

APPROVED

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

Thursday, February 9, 2017

9:00 A.M.

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

**Teleconference:
Lorrin Ellis
1260 Pacific St.
Union City, CA 94587
510-675-5621**

Members Present:

Castro Valley Sanitary District	Dave Sadoff
City of Hayward	Sara Lamnin
City of Livermore	Bob Carling
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 (teleconference)

Absent:

County of Alameda	Keith Carson
City of Berkeley	Jesse Arreguin
City of Dublin	Don Biddle
City of Fremont	Vacant

Staff Present:

Pat Cabrera, Administrative Services Director
Wendy Sommer, Executive Director
Tom Padia, Deputy Executive Director
Teresa Eade, Senior Program Manager
Meghan Starkey, Senior Program Manager
Arless Dunn, Clerk of the Board

1. Convene Meeting

Chair Dave Sadoff called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. Item #5 was held first until a quorum of the members arrived. Chair Sadoff announced that Board members are no longer required to use the sign-in

APPROVED

attendance sheet as staff will now record the attendance. Staff will confer with legal counsel to confirm that it meets the legal requirement.

2. Public Comments

There were none.

3. Approval of the Draft Minutes of January 12, 2017 (Pat Cabrera)

Action

Board member Hannon made the motion to approve the draft minutes of January 12, 2017. Board member Carling seconded and the motion was carried 8-0 (Ayes: Carling, Cox, Ellis, Hannon, Kalb, Lamnin, Sadoff, Young. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Arreguin, Biddle, Carson. Fremont, vacant).

4. Waste Characterization 2017: Contractor Recommendation (Meghan Starkey)

Action

Staff recommends that the Programs & Administration Committee recommend to the Authority Board to authorize the Executive Director to enter into a contract with SCS Engineers for a total of \$347,000.

Meghan Starkey provided a summary of the staff report. The report is available here:

[Waste-Characterization-2017.02-09-17.pdf](#)

Board member Sadoff inquired if we have audited MRFs before now. Tom Padia stated that Davis Street Transfer Station C&D/Dry MRF applied to be a high diversion mixed waste processing facility under our mandatory recycling ordinance for dry materials and we audited the residuals to see if they contained more or less than 10% "good stuff" but we have not comprehensively looked at the other MRF's at Davis Street nor in the rest of the county. The city of Oakland requires that California Waste Solutions provide a profiled sort of their residuals. We will use whatever existing data from member agencies and facility operators are available but we want to fill in so that we'll have a comprehensive picture of that whole stream. Board member Young inquired if there was 10% or less of good stuff in the residuals from Davis Street. Mr. Padia stated yes and they did qualify for sorting dry materials (cardboard, bottles, cans and paper) out of the dry waste. Board member Young recommended that new members receive a tour of operating facilities and stated that a tour of Davis Street and the Altamont are good starting points. Mr. Padia stated that Davis Street is building a new Organics Processing facility that is expected to go online a year from now and recommended that we wait until they are fully up and running.

Board member Young inquired about the location of SCS Engineers. Ms. Starkey stated that they are located in Sonoma County but work in Alameda County. Board member Young inquired about the role of the inspectors for mandatory recycling. Mr. Padia stated that the inspectors focus on commercial and multi-family accounts and we also contract with the same company but a different crew to do benchmark sampling. He added the inspectors are primarily looking for "significant quantities" of covered materials in the garbage but they are not characterizing the entire contents. The benchmark crew have been targeting single family, multi-family, and certain select commercial accounts and bagging, tagging and taking the material back to a solid waste material for sorting into three categories; recyclables, compostables, and garbage. Mr. Padia said that we use the latter information to see how much good stuff is in the garbage. Board member Young inquired if the WCS will be working with any or all of that material. Mr. Padia stated that we're planning to use the single-family and multi-family sampling from the benchmark sampling and not expend more money sorting material from residential sources.

