgomery, Alabama. Houston has also released a six-part video series looking into the merits of the "all in one bin" approach. According to equipment maker Bulk Handling Systems, which has released a six-part video series on the issue, mixed waste processing has evolved significantly and can now effectively separate recyclables from a mixed municipal waste stream.

Read more recent stories

- Depressed fiber prices felt by Casella and Advanced
- Where are the current paper and plastics export markets?
- Recycled paper pulp facing tariff threat
- Here’s how well Canadian programs did last year

Our “flip” edition lets you look through back issues of Resource Recycling with ease. Look through the June edition or head to our print edition page for an archive of magazines from past months.
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1 Executive Summary

Mixed waste processing (MWP) is a mechanical system that separates recyclable commodities from Municipal Solid Waste (MSW). Mixed waste processing facilities (MWPF) use a variety of new and existing technologies to sort recyclables from a stream of mixed trash. Sometimes MWPFs are combined with source-separated collection of recyclables and a Materials Recovery Facility (MRF). Or a MWPF can be found as a stand-alone facility processing the entire waste stream.

MWPFs, in their earliest of designs, were first introduced in the 1970s\(^1\) as a way to capture high BTU elements of MSW for combustion-based energy recovery. Today, MWP is attracting renewed interest across the country as a way to address low participation rates for source-separated recycling collection systems and prepare feedstocks for conversion technologies and/or fuel products. In theory, these facilities can give communities the opportunity to recycle at much higher rates than has been demonstrated by curbside or other collection systems. Advances in technology make today's mixed waste processing facilities different and in many respects better than older versions. Yet legitimate questions remain regarding recovery rates, quality and contamination of recovered materials, and the commercial readiness of the technologies compared to existing systems.\(^2\)

There are three questions regarding MWPF that proponents need to address with performance data and a coherent public policy argument:

- Will increased volumes of recyclables from MWPFs be contaminated? And would the increased volumes offset discounted prices for contaminated materials?
- Are MWPFs inconsistent with the conventional wisdom that the act of source separating one’s recyclables is by itself important?
- Is the belief correct in suspecting that energy recovery, not recycling, is still the main driver behind these facilities?

Interest in these facilities is high. Several communities across the country are evaluating mixed waste processing systems as a way to reduce collection costs while also increasing the recovery of recyclable materials in the waste stream.

The key findings of this Report are:

- Sortation technology continues to evolve and improve. This has enabled significantly higher diversion rates and more recoverable streams. For example, optical near infrared (NIR) light and sensors that recognize different types of plastics are being utilized in modern MWPFs. These systems accurately separate plastics by resin type. This dramatically increases the potential overall recovery of plastics for both recycling and energy recovery.
- Recovery of high value materials, such as plastics and metals, has the potential to increase significantly via modern MWPFs. Recovery rates for lower value materials, such as fiber/paper and glass, are likely to be reduced.

---


\(^2\) The findings presented in this Report are based on publicly available information and present the background and design concepts of the original facilities in the context of today’s technological advancements through March 2015. This Report also presents historical data on the number of existing MWPFs and their type, as the industry has adjusted to market demands with advanced higher performance equipment.
September 15, 2016

Scott Smithline
Director, CalRecycle
1001 I Street – PO Box 4025
Sacramento, CA 95814-4025

RE: Letter of Support – CalRecycle GHG Organics Grant Program

Dear Mr. Smithline:

I am writing in support of Waste Management of Alameda County, Inc’s application for grant funding of its Innovative, end-of-the-line solution to capture organics before they reach our landfills.

Our current Strategic Plan goal is for landfilled material from Alameda County to be comprised of less than 10 percent “readily recyclable or compostable materials” by 2020. It is an ambitious goal supported by our Mandatory Commercial and Multi-family Recycling Ordinance and the three-stream residential collection system adopted by our 17-member jurisdictions. Diverting recyclables and compostables at the source is the focus of our outreach and enforcement efforts. However, as our 2015 Benchmark Study revealed, significant volumes of food waste are still going to our landfills.

We believe the Organics Material Recovery Facility (“OMRF”) proposed by Waste Management for its Davis Street facility in San Leandro can play a vital role in helping Alameda County achieve its resource conservation goals as well as reduce greenhouse gas emissions and extend the life of our in-county landfills. An additional benefit will be the “recovery of last resort” of recyclables from the processed waste stream, bringing us closer to achieving our long-term goals.

Waste Management has long been a valued partner in our campaign to stop waste in Alameda County. We entered into an incentives-based partnership with Waste Management at the Davis Street Transfer Station to build and operate the first and most robust Construction and Demolition mixed debris recycling line in our county back in 2002, and they have been an invaluable partner in our schools outreach efforts, providing space for our Education Center classroom at Davis Street from which we provide hundreds of tours to thousands of elementary school students each year.

We believe the OMRF is an innovative step that will take us closer to reaching our diversion goals, and we heartily support Waste Management’s grant application to bring this technology to Alameda County. With CalRecycle’s assistance, California will be home to the most technically advanced organics diversion efforts in the country. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Wendy Sommer
Executive Director