



**MINUTES**

**SOUTH BAYSIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY  
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

May 12, 2016 – 2:00 p.m.  
San Carlos Library Conference Room A

**Call to Order: 2:06PM**

**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 March 14, 2016 TAC Meeting Minutes**

Member Rodericks made a motion to approve the minutes  
Member Murray seconded the motion  
Voice Vote: All in Favor

**4. Discuss the Plan and Recommended Process for Supporting Member Agencies with Negotiation a Potential Franchise Agreement Extension with Recology**

**A. Update on Member Agency Notice of Commitment to Participate in the Franchise Agreement Extension Negotiations (Staff Update)**

Staff Feldman gave an update as to the Member Agencies that have agreed to participate in the Franchise Agreement Extension Negotiation Process, and asked TAC Members from Agencies who've

not yet notified of their status. Menlo Park would be going to council on May 24, Redwood City and San Mateo voted on May 2, San Carlos approved on May 9, and West Bay Sanitary District was still outstanding, but was the last one.

B. Recology San Mateo County 2011 - 2015 Self-Assessment (*Discussion item*)

Chair Oskoui noted that items B and C could be discussed together, and asked the Committee how they would like to discuss the two.

Staff Feldman gave an introduction to the Recology Self-Assessment noting that these two items are brought to the TAC for discussion as part of the Plan and Recommended Process that was approved. In that approved plan Recology would have the opportunity to perform a critical self-evaluation, and self-review of their service thus far. He noted that this report has already been provided to the Board, and staff will not be providing any written comments unless the TAC discussion today warrants it.

Mike Kelly of Recology commented that the report provided an opportunity to highlight what Recology has accomplished in the first 5 years, identify some of the struggles at the beginning of the contract, and highlight the proud employee ownership in San Mateo County. He noted that he hoped it came across that Recology is proud to be here in the SBWMA service area.

C. SBWMA High-Level Review of Recology's Performance 2011-2015 (*Discussion item*)

Staff Feldman gave a background of the high level review that staff put together, noting that it was meant to be exactly that, a high level review, and noted that staff did not get into all of the individual contract compliance pieces. He added that staff tried to look at the bigger picture within the context of the contractor selection process in two steps, one, the roll out and two, since the roll out. He added that the report highlights the differences between the initial roll out and the tremendous efforts made in the first year, and what has happened since. He added that the goal from this discussion is to produce a final report that goes to the Board at the May Board meeting.

Chair Oskoui asked for an explanation of the discrepancies in section 3B regarding liquidated damages between the audited numbers versus the self-reported numbers.

Staff Feldman explained that the details of what is found in the audits versus what the Board ultimately approves are contained in the actual audit reports of Recology and aspects of SBR's operations. He noted that it is an annual audit. Once the audit is completed the results are shared with Recology and SBR some of the results are objected to, and there is a negotiation process on the objections, then a final audit that both parties agree to is produced that adjusts the originally reported numbers.

Chair Oskoui commented that he would like to see a paragraph added to the report that explains the variance because just seeing the tables the discrepancy is not explained.

Member Cook asked how the suggested improvements in section 3E get incorporated.

Staff Feldman answered that the improvements are taken out of the yearly audit report, so when the next year's audit is completed the suggestions for improvement from the previous year are checked to see if they have been implemented.

Vice Chair Rodericks asked for clarification on whether the suggestions in the high level review are

suggestions that have been agreed to be implemented by Recology.

Staff Feldman answered yes, they are an abridged version.

Chair Oskoui asked if the recommendations have been implemented and are completed, and suggested that if they are completed to list which have been completed and which are still ongoing in the review.

Staff Feldman answered that by and large they have been implemented.

Member Cook asked for further explanation of the last sentence of the second to last paragraph on page 17 of the report regarding additional gains in reducing disposal may need to be made.