Board member Kalb inquired if the single-family and multi-family sampling proportioned to what we have in the county and stated that he is concerned that the countywide results are not the same and would not be sufficient. Ms. Starkey stated that staff and well as the TAC are confident that the countywide

APPROVED

information is sufficient. Board member Carling inquired about the proposed sampling schedule. Ms. Starkey stated the sampling will be for three weeks, eight hours a day, in each of the two seasons. The sampling will be done at transfer, disposal and processing facilities. Board member Carling inquired about any consequences for exceeding 10% of good stuff in the garbage. Ms. Sommer stated currently less than 10% of good stuff in the garbage is our aspirational goal which was established during our strategic plan in 2010. Board member Kalb stated that some jurisdictions, such as Oakland, do have consequences imbedded in their franchise agreements which could result in fines if there are repeated incidents of exceeding the 10% threshold.

Board member Lamnin inquired if the study will contain information on textiles. Ms. Starkey stated yes, the study will include information on textiles as a material category. Chair Sadoff asked for a listing of the materials that will be included in the study. Mr. Padia added in the past we have done four season sort but received consensus from the consultants that doing two seasons, avoiding Thanksgiving and after the holidays, would yield good data. Board member Hannon asked for clarification on the reduction of sampling. Ms. Starkey stated the study will go from 50 material types to 25, e.g. consolidating different types of paper, etc. Board member Hannon inquired about the differences in the RFPs submitted by the consultants. Ms. Starkey stated that Cascadia offered fewer sampling days. Board member Hannon stated given the changes that we have implemented with our contractors will it be possible to compare our prior 2008 study to this new one. Mr. Padia stated that we're trying to strike a balance between trends over time and also revising it for doing post processing residuals to actually having a more accurate picture of where we are in terms of our strategic or aspirational goal. Board member Hannon inquired about the timeline for completing the study and providing the information to the Board and asked if staff will be able to provide comparison to the 2008 study. Mr. Padia stated that every study has had comparisons to the prior studies and this study will include comparisons to the 1995, 2000, and 2008 studies and we'll have to combine categories from prior studies to come up with the comparability to the reduced number of categories in the proposed study. Ms. Starkey stated that the results of the study will be available in early 2018. Board member Hannon inquired about the contractor for the 2008 study and inquired if they had submitted an RFP for the current study. Ms. Starkey stated it was R.W. Beck. Mr. Padia stated that they have been acquired by another company and the successor company was the third proposer and they submitted the highest bid.

Ms. Starkey provided the list of materials covered in the study:

- Uncoated corrugated cardboard
- Recycled Paper (high grade newspaper, compostable paper)
- Bottles and plastic containers
- Plastic bags
- Other film plastic
- Recyclable glass
- Aluminum cans
- Sealed food and beverage
- Yard waste (leaves, grass, chips, branches stumps, and prunings)
- Food Waste
- Untreated lumber and pallets
- Textiles and leather
- Carpet
- Crushable nerds, Gipsen board, and treated wood waste
- Paints, adhesives, and vehicle equipment fluid
- Universal hazardous waste

APPROVED

Medical waste
Other hazardous waste
Covered E-waste and other E-waste
Brown goods (medium sized appliances, microwaves, stereos)

Board member Hannon requested that a summary of the questions and answers from the P&A discussion be provided to the WMA Board.

The following summarizes the questions and staff responses from the discussion at the P&A meeting:

Q. Why are we sampling MRF residuals as part of this study, and have we audited MRFs before?

A. An increasing amount of material, including MSW solid waste and mixed dry loads, is passing over MRF lines. In order to get an accurate view of our progress to goals, we need a picture of what is going to disposal from this source and not just material directly sent to landfill. The Davis St. Dry MRF was audited as part of the Mandatory Recycling Ordinance Phase One implementation, and the City of Oakland requires audits of the CWS facility. We plan to use these results as part of the study, as applicable.

Q. Why are there differences in cost between proposals, and why are we selecting a contractor who did not submit the lowest bid?

A. The lowest bid submitted contained fewer samples than the SCS Engineers bid, hence the lower cost. We did not feel the number of samples in the Cascadia bid was adequate, and would have requested additional samples (at an additional cost) had we chosen them. SCS will offer more robust results with their sampling plan. SCS also has superior expertise in statistics and will meet our need for analysis better.

Q. Where is the firm located?

A. Local offices are in Santa Rosa, CA, and sorting employees will be drawn from Alameda County.

Q. How does this relate to the inspectors under the MRO project?

A. Inspectors under the MRO are simply looking for the presence of covered materials in the garbage bins of covered accounts. This study will sample and quantify a longer list of materials and use data from the haulers to get a picture of the entire waste stream, and not just the covered accounts under MRO.

