



CONSENT CALENDAR

**DRAFT MINUTES**

**SOUTH BAYSIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY  
MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
November 15, 2012 – 2:00 p.m.  
San Carlos Library Conference Room A/B**

**1. Call to Order at 2:01 PM  
Roll Call**

Agency	Present	Absent	Agency	Present	Absent
Atherton	X		Menlo Park	X	
Belmont	X		Redwood City	X	
Burlingame	X		San Carlos	X	
East Palo Alto	X		San Mateo	X	
Foster City	X		County of San Mateo	X	
Hillsborough	X		West Bay Sanitary District	X	

**2. Adjourn to Closed Session - Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(A): Conference with Legal Counsel – anticipated litigation – one case.**

**Regular Session Called to Order at 2:08 PM**

**3. Report from Closed Session**

None

**4. Public Comment**

Persons wishing to address the Board on matters NOT on the posted agenda may do so.

Each speaker is limited to two minutes. If there are more than five individuals wishing to speak during public comment, the Chairman will draw five speaker cards from those submitted to speak during this time. The balance of the Public Comment speakers will be called upon at the end of the Board Meeting.

If the item you are speaking on is not listed on the agenda, please be advised that the Board may briefly respond to statements made or questions posed as allowed under The Brown Act (Government Code Section 54954.2). The Board's general policy is to refer items to staff for attention, or have a matter placed on a future Board agenda for a more comprehensive action or report and formal public discussion and input at that time.

**5. Approval of Consent Calendar:**

Consent Calendar item(s) are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless members of the Board, staff or public request specific items be removed for separate action. *Items removed from the Consent Calendar will be moved to the end of the agenda for separate discussion.*

- A. Adopt the September 27, 2012 BOD Meeting Minutes
- B. Approval of Technical Revisions to SBWMA Retirement Plan
- C. Resolution Approving Third Amendment to the Executive Director's Employment Agreement
- D. Resolution Approving Revised SBWMA Investment Policy
- E. Resolution Approving Adjustment to FY13 Non-Master Plan Capital Budget
- F. Receipt of Recology and SBR Monthly Reports

Motion/Second: Oskoui/Doughty

Voice Vote: All in Favor

**5. New Business:**

**A. Election of Vice Chair**

Chair Porter called for nominations for Vice Chair.

Carl Yeats nominated Mike Gibbons.

Mike Gibbons declined the nomination.

Brian Moura nominated John Doughty.  
 Larry Patterson seconded the nomination.  
 John Doughty accepted the nomination.  
 Roll Call Vote: 12-0-0-0

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Atherton	X				Menlo Park	X			
Belmont	X				Redwood City	X			
Burlingame	X				San Carlos	X			
East Palo Alto	X				San Mateo	X			
Foster City	X				County of San Mateo	X			
Hillsborough	X				West Bay Sanitary District	X			

**B. Resolution Approving Shoreway Environmental Center Tipping Fee Adjustments Effective 1/1/13**

Executive Director McCarthy explained that a new version of table 1 in the staff report was being distributed. He added that staff is not recommending any changes to the tipping fees that were assumed in the budget that was adopted in September. He further explained that the budget is pretty tight, but suggesting an increase in tipping fees is not recommended at this time. He noted that we will meet our bond covenant break even test, but just slightly.

Member Patterson noted that he was looking at revenue versus operational expenditures and asked if there was any hope in the future in organics costs.

Executive Director McCarthy answered that nothing would change in the next year or two that will make a difference, because we are tied into two contracts don't expire until 2014. He added that there is a new facility in San Jose called Zero Waste Energy, that will have capacity, but we don't know tipping fees at this time.

Staff Gans explained that there are very few options for where to take food waste, so it's very expensive. He added that he is working on a project with the SBSA whereby food waste is turned into energy via methane gas providing an electricity cost offset. He noted that he has meet with their engineer several times to discuss options for bring SBWMA food waste to their facility.

Chair Porter asked if there are any grant opportunities to help the SBSA incorporate this type of digestion facility into their capital improvements project.

