

MINUTES

SOUTH BAYSIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
May 9, 2019 – 2:00PM.
San Carlos Library Conference Room A

Call to Order: 2:10PM

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. Executive Director's Update

Executive Director La Mariana welcomed everyone to the meeting and made the following announcements:

- By the May Board Meeting the disposal numbers will be a known entity for financial and operational planning.
- The Bond Refunding project now has 4 Member Agencies who've approved the bonds, and by the Board meeting 11 of the 12 will have voted on the bonds. He noted that Atherton has decided to solicit for collection services and they would not be voting on the bond refunding.
- The new financial services contract begins July 1 with the City of Redwood City, and staff is working on the transition.
- The June TAC meeting will be the final TAC discussion on the Long-Range Plan, the County will give a presentation on their plastic server ware ban, the 2018 Cal Recycle EARs will be reviewed, and there will be an update on SB1383. Executive Director La Mariana asked TAC members to send an alternate if they were not able to attend.

4. 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. Approval of Minutes from the March 14, 2019 TAC Meeting

Motion/Second: Ramirez/Daher

Voice Vote: All in Favor

5. Discussion on Draft Long-Range Plan

Staff Ligon thanked TAC members for their survey feedback. He gave a Power Point presentation and went over the process to date, project highlights and revised timeline. He asked for feedback on the use of icons, expanded realms and revised mission statement.

The TAC Members gave mission statement feedback, noting that a mission statement doesn't need examples those should be saved for principles. They liked putting public health above economics and thought the mission statement should be listed in order of priority. They liked the term solid waste management, not recycling programs, and they didn't like the term rot.

The TAC members discussed the proposed guiding principles. They didn't like the word strive and discussed if the goal of zero waste should be a goal or not but not to use the word strive. They noted that premium choices come at a higher cost, and there may be ways to word the guiding principles to meet in the middle. They noted that broader language helps to keep the Agency more agile and allows for Member Agencies' climate action plans to push the SBWMA's programs and policies.

The TAC discussed the zero waste principles and gave feedback. Overall, they agreed that the bullet points should be in priority order. They also wanted to prioritize leveraging resources and zero waste infrastructure. They didn't like the phrase "adhere to" and wanted an active word instead of adhere. They wanted to prioritize the principles that had to do with meeting mandates before those that went further.

The TAC discussed whether as a group they wanted the Long-Range Plan to focus on zero waste principles, so they would have that consistently in their thoughts when giving feedback on the draft long-range plan. Generally, they agreed with the zero waste principles but there was concern over how achievable it would be, knowing that there isn't a market for all of the material now, and how to reduce what already exists. Steve Sherman suggested that the Long-Range Plan include waste reduction targets on a pounds per person per day or volume. Another suggestion was to go carbon free or carbon reduction instead of zero waste.

Staff Ligon asked for feedback on the one page hand out as soon as possible and that the full draft would be available for feedback by May 22.

6. Discussion on the Shoreway Operations Agreement with South Bay Recycling (SBR) expiring 12/31/20

Executive Director La Mariana introduced the item, and Staff Gans gave the details. He noted that the contract expires in 1 ½ years, there is extension language in the contract that the agency can decide to

execute at the current term for 1 to 3 years. So, the Agency needs to make a decision about going out to RFP or extending. He gave some details of the SBR contract:

- The SBWMA has a good deal with SBR. In 2009 there were 7 bidders and SBR was over \$1M lower than the next lowest bid, and it's not a cost plus contract, the contract is only increased by CPI.
- SBR has provided excellent services, they are able to move large volumes of material on a reliable basis.
- SBR has had a cooperative approach with the SBWMA, noting their response after the fire, and the China commodity market issue, as well as their assistance in developing the capital projects being funded by the bonds.
- There are no obvious better alternatives.
- The operations agreement document is a robust and precise instrument that is working really well.
- Now is not the best time to go into negotiations with the commodity markets at their lowest given the revenue share approach to these contracts.
- There is a benefit to doing construction and facility upgrades with a competent experienced operator, and if the three-year option was exercised SBR would be the operator until the completion of the MRF upgrades.
- An RFP makes more sense after the capital upgrades are complete.

