



**MINUTES**

SOUTH BAYSIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY  
 MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
 February 13, 2014 – 2:00 p.m.  
 San Carlos Library Conference Room A

**Call to Order: 2:07 PM**

**1. 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 (late)	

**2. 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.

None

**3. 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 January 13, 2014 TAC Meeting Minutes

Motion/Second: Gibbons/Murray

Voice Vote: All in favor

**4. New Business:**

A. Additional Third Party Tons into the Shoreway Environmental Center MRF

Executive Director McCarthy noted that the facility was designed for additional processing capacity and that when the Board approved accepting 3<sup>rd</sup> party tons, there were conditions including a host fee and limited to 15,000 tons. He added that Recology would like to commit additional tons into the facility from outside the service area, which is good news, but the tons would require a second shift, and there are concerns that the space may not be big enough, and that the VRS contract isn't finalized. He explained

that this is why staff is recommending a 6 month approval for now to assess how the facility is handling the capacity and the second shift.

Member Porter asked what the possible facility upgrades needed would be.

Executive Director McCarthy explained that a canopy may need to be added to extend the tipping floor, because the extra tons may not fit, noting that the facility permit doesn't allow material to be stored outside.

Member Porter asked to do a lifecycle cost analysis to ensure the extra tons would make a profit.

Executive Director McCarthy stated that with the current arrangement the profit is \$3.70/ton. He added that the plan is to try and negotiate a higher host fee.

Chair Oskoui recommended increasing the host fee to cover the cost of the facility improvements, and asked if there was a termination clause.

Executive Director McCarthy answered yes there is a termination clause.

Member Walter asked if there was a planned outreach approach to get the tons into the facility in the short 6 month time frame.

Executive Director McCarthy noted that the request is solely based on tons Recology has already committed, and that Recology would like a long term agreement, but staff is recommending this 6 month assessment period to start with.

#### B. Review of Draft Ordinance Implementing a Recycling Permit System for Commercial Recyclers

Staff Feldman gave an overview of why the SBWMA would want to implement a permit system for commercial recyclers. He noted that it is not related to AB939 compliance, but is to help fill in a complete picture of commercial diversion in the SBWMA service area.

Counsel Lanzone explained that he needed more time to look at it, and that he thought of it more as an information reporting system, which is well within the powers of the JPA. He noted that the ordinance should include a civil administrative penalty and cut back on enforcement. He added that the idea would be for the haulers to provide information electronically to the SBWMA. He noted that he would redo the ordinance and that the next steps would be to send a new draft to the TAC members and City Attorneys.

Member Murray asked if the ordinance would only be adopted by the SBWMA, or if the individual cities would adopt it. She also commented that it could be pretty expensive to do the outreach, and expressed concern over how many haulers would be subject to this, noting that it could be hundreds, and asked if the haulers would know how to report the information.

Counsel Lanzone answered that only the SBWMA would adopt the ordinance.

Staff Feldman added that the more reporting the better, the more haulers reporting the more accurate the diversion number becomes. He acknowledged that getting the ordinance in the field is the hardest part, and added that staff could help haulers fill out the information.

Member Galli asked how the penalties would be applied and expressed concern over the language in the ordinance stating that if a business doesn't comply with the reporting they wouldn't be able to do business in the City.

Counsel Lanzone answered that the penalties would be applied via letter asking for reporting, and that he planned to remove the language about not being able to do business.

Chair Oskoui noted that the permit fee should cover the administrative costs of the ordinance.

Vice Chair Rodericks asked if the reporting information would be given by jurisdiction.

Staff Feldman answered that the reporting system will be set up to get the information jurisdictionally, but that it might not happen.

Member Porter commented that there is a lot of value in each Agency knowing, and would like to see if information can be collected by jurisdiction.

Member Porter commented that there should be some kind of penalty for not registering and reporting.

Chair Oskoui suggested a lot of public relations with Board members and community, and to be clear what the goals and benefits are to businesses.

Staff Feldman noted that the plan was to host workshops with the business community before implementing the ordinance.

Member Murray thought an incentive component would be a good idea and suggested that participating haulers become recommended haulers in each Agency.

Member Walter asked for clarification on how a hauler would be defined.

Executive Director McCarthy explained that back haulers would be on the list of haulers.

Member Galli suggested making it clear why the information is needed and how the ordinance will be enforced at the community meetings.

Chair Oskoui suggested including an implementation plan when this item is presented to the Board.

## **5. Staff Updates**

### **A. Potential Future Agenda Items**

Executive Director McCarthy gave an overview of what the TAC could look for on future agendas. Noting specifically that April, May and June would be the budget process and that in April staff would be coming to the TAC for feedback on FY15 programs, and that at the moment staff is heavily into research and benchmarking to see what similar agencies are doing.

## **6. TAC Member Comments**

## **7. Adjourn 3:04PM**