

**MINUTES**

**SOUTH BAYSIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY  
MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

June 23, 2022– 2:00 p.m.

Via Zoom Tele or Video Conference Only

**Call to Order: 2:01 PM**

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

Agency	Present	Absent	Agency	Present	Absent
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	
Menlo Park	X				

All Members and public participated by Zoom Video or Conference Call

**2. Public Comment**

Persons wishing to address the Board on matters NOT on the posted agenda may do so. Each speaker is limited to three 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. **Speakers may also submit comments via email prior to the meeting by sending those comments to [rethinker@rethinkwaste.org](mailto:rethinker@rethinkwaste.org).**

None

**3. Executive Director's Report**

Executive Director La Mariana welcomed all to the meeting and gave the following updates:

- At the end of the meeting today, there will be an input session on the site optimization study.
- There are 3 remaining board meetings for the remainder of 2022: September 22 to review and approve the Recology and SBR compensation applications, which will also be reviewed by the TAC in early September. October 27 there will be a study session to review the 2023 budget and capital improvement plan, in addition to the preliminary recommendations for site optimization. Lastly, November 17, which will hopefully be in person, will be final approval of the site optimization study recommendations.
- Staff is working on in person/hybrid meeting solutions with DTE Networks the Agency's IT team.
- Yesterday he spent the day in Sacramento to provide technical testimony to the Senate Environmental Quality Committee on the battery bills, which are currently trending in the right direction.
- He then went over key decision points at today's meeting: a recommendation from staff to enter into parallel negotiations on the operations agreement, a decision and discussion regarding property insurance.

- Finally, he introduced Reyna Ocegüera who joined RethinkWaste as the Environmental Education Coordinator. Ms. Ocegüera formerly worked with Recology of San Bruno as an Commercial Outreach Specialist.

#### 4. 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.*

- Approval of the Minutes from the April 28, 2022 , Board of Directors Meeting
- Resolution Approving the Audited Financial Statements for the period ending December 31, 2021
- Resolution Directing that all meetings of the SBWMA Board of Directors, Technical Advisory Committee and all Board Appointed Subcommittees will continue to be held via teleconference Pursuant to California Government Code Section 54953(e)

Motion/Second: Bonilla/Rak

Roll Call Vote: 10-0-0-1

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
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			
Menlo Park	X								

#### 5. Administration and Finance

- Resolution Accepting the Findings from the Annual Operational and Financial Systems Audit for 2021

Staff Mangini gave an overview of the staff report and noted that this third-party independent audit verifies that Recology has reported their data accurately. It consists of two parts - the financial audit and the operational audit. The financial audit verifies Recology’s revenue reconciliation which generates a surplus/shortfall for each member agency. Overall, both contractors are in substantial compliance with their contract and with their reporting.

Motion/Second: Royce/McCune

Roll Call Vote: 10-0-0-1

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
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			
Menlo Park	X								

- Resolution Approving the Facility Property Insurance Coverage/Premium for Policy Year 2022-23

Executive Director La Mariana gave background and history of how the Agency is continuing to see an upwards trajectory in both costs and the number of carriers that are willing to take on the risk to provide insurance coverage. He noted that before the fire in 2016 the cost for insurance for the entire facility was \$180,000 per year by one insurance carrier. This year the quotes that have come in are for 14 different carriers (there were 7 last year) at a premium cost of \$2.1M. He expressed serious concern that, if there were a significant fire claim incident, going through a claims process would be a nightmare scenario with 14 different carriers (having done it in 2016 with just one carrier).. He also noted that this issue was discussed in depth at the Finance Committee

meeting and their recommendation was to take steps to set up a captive for self-insurance. A special, single-topic Finance Committee meeting will be held on September 13<sup>th</sup> to address this topic and to provide Staff with direction in next steps.

Staff Mangini updated the Board that since the staff report was written the actual 2022-2023 property insurance quote was received and it's \$2,080,000. He also noted that the September 8 Finance Committee meeting would be dedicated to how to move forward with setting up a captive. He introduced John O'Neill of Risk Strategies the Agency's insurance broker.