Staff Gans noted that the whole waste water industry is very aware of the opportunity to use organic input for energy. The challenge is matching up the world of solid waste to the world of liquid waste. Executive Director McCarthy, added that well in advance of the current two contracts expiring we want to do the research to see what options we have. He noted that right now the only viable option is the Zero Waste Energy Facility in San Jose, and added that the next future opportunity is this wet waste.

Member Oskoui asked if there is a reason to raise the tip fees more to help offset subsidies and financial short comings.

Executive Director McCarthy pointed out attachment A to the staff report and noted that the public tip fee is such a small part of the SBWMA total revenue that the tip fees would have to be raised significantly to make a dent in cash flow. He also noted that we've seen the volume start to come back up with our current rates.

Member Masbad asked for a clearer picture on the net costs of moving the material subsequent to the tip fee being charged.

Executive Director McCarthy noted that if you net all of the expenses out of the commodity revenue, what's left over essentially subsidizes the tipping fees to about 12.2%, so the tipping fees in aggregate are 12.2% lower after we put the revenue against those expenses.

Member Oskoui added that it has been coming up in rate hearings that it's not clear that commodity revenues are offsetting operational costs, and that needs to be a clearer message.

Member Moura commented that he would like to look at building in discounts to encourage Multi-Family developments to participate in the organics program in the next year.

Member Patterson made a motion to accept the staff proposal for 2013 tip fees.

Member Moura seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: 12-0-0-0

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Atherton	X				Menlo Park	X			
Belmont	X				Redwood City	X			
Burlingame	X				San Carlos	X			
East Palo Alto	X				San Mateo	X			
Foster City	X				County of San Mateo	X			
Hillsborough	X				West Bay Sanitary District	X			

C. Discussion on Model Anti-Scavenging Ordinance

Staff Feldman explained scavenging is an ongoing problem in our industry. He added that there is a state law prohibiting removal of recyclables from contracted containers, however very few of these infractions have ever been prosecuted. Staff is recommending that SBWMA agencies adopt local anti-scavenging ordinances, noting that this may be one of the only feasible alternatives in addressing the problem of scavenging.

Member Patterson asked if there was any data available comparing scavenging before single stream and after single stream.

Staff Feldman agreed that one of the attributes of going to single stream was to make scavenging harder; noting that on the flip side there has been an increase in material due to single stream making it easier for people to recycle. He added that he has not seen any research on scavenging numbers because it hard to quantify.

Member Oskoui noted that it would be beneficial to be able to quantify the dollars lost, and where the problems are regional via scavenging when going to councils. He also suggested administrative fines instead of misdemeanors to make the ordinance a little more flexible.

Member Yeats commented that scavenging is a symptom of the economy. He noted that Burlingame does have anti-scavenging as part of their solid waste code, and since it was written in 2009 they have fined 30 people. He added that usually the fine is \$50, but they can also fine port fees up to \$250. He added that he thought there would need to be more data on what it's actually costing before a community is going to devote code enforcement officers.

Member Fotu noted that Menlo Park only has one code enforcement officer, and that she didn't see that Menlo Park would want to spend staff time on an ordinance that had no way to be enforced. She suggested the SBWMA pilot a program with one code enforcement office for all the agencies that was paid for out of the rates.

Staff Feldman reiterated that quantifying is the issue; noting that it's hard to measure the success of having an ordinance or the detriment of not having an ordinance.

Member Moura suggested SBWMA contracting directly with the county for code enforcement, and pay for the officer with the fines collected.

Gino Gasparini of Recology thanked Foster City, Redwood City, and Burlingame for their help in this area. He noted that a family was caught; a letter was written and that Recology has not seem them again in our area.

Mario Puccinelli of Recology added that it he'd thought it might be a good idea to use Recology's recycle truck drivers to help quantify scavenging.

Chair Porter summarized that it would be nice to know what the magnitude of this problem is relative to the revenue from commodities, so that we can decide if we want perception based enforcement or if it's to recover lost revenue.

**7. Old Business:**

**A. RSMC Franchise Agreement Operational and Contract Administration Update**

Gino Gasparini thanked member Oskoui and his staff for the great explanations at the Belmont City Council meeting regarding rates. He commented that the Belmont rate increase was not highlighted in the newspaper this year. He also added that the Coats for Kids program ends tomorrow.