Staff Feldman answered several years ago the state changed AB939 compliance from a flat 50% diversion which included a calculation of what is composted, what is recycled and how much is disposed to a per capita disposal quantitative compliance measure. He noted that the report is trying to point out that given the new measurement formula the focus is by and large on disposal not necessarily how much is being recycled, so there is a significant emphasis on implementing what is being educated.

Member Cook asked if there were action plans in place to make the necessary gains in diversion given the new measurement.

Staff Feldman answered that the programs the SBWMA has in place are intended to reduce disposal, and if those gains aren't being made then a critical look needs to be taken as to why disposal is not being reduced. He also noted that there may be some factors beyond Recology's control. He added that there is a mixed waste processing system planned for the future they will go directly at the reduced disposal goals.

Member Cook asked for confirmation that based on the plans the SBWMA believes that this won't be an issue.

Staff Feldman answered that SBWMA future plans are addressing that issue, and the statement in the review is meant to say that through collection services, and other means the SBWMA service area needs to further reduce disposal in order to achieve higher compliance.

Chair Oskoui commented that given that this is an audit of Recology's contract, are there things that should be considered as we look at the next contract.

Staff Feldman answered that the data presented in the report shows that disposal has flattened out over the last three year, and recycling is not increasing. He added that the contractual tools are in place through incentives to drive more recycling and less disposal, but the data shows that the ball is not getting hit out of the park.

Member Abrams asked how Member Agencies could look at it in terms of a contract extension.

Staff Feldman answered that similar to the process in the past all the Member Agencies will be surveyed as to what they'd like to see changed in a new uniform franchise agreement, and staff will be working with Recology to get proposals on the various items, one of which could be changes to the incentives/disincentives model or changes to the base lines.

Member Porter asked if staff would also be soliciting suggestions from Recology as well in terms of what they would recommend to move the dial on recycling.

Staff Feldman answered that staff views the negotiation as a cooperative process, and the ultimate goal is a uniform franchise agreement that everyone can agree with.

Member La Mariana added that considering the Agency's Long Range Plan there are a lot of projects and programs that have been committed to that will help move the diversion dial.

Chair Oskoui asked for next steps.

Staff Feldman answered that a final review will be presented to the Board at the May board meeting, and then it could go to the governing bodies of the Member Agencies as they see fit, along with the Member Agency snap shot reports that will give the tables and data for individual agencies.

## **5. TAC Member Comments**

Member Walter asked for an outline and timeline for the next 3 to 6 months as it relates to the Ad Hoc Committee, and when will there be recommendations made to the Board or each of the Member Agencies.

Staff Feldman answered that the Ad Hoc Committee hasn't met yet, and staff has not meet with Recology yet. He noted that a meeting is scheduled with Recology for next week, the idea is to meet with them before the Ad Hoc Committee, to get a road map of how they want to move proposals through their corporate offices. After the meeting with Recology there will be a meeting with the Ad Hoc Committee, and part of the initial meeting with the Ad Hoc committee would be reaching out to each Member Agency to get their wish list for recommended changes, what they think is and is not working, and ideas for the future agreement. He noted that he hopes to meet with the Ad Hoc committee in the next 2 to 3 weeks.

Member Murray asked if there were results from the split body pilot.

Mike Kelly of Recology answered that the reality was that it was not as efficient as they had hoped. They had hoped to get over 500 homes per route with a dual collection vehicle, and they were able to get about 360, and it ended up adding more routes.

Gino Gasparini of Recolgo added that split body trucks often work in situations that may be distance oriented, where carts are similar in sizes and at equal capacity, but with the variances in our service area there were issues.

Member La Mariana asked if the results of the split body pilot would be reported out at the next Board Meeting.

Staff Feldman answered that it would be in the next Long Range Plan update.

Member La Mariana gave some industry updates, noting that Scott Smithline was being confirmed as the Cal Recycle Executive Director, and SWANA is hosting a workshop called Municipal Contracts 101 on June 22 in Fremont.

## **6. Adjourn 2:39PM**

