



MINUTES

**SOUTH BAYSIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY
MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
November 17, 2016 – 2:00 p.m.
San Carlos Library Conference Room A/B**

Call To Order: 2:03PM

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	

Alternate Member Emily Beach Attended Representing Burlingame

Alternate Member Diane Papan Attended Representing San Mateo

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. Adjourn to Closed Session – Pursuant to Government Code Section Govt. Code Sec. 54956.9
Conference with Labor Negotiator: Unrepresented employees- (All employees).**

Call To Order: 2:16

4. 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	

5. Additional Public Comment

None

6. Executive Director's Report

Executive Director La Mariana welcomed everyone to the Thanksgiving edition Board Meeting. He highlighted some items in his report. First, the bond covenant: He noted that the bond covenant ratios are being met, and that staff met with the City of San Carlos accounting department to discuss ways to stay within those ratios. Second, he introduced Madison Guzman, RethinkWaste's new Environmental Education Associate, and he gave some background information about her. Third, he noted that the contractor compensation process is winding down, and that most member agencies had a small or no rate impact for 2017. Fourth, he noted that Waste Management Curbside did not accept the terms the Board required of being able to opt out with 60 days notice from the Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) contract. So, that program will end on December 31, 2016, and a post card will go out notifying residents of the change, and later in the meeting other HHW program options will be discussed. Fifth, he noted that the Franchise Agreement Extension (FAX) committee has had their first meeting, and two preliminary meetings with Recology to determine likely key discussion points for the next term of the contract. Sixth, he gave an update that it looks like fire restoration will be complete and the facility will be operational in January, and the laid off workers can come back to work sooner than anticipated. He also noted that so far we've received \$2.5M in reimbursements and have had \$2.2M in expenses. Seventh, he also noted that as of November 1, the County has enacted a living wage ordinance, and there will be a discussion later in the meeting on how that will affect SBR's rate scale. Eighth, he noted that staff is in negotiations with Zanker Road for C&D material processing contract, and so far the numbers are pretty high, and staff will keep the Board updated as negotiations progress.

Member Widmer commented that the Executive Director reports are a great executive briefing, and are better than what was received previously and he thanked Executive Director La Mariana.

7. 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 October 27, 2016 Board of Directors Meeting
- B. Consideration of Approval of 2017 Merit Pool for Unrepresented Employees
- C. Approval of SBWMA 2017 Board Meeting Calendar
- D. Approval of Shoreway Environmental Center MRF Equipment Capital Projects
- E. Approval of Code of Conduct for Franchise Agreement Extension Decisions
- F. Approval of Quarterly Investment Report for First Quarter 2017

Member Widmer requested item 7E

Member Rutherford removed 7A

Member Papan removed 7F

Member Aguirre made a motion to approve consent items B through D

Member Benton seconded the motion

Voice Vote: All in favor

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	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 Dist.	X			

Member Papan asked about item 7F, questioning why there was a \$4M loss this quarter.

Executive Director La Mariana said a very large part of the loss is a timing consideration, there was a bond payment, and a bond interest payment during that period, and because of the timing of the quarters, there was a positive variance last quarter, so it's a timing true up.

Member Rutherford noted that she would abstain from item 7A.

Counsel Savaree noted that Member Widmer was concerned about the time period being approved for item 7E. She noted that the Board was being asked to consider two codes of conduct - one for the staff and officers, and one for the contractor, and that they mirror the codes of conduct that were in place when the original Franchise Agreements were being negotiated. She noted that the way that they were drafted Ex Parte contacts would be prohibited throughout the entire year of 2017, and there was a concern that the negotiations might be complete before that. So, the suggested revision is that Ex Parte contacts be prohibited until the contract extension conversion is completed. She also noted that there was a second concern that the code of conduct prohibited all Ex Parte contacts, and that was to the board as a Board member might run into the contractor at a social engagement or on the street, as the intent was it was only supposed to apply to the meet and confer process. She handed out a proposed revised code of conduct with those changes for the Board's consideration.

Chair Widmer asked for clarification on the definition of meet and confer.

Counsel Savaree noted that she viewed that as until a contract extension is brought back to this Board for approval.

Chair Widmer noted that he was concerned that if the contract that was brought to the Board in mid-2017 didn't meet the needs of his jurisdiction that it might be too late for his jurisdiction to go through their own process.

Counsel Savaree noted that the Executive Director plans to have a potential uniform franchise agreement to the Board by April.