John O'Neill noted that this has been an especially challenging renewal term as Executive Director La Mariana alluded to in his introduction. At this point the Agency is at a fork in the road with where costs and coverage is now that development a captive to set up the Agency's own captive insurance company is the logical next step. He noted that a captive is self-insuring a portion of the risk and purchasing re-insurance on the balance of the risk. At that September meeting they will educate the finance committee on what's involved in setting up a captive, what's involved, what are the tax requirements, what are the risks etc. He thought it would give the agency much greater control of risk management and insurance activities in the long run.

Member McCune noted that he has captive insurance experience, but the risk was spread over a group of companies that were part of the captive. The risk was pretty low, and the deductibles were pretty high, but it worked really well, and saved the firm a lot of money. He asked if a retention group was a possibility to spread the risk.

Executive Director La Mariana mentioned that he has talked about it extensively in industry meetings, and there is an appetite for others to join, so should be decided to move forward with creating a captive it's a possibility.

Member Brownrigg commented that it does make sense to partner with other waste facilities, so he looked forward to the discussion at the Finance Committee meeting. He noted that creating a captive and purchasing reinsurance does put the agency at significantly higher risk, so there might be a budget problem. He also added that getting that battery legislation passed would help him feel much more comfortable about self-insuring if there was a better solution to the lithium-ion battery problem.

Motion/Second: McCune/Royce/

Roll Call Vote: 10-0-0-1

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
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			
Menlo Park	X								

C. Resolution Approving Mid-Year 2022 Budget Adjustments and the FY2023 Budget Forecast for 2023 Member Agency Tip Fee Projections

Staff Mangini gave an overview of the mid-year budget and provided an overview of where the Agency stands with the approved budget of six months ago. He noted that the budget is stronger than the approved budget due to stronger outlook in commodity pricing, a favorable reassessment of the SB 1383 implementation costs, as well as a reduction in processing costs at Ox Mountain. He also noted that along with the approval of the mid-year budget is the approval of the 2023 forecasted tipping fees, because staff will use these numbers to complete the compensation application process for Recology this fall which then allows the member agencies to set their 2023 rates.

Motion/Second: Bonilla/Rak

Roll Call Vote: 10-0-0-1

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
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			
Menlo Park	X								

- D. Resolution Approving a Renewal of Contract with Citizen Communications, dba "Recyclist" with Cost Estimator Tool Add-On in an amount not to exceed \$95,000 for SB1383 Recordkeeping Compliance

Staff Carter gave background and overview of the staff report recommending renewal of the contract with Recyclist for SB1383 record keeping compliance, as well as adding an additional cost of \$5,000 to add a cost estimator tool.

There were no questions or comments.

Motion/Second: Rak/Dehn

Roll Call Vote: 10-0-0-1

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
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			
Menlo Park	X								

- E. Resolution Approving the Revised Reserve Policy

Staff Mangini gave an overview of the staff report and explained the recommendation from the Finance Committee to create a sub emergency reserve several years ago, and this action formalizes that change in the reserve policy language.

There were no questions or comments.

Motion/Second: Royce/Brownrigg

Roll Call Vote: 10-0-0-1

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
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			
Menlo Park	X								

## 6. Collection and Recycling Program Support and Compliance

No Items

## 7. Shoreway Operations and Contract Management

A. Resolution Approving Contract with Pacific Polymers, Inc. DBA American Foam Experts not-to-exceed \$80,120.83 for MRF Administration Office Building Roof Replacement

Staff Nghiem gave a PowerPoint presentation describing the roof replacement project for the MRF Administrative Office building. She noted that leaks in the smaller administrative office building have become a recurring problem, so an RFP for construction of a new roof using a new foam material was released which included a 30% contingency due to multiple unknown factors, as well as the urgency to complete the roof before rains begin this fall. She then gave background information on the challenges of the 3 bids that were received, including proposing square footage different than what the bid documents specified, and different contingency than what the bid documents specified. Based on this and with the advice of legal counsel she decided to evaluate the bids based on dollars per square foot instead of the lump sum total.

