



MINUTES

SOUTH BAYSIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY
 MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
 October 9, 2014 – 2:00 p.m.
 San Carlos Library Conference Room A

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 13, 2014 TAC Meeting Minutes

Motion/Second: Murray/LaMariana
 Voice Vote: All in Favor

4. New Business:

A. Update on Long Range Plan and Discussion on Existing Programs and Infrastructure

Executive Director McCarthy gave an overview of the staff report, noting that the purpose was to seek TAC feedback on current programs, and that the staff report included information on current programs and whether to keep, change or eliminate them. He also noted that policy options will be discussed in

phase 2, and will be on the final list. He explained that this long range plan document is about programs and infrastructure and not about the Franchise and Operations agreements, noting that the process for looking at those agreements would start about 9 months to a year from now.

Member Murray asked if a wet/dry system was considered.

Executive Director McCarthy answered that staff, Recology and SBR did not assume any fundamental changes in the current collection system. He noted that the Member Agencies spent \$120M on this system which is producing really good results. He added that it was discussed, but that the group didn't want to go that route and likely degrade the value of the material being recycled.

Member Scott asked for clarification around glass storage options, and wondered if it would affect how glass was collected.

Executive Director McCarthy answered that there are operational challenges around how glass is handled at the facility, so the thought is to look at process improvements to see if there is something that can be done to improve the process, noting that nothing would change in the way it was collected.

Member Scott asked if it was looked at in the building plans.

Executive Director McCarthy answered yes, and at the time it was thought that the process adopted was the best option, but staff would like to take another look at this point to see if there is a better option.

Member Scott asked if there was an equipment replacement fund.

Executive Director McCarthy answered that there was an equipment replacement fund in place, and noted that the Long Range Plan wasn't assuming any changes in funding, but is assuming some changes in equipment, as it will be time to replace some of it.

Member Scott questioned why the MRF was being expanded if it wasn't at full capacity.

Executive Director McCarthy answered that as part of the Board approving the additional tons they required a second shift, they also approved extending the tipping floor area because there isn't enough storage for the additional tons.

Dwight Herring of SBR noted that currently the facility is processing about 100,000 tons per year, and there is probably capacity for 10-15,000 additional tons per year.

Executive Director McCarthy added that the permit to operate our facility requires that all the material be inside, nothing can be outside.

Member LaMariana clarified that there is limitations in storage, as the material is being staged for wherever it is going next.

Member Scott asked for clarification about moving to a single waste stream.

Executive Director McCarthy answered that staff is investigating a project to recover wet waste at the transfer station, and as part of that other options for garbage are being considered including possible every other week garbage pickup.

Chair Oskoui expressed concern that the law required garbage to be picked up at least every 7 days.

Executive Director McCarthy answered that some large cities have done it on a trial basis, like the City of Portland, and that if our agency were to try every other week collection it would also be on a trial basis. He also added it would require San Mateo County Department of Health approval before a trial would start.

Chair Oskoui asked what the analysis on rates would be for every other week collection.

Staff Feldman answered that behavior changes would need to be closely monitored during the trial, because a decrease in the garbage collection by 50% only decreases Recology's cost by 1/6, but the rates are based on the size of the black cart, so the customer's perception would need to be monitored.

Executive Director McCarthy added that there is concern that people will put garbage in the blue or green cart, if they don't have capacity in the black cart, which is what happened in some of the cities that have tried it, so there would definitely be a pilot program to measure the effectiveness.

Member Scott wondered if there were other cost savings other than the route hours if a pilot program was initiated.

Staff Feldman answered that one of the reasons for doing a pilot of the program is to see what the benefits might be.

Executive Director McCarthy added that page 2 of the staff report lists things to staff would like to get more data on, and that there is a window to try things and make recommendations for changes.

Member Scott noted that changes are scary because many Member Agencies had such big rate increases in 2012.

Executive Director McCarthy acknowledged that any new idea would go through a vetting process to improve efficiencies and lower costs.

Member Murray suggested that the Member Agencies look at how the service is being charged.

Executive Director McCarthy noted that it would be smart to review because almost every agency has a commercial subsidy of residential rates.

Chair Oskoui asked about the possibility of embedded bar codes on carts and scales on trucks.

Executive Director McCarthy answered that staff would like to see that tested, because rate models could be changed to charge on usage rather than size of cart.

Member Augustine noted that the truck scales didn't make it to the summary page.

Member Scott asked if recycling would be weighed too with the scale system.

Executive Director McCarthy noted that if operationally the scale system work then rate systems could be built around that information and staff could go from there.

Mario Puccinelli added that currently Recology is test driving scales on the mechanical arms, and that it's very new technology.

Executive Director McCarthy added that this would be a fundamental change for the residents and a complex rate system, but through the long range plan staff would like to see if there is a better way of structuring the rates.

Member Scott commented that he was not optimistic about the project, noting that it was complicated and the equipment would cost a lot.

Member Scott asked for clarification on the compressed natural gas test.

Executive Director McCarthy noted that anything of that nature would be implemented when there is a new contract with the service provider, but it is noted in the long range plan because with current natural gas prices, converting the collection fleet to CNG vehicles is a winner.