**B. SBR Shoreway Operational and Contract Administration Update**

No Report.

**8. Staff Updates**

- a) Update on Recology Commercial Recycling Outreach Efforts
- b) Recycling and Outreach Programs Update
- c) Shoreway Operations and Master Plan Update
- d) Update on 2013/14 Franchise Rate Setting Process
- e) Preview of Upcoming Board meetings

Executive Director noted that he had a few miscellaneous comments.

- He noted that a final total collection rate impact will be emailed out. He added that because there were some abstentions at the September meeting when rates were voted on, staff needed to do additional work, that work is completed and this will show those changes which are minor.
- He also stated that Staff and Recology will be meeting soon to restart the conversation about commercial recycling. He added that this is an area of opportunity for us, and that effort will start up again shortly.
- He recognized Burlingame who will be rolling out the on call HHW program beginning February 1<sup>st</sup>.
- He also commented on the press release that went out earlier in the day that we will be taking plastic bags at Shoreway in the drop off center.

**9. Board Member Comments**

**10. Adjourn 3:00 PM**



## STAFF REPORT

---

To: SBWMA Board Members  
From: Marshall Moran, Finance Manager  
Date: January 24, 2013 Board of Director's Meeting  
Subject: Resolution Accepting the Fiscal Year 2011-2012 Annual Financial Statements

---

### Recommendation

Staff recommends the Board approve the attached Resolution No. 2013-01, accepting the South Bayside Waste Management Authority's audited Annual Financial Statements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012 as prepared by the SBWMA's audit firm, Lance Soll & Lunghard, LLP.

### Analysis

The financial statements of the South Bayside Waste Management Authority for fiscal year ending June 30, 2012, have been prepared by the City of San Carlos Administrative Services Department and examined by the independent auditing firm of Lance Soll & Lunghard, LLP and SBWMA staff. It is the **unqualified opinion** of the firm that the financial statements present fairly the financial position of the SBWMA as of June 30, 2012, and that the financial statements were prepared in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

The purpose of the financial statements is to present a summary of the financial position of the Authority. The final step in the formal process of preparing these financial statements is to transmit them to the Board for its acceptance. The financial statements have previously been sent to the Board members on January 7, 2013 and are also shown in **Exhibit A**.

### *Overview of the Financial Statements*

The annual report consists of two parts – *management's discussion and analysis* (MD&A) and the *basic financial statements*. The financial statements also include *notes* that explain some of the information in the financial statements and provide more detailed data.

The financial statements include two important schedules that present financial data for the SBWMA as a whole: the Statement of Net Assets and the Statement of Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Net Assets. These two statements report the SBWMA's assets, liabilities, revenue, and expenses and changes in net assets. These statements are prepared using the accrual basis of accounting, which is similar to the accounting used by most private-sector companies. All of the current year's revenues and expenses are taken into account regardless of when cash is received or paid.

### *Financial Condition Highlights*

Net assets of the SBWMA's activities decreased \$1.3 million to \$22.5 million largely because of interest expense that had previously been capitalized. Unrestricted net assets – the part of net assets that can be used to finance day-to-day operations without constraints established by debt covenants, enabling legislation, or other legal requirements – increased from \$9.2 million at June 30, 2011 to \$13.1 million at the June 30, 2012. Unrestricted net assets are used to fund the Board designated reserves as shown in the annual budget documents.

### *General Operating Results*

The operating results for FY2012 and FY2011 were as follows:

	<u>FY2012</u>	<u>FY2011</u>
Operating Revenues	\$40,081,800	\$40,007,400
Operating Expense	\$33,543,500	\$36,357,000
Depreciation Expense	<u>\$3,168,300</u>	<u>\$204,300</u>
Operating Income <Loss>	\$3,370,000	\$3,446,100
Non-Operating Loss (Interest)	<u>(\$3,306,900)</u>	<u>(\$15,300)</u>
Net Asset Change	<u>\$63,100</u>	<u>\$3,430,900</u>

As shown above, a major change from last year is the large increase in depreciation expense due to the closure of most of the Master Plan capital project at Shoreway for accounting purposes with the resulting initial depreciation of the project. This was largely offset by lower Shoreway operating expense and lower SBWMA administrative expense. (Please see page 9 of the attached financial statement for this detail).

