

**Planning & Organization Committee and
Recycling Board Members**

Tim Rood, **President**
City of Piedmont

Toni Stein, **1st Vice President**
Environmental Educator

Dianne Martinez, **2nd Vice President**
City of Emeryville

Adan Alonzo, Recycling Programs

Greg Jones, City of Hayward

Bernie Larrabe, Recycling Materials Processing Industry

Peter Maass, City of Albany

Daniel O'Donnell, Environmental Organization

Michael Peltz, Solid Waste Industry Representative

Jerry Pentin, City of Pleasanton

Steve Sherman, Source Reduction Specialist

Wendy Sommer, Executive Director

AMENDED

AGENDA

**MEETING OF
PLANNING AND ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE
AND
ALAMEDA COUNTY RECYCLING BOARD**

Thursday, June 9, 2016

4:00 P.M.

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

Meeting is wheelchair accessible. Sign language interpreter may be available upon five (5) days' notice to 510-891-6500.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT

Page **IV. CONSENT CALENDAR**

- | | | |
|---|--|--------------------|
| 1 | 1. Approval of the Draft Minutes of May 12, 2016 (Wendy Sommer) | Action |
| 5 | 2. Board Attendance Record (Wendy Sommer) | Information |
| 7 | 3. Written Report of Ex Parte Communications | Information |

V. OPEN PUBLIC DISCUSSION

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

VI. REGULAR CALENDAR

- | | | |
|----|---|-----------------------------------|
| 9 | 1. Proposed FY 2016/17 Budget (Wendy Sommer & Pat Cabrera)
Adopt the FY 16/17 budget as it pertains to the RB and as outlined in the attached resolution. | Action/
Public Hearing |
| 19 | 2. 4Rs (Reduce, Reuse, Recycle, Rot) Student Action Project Presentation (Angelina Vergara)
This item is for information only. | Information |

- 21 **3. Amendment to the Alameda County Integrated Waste Management Plan to include the Vision Recycling Compost Operation/Facility in the unincorporated area of Livermore** **Action**
(Debra Kaufman)

Staff recommends that the Planning & Organization Committee and the Recycling Board (in its role as Local Task Force) recommend to the Authority Board that it hold a first reading of the ColWMP Amendment ordinance (Attachment A) at the June 22 meeting to (1) amend the ColWMP (Exhibit 1) to include the Vision Recycling Compost Facility in the unincorporated Livermore area, and make additional changes for consistency, (2) find that the Vision Recycling Compost Facility conforms to the ColWMP as amended, and (3) make the findings required by CEQA, and also recommend that the Authority Board hold a public hearing and second reading of the ColWMP Amendment ordinance and adopt the ordinance at the July 27 meeting.

VII. OTHER PUBLIC INPUT

VIII. COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Information

IX. ADJOURNMENT

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PLANNING & ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE
AND
ALAMEDA COUNTY RECYCLING BOARD**

**Thursday, May 12, 2016
7:00 p.m.**

**Hayward City Hall
777 B Street
Conference Room C, 1st Floor
Hayward, CA 94541
(510) 583-4000**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Dianne Martinez, 2nd Vice President, called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Tim Rood, City of Piedmont, Chair
Adan Alonzo, Recycling Programs
Greg Jones, City of Hayward
Bernie Larrabe, Recycling Materials Processing Industry
Don Biddle, City of Dublin, for Peter Maass, City of Albany
Dianne Martinez, City of Emeryville
Daniel O'Donnell, Environmental Organization
Michael Peltz, Solid Waste Industry Representative
Steve Sherman, Source Reduction Specialist
Toni Stein, Environmental Educator

Members Absent:

Jerry Pentin, City of Pleasanton

Staff Present:

Wendy Sommer, Executive Director
Tom Padia, Deputy Executive Director
Kelly Schoonmaker, Program Manager
Debra Kaufman, Senior Program Manager
Meghan Starkey, Senior Program Manager
Audrey Beaman, County Counsel
Arliss Dunn, Clerk of the Board

Others Present:

Lori Mara, City of Fremont
Jennifer Yee, City of Hayward
Andreea Simion, Oro Loma Sanitary District
Natasha Neves, Oro Loma Sanitary District

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT

There were none.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

- 1. Approval of the Draft Joint Minutes of April 27, 2016 (Wendy Sommer)**

Action

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| 2. Board Attendance Record (Wendy Sommer) | Information |
| 3. Written Report of Ex Parte Communications (Wendy Sommer) | Information |

Board member Jones made the motion to approve the Consent Calendar. Board member Biddle seconded and the motion carried 7-0-1 (Pentin, Rood, and Stein absent) (Martinez abstained).

V. OPEN PUBLIC DISCUSSION

There was none.

VI. REGULAR CALENDAR

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 1. Legislative Positions for 2016 (Debra Kaufman) | Action |
| Staff recommends that the Committees recommend the preliminary Legislative positions outlined in the staff report to the full Authority Board for the 2016 session of the California legislature. | |

Debra Kaufman provided a summary of the staff report. The report is available here: [Legislative Positions for 2016 memo-05-12-16](#). Ms. Kaufman informed the Board of an additional bill to be added to the list of bills to be supported. AB 1577 (Eggman) would expand tax credits for donating food to food banks. The bill is also supported by Californians Against Waste (CAW). Ms. Kaufman revised the staff recommendation to include AB 1577 (Eggman).

President Rood arrived and assumed chairmanship of the meeting following the staff presentation.

Board member Martinez inquired if AB 45 does not die in session if there is opportunity to add some EPR aspects. Ms. Kaufman stated that there have been futile attempts to change the bill but the pharmaceutical industry has strong opposition to adding any EPR aspects to the bill. Board member Sherman inquired about AB 1063 and 1103 and why the agency has taken a watch position on both bills. Ms. Kaufman stated that AB 1063 seeks to increase the State tip fee surcharge and the agency was considering additional costs posed to member agencies as well as ratepayers. However, it is at the Board's discretion to determine the agency's position. Ms. Sommer concurred with Ms. Kaufman's statement and added staff determined we should take a cautious approach to legislation that includes any additional costs to ratepayers. Board member Sherman stated for the record that the legislation is considering a \$4 per ton fee and in Europe fees exceed \$100 per ton as a way to reduce the amount of materials going into the landfills. Ms. Sommer added AB 1103 has already failed. Board member Sherman commented that a recent draft California Air Resources Board proposal seeks to eliminate organics from the landfill by 2025 and inquired if staff has submitted a letter of comment or support on this matter. Ms. Kaufman stated yes, we did. Board member Sherman asked that staff provide a copy of the letter. Ms. Sommer stated that we would comply with the request.

Board member Martinez made the motion to approve the staff recommendation with the addition of AB 1577 (Eggman). Board member Biddle seconded and the motion carried 8-0-1 (Pentin and Stein, absent) (Sherman abstained).

