

APPROVED

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

**Thursday, August 11, 2016
4:00 p.m.**

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

**Teleconference:
Toni Stein
Hotel Wales
1295 Madison Ave, New York, NY 10128
(212) 876-6000**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Tim Rood, President, called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Adan Alonzo, Recycling Programs
Jerry Pentin, City of Pleasanton
Bernie Larrabe, Recycling Materials Processing Industry
Peter Maass, City of Albany
Dianne Martinez, City of Emeryville
Jim Oddie, City of Alameda
Daniel O'Donnell, Environmental Organization
Michael Peltz, Solid Waste Industry Representative
Tim Rood, City of Piedmont
Steve Sherman, Source Reduction Specialist
Toni Stein, Environmental Educator (via teleconference)

Staff Present:

Wendy Sommer, Executive Director
Tom Padia, Deputy Executive Director
Wes Sullens, Program Manager
Miya Kitahara, Program Manager
Farand Kan, Deputy County Counsel
Arliss Dunn, Clerk of the Board

Others Present:

Ed Boisson, Boisson Consulting

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT

President Rood announced that Wendy Sommer and Board member Pentin were delayed due to another meeting and would join the Board meeting in progress.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

- | | |
|---|--------------------|
| 1. Approval of the Draft Minutes of July 14, 2016 (Wendy Sommer) | Action |
| 2. Board Attendance Record (Wendy Sommer) | Information |
| 3. Written Report of Ex Parte Communications (Wendy Sommer) | Information |

Board member Stein pulled the minutes from consent and asked for clarification on the attendance of Board member Sherman. Board member Sherman clarified that he was absent for the consent calendar vote but was present for the remainder of the meeting.

Board member Maass made the motion to approve the Consent Calendar. Board member Stein seconded and the motion carried 10-0 (Pentin absent).

V. OPEN PUBLIC DISCUSSION

There was none.

VI. REGULAR CALENDAR

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 1. Scope of Work for Five Year Program Review (Tom Padia) | Action |
| Approve the proposed schedule and scope of work for the Five Year Program Review. | |

Tom Padia provided a summary of the staff report. The report is available here:

[Five Year Review memo-8-11-16.pdf](#)

President Rood thanked Mr. Padia for bringing the information back to the Board and asked if staff is satisfied that the proposed recommendation fulfills the statutory requirement for this report and that it will yield helpful information. Mr. Padia responded yes, staff is satisfied on both accounts. Board member Stein inquired if there were resulting amendments to the Recycling Plan as referenced in Attachment A with respect to not accomplishing diversion targets. Mr. Padia responded there was not resulting amendments in response to the last five year review conducted in 2012/2013 however it's possible that there may be course corrections if information from the proposed five year review prompts such action. Board member Stein inquired if any recommendations from the previous five year review were implemented and did they prove helpful. Mr. Padia responded that there were observations and recommendations but the information was primarily focused on member agency franchise agreements and collection programs which are not directly under our purview or power to implement. Board member Stein requested that staff provide additional clarification on diversion strategies.

Board member Sherman requested clarification on the nexus between the five year review and the grants-to-nonprofits program. Mr. Padia stated that the county charter requires that 10% of recycling revenues be used for grants-to-nonprofits programs that engage in waste reduction efforts but can also be used for research and studies that further the purposes of the Charter. Mr. Padia added that any unspent funds from the five year review will revert back into the grants-to-nonprofits fund balance. Board member Sherman stated with respect to recommendations for the scope of work for the five year review he would like to 1) see greater focus on waste prevention and higher and better uses in whatever hierarchy the agency has adopted, 2) receive definitive information on the fate of plastics 3-7, i.e. are they being incinerated or put to some other purpose, and 3) a focus on the food hierarchy with respect to organics processing and food at the curb going to animal feed as well as to composting. Board member Peltz responded with respect to plastics 3-7 that international markets don't typically discard materials that they

have purchased and deem valuable and his experience has been that plastics 3-7 go abroad and are re-sorted into individual resins and on to respective end uses. Board member Peltz suggested that the Board could invite industry experts in plastics to a future Board meeting. Board member Alonzo added that as a waste processor there are internal structures and auditing processes that enable them to know the volume of specific materials the municipalities are processing. When the buyers approach them about buying materials they are specific about the level of contamination and how much plastic 3-7 need to be in the materials. This information is then provided to the municipalities.

Board member Peltz inquired about the structure of the RFP with respect to soliciting bids if staff anticipates putting in the \$100,000 or figuring out cost based on discussions with proposed bidders. Mr. Padia stated that his proposal is to include the “up to \$100,000” ceiling and ask for itemized segments of the scope and determine the value based on the elements proposed.

Ed Boisson, Boisson Consulting, commented the last study required intensive interaction with the member agencies and stated that proposed bidders will notice the intentional scale back of engagement with member agencies and will need to clarify with staff the level of interaction expected. If minimal, it would allow sufficient funds for additional data collection and research on other specified topics and issues.

Board member Pentin made the motion to approve the staff recommendation. Board member Sherman seconded and the motion carried 10-1 (Stein:No.)