### ***Long-Term Debt***

At the end of the current fiscal year, the SBWMA had bond debt outstanding of \$56,679,700 after the sale of the 2009 revenue bonds for Master Plan improvements and the defeasance of the 2000 bonds.

#### **Outstanding Debt Activities**

	<u>FY2012</u>	<u>FY2011</u>
Revenue Bonds	\$56,679,700	\$56,687,200

Payment of principal on the 2009 bonds begins on September 1, 2012 which is why the debt balance shows only a minor change. Additional information on the SBWMA's long-term debt can be found in the notes (5) to the accompanying financial statements.

### **Fiscal Impact**

There is no financial impact associated with the adoption of this Resolution.

#### ***Attachments:***

Resolution 2013-01 Accepting the Authority's FY 2011-2012 Financial Statements

Exhibit A - Fiscal Year 2011-2012 Annual Financial Statements



## RESOLUTION NO. 2013-01

### RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTH BAYSIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS ACCEPTING THE FISCAL YEAR 2011-2012 ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

**WHEREAS**, the South Bayside Waste Management Authority contracted with the audit firm of Lance Soll & Lunghard, LLP to conduct an audit of the Agency's financial records in accordance with Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statement 34; and

**WHEREAS**, the financial statements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012 as prepared by said firm have been completed and are attached as Exhibit A; and

**WHEREAS**, it is recommended that the Board accept the financial statements.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the South Bayside Waste Management Authority hereby adopts the Annual Financial Report as prepared by Lance Soll & Lunghard, LLP for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the SBWMA Board of Directors hereby accepts the Fiscal Year 2011-2012 Annual Financial Statements.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** by the Board of Directors of the South Bayside Waste Management Authority, County of San Mateo, State of California on the this 24<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2013, by the following vote:

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Atherton					Menlo Park				
Belmont					Redwood City				
Burlingame					San Carlos				
East Palo Alto					San Mateo				
Foster City					County of San Mateo				
Hillsborough					West Bay Sanitary Dist				

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution No. 2013-01 was duly and regularly adopted at a regular meeting of the South Bayside Waste Management Authority on January 24, 2013.

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jim Porter, Chairperson of SBWMA

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cyndi Urman, Board Secretary



---

**Agenda Item 5B**  
**Resolution Accepting the Fiscal Year 2011-2012 Annual Financial Statements**

**Exhibit A – Fiscal Year 2011-2012 Annual Financial Statements**

---

Files too large to be included in packet Posted on Website: [www.rethinkwaste.org](http://www.rethinkwaste.org)

- Exhibit A: Fiscal year 2011-2012 Annual Financial Statements\*

\*Also available in an email sent to the SBWMA Board of Director's on Monday, January 7, 2013



## STAFF REPORT

---

To: SBWMA Board Members  
From: Cliff Feldman, Recycling Programs Manager  
Date: January 24, 2013 Board of Directors Meeting  
Subject: Results of 2012 Fourth Quarter Recology Franchise Agreement(s) Quarterly Contamination Measurement for Loads of Recyclable Materials, Organic Materials and Plant Materials

---

### Recommendation

This is an informational report and no action is necessary.

### Analysis

#### *Sampling Process and Protocol*

The SBWMA is charged with performing a twice annual (formerly quarterly) analysis of the contamination levels present in five distinct types of materials collected (see **Table 1**) and delivered to the Shoreway Environmental Center (SEC) by Recology San Mateo County (Recology) per the Franchise Agreement(s) with the Member Agencies. One of several items negotiated in 2012 by the SBWMA and Recology in an effort to reduce costs was to decrease the number of contamination sampling events from the contractually required four to two. Therefore, the SBWMA budgeted funds to only perform two sampling events in FY13 as explained to the Board at the June 28, 2012 meeting. The 2012 Fourth Quarter sampling project was conducted from November 12-16, 2012 by Sloan Vazquez LLC (Irvine, CA) with the full cooperation of both Recology and South Bay Recycling (SBR). The full sampling report can be found in **Attachment A**.