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| 2. Scope of Work for Five Year Program Review (Tom Padia) | Information |
| Staff recommends that the Recycling Board review and discuss the proposed schedule and scope of work for the Five Year Program Review and that the Board propose additions/modifications as appropriate. Additional input will be solicited from member agency staff and recycling industry partners/stakeholders. | |

Tom Padia provided a summary of the staff report. A link to the report is available here: [Scope of Work for Five Year Audit memo-05-12-16](#)

Board member Martinez inquired if the last program review included a review of the HHW program. Mr. Padia stated no, we have not specifically looked at the HHW program. Board member Martinez stated that she is interested in evaluating the effectiveness of the current program. Board member Rood inquired if there was a mechanism for evaluating the program embedded in the ordinance. Ms. Kaufman stated that prior to adopting the \$9.55 fee, an outside consultant conducted an extensive study of our program in comparison to other similar programs comparing cost and participation rates. The study was conducted in 2013. The expansion increased the hours and days of the facilities and added the one day events. The study also reviewed participation rate comparisons of other cities which ranged from 6-12%. The Fremont facility has one of the highest participation rates at 12% and we are trying to get the other 3 facilities to reach that higher rate. The national high rate point is between 12-14% participation. Ms. Kaufman added we get an annual report in October of each year where we look at participation and program effectiveness. We can share more of that data with the Board. Board member Martinez stated that the program is important and visible and she would like to have a report agendaized at a future meeting to look at the data comparison to other jurisdictions. Ms. Sommer stated that we will present a report of the HHW program at the June meeting as part of the fee collection report presentation.

Board member Sherman stated that he thoroughly reviewed the previous Five Year Program report and concludes that the work is highly commendable and recommends that staff scale it down to make the process more interactive and more useful to the member agencies. Some ideas would be to allow some of the leading examples to present to the TAC and not expend \$150,000 on such an extensive written document but maybe channel funding to more pilot programs, such as every other week collection, multi-family organics collection, etc. Ms. Sommer agrees and stated that this topic can be further explored during the upcoming priority setting session for the Board. Board member Biddle stated that report should focus on new opportunities and not solely what we've done in the past. Board member Jones stated that we should also do research internationally to see what other countries are doing and although we may not be able to actually replicate their programs we can look at best practices.

Mr. Padia stated that there is a lot of room for scaling it back as a significant portion of time is spent on back and forth with member agencies on data collection, and different haulers categorize accounts in different ways, e.g. multi-family is combined with commercial accounts, etc. President Rood inquired if the consultant field has changed since 5 years ago. Mr. Padia added it is somewhat dynamic. President Rood added he would like to see the last report and the scope of work for the previous RFP as well as the final scope of work for the proposed RFP. He added we could possibly ask the bidders to suggest metrics that they think would be helpful to us. Mr. Padia stated that we could agendaize the discussion in July or August.

Board member Stein commented on the significant litter on the streets, odors from waste containers and the effort to move waste in our county via trucks and their impact on air quality. She added we must keep public health concerns at the forefront of our efforts. President Rood inquired if Alameda County Public Health commented on the EIR when adopting the mandatory recycling ordinance. Ms. Kaufman stated that an EIR was circulated and CEQA analysis was conducted in 2012 which covered both the MRO and the reusable bag ordinance and all county environmental agencies had the opportunity to review and comment. President Rood stated yes we should coordinate our efforts with these agencies but not take over their mandates. Board member Alonzo commented that the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) conducts monthly inspections and identifies parameters to address all of the air quality and facility related issues that may arise. The LEA is the leading authority on these issues.

Board member Martinez inquired if the "every other week" collection can be expanded to include looking at restaurant collection as well. Mr. Padia stated that "every other week" just refers to single family residents. Commercial collections can vary from 3-5 times a week or more. President Rood commented that the multi-family recovery rates are the important topic to pursue as the county has a significant number of multi-family properties and the MRO is relatively new. Board member Sherman

commented that if we decide to have the consultant focus on multi-family recovery rates he encouraged staff to expand the discussion beyond recovery rates and to describe and discuss some of the fault lines that exist in communities regarding the social and economic issues with regard to worker health and safety at so called “Dirty MRF’s.”

President Rood thanked Mr. Padia for the thorough report.

3. Municipal Panel: Adequate Space for Recycling and Composting (Meghan Starkey) Information

This item is for information only.

Meghan Starkey provided an overview of the staff report (available here: [Adequate Space for Recycling and Composting memo-05-12-16](#)) and introduced the members of the municipal panel. The panel included: Lori Mara, City of Fremont, Jennifer Yee, City of Hayward, Andreea Simion, Oro Loma Sanitary District, and Natasha Neves, Oro Loma Sanitary District. The City of Newark panelist had a scheduling conflict and was unable to attend but sent along his information.

The panelists shared their current issues and solutions for ensuring adequate space for recycling and composting. A link to the audio of the discussion is available here: [Municipal Panel Audio Discussion-05-12-16](#)

President Rood thanked Ms. Starkey and the panelists for their participation.

4. New Regional Lawn to Garden Website (Kelly Schoonmaker) Information

This item is for information only.

Kelly Schoonmaker provided a summary of the staff report and provided an overview of the Lawn to Garden website and associated grant activities. A copy of the combined staff report and presentation is available here: [Lawn to Garden Website memo-05-12-16](#)

A link to the website is available here: <http://lawntogarden.org/>

Ms. Schoonmaker requested that Board members add a link on their respective websites and inform staff of sheet mulching events in their jurisdictions so we can put them on the agency calendar.

Board member Stein inquired about the criteria or impetus for the water savings. Ms. Schoonmaker stated that if people don’t like their current lawn then sheet mulching is the preferred method for lawn conversions. Ms. Schoonmaker added over the past two years the interest in sheet mulching has increased so that the conversation is no longer about why use sheet mulch but how to sheet mulch. Board member O’Donnell commented that in Fremont over the past five years native/bay-friendly gardens have become more acceptable and requests to convert lawns have increased quite a bit. The message of sheet mulching is spreading to outlying areas as well.

President Rood thanked Ms. Schoonmaker for the presentation.

VII. OTHER PUBLIC INPUT

There was none.

VIII. COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

President Rood announced that he cut the ribbon at the “Grand Avenue Bike Lane” installation ceremony. The cities of Piedmont and Oakland collaborated to complete the project. Board member Martinez announced that she cut the ribbon for the Christie Avenue Bike Trail that will allow cyclists to ride the Bay Trail uninterrupted from Richmond to San Leandro.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

2016 - ALAMEDA COUNTY RECYCLING BOARD ATTENDANCE

	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
REGULAR MEMBERS												
A. Alonzo	X	X	X	X	X							
G. Jones	X	I	X	X	X							
B. Larrabe	X	X	X	A	X							
P. Maass	X	X	X	X	I							
D. Martinez	X	X	X	I	X							
D. O'Donnell	X	X	X	X	X							
M. Peltz	X	A	X	X	X							
J. Pentin	X	I	I	X	A							
T. Rood	X	X	X	X	X							
S. Sherman	X	X	X	X	X							
T. Stein	X	X	X	X	X							
INTERIM APPOINTEES												
D. Biddle		X			X							
S. Young		X										
D. Sadoff			X									
D. Kalb				X								

Measure D: Subsection 64.130, F: Recycling Board members shall attend at least three fourths (3/4) of the regular meetings within a given calendar year. At such time, as a member has been absent from more than one fourth (1/4) of the regular meetings in a calendar year, or from two (2) consecutive such meetings, her or his seat on the Recycling Board shall be considered vacant.

X=Attended

A=Absent

I=Absent - Interim Appointed

This page intentionally left blank

DATE: June 9, 2016
TO: Recycling Board
FROM: Wendy Sommer, Executive Director
SUBJECT: Written Reports of Ex Parte Communications

BACKGROUND

Section 64.130 (Q)(1)(b) of the Alameda County Charter requires that full written disclosure of ex parte communications be entered in the Recycling Board's official record. At the June 19, 1991 meeting of the Recycling Board, the Board approved the recommendation of Legal Counsel that such reports be placed on the consent calendar as a way of entering them into the Board's official record. The Board at that time also requested that staff develop a standard form for the reporting of such communications. A standard form for the reporting of ex parte communications has since been developed and distributed to Board members.