Staff Gans then asked for the TAC's feedback.

Executive Director La Mariana added that the SBR contract is with the SBWMA on the Member Agency's behalf not with the individual Member Agencies. He noted that there are two decisions to make. 1) do we exercise the 3-year options or not, and 2) what about after those options should they be exercised.

Dwight Herring of SBR added that SBR is interested in continuing the relationship that has been collaborative and positive and would like to continue the partnership for as long as possible. He did note that the CPI adjustment is a federal CPI, and they would like to look at a more local CPI adjustment.

The TAC agreed that with the risky time to go out to RFP, and the great partnership with SBR the extension options should be exercised. They did ask to see if there were comparable RFPs out there to compare to, to show rate payers that due diligence was done. They suggested a presentation to the Board on what SBR's responsibilities are and the value they bring to the SBWMA.

7. Discussion on Amendment One Modifications to the Model Recology Amended and Restated Franchise Agreement

A. Presentation by C/CAG Countywide Stormwater Program Manager, Matt Fabry

Matt Fabry gave background and overview of the Stormwater pollution regulations affecting the Franchise Agreement Amendment One discussion. He noted that the regulations are coming from the state control board that issues the Municipal Regional Permit, which covers everything that can cause a problem with stormwater. One of those is trash which has been targeted by the regulating board and in the second term of the permit the regulations required a 70% reduction by July 1, 2018, and 80% by July 1 of 2020. He added there is a goal which falls outside of the existing term of the permit to get to 100% by July 2022. He discussed what 100% means, noting that in 2009 baseline numbers were established by the Bay Area Storm Management Associations via assessments of how much trash was in catch basins, visual assessments, and using other factors like land use types and socio economic factors to create land use space loading maps to figure out how much trash was coming off the urban environment. The Water Board has accepted these maps which have been categorized from low, which is green, moderate, which

is yellow, high, which is red, and very high which is purple. The goal of 100% is to change the maps everywhere to green. He added that there are different sources of trash litter, but they do know that the collection process especially with overfilled bins is part of the problem of contributing trash into the environment. And this Franchise Agreement Extension process is an ideal time to get the recommended language into the Franchise Agreements to reduce litter happening through the collection process. He concluded that there are two ways to get to green on the maps. 1) Install full trash capture devices, areas where these are installed are automatically green, and 2) If trash capture won't work in your Agency's system, there is a combination of things that count like bag bans, but then Agency's are responsible for going out and doing inspections to verify that the measures in place are actually reducing litter in the landscape.

Executive Director La Mariana gave an overview of the 7 recommended Franchise Agreement Extension changes that are part of the Amendment One decision process, and specifically the 5 that are related to litter reduction as part of the storm water regulations.

The TAC discussed the issue of cameras for overages in containers. Cameras are very expensive. Member Daher wants the photos to document the overages especially for repeat and excessive overage. Executive Director La Mariana noted that the cameras would not be immediate. They wouldn't be able to be implemented until the fleet needed to be replaced and the cost is not just the cameras, but the software and the management and all the back-end reporting.

The County is trying to get to a county wide number on how much storm water compliance is costing, so Member Lee asked that those cost be broken down by jurisdiction. The TAC then discussed the costs associated with storm water compliance and asked about a County wide tax to help pay for compliance. Matt Fabry noted that there isn't a storm water utility with a Prop 218 process, which is why they suggested the approach of paying for it through the garbage rate and street sweeping infrastructure that already exists. Anything storm water specific would have to go through the balloting process.

Vice Chair Murray noted that San Mateo's Franchise Agreement says that lids must be closed, and no overages are allowed, and they've also upgraded the street sweeping. Matt Fabry concluded that there a lot of different tools in the toolbox the Agencies can use to get credit toward meeting the regulations in the Permit.

8. Contractor Updates

- A. Recology – No Report
- B. South Bay Recycling – No Report

9. TAC Member Comments

10. Adjourn 4:00PM