Both the route or truck to be sampled and the location of the material pulled out of the load are selected completely at random. The sampling process is to randomly pull out approximately 175 pounds of material from each randomly selected collection vehicle (i.e., this amount ranges from 125 to 225 pounds depending on the material type). These 175 pound samples are taken from 12 different collection vehicles for each material stream per the requirements to achieve statistically significant or accurate results per Franchise Agreement Attachment E-2. The material from each sample is then required to be divided into two basic categories which includes both acceptable and unacceptable items. (However, beginning with the 2011 Third Quarter Sampling, Sloan Vazquez is separating most material streams into as many as twelve categories to provide additional pertinent data on the composition of the samples.) The definitions and other sections of the Franchise Agreement(s) primarily govern how this process will unfold; however, the SBWMA, Sloan Vazquez, Recology and SBR all worked closely to develop a more detailed approach (i.e., actual policy and procedures for the sampling process) to get this work done accurately and cost effectively; this is captured in a document shown in **Attachment B**. It is important to note that targeted recyclables materials such as paper are deemed a contaminant if they contain too much moisture; the actual language is found on page 2 of **Attachment B** and states: "Clumped, wet paper ('wringable', exhibiting free-flowing liquid and drips is considered contaminated; dampness and sheets of paper loosely stuck together is acceptable").

Table 1 below lists the material types and number of samples measured from each.

**Table 1**  
**2012 Fourth Quarter Material Types and Number of Samples**

<u>Material</u>	<u>Total Number of Samples Measured</u>
Commercial Targeted Recyclable Materials	12
Commercial Organic Materials	12
Commercial Plant Materials	12
Residential Targeted Recyclable Materials	12
Residential Organic Materials	12
Total	60

**2012 Fourth Quarter Sampling Results**

Four of the five material types sampled complied with the allowable contamination thresholds prescribed in the Franchise Agreement(s). Only the Commercial Targeted Recyclable Materials category exceeded the allowable contamination threshold. Table 2 provides the allowable contamination thresholds, the results from the 2012 Fourth Quarter sampling (i.e., measured contamination level) and the percent difference for each material type.

**Table 2**  
**2012 Fourth Quarter Sampling Results**

<u>Material</u>	<u>Allowable Maximum Contamination Level</u>	<u>Measured Contamination Level</u>	<u>Percent Difference</u>
Commercial Targeted Recyclable Materials (CR)	8.0%	9.1%	1.1%
Commercial Organic Materials (CO)	10.0%	3.7%	- 6.3% <sup>2</sup>
Commercial Plant Materials (CP)	5.0%	0.2%	- 4.8% <sup>2</sup>
Residential Targeted Recyclable Materials (RR)	8.5% <sup>1</sup>	8.1%	-0.4%
Residential Organic Materials (RO)	5.0%	2.2%	- 2.8% <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Residential Targeted Recyclable Materials Maximum Allowable Contamination Level for years 2-10 (i.e., 2012 – 2020) of the Recology Franchise Agreement(s) was established as the average percentage measured for all four quarters in 2011.

<sup>2</sup> No disincentive payments are associated with results that are at or below the allowable maximum contamination levels.

The ramifications to the SBWMA of Recology failing to deliver material to the SEC that is consistently equal to or under the allowable contamination thresholds are primarily fiscal. This is the fundamental rationale for including the contamination related provisions in both the Recology Franchise Agreement(s) and the contract with South Bay Recycling. The presence of unacceptable materials or contamination in the recyclable materials collected by Recology results in additional disposal costs and potentially reduced commodity revenue for the SBWMA. The per ton disincentive payments that must be paid by Recology for exceeding the maximum allowable contamination level for any of the five material categories are prescribed in the Franchise Agreement(s) Attachment I - Performance Incentives and Disincentives.

### **Background**

In 2007, the Board approved staff's recommendation to ensure that a comprehensive contamination management program would be included in both the future Franchise Agreement and SEC Operations Agreement. The primary rationale for this recommendation was to control costs for the SBWMA as excessive contamination increases disposal and processing costs and can also result in reduced commodity revenue. Subsequently, the Collection Services and Facility Operations RFPs were issued with provisions mitigating the impact of contamination on both the SBWMA and Member Agencies. Thus, the Franchise Agreement(s) with Recology and the SEC Operations Agreement with SBR both include specific provisions and associated monetary penalties to reduce contamination as much as possible.