At the December 9, 1999 meeting of the Recycling Board, the Board adopted the following language:

Ex parte communication report forms should be submitted only for ex parte communications that are made after the matter has been put on the Recycling Board's agenda, giving as much public notice as possible.

Per the previously adopted policy, all such reports received will be placed on the consent calendar of the next regularly scheduled Recycling Board meeting.

This page intentionally left blank



DATE: June 9, 2016

TO: Alameda County Source Reduction and Recycling Board

FROM: Wendy Sommer, Executive Director
Pat Cabrera, Administrative Services Director

SUBJECT: Proposed FY 2016/17 Budget

SUMMARY

The proposed budget for FY 16/17 was presented at a combined meeting of the Alameda County Waste Management Authority (WMA), the Alameda County Source Reduction and Recycling Board (RB) and the Energy Council (EC) on April 27, 2016. The proposed budget is available at <http://stopwaste.org/proposed-budget-FY16-17> and hard copies will be available at the meeting.

The staff memo from the April 27 combined board meeting is available at:
<http://stopwaste.org/proposed-budget-transmittal-memo-FY16-17>

The PowerPoint presentation is available at:
<http://stopwaste.org/proposed-budget-presentation-FY16-17>

The proposed FY 16/17 budget totals approximately \$38.4 million (the RB portion totals approximately \$8.5 million). The Agency's core budget is similar to FY15/16 totaling \$11.4 million. Estimated total year-end core fund balances and reserves amount to \$20.3 million. The budget presentation was well received with no requests for changes or revisions by the Boards. The budget was adopted by the WMA and the EC on May 25, 2016. The budget is now being presented to the RB for adoption.

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt the FY 16/17 budget as it pertains to the RB and as outlined in the attached resolution.

Attachment A: RB Budget Resolution
Attachment B: RB Financial Information

ATTACHMENT A

ALAMEDA COUNTY SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING BOARD RESOLUTION #RB 2016 -

MOVED:
SECONDED:

AT THE MEETING HELD JUNE 9, 2016
THE ALAMEDA COUNTY SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING BOARD AUTHORIZES
ADOPTION OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2016-17 BUDGET AND
PROJECT CONTRACTS

WHEREAS, a preliminary budget for Fiscal Year 2016-17 has been developed which incorporates programs and projects recommended by the Executive Director; and

WHEREAS, this budget was presented at the joint meeting of the Alameda County Waste Management Authority, the Alameda County Source Reduction and Recycling Board and the Energy Council at the meeting held on April 27, 2016 for review and comment; and,

WHEREAS, legal notice of the public hearing on the budget has been provided, and the matter scheduled on the June 9, 2016 Recycling Board agenda for adoption.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Alameda County Source Reduction and Recycling Board hereby:

1. Adopts the Recycling Board's portion of the Fiscal Year 2016-17 Budget (see Attachment B, pages B1 through B7), with expenditures totaling 8,521,042 and authorizes staff to proceed with Recycling Board administration, programs and operations in accordance with the adopted budget, effective July 1, 2016.
2. Authorizes the following new or augmented contracts and/or spending authority for Fiscal Year 2016/17 subject to approval as to form by Legal Counsel and consistent with the Agency's purchasing policy.

Contracts/Spending Authority

Product Decisions Program Group

Regionalizing Bay- Friendly

ReScape California \$ 35,000

Passed and adopted this 9th day of June, 2016 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABTAIN:
ABSENT:

Wendy Sommer, Executive Director

WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY & SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING BOARD & ENERGY COUNCIL
Projects by Funding Source- Budget FY 16/17

Energy Council Board											
Total		-----Waste Management Authority-----				-----Recycling Board-----					
	Cost	Facility Fee	Mitigation Fee	Externally Funded	Benchmark Fee	HHW Fees	Energy Council	RB Discretionary	RB Grants to Non-Profit	RB Source Reduction	RB Market Development
1000- PRODUCT DECISION:											
EXPENDITURES											
1020 Landscape Services and Partnerships	\$ 575,771		\$ 50,000					\$ 175,292	\$ 175,239	\$ 175,239	
1030 BayROC (Bay Area Regional Recycling Outreach Coalition)	25,011							25,011			
1031 BayROC External Contributions	100,000			\$ 100,000							
Sub-total	700,782	-	50,000	100,000	-	-		200,303	-	175,239	175,239
1100 Bay Friendly											
1140 Regionalizing Bay Friendly	66,044										
1150 Bay-Friendly Water Efficient Landscape Prop 84 WMA	72,107	22,856		-							
1152 Bay-Friendly Water Efficient Landscape Prop 84 Round II	81,292	5,411	5,411					30,188	13,000	45,991	15,295
1153 Bay-Friendly Water Efficient Landscape Prop 84 Round III	5,883,808			81,292							
1154 Drought Response Outreach Program for Schools (DROPS)	1,406,948			5,883,808							
Sub-total	7,510,199	28,267	5,411	7,372,048	-	-		30,188	13,000	45,991	15,295
1200 Product Purchasing and Manufacturing											
1200 Packaging	548,814	180,141									
1220 Waste Prevention: Institutional/Food Service	931,279	235,440	460,400						8,500	180,087	180,087
1250 Waste Prevention: Reusable Bag Ordinance Implementation	120,205	120,205								235,440	
1251 Waste Prevention: Reusable Bag Ordinance External Contributions	100,741			100,741							
1260 Recycled Content: Compost and Mulch	732,904	232,681	35,000								465,223
Sub-total	2,433,943	768,466	495,400	100,741	-	-		-	8,500	415,526	645,309
1300 Buildings											
1347 Bay/REN (Bay Regional Energy Network)	5,933,314						5,933,314				
1348 PG&E Local Government Partnership	96,230						96,230				
1349 Energy Council Incubator	147,898						147,898				
1350 Building Services and Partnerships	355,849	323,349							32,500		
Sub-total	6,533,291	323,349	-	-	-	-	6,177,442	-	32,500	-	-
Total Product Decisions											
\$	17,178,215	1,120,082	550,811	7,572,789	-	-	6,177,442	230,491	54,000	636,757	\$ 835,844

WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY & SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING BOARD & ENERGY COUNCIL
Projects by Funding Source- Budget FY 16/17

Total	Waste Management Authority					Energy Council Board					Recycling Board			
	Cost	Facility Fee	Mitigation Fee	Externally Funded	Benchmark Fee	HHW Fees	Energy Council	RB Discretionary	RB Grants to Non-Profit	RB Source Reduction	RB Market Development			
\$	602,436	301,218						301,218	394,973					
	404,973	10,000												
	1,327,205	581,717	163,772		221,778			581,717						
	221,778				542,969									
	542,969													
	2,155,138	375,687	1,779,451											
	5,254,499	1,288,622	1,943,223	-	764,747	-	-	882,935	394,973	-	-			
	191,828		186,731										5,097	
	191,828	-	186,731	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		5,097	
	17,805	17,805		155,000		6,467,992								
	155,000													
	6,467,992													
	6,640,797	17,805	-	155,000	-	6,467,992		-	-	-	-			
	553,517	148,970	255,578					-		148,970				
	553,517	148,970	255,578	-	-			-	-	148,970				
\$	12,640,641	1,435,396	2,385,532	155,000	764,747	6,467,992	-	882,935	394,973	148,970	\$	5,097		

WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY & SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING BOARD & ENERGY COUNCIL
Projects by Funding Source- Budget FY 16/17

	Waste Management Authority					Energy Council Board				Recycling Board			
	Total Cost	Facility Fee	Mitigation Fee	Externally Funded	Benchmark Fee	HHW Fees	Energy Council	RB Discretionary	RB Grants to Non-Profit	RB Source Reduction	RB Market Development		
3000-COMMUNICATION, ADMINISTRATION, PLANNING													
3021 Miscellaneous Small Grants Administration	\$ 300,000	-	-	300,000	-	-							
Sub-total	300,000	-	-	300,000	-	-							
3200 Other General Activities													
3210 Property Management	161,082		161,082										
3220 Disposal Reporting	73,041	21,912			51,129								
3230 Technical Advisory Committee	44,967	44,967											
3240 Fee Enforcement	417,047	417,047											
Sub-total	696,137	483,926	161,082	-	51,129	-							
3400 Planning													
3410 General Planning	162,089	132,089	30,000										
3420 Residential Organics Recovery Pilots	178,198	78,198	100,000										
3430 ColWMP Amendments Application	9,610	9,610											
3440 Waste Characterization Study	487,530		400,500						87,030				
3460 Five Year Audit	244,520								244,520				
3470 Standards Development	163,219	163,219											
Sub-total	1,245,166	383,116	530,500	-	-	-			331,550				
3500 Agency Communications													
3510 General Agency Communication	1,192,344	1,156,244							36,100				
3530 Legislation	219,607	189,607							30,000				
Sub-total	1,411,951	1,345,851	-	-					66,100				
Total Communication, Administration, Planning	\$ 3,653,254	2,212,893	691,582	300,000	51,129	-			397,650				
Total Project Expenditures**	\$ 33,472,110	4,768,371	3,627,925	8,027,789	815,876	6,467,992	6,177,442	1,113,426	846,623	785,726	\$ 840,941		
** Total Project expenditures include:													
Salaries \$4,815,568													
Benefits \$2,332,296													
Core Budget \$11,444,555													
AND Core Revenues equal \$9,432,005													

WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY & SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING BOARD & ENERGY COUNCIL
Projects by Funding Source- Budget FY 16/17

	Total Cost	-----Waste Management Authority-----					Energy Council Board	-----Recycling Board-----				
		Facility Fee	Mitigation Fee	Externally Funded	Benchmark Fee	HHW Fees		RB Discretionary	RB Grants to Non-Profit	RB Source Reduction	RB Market Development	
REVENUES												
Benchmark Fees	\$ 798,376				798,376	7,088,263	6,177,441					
HHW Fees	7,088,263											
Energy Council	6,177,441											
Tonnage revenues	8,032,596	4,269,961	289,571									
Interest	110,133	30,000	46,633									
Externally funded revenues	8,027,789			8,027,789								
Property and Other revenues	555,900	15,000	490,900									
Total revenues	\$ 30,790,498	4,314,961	827,104	8,027,789	798,376	7,100,263	6,230,441	1,176,188	771,792	771,792	\$ 771,792	
TRANSFERS												
Transfer remaining MRF reserve to fund balance(close out)	\$ 93,401		93,401									
From OPD Reserve to fund Landscape Serv. & Partnership project (1020)	50,000		50,000									
From OPD Reserve to fund Wst. Prevent-Inst./Food Service (1220)	460,400		460,400									
From OPD Reserve to fund Recycl. Content/Compost and Mulch (1260)	35,000		35,000									
From OPD Reserve to fund Bus. Assistance Supporting Activities (2420)	255,578		255,578									
From OPD Reserve to fund General Planning (3410)	30,000		30,000									
From OPD Reserve to fund Residential Organics Recovery Pilots (3420)	100,000		100,000									
From OPD Reserve to fund Waste Characterization Study (3440)	400,500		400,500									
From Product Decisions Reserve to fund Region. Bay-Friendly (1140)	22,856	22,856										
Total Net Transfers	\$ 1,447,735	\$ 22,856	\$ 1,424,879	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
FUND BALANCE												
Beginning fund balance 7/1/16	\$ 15,594,598	\$ 3,812,966	\$ 889,854	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,496,584	\$ 51,478	\$ 3,449,145	\$ 1,135,178	\$ 551,081	\$ 208,312	
Closed contracts	361,299	131,094	121,088		17,500			20,780	29,155	17,728	23,954	
Estimated unspent FY 15/16 MRF allocation	365,000		365,000									
Adjusted Beginning fund balance 7/1/16	\$ 16,320,897	\$ 3,944,060	\$ 1,375,942	\$ -	\$ 17,500	\$ 5,496,584	\$ 51,478	\$ 3,469,925	\$ 1,164,333	\$ 568,809	\$ 232,266	
AVAILABLE FUNDING	\$ 48,559,130	\$ 8,281,877	\$ 3,627,925	\$ 8,027,789	\$ 815,876	\$ 12,596,847	\$ 6,281,919	\$ 4,646,113	\$ 1,936,125	\$ 1,340,601	\$ 1,004,058	
Less: Project Expenditures	\$ (33,472,110)	\$ (4,768,371)	\$ (3,627,925)	\$ (8,027,789)	\$ (815,876)	\$ (6,467,992)	\$ (6,177,442)	\$ (1,113,426)	\$ (846,623)	\$ (785,726)	\$ (840,941)	
ENDING FUND BALANCE	\$ 15,087,020	\$ 3,513,506	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ 6,128,855	\$ 104,477	\$ 3,532,687	\$ 1,089,502	\$ 554,875	\$ 163,117	

WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY & SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING BOARD & ENERGY COUNCIL
Projects by Funding Source- Budget FY 16/17

	Waste Management Authority					Energy Council Board					Recycling Board				
	Facility Fee	Mitigation Fee	Externally Funded	Benchmark Fee	HHW Fees	Energy Council	Discretionary	RB Grants to Non-Profit	RB Source Reduction	RB Market Development					
ADJUSTED ENDING FUND BALANCE	\$ 3,513,506	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,128,855	\$ 104,477	\$ 3,532,687	\$ 1,089,502	\$ 554,875	\$ 163,117					
OTHER PROJECTS:															
Revolving Loan (RLF): (Project 2030)															
Beginning fund balance	\$ 1,053,226														
Revenues	21,667														
Loan Repayment	126,388														
Project cost (loans and expenses)	(687,469)														
Ending fund balance	\$ 513,812														
RB Municipalities (Measure D 50%) (Project 2220)															
Beginning fund balance	\$ -														
Revenues	3,860,961														
Project cost	(3,860,961)														
Ending fund balance	\$ -														
Recycled Product Purchase Preference Meas. D 5% (proj. 1210)															
Beginning fund balance	\$ -														
Revenues	385,896														
Project cost	(385,896)														
Ending fund balance	\$ -														
Total project cost including other projects	\$ 38,406,436														
Total revenues including other projects	\$ 35,185,410														

NOTE
 Facility Fees=Authority user fee of \$4.34 per ton.
 Mitigation Fees= Import Mitigation Fee of \$4.53 per ton collected on all other wastes landfilled in Alameda County that originate out-of-county.
 RB Discretionary=Recycling Board Discretionary Fund - 15% of Measure D fees, of which 3% may be used to cover expenses necessary to administer the recycling fund.
 RB Grants to Non-Profit = Recycling Board Grants to Non-Profit Fund - 10% of Measure D fees.
 RB Source Reduction= Recycling Board Source Reduction Fund - 10% of Measure D fees.
 RB Market Development = Recycling Board Market Development Fund - 10% of Measure D fees.
 RB Recycled Prod. Pref. = Recycling Board Recycled Product Price Preference Fund - 5% of Measure D fees.
 RB Municipalities = Recycling Board Municipalities Fund - 50% of Measure D fees.
 RLF = Revolving Loan Fund
 HHW= HHW fees of \$2.15 per ton and \$8.60 per residential unit.

