



MINUTES

SOUTH BAYSIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY
 MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
 October 8, 2015 – 2:00 p.m.
 San Carlos Library Conference Room A

Call to Order: 2:05 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	

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 September 10, 2015 TAC Meeting Minutes

A correction was made to the minutes via a phone call with Member Gibbons

Member Murray made a motion to approve the minutes with that correction

Member Porter seconded the motion

Voice Vote: All in Favor

4. Consideration of Approval of Plan and Recommended Process for Supporting Member Agencies with Negotiating a Potential Franchise Agreement Extension with Recology San Mateo County

Chair Oskoui noted that a subcommittee of TAC members met and discussed the process.

Executive Director McCarthy gave additional background noting that he suggested a smaller group discuss the pros and cons and get more detail. He then went over the amended and more detailed key assumptions, noting:

- This documents outlines a process for entering into negotiations with Recology for an extension for all Member Agencies. He noted that a Member Agency could decide not to move forward with an extension.
- JPA staff would help negotiate the future contract that would apply to all the member agencies, and Staff could assist with individual Member Agency changes as requested.
- For any changes that are being considered the JPA staff would provide rate/revenue analysis.
- The process would include as much time as possible in 2017 for giving individual presentations to City Councils.
- If a Member Agency decides not to move forward with a contract extension with Recology, the JPA staff would take the lead in managing the RFP process.

Member Cooke asked if the subcommittee discussed any assumptions around engagement.

Executive Director McCarthy answered that is was not discussed at the subcommittee level, but the process is designed to give each member agency plenty of time for engagement.

Member Ramirez asked why there is not one contract for the JPA with Recology.

Executive Director McCarthy gave a bit of history noted that for some reason a split in the rate application happened before his time at the JPA, and adding that elected officials want to have local control over the decisions.

Member Galli asked for clarification on the timeline and how many times it would go to Member Agencies Councils.

Member Porter noted that at some point each Agency needs to say whether they are in or out.

Chair Oskoui commented that each Agency needs their own timeline.

Member Galli noted that she had spoken with her Board Member and he is interested in moving forward with Recology, so she thought that Foster City's path might be more direct than the time line in the staff report.

Chair Oskoui noted that the outlined process did not include a path if the agency got to a point in the negotiations that lead to a deal breaker.

Executive Director McCarthy pointed out that all of those negotiations and cost projections will happen in 2016, so that there will be plenty of time for an RFP process if necessary.

Member Galli asked if there would be a drop dead date.

Executive Director McCarthy answered yes, but it's been left vague for the Board to be held accountable.

Motion: Member Porter made a motion to approve the recommended process for supporting Member Agencies with negotiating potential Franchise Agreement Extension with Recology.

Second: Member Murray
Voice Vote: All in favor

5. TAC Member Comments

The TAC Members had a discussion on rate alignment, and Executive Director McCarthy noted that he would send a link to the SF Environment pricing model as a reference.

6. Adjourn 2:46PM