The Franchise Agreement(s) with Recology contain provisions in section 6.02 and Attachment I (Performance Incentives and Disincentives) that explains the maximum contamination levels and how monetary penalties associated with exceeding these levels would be calculated. In addition, Attachment E-2 (Contamination Measurement Methodology: Quarterly Protocol) prescribes in detail the sampling methodology and statistical rationale supporting implementation of this methodology that is used to measure contamination on a quarterly basis.

### **Fiscal Impact**

The fiscal impact to the SBWMA for the results of the 2012 Fourth Quarter Contamination Sampling will be a payment due from Recology to the SBWMA of approximately \$5,000 for excessive contamination levels in the commercial recycling materials. The exact amount will be calculated by Recology and payment is owed with submittal of the company's Fourth Quarter 2012 Report due on April 30, 2013.

### **Attachment:**

Attachment A – Sloan Vazquez LLC Fourth Quarter 2012 Contamination Measurement Sampling Report

Attachment B – Appendix A: Materials Sorting List



---

## **Agenda Item 5C**

### **Results of 2012 4th Quarter Recology Franchise Agreement(s) Quarterly Contamination Measurements for Loads of Recyclable Materials, Organic Materials and Plant Materials**

#### **Attachment A – Sloan Vazquez LLC Fourth Quarter 2012 Contamination Measurement Sampling Report**

#### **Attachment B – Appendix A: Materials Sorting List**

---

Files too large to be included in packet Posted on Website: [www.rethinkwaste.org](http://www.rethinkwaste.org)

- Attachment A: Sloan Vazquez LLC Fourth Quarter 2012 Contamination Measurement Sampling Report
- Attachment B: Appendix A: Materials Sorting List



## STAFF REPORT

---

**To:** SBWMA Board Members  
**From:** Cliff Feldman, Recycling Programs Manager  
Hilary Gans, Facility Operations Contracts Manager  
**Date:** January 24, 2013 Board of Directors Meeting  
**Subject:** Receipt of Recology and SBR Monthly Reports

---

### Recommendation

This is an informational report and no action is necessary.

### Analysis

Recology San Mateo County (Recology) and South Bay Recycling (SBR) are required to submit monthly reports. Both companies submitted their Monthly on time. These Monthly Reports are due 15 days after the end of each month. Recology's and SBR's monthly reports for November and December 2012 are attached.

It's important to note that the tonnage information presented in Recology's Monthly Report is derived from data compiled by SBR as the Shoreway Environmental Center facility operator. Therefore, regarding the reporting of tonnage, the Recology and SBR reports are redundant. In addition, the SBR report provides details on the transfer station and buy-back center activities and therefore includes more facility tonnage data than the Recology Monthly Report. Recology's report includes collection data, monthly updates on various operations, and call center complaint/inquiry related metrics.

### Background

Article 9, section 9.05 of the Member Agencies Franchise Agreement(s) with RSMC require the company to prepare and submit a monthly report. Similarly, Article 8, section 8.07 of the Operations Agreement between the SBWMA and SBR requires the company to submit a monthly report. The guidelines and reporting requirements for each company are specified in their respective Agreements.

### Attachments:

Attachment A - Recology November 2012 Monthly Report  
Attachment B - SBR November 2012 Monthly Report  
Attachment C - Recology December 2012 Monthly Report  
Attachment D - SBR December 2012 Monthly Report



---

**Agenda Item 5D**  
**Receipt of Recology and SBR Monthly Reports**

**Attachment A – Recology November 2012 Monthly Report**

**Attachment B – SBR November 2012 Monthly Report**

**Attachment C – Recology December 2012 Monthly Report**

**Attachment D – SBR December 2012 Monthly Report**

---

Files too large to be included in packet Posted on Website: [www.rethinkwaste.org](http://www.rethinkwaste.org)

- Attachment A: Recology November 2012 Monthly Report
- Attachment B: SBR November 2012 Monthly Report
- Attachment C: Recology December 2012 Monthly Report
- Attachment D: SBR December 2012 Monthly Report