Member Benton made a motion to approve items 7A, 7E and 7F

Member Aguirre seconded the motion

Voice Vote: All in Favor

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Atherton	X				Menlo Park				X
Belmont	X				Redwood City	X			
Burlingame	X				San Carlos	X			
East Palo Alto	X		7A		San Mateo	X			
Foster City				X	County of San Mateo				X
Hillsborough	X				West Bay Sanitary Dist.	X			

8. Administration and Finance

A. Staff Update on Bond Covenant Impacts with Tip Fee Increases

Executive Director La Mariana noted that the SBWMA is currently within the Bond Covenant ratio breakeven of 1.4, and the debt coverage ratio of 1.93, which is a very comfortable and secure position, and that the staff report gives further detail.

Member Benton asked what numbers go into the computation to figure out break even.

Staff Fakira answered that break even is determined by dividing net income by the total operating expenses, and debt coverage is determined by net revenue divided by the total debt commitments.

9. Collection and Recycling Program Support and Compliance

A. Staff Update on Household Hazardous Waste Program Options and Presentation by Larry Sweetser, Sweetser and Associates, (Principal)

Executive Director La Mariana introduced Larry Sweetser, an industry expert in the field of Hazardous Waste, who has been retained to identify the SBWMA's best options to handle Household Hazardous Waste (HHW).

Larry Sweetser gave a Power Point presentation on HHW program options.

Executive Director La Mariana reiterated that the door to door HHW collection program is no longer an option.

Member Benton asked for clarification that they didn't accept the Board counter proposal, but does that mean they aren't willing to accept a contract at all.

Executive Director La Mariana answered that WM Curbside was not willing to accept the terms that the Board had given direction at the October meeting, they are not willing to negotiate the pricing, nor are they willing to offer an extension. So it was a take the terms and pricing "as is" or leave it.

Member Widmer commented that he would like to see the addresses of where things can be dropped off, and he wanted to follow up on the possibility of WM Curbside still picking from the residents, but then dropping off at either Shoreway or a County facility that is closer.

Larry Sweetser noted that there is still an opportunity to do that, but it would be a whole new discussion not the current contract.

Executive Director La Mariana noted that there was a conceptual discussion around putting a HHW collection shed at Shoreway, not the other County facilities, but there were some barriers to doing it, so it was a discussion for the future.

Member Dehn noted that Executive Director La Mariana mentioned in his Executive Director's report that WM Curbside would be reaching out to the Board Members individually, and she asked if they wanted to negotiate contracts individually or come back with a future contract as a group.

Executive Director La Mariana noted that they are attempting to retain as many of the Member Agencies as possible under individual contracts.

Member Beach asked if there are other HHW door to door providers that could be more competitive.

Larry Sweetser answered that it is one of the options laid out in his presentation, and there are a few other companies that offer the service, but it is very expensive, and he noted that HHW is an expensive endeavor in general, as it usually costs more to get rid of it than it does to buy it.

Member Beach noted that it seemed like there was an option, but perhaps not an optimistic option.

Larry Sweetser noted that about 2/3 of the door to door programs in California service only seniors and disabled life line services. So that might be an option for making the services cheaper.

Member Hurt asked what the next step is after HHW is dropped off or collected.

Larry Sweetser answered that it depends on the material, there are a number of different vendors collecting different types of materials, and they come and pick it up from the drop off facility.

Member Hurt noted that even though the WM Curbside program is a Cadillac program, in the end maybe the savings is in car trips.

Executive Director La Mariana noted that the quality of the program is not in question regarding the current program. The discussion was around price, and what is perceived as low participation rate of about 5%. He noted there was a general sense among the Board to maximize the existing County's program because each ratepayer in the county that disposes waste at Ox Mountain landfill is already paying into that program.

Larry Sweetser noted that residents don't generate HHW on a daily or weekly basis like they do with recycling, so it's hard to measure participation in these programs. He then continued his presentation on HHW options.

Member Widmer asked what lifeline services are.

Larry Sweetser answered that it is a door to door program only for senior and disabled residents, it's a program offered to a limited group of people who don't have access to a car.

Executive Director La Mariana asked Waymond Wong from the County of San Mateo to speak about a pilot lifeline program in Millbrae.

Waymond Wong noted that the pilot program does not currently exist, they are still doing research on vehicles, and what is needed to get that program up and running.

Member Aguirre commented that the County seemed like a good option economically. She asked what the willingness is on the part of the County to partner with the SBWMA, and what are the benefits, cost savings, and things that would be a deterrent to partnering with the County for HHW programs.

Executive Director La Mariana answered that he is pleased with the spirit of the cooperation on the County in the discussions thus far, they have an existing program, with an existing funding source that all of our Member Agencies are already contributing to, and all of our discussions have been very collaborative.

