



MINUTES

SOUTH BAYSIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY
 MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
 November 7, 2013 – 2:00 p.m.
 San Carlos Library Conference Room B

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 10, 2013 TAC Meeting Minutes
 Motion/Second: Gibbons/Chan
 Voice Vote: All in favor

4. New Business:

- A. Discussion on Recycling Permit System to Collect Commercial Recycling Data
 Staff Feldman presented the staff report noting that the goal behind the program is to get commercial recycling data for outside the scope of the Franchise Agreements, and the goal for bringing this item to the TAC is to get feedback on the specifics for implementation laid out in the staff report.

Member Galli clarified that she thought it was the TAC's job to decide whether or not to make a recommendation on the project. She noted that Staff Feldman had presented in such a way that the project was moving forward, as is, and the TAC was just being presented the details. She also explained that she thought the new Board would be relying on the TAC to see if the project was a good idea or not.

Staff Feldman responded that the staff's goal was to have a detailed discussion on the framework, but a discussion on the pros and cons could take place.

Executive Director McCarthy added that the Board requested that the framework presented to them at the last meeting be brought to the TAC, but noted that this information was also shared with the old board.

Member Scott commented that he thought it was the TAC's responsibility to discuss the pros and cons.

Member Porter asked what the end goal should be.

Staff Feldman answered that right now the only commercial recycling data we have, is the tons Recology collects. He added that more is being recycled through 3rd party vendors and finding out how much more is the goal, to find out if designing programs to improve diversion system wide is worth it, and to be prepared if the 75% state goal becomes a local mandate.

Member Porter responded that he wanted to make sure this is the way to reach those goals.

Member Scott asked if the results would be used to get diversion credit or to know if commercial recycling needed to be franchised.

Staff Feldman answered that the current emphasis is on programs and implementation.

Executive Director McCarthy added that it is part of the long range planning process. He noted that service area wide the base line for commercial recycling is not known.

Vice Chair Rodericks asked if the permitting of non-franchised haulers constituted a program.

Member Galli asked if the state will honor these numbers and actual data, she also asked if the driving force behind the permit program was to position our Agencies to collect better data or to create better programs.

Executive Director McCarthy commented that after spending \$120M to update the SBWMA programs, area wide commercial recycling diversion has plateaued. He added that there are several things to consider, one is the closing of the Ox Mountain Landfill, and should the SBWMA spend money to go after more diversion in preparation for that. Two is should we franchise commercial recycling in the future. And three is in preparation for complying with any possible future state mandate.

Member Walter asked if other areas that have implemented similar ordinances have had any trouble

collecting data.

Staff Feldman answered that it was fairly predictable and that the first 3-5 years there was a lot of administration of the program.

Member Gibbons noted that he has spoken with Jeff Ira and that Redwood City was in favor of pursuing this.

Member Porter asked how it would be determined who the 3rd party commercial recyclers are and how to get accurate and usable information.

Staff Feldman referred the committee to bullet two in the staff report.

Member Taylor commented that he thought small haulers would not going to get a permit, and asked if there was a way to proceed on a voluntary basis.

Staff Feldman felt that a permit system lends itself to a more organized approach for date collection.

Member Porter asked to make sure there was no impact on rate payers.

Staff Feldman answered that the fee for the permit application would cover the administrative costs of the program, and likely over time those administrative costs would go down.

Member Scott commented that he would like to know who in his area has applied for a permit.

Staff Feldman noted that a permit application wouldn't be reviewed until a valid business was verified.

Member Galli and Member Chan requested checking with the City Attorney's before moving forward.

Executive Director McCarthy noted that the JPA agreement does allow for the SBWMA to issue ordinances. He also added that he sees value in doing it service area wide, and not as much value in doing it 12 different ways.

Member Scott added that the SBSA also issues and enforces permits.

Member Porter asked if the reporting process would be differentiated between the agencies.

Staff Feldman answered that the goal is to get information in aggregate, but that he would like to get it for each city.

Member Augustine asked if a certificate of insurance would be required before issuing the permit.

Staff Feldman answered that the intent is not to restrict commerce the only requirement intended is a business license.

Member Scott commented that he thought there would need to be some kind of enforcement.

Member Galli asked if there would be any incentive to participate.

Staff Feldman noted that there would be a disincentive not to participate.

Member Galli stated that she would like to see a big picture budget report on this item.

Member Chan asked if additional funds would be needed for implementation.

Executive Director McCarthy answered in this fiscal year no, but a small dollar amount would be needed going forward for some enforcement.

Member Chan asked for elaboration on the need for contractors for the project.

Staff Feldman answered that contractors with experience helping similar agencies implement these ordinances would be hired to help in the various steps in the process.

Member Galli suggested outlining the proposed steps to the Board.

Member Taylor added that the Board needs to understand, the reasons for the ordinance, the alternatives, and that this is the most cost effective option.

B. Discussion on Model Uniform Enclosure Standards

Staff Feldman gave an overview of the staff report and noted that there is already a system in place for new development with the contractor through the franchise agreements. The question being raised is should effort be taken to develop uniform enclosure standards agency wide.

Vice Chair Rodericks noted that he thought this was a local land use issue.

Member Galli stated that Foster City worked with the hauler on a case by case basis, and that it would be nice to have a uniform template with minimum requirements.

Gino Gasparini of Recology noted that if it takes longer to service, it could create cost allocation issues.

Staff Feldman noted that the attachment to the staff report is a system Menlo Park has already put in place, and posed the question of a one size fits all approach service area wide.

Member Gibbons commented that he would like to use Menlo Park's guidelines.

Gino Gasparini noted that Recology would like to add some Franchise Agreement specifics to it.

Staff Feldman that staff will have an update on this item at a future meeting.

5. TAC Member Comments

Member Walter asked if there was any kind of labor update.

Executive Director McCarthy answered that he spoke with Mark Arsenault of Recology who said, "very little progress."

Member Scott noted that he has spoken with his Board Member, and that she would like the tipping fee adjustment, floor repair, and compensation applications referred to the TAC.

6. Adjourn 3:24 PM