Executive Director La Mariana added that legal counsel provided guidance every step of the way, and that the reason staff is requesting to move forward in this manner, and with the high contingency amount is because roof repair needs to be done in the summer before it starts raining.

Member McCune commented that this is not a good way to do this kind of project. The square footage should not be in question on an existing building, and the contingency should be to accommodate weather or timing.

Member Rak asked if there were any legal issues with taking this different approach. Secondly, is the contractor that was determined to be the low bidder with the price per square footage assessment accepting of the smaller contract. Lastly, he noted that he was uncomfortable moving forward given how off the bids were, and all of the contractor's inability to follow a bid process.

Counsel Savaree answered that there is no legal issue with the way staff has determined the lowest bidder. Staff Nghiem answered that she has been communicating with the bidders, and the lowest bidder has agreed to the smaller contract of \$80K including the 30% contingency.

Member Rak asked if staff was confident in the 3,500 square foot number.

Staff Gans answered that he didn't provide square footage, he provided engineers' drawings, and the potential bidders came to visit Shoreway.

Member Rak noted that he was still struggling to understand where the 3,500 square foot number in the bid package came from.

Executive Director La Mariana noted that the area to be replaced is a building within a building which makes it challenging.

Staff Southworth noted that he was on the roof with the potential bidders, and they measured the roof, but noted he should have measured the roof for an exact number in the bid documents.

Member McCune disagreed with the unit price approach on an existing building.

Member Brownrigg asked if this was now a fixed price contract going forward, even though the determination of the lowest bidder was determined based on the unit price. And, if staff didn't stipulate the square footage, why didn't the lowest responsible bid get the contract.

Executive Director La Mariana answered yes, it's now a fixed price contract.

2:47PM Member Abrica now absent

Counsel Savaree gave background of her advice during the bid review process. Staff received 3 bids none of which were responsive. The square footage called for was in the bid documents, but none of the proposers responded to that number. In a perfect world she would have recommended rejecting all bids but given the timing and the desire to complete the work by September, staff and legal counsel tried to come up with a way to compare the bids apples to apples and the way they did that was with a unit price but the contract will be fixed price.

Member Bonilla asked what the existing roofing material consists of, and if staff and the contractors had been on the roof to look at it. He also wondered if there are natural points on the roof to help determine where the new foam roofing will terminate.

Staff Southworth noted that it is currently a PVC membrane roof, and the polyurethane foam roof will work fine in the MRF admin area. He also noted that there are several changes in height and equipment on the roof to help determine the exact area.

Member Bonilla commented that given that he feels comfortable with the contractors submitting their bids for what ever it is that they looked at, but contingency should be for any changes that might come up.

Member Rak commented that he's not supportive of this resolution because he has some concerns about the process.

Member Brownrigg commented that there are several outstanding questions including, the 30% contingency and making sure the contractor is not expecting to receive the full \$80K, and that he was torn but would second the motion.

Motion/Second: Bonilla/Brownrigg

Roll Call Vote: 4-5-0-2

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
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		
Menlo Park		X							

Counsel Savaree asked the board if they wished to reject all bids, and direct staff to go back out into the market again.

Member Bonilla made a motion to reject all bids but negotiate with the low bidder.

Member Rak asked how the low bidder would be determined.

Counsel Savaree answered that staff has already identified who they believe to be the low bidder so if the motion passes staff would negotiate with that bidder and bring the contract back to the board in September.

Member Royce seconded the motion.

Member Rak made a counter motion to reject all bids and rebid the project.

Member Brownrigg noted that he would second that motion as long as the maker of the motion would sign off that the board would give proxy to a board sub committee to sign off so that the full Board doesn't have to have another meeting to get the work completed.

Member Rak accepted the amendment to the motion

Member Bonilla withdrew his motion.

Chair Aguirre asked Member Rak to restate the motion.

Member Rak made a motion to reject all bids, rebid the roof replacement project and create a subcommittee of board members that has the proxy authority to approve the contract with the lowest responsible bidder.