**ALAMEDA COUNTY SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING BOARD
FUND BALANCES AVAILABLE
FISCAL YEAR 2016-2017 BUDGET**

<i>FUND NAME</i>	<i>RB</i>	<i>BEG. FUND BALANCE JULY 1, 2016</i>	<i>ADJUST- MENTS</i>	<i>BEG. FUND BALANCE JULY 1, 2016</i>	<i>PROJECTED REVENUES</i>	<i>PROJECTED EXPENDITURES</i>	<i>TRANSFERS</i>	<i>ESTIMATED FUND BALANCE JUNE 30, 2017</i>
RECYCLING BOARD								
	% **							
Discretionary****	15%	\$ 3,449,145	20,780 (a)	3,469,925	1,176,188	(1,113,426)		\$ 3,532,687
Grants to Non-Profits	10%	1,135,178	29,155 (a)	1,164,333	771,792	(846,623)		1,089,502
Source Reduction	10%	551,081	17,728 (a)	568,809	771,792	(785,726)		554,875
Market Development	10%	208,312	23,954 (a)	232,266	771,792	(840,941)		163,117
Recycled Prod. Purch. Prefer.	5%	-		-	385,896	(385,896)		0
Municipalities Allocation	50%	-		-	3,860,961	(3,860,961)		0
Recycling Board Total		\$ 5,343,716	91,617	5,435,333	7,738,421	(7,833,573)	-	\$ 5,340,181
Revolving Loan		\$ 1,053,226		1,053,226	148,055	(687,469)		\$ 513,812

** Mandated percentage apportionment of revenue. Discretionary and Municipalities allocation includes interest.

**** 3% of Discretionary funds may be used to cover expenses necessary to administer the recycling fund.

(a) Closed contracts.

ALAMEDA COUNTY SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING BOARD
SCHEDULE OF RESERVES
FISCAL YEAR 2016-2017 BUDGET

	RB			
DESCRIPTION	BALANCE JULY 1, 2016	TRANSFERS IN	TRANSFERS OUT	BALANCE JUNE 30, 2017
FISCAL RESERVE	\$ 694,981			\$ 694,981
Total	\$ 694,981	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 694,981

This page intentionally left blank



DATE: June 9, 2016

TO: Planning & Organization Committee/Recycling Board

FROM: Wendy Sommer, Executive Director

BY: Angelina Vergara, Program Manager

SUBJECT: 4Rs (Reduce, Reuse, Recycle, Rot) Student Action Project Presentation

SUMMARY

StopWaste's elementary school program, the 4Rs Student Action Project, has been serving the county's students, teachers, school district leaders and school communities for the past six years. At the June 9, 2016 Planning & Organization/Recycling Board meeting, staff will present a short summary of project highlights as an information item.

DISCUSSION

The 4Rs Student Action Project engages schools in activities that support both educational goals and Agency initiatives, in particular Ready Set Recycle, sheet mulching, and food waste prevention. At the committee meeting, staff will give a brief overview of the project's methodology, goals and highlights. One specific highlight is the partnership with Bay Farm Elementary School in Alameda. Their participation in the 4R's program supported their recent recognition as a Green Ribbon School by the U.S. Department of Education this spring. At the meeting, Bay Farm students will be in attendance to showcase their Green Ribbon award presentations.

RECOMMENDATION

This item is for information only.

This page intentionally left blank

DATE: June 9, 2016

TO: Planning & Organization Committee/Recycling Board

FROM: Wendy Sommer, Executive Director

BY: Debra Kaufman, Senior Program Manager

SUBJECT: Amendment to the Alameda County Integrated Waste Management Plan to include the Vision Recycling Compost Operation/Facility in the unincorporated area of Livermore

SUMMARY

On May 9, 2016, Kevin Tulley on behalf of Tom DelConte and Roberto Aguirre, submitted the required information to the Authority to amend the Alameda County Integrated Waste Management Plan ("CoIWMP") to include the Vision Recycling-Livermore Compost Facility ("Facility") in the unincorporated Livermore area of Alameda County. This report sets forth the background of the proposed amendment, a description of the Facility, the process for considering the amendment, the environmental review for the Facility, and a staff recommendation. Staff recommends approval of the amendment and a finding of conformance with the CoIWMP.

DISCUSSION

Vision Recycling currently leases a large property at 30 Greenville Road in Livermore. The 3.47 acre site is located in unincorporated eastern Alameda County, east of the City of Livermore and South of the I-580 freeway. The applicant currently operates a chip and grind facility for wood and green materials approximately 1/2 mile away from the proposed project site. The applicant is not proposing any changes to that operation.

Vision Recycling is an experienced compost operator, with 20 years of work in the Bay Area and Central Valley. Vision Recycling operates the organics recycling program for the County of Santa Cruz and Salinas Valley Solid Waste Authority.

Vision Recycling would use the 3.47 acre site for a small compost facility. It has applied to the Alameda County Local Enforcement Agency to operate under the Enforcement Agency

Notification tier compost operation regulations. The compost Facility would compost ground green waste from the chip and grind facility and from other Vision Recycling facilities. No food material would be composted at the Facility.

The property is zoned as large parcel agriculture, which would allow such a use. Composting the feedstock from the chip and grind facility will enable the operator to make a more marketable and higher quality product, especially given the current decline in the bio-fuel market.

In December, 2015, the County of Alameda adopted an initial study/negative declaration for the compost facility. On February 4, 2016 the County issued a conditional use permit to the applicant for the compost facility.

Description of Facility and Permitting

The project site is located on a 3.47 acre parcel at 30 Greenville Road, 1900 feet east of the eastern terminus of Las Positas Road in the unincorporated Livermore area of Alameda County. The project site is zoned for agricultural uses, which allows for composting facilities as a conditional use. The nearest residence is the lessor of the project site, the adjacent 125 acre Mills Ranch property. Driving distance from the Facility to I-580 is a little over one mile.

Construction to prepare the site is expected to last one month and would include the installation of a 10,000 gallon water tank and a 350,000 gallon stormwater pond, creation of one employee parking space, and placement of a shipping container to house computer equipment and supplies. A berm will surround the site.

The Facility will accept ground green waste for composting from Vision Recycling's nearby chip and grind facility and other Vision Recycling facilities. Incoming materials will be composted in two phases via an aerated static pile system. An aerated static pile system forces air through the piles with a blower and is designed to maintain oxygen levels in the pile, preventing anaerobic conditions that could otherwise produce objectionable odors. This process reduces odors that would be caused by alternative cooler, slower decomposition methods. No food material will be composted on site.