Q. How does this study relate to the benchmark study?

A. We will not directly sort and weigh material from the single family and multifamily streams as part of this study, but will apply the benchmark results instead. This study will also sample the entire commercial stream, as well as roll-off and self-haul streams, which are not covered by the benchmark study.

Q. Are we confident that a countywide study is adequate and that we should not do city specific studies?

A. Yes. Past studies have shown there to be no significant difference between individual city results and countywide results, i.e., differences between the member agencies and the county fall within the confidence interval. After much discussion on specifics, member agency staff members have agreed with our assessment. Member agencies need different types of studies to inform their local policies and programs, and some are undertaking these independently.

Q. How many days are we sampling?

A. The plan is to sample daily for three weeks, eight hours a day, in each of two seasons. This is a cost-saving feature over the four-season sorts performed for prior studies.

APPROVED

Q. The study scope refers to the 10% goal, and are there consequences for not meeting this goal?

A. The 10% goal is aspirational rather than required by the Authority. The City of Oakland does include a 10% goal in the franchise and there are consequences for the hauler to miss this goal. Other cities also have specific requirements in their franchises.

Q. Why are we reducing the material categories? Will we be able to compare to previous studies? Which categories are we including? Are we sampling textiles?

A. We are eliminating categories that do not meet policy or program needs. For example, distinguishing between five different types of paper when they are all handled the same way is not compelling in light of the cost. The new material categories are based on the previous list, with some categories collapsed but still comparable when aggregated. Since hazardous materials need to be handled carefully, those will also be sampled. The specific list is in the attachment to this memo. Material categories will be reviewed again and finalized before field work. We are sampling textiles and carpet.

Q. When will results be available?

A. Early 2018.

Board member Kalb asked that a list of material categories be provided in the WMA staff report. Ms. Starkey stated that she would do so.

Board member Young made the motion to approve the staff recommendation. Board member Cox seconded and the motion carried 8-0. (Ayes: Carling, Cox, Ellis, Hannon, Kalb, Lamnin, Sadoff, Young. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Arreguin, Biddle, Carson, Fremont, vacant).

5. Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance Update (Teresa Eade)

Information

This item is for information only.

Teresa Eade provided an overview of the staff report and presented a PowerPoint presentation. The report and the presentation are available here: [WELo-Update.02-09-17.pdf](#)

Board member Carling inquired why forest products are not okay for mulch. Ms. Eade stated it is okay, however we have a lot of recycled material and the State says if recycled material is available in your area you must use that material first. If it's not available you can use other types. Ms. Eade added we have a list of providers of recycled compost and mulches available on the Lawn to Garden website.

Board member Hannon inquired if staff has looked at a self certification program for businesses to self regulate. Ms. Eade stated that we've supported bay friendly rated landscapes and the cities have adopted it as a standard for their landscape projects. There are also other possibilities such as requiring the developer to have a bay-friendly rated landscape and accept it as a meeting the WELo requirement or some cities require the developer to pay a deposit based on an estimate of what it would take to rate the project and hire out a contractor to review the project for WELo compliance. Board member Hannon inquired if a portion of the fee is refunded back to the developer. Ms. Eade responded yes. Chair Sadoff thanked Ms. Eade for the presentation.

6. Member Comments

Executive Director Wendy Sommer welcomed Councilmember Sara Lamnin to the Board as the new representative for the City of Hayward. Board member Young inquired about the decrease in the number of local bottle and can redemption centers. Mr. Padia stated that the California Redemption System is administered by CalRecycle and approximately one-third of the centers have closed due to financial

APPROVED

problems. The larger centers are still in operation and CalRecycle is leading an effort to do a legislative fix to keep the smaller parking lot vendors afloat. We have a list of available centers on our Recyclewhere website portal. Chair Sadoff inquired about the status of the CRV fund. Mr. Padia stated that the overall redemption rate has been over 80% and the remainder is used to fund CalRecycle staff, grants to cities, subsidies to redemption centers and to fund local conservation corps. The long term projection is that it is not sustainable at the current payout rates so they are looking at other models to increase revenues.

Board member Lamnin stated that she is looking forward to serving on the Board. She added that she worked with youth sorters doing waste audits as well as with other grantees funded through StopWaste.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.