Member Scott asked Executive Director McCarthy to expand on the Admin building plans.

Executive Director McCarthy answered that as part of the long range plan staff is looking at relocating the admin building because with the existing infrastructure there is no more room at Shoreway. The MRF is at capacity, and with the organics to energy project and other possible changes more room will be needed in the transfer station, and the only places to expand are to the east or west. In order to move west the current administration building would need to be relocated, and as it turns out Recology would rather be in the back where their operations are.

Chair Oskoui asked if there was a campus master plan team.

Executive Director McCarthy answered that JR Miller, the original architect for Shoreway, has been hired to give a cost evaluation of the ideas in the long range plan.

Member Scott asked if the building changes were related to when the contract renews or changes.

Executive Director McCarthy answered with the exception of the CNG project the infrastructure would be separate from the contractor, but the idea is to get preliminary numbers to see if the ideas in the long range plan make sense or don't.

Chair Oskoui asked if CNG gas would be delivered and wondered if the SBSA pipeline project offered a potential for methane gas.

Staff Gans answered that SBSA had approached him with a pipeline proposal of running a gas line to our facility, and running a slurry line to their facility, and that staff is thinking about the proposal but not sure if the timing will work out.

Member Scott asked if it would be enough gas for the Recology vehicles.

Staff Gans answered that he didn't know yet, it is not a simple process, and there are a lot of parts to the puzzle. SBSA is already using a lot of the gas to power their building. The engine manufacturer of Recology's trucks would also need to certify the gas to be OK to use in the trucks.

Member Scott asked when it would all happen.

Executive Director McCarthy answered that in March the Board will review the long range plan, and that timelines will be reviewed in phases.

Member Walter commented that staff should be sure the plans for Shoreway included planning for the periodic flooding that happens at the facility. He also asked Recology to comment on the latest in automated truck technology.

Mario Puccinelli answered that there are some new bodies and chassis, but nothing new in the way of automation.

Chair Oskoui questioned how the report on storm water waste, driving trash out of the road and water ways would be looked at.

Staff Feldman answered that the report would be forwarded to the Board, and discussed in relation to the long range plan.

Member Scott asked for more information on the public spaces pilot program.

Staff Feldman answered that the pilot program is happening in this year's budget and staff is looking for ways to improve the existing system.

Executive Director McCarthy noted that there are challenges with public spaces recycling because all the jurisdictions have handled it differently and Recology charges more if the bins are far from the curb. He acknowledged that there is probably not going to be a single solution.

Member LaMariana asked for more detail on implementing the coupon for the bulky item collection.

Executive Director McCarthy answered that this is a recommendation item and the customers would get a coupon to take items to the transfer station for free instead of having a bulky item collection, but the collection would still be available.

Staff Devincenzi added that the hope is that it will help with illegal dumping.

Mario Puccinelli added that some customers want their pick-ups on Saturday and this would be a solution.

Member LaMariana asked if adding carpet and textiles to the program was being looked at.

Staff Devincenzi answered that SBR has been working with vendors and will be taking it soon for recycling.

Member LaMariana noted that the County has gotten good feedback on those that have used the HHW program, but that not that many are using it, and wondered if there was something to help more people use the program.

Staff Feldman answered that when the program is promoted the usage numbers go up, and that the HHW program will continue to be promoted as long as there are funds available.

Staff Devincenzi added that our service area has one of the highest participation rates of the markets At Your Door serves.

Chair Oskoui noted that Belmont has gotten some calls from residents who've called Recology, but weren't then redirected to the HHW program; they were simply told that Recology doesn't pick it up.

Mario Puccinelli noted that he would look into that, because the customer service reps are trained to direct people to the HHW program.

Member Scott questioned if the program didn't have a high volume of users should dropping the program be considered, and wondered if it was worth adding it to the service options in attachment Q.

Executive Director McCarthy noted that it is a popular and well liked program from the comment cards we get back from the program participants. And noted that staff is going to explore other contractors and other options including possibly partnering with the County. He noted that the At Your Door contract is up in two years and they are looking for big increases.

Member LaMariana asked how the passage of AB1826 was going to be integrated into the RethinkWaste commercial programs.

Staff Devincenzi answered that a staff report was going to the Board on both AB 1594 and AB 1826 in the October packet. She noted that 1826 has a phased in approach, but there would be no change in programs, but there would be changes to public outreach.

5. TAC Member Comments

Executive Director McCarthy reminded TAC members of the Workshop on 11/6, and noted that there would be industry speakers there and asked TAC Members to sign up and come.

Executive Director McCarthy added that after the Board considers the long range plan in March, it will be time to look at the Franchise Agreements.

Chair Oskoui asked if the final plan would be coming back to the TAC before March.

Executive Director McCarthy noted that the Board doesn't have a consensus view on what the role of the TAC is, and the Board will be having a discussion on the role of the TAC to see if they can come to some sort of consensus.

Member LaMariana invited TAC Members to attend two county workshops, one on 10/15 a deconstruction workshop, and a volunteer academy on 11/1 and 11/8 on energy efficiency. He noted that these are at the San Mateo Library and open to the general public.

6. Adjourn 3:27PM