The materials will stay in the Phase 1 pile for 28 days with air pumped in by a blower. After the 28 days, materials will be moved to the Phase 2 curing pile for another 30-45 days, also with air pumped in by a blower. After Phase 2, materials will be moved to the finished compost storage pile. These materials would be stored for no more than two months. The Phase 1 pile will have a maximum limit of 2,400 cubic yards at any one time. The phase 2 pile has a limit of 4,500 cubic yards at any one time, and the finished compost storage pile will have a limit of 2,400 cubic yards at any one time. The Facility will hold a maximum of 12,500 cubic yards of material at any one time. Given that the composting process takes at least three months, the Facility could process those 12,500 cubic yards a maximum of four times per year, for a total of 50,000 cubic yards per year. This is equivalent to 12,000 tons per year, which makes it a small compost operation. Finished compost will be delivered to one of three possible locations: the existing nearby chip and grind facility for sale to customers, Vision Recycling's Newark Facility, or directly to customers in the Bay area.

Anticipated vehicular traffic on public roadways would be limited to truck trips to move finished compost out of the Facility via Greenville Road and to bring ground green waste to the Facility from off-site Vision Recycling facilities other than the chip and grind facility, which would use only internal access roads. The project would generate approximately 406 offsite truck trips annually for the purpose of taking finished compost to customers or to Vision facilities in other areas and 78 trips annually for bringing green waste from off-site Vision Recycling facilities. This equates to approximately 1.9 vehicle trips per weekday on public roadways. Another 3 trips are estimated per day on internal access roads to move feedstock from the chip and grind facility to the compost facility, and compost from the compost facility back to the chip and grind site for retail sale. The vehicle trips on public roads would be conducted using 20 ton trailer trucks. The traffic study conducted for the facility and additional analysis conducted since completion of the traffic study determined that this would not significantly impact local roadways. The air and greenhouse gas study determined that the project would have less than significant impacts.

The Facility's operational hours are between 6:30 am and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday and will be closed on Sundays. The Facility's maximum capacity is 12,000 tons per year, but it is expected to receive closer to 6,000 tons/year.

The Facility would operate under the EA notification level tier of regulations enforced by the Alameda County LEA. The Facility must also comply with State Water Resources Control Board waste discharge requirements for composting operations. It will also be subject to Bay Area Air Quality Management district air emission requirements and must meet Alameda County Fire Department and Alameda County Mosquito Control District requirements.

ColWMP Amendment and Finding of Conformance

An amendment to the ColWMP is needed to add the Facility to the ColWMP. Under the criteria set forth in the ColWMP, the Facility would be considered a composting facility, which is defined in the ColWMP as serving individual jurisdictions or a sub-regional area. Activities typically include recovery (sorting) and processing for transportation (recycling) but may also include composting activities. If the amendment is approved, the Authority Board could then find the proposed project to be in conformance with the ColWMP.

Before the Authority Board considers the ColWMP Amendment, the proposed ColWMP Amendment must be reviewed by the Recycling Board in its capacity as the Local Task Force and the Planning & Organization Committee of the Authority. If the Authority Board approves the amendment, the changes will be forwarded to CalRecycle for processing and approval.

Environmental Review

For purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), the County of Alameda is the Lead Agency for this project. A negative declaration and initial study ("ND/IS") were prepared by the County that considered the environmental impacts of the facility. The ND/IS concluded that the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment.

The Authority is a Responsible Agency under CEQA. As a Responsible Agency, the Authority must independently evaluate the environmental review prepared by the County of Alameda, consider the environmental impacts identified in such review, and make the findings required by CEQA.

Authority staff has reviewed the County of Alameda's documents for the ND/IS including the air quality and greenhouse gas study and traffic analysis. Authority staff finds that, based on the whole record before it, the facility underwent the review required under CEQA and that the ColWMP amendment is within the scope of activities addressed by the County of Alameda's ND/IS except for the source of the feedstock for the Facility. Since preparation of the ND/IS, Vision Recycling has clarified that one half the green waste for the Facility will be from the chip and grind facility and one half will be transported from other Vision Recycling facilities. This would add 0.3 trips per day on public roads. BSK Associates, the consultant that prepared the original traffic analysis for the ND/IS has considered the impact of project traffic, including these additional trips, and concluded it would not change the conclusion in the ND/IS that the traffic generated by the compost facility would not result in a significant traffic impact, or change the ND/IS conclusions that air quality and greenhouse gas impacts would be insignificant.

Local Task Force and Planning and Organization Committee Review

The Recycling Board, as the Local Task Force, and the Planning & Organization Committee of the Authority will consider the proposed ColWMP at its meeting on June 9, 2016 at 4 p.m. in Oakland. In its advisory capacity, the Local Task Force will review and provide comments on the proposed ColWMP (which can include a comment recommending adoption). The Planning & Organization Committee will receive the staff report and take action on the proposed ColWMP Amendment.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning & Organization Committee and the Recycling Board (in its role as Local Task Force) recommend to the Authority Board that it hold a first reading of the ColWMP Amendment ordinance (Attachment A) at the June 22 meeting to (1) amend the ColWMP (Exhibit 1) to include the Vision Recycling Compost Facility in the unincorporated Livermore area, and make additional changes for consistency, (2) find that the Vision Recycling Compost Facility conforms to the ColWMP as amended, and (3) make the findings required by CEQA, and also recommend that the Authority Board hold a public hearing and second reading of the ColWMP Amendment ordinance and adopt the ordinance at the July 27 meeting.

Attachments:

Attachment A: Ordinance 2016-01
Exhibit 1: ColWMP Amendment Text
Exhibit 2: Siting Criteria Findings
Exhibit 3: Conditions of Approval

Attachment A

ORDINANCE 2016-01

AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO THE COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN, AND FINDING PLAN CONFORMANCE FOR THE VISION RECYCLING COMPOST FACILITY AT 30 GREENVILLE ROAD, LIVERMORE, CA 94551

The Board of the Alameda County Waste Management Authority (“Authority”) ordains as follows:

SECTION 1 (Enactment)

The Board of the Authority does hereby enact this Ordinance in full consisting of Section 1 through Section 7.

SECTION 2 (Findings)

- (a) The Authority finds that the California Integrated Waste Management Act (California Public Resources Code §§ 40000 et seq.) requires the preparation and adoption of a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (“CiWMP”).
- (b) The Authority finds that the Alameda County Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement for Waste Management directs that the Authority prepare, adopt, revise, amend, administer, enforce, and implement the CiWMP.
- (c) The Authority finds that it adopted a CiWMP, dated February 26, 2003, and has adopted minor amendments since then. A five-year review of the CiWMP was conducted in November 2009, a factual update was adopted in April 2010, and amendments were made in January 2011, December 2011, July 2013, and April 2015.
- (d) The Authority finds that on February 1, 2016, the County Planning Commission of Alameda County issued a conditional use permit for the Vision Recycling Compost Facility at 30 Greenville Road, unincorporated Livermore Area of Alameda County after preparing, considering, and adopting a negative declaration and initial for the Facility as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”).
- (e) The Authority finds that on May 9, 2016, the Facility applicant submitted the required information to the Authority to amend the CiWMP to site the Facility on an existing site at 30 Greenville Rd. in the unincorporated area of Livermore.
- (f) The Authority finds that the Recycling Board, acting as the Local Task Force, has reviewed and commented on the proposed amendment, and the Planning & Organization Committee of the Authority has considered the CiWMP Amendment, including any comments by the Local Task Force, and has recommended approval of the CiWMP Amendment and conformance finding.
- (g) The Authority finds that Authority staff provided all required notice and held a duly noticed public hearing on July 27, 2016 to consider the CiWMP Amendment and conformance finding for the Facility.

