



**MINUTES**

**SOUTH BAYSIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY  
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
April 9, 2015 – 2:00 p.m.  
San Carlos Library Conference Room**

**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	

**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 October 9, 2014 TAC Meeting Minutes

Motion/Second: LaMariana/Murray

Voice Vote: All in Favor

**4. Review of Draft 2015 Long Range Plan**

Executive Director McCarthy commented that the Draft Long Range Plan Document was being restructured for the April 23<sup>rd</sup> Board Meeting, mostly to reduce the size. He also announced that the April Board meeting would be a joint Board/TAC meeting focused on the budget. He then went through the presentation given at the 3/26/15 Board Meeting, and noted that the focus of the Long Range Plan is

primarily AB341 and how to get to the 75% diversion goal.

Vice Chair Rodericks asked which agency would get the AB32 credits if Recology moved to a CNG fleet, would it be San Carlos because the facility is in San Carlos, or would the Member Agencies get it too.

Executive Director McCarthy answered that he wasn't sure he'd have to look into that.

Member Murray noted that all of San Mateo's environmental requirements for AB32 went through San Carlos, but that she had to give individual emissions information.

Vice Chair Rodericks asked what office space at Shoreway would look like for the SBWMA staff, and wondered if it would be new or existing space.

Executive Director McCarthy answered that both new space and remodeling existing space are options laid out in the Long Range Plan, but that both are tied into options around the mixed waste processing system.

Vice Chair Rodericks asked if there was or could be a revenue component to the CNG system.

Staff Gans answered that the CNG system would be designed for our facility's needs, and can either be designed with fast flow or slow flow. With slow flow the trucks would get refueled overnight, but it would have to be designed as fast flow if there was a merchant component.

Member LaMarina asked if slow flow was even feasible with at 200 truck fleet.

Staff Gans answered yes.

Member LaMariana asked if there had been any discussion about CNG availability.

Staff Gans answered that he had been discussing it with Clean Energy and that it didn't seem to be an issue.

Member Murray asked how long the processing time was for the Mixed Waste Processing system, and how big it was.

Staff Gans answered that the processing time was about 3 minutes total, and that it would take up about 1/4 of the existing north-side of the transfer station, that it would go about 30 feet out (to the west) towards highway 101.

Member Clark questioned where the labor costs were in the Mixed Waste Processing system analysis.

Executive Director McCarthy answered that the additional personnel would be in the operating expense line item.

Member LaMariana asked what type of peer review was involved developing the plan for the Mixed Waste Processing System.

Executive Director McCarthy noted that Staff Gans, and contractor Joe Sloan were brought in first, followed by Staff Moran and himself and then SBR Dwight Herring and Dan Domonoske all vetted the project.

Vice Chair Rodericks asked for more information on the thinking about split-body collection vehicles noting that intuitively he thought that would make more trips.

Gino Gasparini of Recology that a split-body vehicle would get a whole truck off the streets, even though it would be servicing less households it would be two trucks instead of 3 servicing a home.

Executive Director McCarthy noted that the reason it is earmarked as a pilot program is that it needs to be tested to see if the quantiles of material make it worthwhile. He noted that several Cities have also done pilot programs, and some have gone forward and some have not, and if the material wasn't evenly collected.

Gino Gasparini added that San Francisco uses split-body vehicles, so there are advantages.

Member Murray questioned how an every other week pilot or program would work with a split body collection vehicle, she also asked if it would mean changing the cart size options.

Executive Director McCarthy acknowledged that it would be a fundamental change. Recology would have to reroute the service area, and Member Agencies would have to completely reform their rate structures. He noted that there are many unpredictable questions which is why a pilot program is recommended first, and then if every other week collection works the change would occur with the new contracts.

Member Murray wondered what the current law stated with regards to every other week collection and if it was a state or local law.

Vice Chair Rodericks commented that non-inerts need to be picked up every 7 days.

Staff Gans noted that it would be the County LEA that would approve every other week collection.

Member Murray commented that every other week collection didn't seem to have much benefit.

Executive Director McCarthy commented that there a lot of operational cost savings, and too many potential upsides to not at least try it, but acknowledged that there might be too many barriers too, which would keep it from ever happening.

Member Clark commented that she was concerned about air quality safety for the sorters working on the Mixed Waste Processing System.

Staff Gans replied that the system hasn't been built yet, and that OSHA would regulate that.

Executive Director McCarthy noted that an air conditioning and/or filtering system was not required on the MRF side.

**5. Recology San Mateo County 2014 Revenue Reconciliation**

Staff Moran gave an overview of the 2014 revenue reconciliation report, and noted that the revenue was slightly better than estimated at 0.2% rate impact, noting that each Member Agency would have slight differences.

**6. TAC Member Comments**

Staff Devincenzi invited TAC Members to attend and help promote the Annual Earth Day at Shoreway event being held Saturday, April 11, from 10a.m. to 2p.m.

**7. Adjourn 3:15PM**