- 2. Priority Setting: Overview and Timeline (Wendy Sommer) Information**
The timeline and process were approved by the Waste Management Authority Board at its July meeting. This item is for information only.

Ms. Sommer announced that the agency had hired a new Receptionist, Angela Vivians.

Wendy Sommer provided a summary of the staff report and a PowerPoint presentation. The report and presentation is available here: [Priority Setting memo-08-11-16.pdf](#)

Board member Alonzo asked for clarification on the issue of declining revenues and inquired if it is attributed to effective programs or loss of revenue from fees due to materials leaving the county. If the latter, we need a determined focus on enforcement efforts that holds accountable the haulers that are transporting materials out of county thus taking revenue that is destined for Alameda County. Ms. Sommer stated it is attributed to both but added there is no current plan for a reduction in staffing and stated we can continue to provide quality programs within a balanced budget. Mr. Padia added the Authority’s facility fee applies to waste generated in Alameda County that is landfilled anywhere in California and we have been closely tracking those quantities and trying to collect fees on those tons. We have not seen a significant increase in those quantities. Mr. Padia added we do not receive the Measure D fee on those tons but some of our Cities such as Piedmont voluntarily pay the fee on their out-of-county waste to stay within the Measure D program. We are aggressively going after the self-haulers that are not paying the fee.

President Rood thanked Ms. Sommer for her report.

- 3. Industry trends: Circular Economy and Consumption Based Emissions Inventory (Wes Sullens & Miya Kitahara) Information**
This item is for information only.

APPROVED

Wes Sullens provided a summary of the staff report. Mr. Sullens and Miya Kitahara presented an update on the circular economy and consumption based emissions inventories. The report and presentation is available here: [Industry Trends memo-08-11-16.pdf](#)

Board member Martinez inquired if any high-profile companies have signed on to the Circular Economy 100 USA Initiative (CEI 100). Mr. Sullens stated that the foundation has not published a list of private sector companies but he has heard that Nike has signed on and of the governmental sector the cities of San Francisco, Palo Alto, Phoenix, Minneapolis, among others have expressed interest in the initiative.

Board member Sherman stated that he attended the World Environmental Forum in Davos in 2015 and was impressed that some European representatives presented that the infrastructure of reuse and waste reduction was systemic in the creation of items such as furniture. There was also an emphasis on the discussion of co-housing as a policy to reduce energy and water consumption. Board member Sherman recommended that going forward we look at the word “recycling” as broadly defined in Measure D, and that in other policies or proposed strategic plans that we mean recycling as including the broader spectrum moving up the hierarchy. Board member Sherman added that he would like to have the report produced by Upstream (formerly the Public Policy Institute) appended to the minutes. Board member O’Donnell inquired if the circular economy companies would be interested in investing more money on better quality materials, and that in the end economic activity is driven by profit. Mr. Sullens responded that locally the Ellen MacArthur foundation has provided the economic analysis to make the business case and to show value.

Board member Stein requested that staff put together a table from slide #33 of the presentation to compare diversion rates and to see if they followed the ICLEI protocol or followed their own protocol. Ms. Kitahara stated that she believes that the graph does not include diversion information but utilized economic data and regional assumptions, but we can attempt to compare to real diversion rates. Ms. Kitahara added the ICLEI methodology was not used in this data set. Board member Peltz added the information was looking at spending patterns demographically. Ms. Kitahara stated that staff is working closely with ICLEI to help the cities update their current inventories to be compliant with an international protocol but it is limited as it doesn’t contain upstream data. Board member Sherman added the City of Berkeley Climate Action Plan places recycling and the materials management at a very low percentage of planned spending of infrastructure dollars and looking at it from a consumption based methodology has the potential to drive public investment. He would also like to see this information included in the climate action plans in a way that will drive change. Ms. Kitahara thanked Board member Sherman for his comments and added that StopWaste staff presented this information to various City staff responsible for waste and action plans and they were interested to have us help them integrate this information into their climate action plans. We have also developed a three page template as a starting point and to help them update their plans in the future. Mr. Sullens added the City of Oakland is also doing an analysis on cost abatement curves for each of the strategies, energy and materials that will allow us to compare different strategies like putting solar panels on City Hall to improving the recycling system.

Ms. Sommer stated that the presentation today is intended to prompt questions from the Board during the priority setting process regarding the proposed agency focus, i.e. should the Agency focus on upstream or downstream activities.

VII. OTHER PUBLIC INPUT

There was none.

VIII. COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Board member Sherman inquired if staff has evaluated how we can educate the public on the effects of Prop 67 (bill to keep or eliminate fees on plastic bags). Ms. Sommer stated that staff is going to the WMA Board in September for the 1st reading of the bag expansion and will also include a discussion about Prop 67. Staff is also having internal discussions on whether it would be appropriate to get Board endorsement on yes on Prop 67. Board member Sherman asked that the item be placed on the RB agenda as an update. Ms. Sommer stated staff will do so. Mr. Padia added that Prop 67 will have no effect on the local bag bans that are currently in place throughout the state, including in Alameda County.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.