- (h) The Authority finds that the Authority Board considered all materials and testimony presented by the public, Local Task Force, applicant for the Facility, and Authority staff.
- (i) The Authority finds that it is a Responsible Agency under CEQA, that this project underwent the required review under CEQA, and that the Authority's action is within the scope of activities addressed by the County of Alameda's negative declaration and initial study ("ND/IS"), except for part of the source of the feedstock for the Facility, which the Authority concluded would not affect the conclusions in the ND/IS regarding the project's environmental impacts.
- (j) The Authority finds that the Authority Board has independently reviewed and considered the County of Alameda's ND/IS along with the additional information submitted by Vision Recycling.
- (k) The Authority finds that since the County of Alameda's adoption of the ND/IS, no substantial changes have occurred and no new information or changed circumstances exist that require revisions of the ND/IS due to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- (l) The Authority concurs with the County of Alameda that the Facility will not result in any significant environmental impacts.

SECTION 3 (CEQA Determinations)

- (a) The Authority's approval of the ColWMP amendment and conformance determination, as conditioned, will have a less than significant impact on the environment as documented in the ND/IS and additional information submitted by Vision Recycling.

SECTION 4 (Amendment of ColWMP)

The Authority hereby amends the ColWMP as set forth in the ColWMP Amendment text attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and made a part of this Ordinance.

SECTION 5 (Conformance Determination)

The Authority does hereby determine that the proposed project is in conformance with the ColWMP as amended, including the siting criteria as set forth in the siting criteria findings attached hereto as Exhibit 2 and made a part of this Ordinance, and that the compost operation to be operated under the Enforcement Agency Notification level regulations for the project as conditioned by the Conditions of Approval attached hereto as Exhibit 3 would be in conformance with the ColWMP as amended.

SECTION 6 (Designation for Ordinance Summaries)

The Authority Board does hereby designate the Authority Executive Director as the official responsible for preparing summaries of ordinances.

SECTION 7 (Notice and Effective Date)

This ordinance shall be posted at the Authority Office for at least thirty (30) days after its second reading by the Board and shall become effective thirty (30) days after the second reading.

Passed and adopted this 27th day of July, 2016 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAINING:

ABSENT:

I certify that under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of ORDINANCE NO. 2016 – 01.

WENDY SOMMER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Exhibits:

Exhibit 1: ColWMP Amendment Text

Exhibit 2: Siting Criteria Findings

Exhibit 3: Conditions of Approval

EXHIBIT 1: ColWMP Amendment Text

Amendments to Alameda County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan for the Vision Recycling Compost Facility at 30 Greenville Road in the Unincorporated Area of Livermore

The Alameda County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, February 26, 2003 and last amended in April, 2015, is hereby amended again as set forth below. In the sections that follow, text to be added to the Plan is shown in **underline bold** and text to be deleted is shown in ~~strikethrough~~.

1. In Chapter II under the heading of "Participants" section 6 "Private Companies," add the following bulleted paragraph directly before Table 2-4:

Tom DelConte and Roberto Aguirre are co-owners/operators of the Vision Recycling Compost Facility located at 30 Greenville Road in the unincorporated area of Livermore. The Vision Recycling Compost facility will be an EA Notification Tier Compost facility. The facility will take green materials from Vision Recycling facilities, including its nearby chip and grind facility, to be composted in an aerated static pile system. Finished compost will be brought back to the chip and grind facility, or one of Vision's other facilities for sale, or directly to customers for sale. This facility is expected to become operational in 2016 upon issuance of all applicable permits.

2. In Chapter II, after the section on Transfer Stations, add a **section 3 "Compost Facilities"** with the following text:

Vision Recycling Compost Facility

In 2016, Alameda County's first compost facility will be located at 30 Greenville Road in the unincorporated area of Livermore on a 3.47 acre site, under EA notification tier regulations enforced by the Alameda County LEA. The facility is limited to 12,500 cubic yards at any one given time and will process a maximum of 12,000 tons per year. The facility will handle green materials only, including wood chips, mulch, soil amendment and co-generation fuel from the nearby chip and grind facility. Composting the materials will add value and create a more marketable end product. The materials will be composted using a two stage aerated static pile compost system. This system forces oxygen into the piles with the use of blower to maintain aerobic conditions and thereby avoid odors. Finished compost will be brought back to Vision Recycling's chip and grind facility for sale to customers, brought to Vision Recycling's other chip and grind facility in Newark, or transported directly to Bay area customers. Materials will be transported efficiently in large trailer trucks. This facility is expected to be operational in 2016 after receiving all applicable permits.

EXHIBIT 2

SITING CRITERIA FINDINGS FOR VISION RECYCLING COMPOST FACILITY AT 300 GREENVILLE ROAD IN THE UNINCORPORATED AREA OF LIVERMORE

The Alameda County Waste Management Authority (“Authority”) has reviewed the materials submitted in connection with the Vision Recycling Compost Facility (“Facility”). Based on that review, the Authority hereby makes the following determinations pursuant to the relevant provisions of ColWMP Section VI, Table 6-2:

- **Seismic** – The Facility is located in the Greenville Earthquake Fault Zone. State and County guidelines require that a fault rupture hazard investigation be performed for development which includes structures that are intended for human occupancy, but structures intended for human occupancy are not part of this project. No permanent structures are planned for this site. There will be no residential use of the site. An employee of the existing nearby chip and grind operation will manage the site on a part time basis as needed. The site is located on rock units mapped as Pliocene age Orinda Formation which are not susceptible to liquefaction or seismic settlement. Therefore, the risk associated with liquefaction or seismic settlement is minimal (excerpted from Initial study, page 39-40).
- **Floodplains** – The Facility is within an area of minimal flood hazard. The proposed project is over .5 mile from the nearest floodplain.
- **Wetlands** –The Facility is located in an area that has been leveled and graded and does not contain riparian habitat, wetlands or other sensitive natural community.
- **Endangered Species Habitat** –The nearest documented special status species observation was of California tiger salamander .4 miles to the west-northwest of the proposed project and California red-legged from .5 miles southeast of the proposed project area. These species’ habitat consists of wetlands. The proposed project area does not contain suitable habitat due to its lack of wetland characteristics.
- **Unstable Soils**- The proposed project will not disturb site soils or result in new activities that could cause or accelerate erosion at the site. The project site is already graded to drain internally and would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. The project would have no impact related to substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. The project area is located on rock units that are not susceptible to liquefaction, seismic settlement or lateral spreading. The site is not located in an area that is known for subsidence from groundwater or petroleum withdrawal. The site soils are not of the types that are prone to hydro compaction or collapse due to wetting. The project would have no impact related to on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.
- **Major Aquifer Recharge Areas** – The proposed project will prevent discharges to waters through internal drainage and retention of stormwater on-site through use of a stormwater pond and 1-foot perimeter berm. The stormwater basin was designed as a

retention basin for a 24-hour, 25-year design rain event, with a total capacity of over 360,000 gallons. The retention basin would be completed with a machine-compacted, native clay-lined bottom. The basin is located at an elevation of approximately 60 feet above the surrounding valley. According to the Natural Resources Conservation Service the project stormwater pond is located on the Altamont clay soil unit (moderately deep, 30 to 45 percent slopes, eroded). According to the USDA soil data, these soils have moderate water holding capacity (USDA 1966; p.13); with an 11.56 inch net actual evaporation (precipitation minus annual evaporation) [USDA 1966; p. 9]. The stormwater pond sizing, the lining, the dense natural clay soils and the significant height above the surrounding terrain would all protect groundwater quality.

