

**DRAFT**

**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**

**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              | Lorin 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 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.

**DRAFT**

- 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](#)

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.

**DRAFT**

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.

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**

## **DRAFT**

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 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 is 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.