Waymond Wong noted that the County's priority is to service all residents in the county, and will work with the SBWMA on ways to maximize those services.

Member Dehn asked if they would consider the lifeline pilot in the SBWMA service area. Waymond Wong noted that he could discuss that with Joe.

Chair Grassilli asked how you discern whether a resident needs the lifeline services or not.

Larry Sweetser noted that the program in Richmond is taken on an honor system basis..

Member Benton asked what percentage of HHW is captured in some form of program, and not going into landfill.

Larry Sweetser answered that we only know how much is collected, not how much is out there, so it's hard to tell, but despite all the programs, there is still Hazardous Waste being found in the garbage.

Chair Grassilli asked the Board what direction they want staff to pursue regarding HHW.

Member Beach recommended expanded advertising to create awareness and support the County's HHW program.

Member Benton commented that he'd like to see the County be the backbone of the program, but the local drop off events need to be well advertised as well.

Member Papan suggested the annual event being on the same day every year.

Member Widmer commented that Recology picks up batteries, so maybe batteries should be taken off the postcard, and he asked each Member Agency to put the list on their websites of alternate drop off locations.

Executive Director La Mariana commented that the document is on the SBWMA website.

Member Benton commented that there wasn't enough information on the post card about where to go now that the HHW program is ending.

Executive Director La Mariana noted that the address is not published because it leads to abandoned waste at their facility; the address is given at the time of the appointment.

Member Widmer reiterated that he'd still like to get more information about what can be done at Shoreway going forward.

Member Benton noted that some items are already taken at Shoreway, what do we need to do to enhance that program with more HHW options.

Member Rutherford commented that in the staff report it says that the Tower Road facility doesn't have sufficient space to handle the material, how will that be dealt with.

Waymond Wong answered that at the Tower Road facility, they can plan for increased drop offs by scheduling more frequent pickups of the HHW that is dropped off. He also noted that there is a temporary collection day in January in Redwood City as well as the Tower Road appointment system.

Larry Sweetser clarified that the staff report was referring to the Door to Door program taking items to Tower Road and that was what the County didn't have capacity for, but they can still do the individual resident appointment system.

Member Dehn commented that Recology's call center needs to be aware of this, and even though it's not a Recology program, Recology will receive calls, so they will need a script.

B. Resolution Approving Contract for Financial Review Support and Negotiation Services to support Franchise Agreement Extension Negotiation Process

Executive Director La Mariana introduced the item, and noted that he discussed the progress of the negotiation process in his Executive Director's report. In deciding on a lead negotiator, and financial consultant, a RFQ was distributed to two well well-known and respected organizations; HF&H, and R3. He noted that staff and the Franchise Agreement Extension (FAX) Committee recommend HF&H as the lead negotiator, and financial consultant, based on their experience with multi-jurisdictional agencies, and their highly structured approach to the process.

Member Dehn made a motion to approve Resolution 2016-44

Member Aguirre seconded the motion

Roll Call Vote: 9-0-0-3

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	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 Dist.	X			

10. Shoreway Operations and Contract Management

A. Resolution Approving Construction and Demolition MOU with Zanker Road

Staff Gans noted that staff is requesting the approval of an MOU with Zanker Road to extend the current agreement for one month. He noted that staff is encountering a situation with Zanker where rates are increasing 25%. He noted that Zanker is the only close by option for C&D processing and there are not a lot of options. Because of that Zanker is dictating the terms. He added that staff will be trying to get a more favorable outcome, but will be back to the Board in January with a proposed rate.

Chair Grassilli asked for confirmation that this MOU would extend the current agreement until February 28.

Staff Gans answered yes.

Member Benton made a motion to approve the one month MOU with Zanker.

Member Hurt seconded the motion

Roll Call vote: 9-0-0-3

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	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 Dist.	X			

B. Staff Update on Fire Restoration Progress

Staff Gans noted that the total restoration process is expected to cost approximately \$9M. He also noted that the equipment repair has been accelerated, and the repairs to the equipment should be completed by December so the equipment can be started in January, the building repair work will extend into March, but the facility will be running while the building work is being completed.

Chair Grassilli noted that all expenses (less the deductible) are being covered by insurance.

C. Resolution Approving Shoreway Environmental Center Site Restoration Services' Contracts Let Under Purchasing Policy

Staff Gans noted that this is a routine item to approve the expenditures let under the purchasing policy for fire damage repair and he had nothing to add other than the staff report.

Member Widmer made a motion to approve the expenses.