Roll Call Vote: 9-0-0-2

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
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			
Menlo Park	X								

Chair Aguirre asked for volunteers to be on the subcommittee. Board Member McCune, Board Member Bonilla and Board Member Rak will serve on the subcommittee to review the rebid project and approve the contract with the lowest bidder.

- B. Resolution Approving Contract with Zivko Corporation, Inc. dba Metal Building Company not-to-exceed \$319,506 for Shoreway Truck Maintenance Building Roof Replacement

Staff Nghiem gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Shoreway truck maintenance roof replacement project. The current roof is a corrugated metal roof, and the recommendation is to replace the roof with the same type of roof which made this a much more straightforward project than item 7A. One responsive bid was received. She noted that very few contractors specialize in this type of work, and even fewer are interested in public works projects which explains why only one bid was received. She added that the responsive bidder was the original installer of the existing roof in the 1980s, so they are familiar with the roof already, and qualified to do this work. She recommended approval of the contract of \$319,506.00 that includes a 10% contingency.

There were no questions or comments.

Motion/Second: Bonilla/Groom

Roll Vote:9-0-0-2

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
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			
Menlo Park	X								

- C. Resolution Approving Contract Extension with Republic Services' Newby Island Facility for Organics Material Processing

Executive Director La Mariana gave an overview of the staff report, and background on the agency's organics processing agreements. He noted that the current contract that exists with Newby Island expires at the end of this year and has options for two extension years. In discussions with Newby Island on the extension, Newby has pointed to the additional costs to comply with SB1383 as their reasoning for needing to adjust rates should the extension be approved. He noted that this is two-part increase in costs – one January 1, 2023, and a second one January 1, 2024. This is what staff is recommending to extend the contract for two years. He noted that due to limited capacity of commercial organics processing facilities, he felt that if the Agency did go out to bid at this time the costs would likely be over \$100-\$125 per ton. In addition Newby is the closest organics processing facility to Shoreway which decreases transportation costs that are overlayed on top of the processing cost. For these reasons staff is recommending entering into this two year extension with Newby Island for organics processing.

Member Groom asked if there was any movement on this side of the bay to look into an organics processing facility closer to this side.

Executive Director La Mariana answered yes, they have been trying at Ox Mountain landfill to get an organics processing facility. The challenge is the topography, Ox Mountain is a canyon, and organics facilities need a flat area. And Republic who owns Ox Mountain and Newby hasn't been interested in expanding Ox Mountain to handle organics. He noted that at his time at the county he researched 85 parcels of land in San Mateo County, and none had the egress for the trucks, the topography or they were too close to residential neighborhoods.

Member Brownrigg asked how much of the organic's material collected in the SBWMA programs is food waste versus yard waste.

Staff Gans answered that since COVID numbers have really fluctuated, but prior to COVID the facility collected 100 tons per day of food waste (source separated organics SSO) and shipping 300 tons a day of residential food and yard waste.

Member Brownrigg reminded the board that this material is 25% of what is collected, and the Zero Waste Committee is looking for other opportunities for food waste processing, and he asked staff to increase those efforts rather than sending the material to Newby Island.

Member Rak noted that he's in support of moving forward with staff recommendations but directed staff to use this two year option to explore other options, and move in a different direction.

Motion/Second: Rak/Groom

Roll Vote:9-0-0-2

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
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			
Menlo Park	X								

D. Staff Update on Operations Agreement RFQ Process and Resolution Authorizing Staff to Proceed with Parallel Negotiations

Staff Nghiem gave a PowerPoint presentation updating the Board on the Operations Agreement RFQ process and timeline. Phase I was the RFQ process which will be completed with today's recommendation



to move forward with the top two responders to the RFQ and enter parallel negotiations with both companies. During the parallel negotiations phase final operating agreements will be negotiated with both companies, and a final recommendation and selection of a contractor will be awarded at the November board meeting.

Member Brownrigg asked if staff has determined if both proposers are willing to enter into parallel negotiations.

Executive Director La Mariana answered yes, both parties have agreed to move forward with parallel negotiations.