- **Depth to Groundwater** – See Major Aquifer Recharge Area above. The Facility will comply with all local and state construction requirements. The underlying groundwater basin is not utilized as a water supply, and no discharge to or pumping of the basin is permitted.
- **Permeable Strata and Soils** – the project is located on soil units identified by the USDA as Altamont clay (moderately deep, 30 to 45 percent slopes, eroded). According to the USDA soil data, these soils are identified as having a Unified Soil Classification System symbol of CH, that suggests highly plastic clay. Highly plastic clays are typically also highly expansive. The effects of expansive soils could damage foundations of structures, paved roads and streets, and concrete slabs. Soil creep can occur on sloped ground with expansive soils and cause damage to structures with vertical walls below grade. Paved roads are not planned as part of the project, and the project will not construct any structures with foundations. Additionally, as a condition of approval to secure a building permit, the project applicant will be required to obtain an engineer's certification that all access routes are all-weather and will support the load of a 75,000 pound piece of apparatus. The site soils have a high percentage of clays that would result in low permeability and may limit the use of septic tanks with leach fields. Waste water disposal is not part of the project, therefore the low permeability of the soils would have no impact related to the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.
- **Non-attainment Air Areas:** The BAAQMD states that “for any project that does not individually have significant operational air quality impacts, the determination of significant cumulative impact should be based on an evaluation of the consistency of the project with the local general plan and of the general plan with the regional air quality plan” (BAAQMD 1999, p. 19). The Alameda County Community Climate Action Plan aims to “encourage participation in recycling and composting throughout the community” (Alameda County 2014b, p. 9). The proposed project would provide infrastructure to achieve this goal. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the local general plan and would not have cumulative air quality impacts.

- **PSD Air Areas** – Operation of the Facility shall be in compliance with all requirements of the BAAQMD.
- **Mineral Resources Area:** The site surface is disturbed and compacted, no soil, sand or gravel will be extracted from the site. The project will not prevent the extraction of any known mineral resource or result in the loss of the availability of any mineral resource recovery site identified in the County GP or any other plan.
- **Prime Agricultural Lands/Open Space** – The project area is located in the east end of the Livermore Valley. This unincorporated area is characterized by industrial uses near Greenville Road and agricultural uses to the east and south. The Project site is zoned “A” (Agricultural), which allows for composting facilities as a conditional use (Alameda County 2014a, section 17.06.035). The site is not used for agriculture; it is currently used to store construction equipment.
- **Military Lands** – The Facility is not sited on any Military lands.
- **Other Federal, State, and Indian Lands** – The Facility is not located on any Federal, State, or Indian lands.
- **Proximity to Major Transportation Routes** – the compost facility is roughly 6,383 feet, a little over one mile, from CA 580.
- **Proximity to Development:** Directly to the north, concrete road dividers are stored in an open area. Further to the northwest are the existing chip and grind facility and several construction company offices with outdoor equipment storage. The nearest residence is the lessor, the adjacent 125-acre Mills Ranch property. The site is not near any public schools, churches, hospitals, civic buildings or libraries.
- **Proximity to Public Services** –Water and sewer will not be needed as utilities on the site. The one employee working on site will be splitting time between this Facility and the Livermore Chip and Grind Facility and will have access to the portable restroom at that site. Water used in the composting process will be from a water truck that is filled from the purple, recycled water hydrant near the intersection of Isabel and Portola Ave. Power will be brought in underground from the nearest telephone pole. The Facility is only just over one mile from CA 580; emergency response times would be minimal.
- **Proximity to Waste Stream** – This Facility is not a public facility; material will be transferred to this Facility from other Vision Recycling sites, primarily from the nearby chip and grind site. Thus proximity to residentially zoned areas is not necessary.
- **Appropriate Zoning** –Project site is zoned “A” (Agricultural) by the County, which allows for composting facilities as a conditional use.
- **Conformance with Approved Countywide Siting Element of the Integrated Waste Management Plan** – The Facility is consistent with the goals and policies of the Countywide Siting Element and has been designed to enhance landfill diversion of materials for Alameda County and to promote the production of high quality, marketable compost and is an integral part of the countywide system.
- **Recreational, Cultural, or Aesthetic Areas** – The Facility is not located in an area of any recreational, cultural, or aesthetic significance.

- **Airport Zones** – This facility is located 31 miles from the nearest airport, the Oakland Airport, and does not occupy any restricted zones as defined by the Alameda County Airport Land Use Policy Plan.
- **Gas Migration/Emission** – Not Applicable.
- **Contingency** – This Facility is not a public facility. An emergency contingency plan for the continuation of service in the event of a natural or man-made disruption is not applicable since Vision Recycling can shut off flow of incoming material at any time internally.
- **Aesthetics** - The project site is located in the eastern portion of the Livermore Valley, in an unincorporated area of Alameda County. Surrounding land uses are primarily grassy, rolling open space to the north, south, east, and west of the property. Directly to the north, concrete road dividers are stored in an open area. Further to the northwest are the existing chip and grind facility and several construction company offices with outdoor equipment storage. The nearest residence is the lessor, the adjacent 125-acre Mills Ranch property. The site is not near any public schools, churches, hospitals, civic buildings or libraries.

EXHIBIT 3

Conditions of Approval for ColWMP Amendment and Conformity Determination for the Vision Recycling Compost Facility

Pursuant to the Joint Powers Agreement establishing the Alameda County Waste Management Authority (“Authority”), the Alameda County Integrated Waste Management Plan, and state law, the ColWMP amendment and conformity determination enacted by the ordinance to which this exhibit is attached is subject to the conditions below:

1. Operations at the Vision Recycling Compost Facility (“Facility”) shall comply with all requirements governing the design and operation of green material compost operations under the EA notification tier as set forth in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations.
2. The materials that may be processed through the Vision Recycling Compost Facility may include only green materials and no food materials.
3. The total site capacity of 12,500 cubic yards per day shall not be exceeded.
4. The ordinance to which these Conditions of Approval is attached shall take effect only upon Vision Recycling’s acceptance of these conditions and its agreement to indemnify and hold harmless the Authority, its agents, officer, and employees according to the terms in paragraph 5 below.
5. Vision Recycling shall indemnify and hold harmless the Authority, its agents, officers and employees for any costs, including attorneys’ fees, incurred by the Authority, its agents, officers or employees in the defense of any action brought against the Authority, its agents, officers or employees, in connection with the approval or implementation of Authority Ordinance No. 2016-01. Vision Recycling shall reimburse the Authority, its agents, officers or employees for any costs, including attorneys’ fees, that the Authority, its agents, officers or employees incur as a result of such action. This indemnification shall be binding upon the Authority, Vision Recycling and all their successors and assigns.
6. Vision Recycling shall comply with the Alameda County Integrated Waste Management Plan, all applicable existing and future ordinances and resolutions of the Authority and all conditions imposed by the County of Alameda and other regulatory agencies.
7. These conditions of approval shall restrict the operation of the Facility.
8. Any activities beyond those provided for by Ordinance 2016-01 shall require a new ColWMP amendment and conformance determination by the Authority.