Member Rutherford seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: 9-0-0-3

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	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 Dist.	X			

D. Resolution approving VRS Contract with South Bay Recycling

Staff Gans introduced the item, and noted that the County Vocational Rehabilitation Services (VRS) program provides the sort labor at the MRF for SBR. He noted that this is a request authorizing the Executive Director to amend the SBR compensation to include the newly enacted County of San Mateo living wage ordinance for the VRS workers. He noted that on November 1, the County passed a living wage ordinance for all workers at \$14/hour on November 1, and the \$15/hour on July 1, 2017. He noted that SBR is requesting that the SBWMA reimburse them for the cost difference between what they're currently paying the workers, and what the living wage ordinance requires they get paid. He added that if approved the SBWMA would increase the per ton processing fee which includes all the costs of operations, from \$85.38 to \$89.73 per ton, and the annualized cost impact would be approximately \$321,000 per year. The net impact of the SBWMA's compliance with this ordinance through the end of FY16-17 is approximately \$134,000.

Member Aguirre commented that this is a priority to her, and she wants to figure out a way to make the budget work to make it happen. She thought the SBWMA needed to a leader in this area.

Member Widmer commented that SBR is under a fixed price contract, and this should be SBR's cost, and noted that this doesn't qualify as one of the items in the contract that would allow SBR to ask for an adjustment in compensation. He concluded that he supports the Living Wage Ordinance, but objects to asking the rate payers to pay for something that they are not obligated to pay.

Member Benton asked for confirmation if SBR is required to pay the \$14 per hour as of November 1st. He also asked what rights under the contract does SBR have to approach the SBWMA for relief from this increase.

Member Widmer had a copy of the contract, which stated a change in scope of services which is directed by the authority. But he noted that this is not a change in scope.

Staff Gans added that under that there is a section about change in law.

Member Widmer noted that the contract states if there is a change in law that requires a change in operation.

Member Benton asked if the increase in wage law fell under a change in operation.

Counsel Savaree answered no, because it doesn't create a change in service. She also noted that it is the burden of the contractor to demonstrate entitlement to increased compensation.

Member Benton commented that he would like to be cautious about authorizing an increase, because there is a legal binding contract. He thinks it's SBR's obligation to come to the Board and make a case for why they should get this increase.

Staff Gans noted that the contract between SBR and VRS ends at the end of 2016, and they have indicated that they will not renew the program at the current wage rate, and if they don't renew the program, SBR will have to find workers to do that work, and the cost will likely much higher than the 2% threshold.

Member Benton commented SBR is making a business decision, and they have the right to terminate the VRS contract and seek labor elsewhere but whatever the economic implication of their business decision is, it's theirs, and not the SBWMA.

Member Papan asked for clarification on the exact language in the contract and noted that if SBR can't do the same work for the same price wouldn't that be a change in operation, and there has been a change in the law that affects their budget.

Member Widmer commented that they have a CPI adjustment, and when the federal minimum wage went up they never petitioned.

Counsel Savaree suggested hearing from SBR.

Member Benton noted that he thought as point of process SBR should point out to the Board the reasons that they are requesting the change in compensation.

Dan Domonoske Vice President of SBR commented that at the direction of the Board he was the one who reached out to the VRS program at the beginning of their contract, and was instrumental in reinstating the relationship. He noted that when the California minimum wage went up SBR approached the SBWMA, and we were in the process of pursuing an adjustment but the increase fell just short of the 2% threshold required to request the adjustment, and that is why a request has not been made before. Based on the change in County law, we have no choice but to comply with the new pay scale, and from a practical perspective it's only right and appropriate to have SBR's compensation adjusted on a pass through basis. He also added that the RFP process was designed to competitively bid a lowest cost operator to maintain cost control. SBR continues to do that, and the fact that the County has changed regulations doesn't give us any position but to request the pass through.

Member Benton asked if it's the interpretation of the contract that gives SBR a legal reason to ask for the pass through.

Dan Domonoske noted that it was his understanding that the 2% threshold, along with the change in law gives them the right to ask for the increase in compensation.

Executive Director La Mariana noted the differences of this decision versus previous conversations the Board has had on this topic in the past. One, there has been a change in law. If the Board were to approve a living wage ordinance adjustment, it would not trigger the two percent clause. The nuance to this discussion is that if the Board doesn't approve their request, SBR would have to go find an alternative labor source, and there is a strong opinion that the alternate labor source would trigger the 2% threshold.

Member Benton wondered why SBR wouldn't just take the hit, and continue to use VRS.

Dwight Herring General Manager of SBR noted that VRS has given them 120 days notice that if SBR couldn't meet the living wage ordinance they would exit the program. If VRS is no longer a labor source option, SBR would need to use temporary staffing, and by contract SBR would need to come back to the Board and get permission to do that, and at some point in time those would become collective bargaining unit jobs, and those costs become exponentially higher.

Member Benton commented that VRS remains a competitive program even with the living wage ordinance, and the Board is being asked to compensate SBR for the increase in wage due to the living wage ordinance to avoid higher costs in the future, but there is no legal reason for the SBWMA to amend the compensation, and even without the SBWMA amending the compensation VRS might still be the most viable option for SBR. He noted that he was concerned about deviating from a signed contract.

Member Dehn asked what the Board action was at the time when SBR increased the wages when the second shift of workers was brought on.

Dwight Herring answered that there was no change in compensation at that time, and VRS required that increase in order to provide the workers.

Member Papan commented that there is a legal side and practical side, and she understood the desire to do the legally right thing by the Board and the rate payers, but the practical side of the matter may be more harmful in the long run.

Chair Grassilli commented that as he remembered this Board encouraged SBR to use VRS, and this could bring an end to that agreement.

Member Benton commented that whomever VRS hires they are going to have to pay the living wage.

Chair Grassilli countered that without looking at the dollars it could be any labor source, but the original direction of the Board was to use VRS workers.

Member Rutherford noted that some of her clients are VRS clients as well, and she wondered if there would be a conflict of interest if she voted on this item.

Counsel Savaree advised Member Rutherford to recuse herself from the vote.

Member Dehn asked for clarification if this was a recommendation from staff not a request from SBR.

Staff Gans answered yes, it's a recommendation from staff.

Executive Director La Mariana added that the MRF will reopen in January, and staff would like to have this resolved so that SBR will know what the labor situation is prior to reopening.

Member Benton commented that if a motion were to come forward he would vote no, and he reiterated that he would prefer SBR to make a formal request and justify the adjustment.

Executive Director La Mariana added that with the plant being projected to open in January, there is a training component of the VRS workers to consider, the workers could come in for training at the end of December.

Member Benton made a motion that the Board asks SBR to make a formal request to the Board for relief given the living wage ordinance.

Member Dehn seconded the motion.

Member Hurt asked what the time line would be for Member Benton's request.

Staff Gans answered that the contract ends December 31, 2016, and if there is no successful negotiation between SBR and VRS then the VRS option goes away. So, the incentive is to wrap up the negotiation before the New Year. He also noted that SBR would not be able to make a presentation to the Board until the January Board meeting, so there are competing timelines. He also noted that SBR can make an application to the SBWMA, but they don't have grounds under the contract to do so because it doesn't reach the 2% threshold.

Member Dehn commented that Dan Domonoske stated that it did earlier.

Staff Gans noted that the increase in wage quantified is \$321,765, and the 2% is \$720,000, but if another group of workers were to come in it could go well beyond the 2%, and there may not be the opportunity to reel things back.

Member Beach commented that she agreed with Member Papan that there is a practical element, and also noted that there is an element of good faith, with a local law that went into effect. She noted that VRS is a good program, and she is concerned about the timing and that the work force might not be available from a practical standpoint. She also added that this Board represents the rate payers, and yes there is a letter of the law piece to this, but also a question of what would our constituents want us to do, how does this affect their rate paying and our budget. She concluded that she was leaning towards being inclined to authorize the Executive Director to authorize the adjustment.

Member Dehn commented that she is in favor of the VRS program, and thinks it has been very successful, but she was objecting to the way that this came forward to the Board based on the contract with SBR not to the VRS program.

Member Aguirre commented that she supported moving forward with authorizing the change in compensation especially due to the timeline.

Chair Grassilli noted that he agreed with Member Beach and Aguirre, but there was a motion on the floor, and called for any further comments on the motion.

Member Hurt commented that she supports the living wage ordinance and that time lines are really critical in this decision, and there are unintended consequences with pushing this down due to formality.

Member Beach asked for clarification of the motion on the table.

Member Benton and Member Dehn withdrew the motion.

Member Hurt made a motion to authorize the Executive Director to amend SBR's compensation to include the newly enacted County of San Mateo living wage ordinance with the VRS program.

Member Aguirre seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: 6-2-1-3

Member Rutherford recused herself from the vote

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	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 Dist.	X			

Member Rutherford commented that the next time the contract needs to be reviewed it needs to come to the Board before the end of the year.

11. Informational Items Only (no action required)

- A. Update on Shoreway Environmental Education Programs
- B. Update on Multi-Family Organics Collection Pilot Program
- C. October 2017 Check Register
- D. Potential Future Board Agenda Items

12. Board Member Comments

Chair Grassilli adjourned the meeting wishing everyone a Happy Holiday season.

13. Adjourn 4:00 PM