Motion/Second: Bonilla/Royce

Roll Vote:9-0-0-2

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
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			
Menlo Park	X								

## 8. Public Education Outreach and Legislation

### A. Mid-Session Legislative Update with EEC

- Update on SB 1215 and AB 2440 (Responsible Battery Recycling Act of 2022)

Staff Au introduced Kayla Robinson from Environmental and Energy Consulting (EEC) to give an update on the current legislative session. She then gave an update on the SBWMA's 3 sponsored bills.

Kayla Robinson gave a PowerPoint presentation updating the board on the legislative session and the Agency's 3 sponsored and bills. She gave an overview of the timeline of the current legislative session.

**SB 1215/SB 2440 – Battery Recycling Legislation.** These bills were mirrored bills in each of the houses until last week, but given productive conversations with opposition, the bills were split into two different proposals for the legislature which tackle two different types of batteries: loose batteries and embedded batteries. Opposition wanted to expand the existing e-waste recycling program to deal with embedded batteries, and there was a lot of support around perusing that option. She noted that because the e-waste program is a fee-based program it does need a 2/3 vote to pass out of legislature which is a much harder vote. So, SB 1215 has been amended to expand the e-waste program to include products with embedded batteries, but AB 2440 has the original extended producer model language. She added that if SB 1215 passes AB 2440 will only cover loose batteries if SB 1215 does not pass AB 2440 will cover both loose batteries and batteries embedded in products.

**AB 1985 – SB 1383 Procurement Requirements.** EEC has been negotiating with CalRecycle on this legislation to offer relief to local agencies on SB 1383 procurement requirements. She noted that CalRecycle has come forward with technical assistance, and they are comfortable with a 2-year phase in of the requirements to give local agencies extra time, but they have held strong in that they don't want to expand the list of eligible procurement products, which is disappointing to the co-sponsors of the bill.

Executive Director La Mariana gave an overview of what the SB 1383 procurements are and noted that in the SBWMA service area our requirement is 30,000 tons of finished compost or mulch per year. So, staff

views the discussions with CalRecycle so far as a partial step in the right direction, but unless they relax their interpretation of what this material is and how much is required, what they've offered so far just kicks the can down the road two years. And there is not enough room in our urbanized service area for that amount of material.

**SB 54 – Plastic Producer Responsibility.** This bill isn't sponsored by the SBWMA but is being watched. There is a similar ballot initiative on the November ballot that the SBWMA has endorsed. She noted that there has been a shift in the last 24 hours on SB 54. It is the legislature's attempt to strike a deal with industry on plastic producer responsibility and remove the initiative from the ballot. By the end of June, they must convince the three signatories of the initiative to remove the initiative. She noted that positions are currently split on this bill, but things are changing rapidly. The bill is now set to be heard in the Assembly Natural Resources Committee on Monday. If the bill passes, they still must convince the signatories of the initiative to remove the ballot initiative.

Member Brownrigg commented that he thought the agency was right to focus on the battery bills but thought that plastics are a high priority for the residents. He suggested that if SB 54 doesn't pass, the ballot initiative get agendized so that SBWMA Board members know what to do to support it.

## **9. Informational Items Only (no action required)**

- A. 2022 Finance and Rate Setting Calendar
- B. Check Register Detail for April 2022
- C. 2022 Meeting Planning Guide

## **10. Site Optimization Study Input Session**

Executive Director La Mariana gave a background on the project and the groups staff has and plans to meet with to get input on this project. He introduced SCS Engineers the firm the Agency has contracted with to write a recommendations report for site improvements. This document will be in draft form to the board at the October study session. He then gave a list of what the Agency is considering as a result of meetings with the Agencies committees thus far:

- Enhanced functionality of site operations
- Emergency Storage
- Fleet and employee parking
- Office and conference areas for both Agency Staff and Contractors
- National and/or international leadership in education
- Storage
- Programming
- New material handling and processing systems.

Rob Kalkbrenner of Common Goal Consulting is serving as project manager for this project. He introduced Jim Porter a sub-contractor of SCS Engineers who will be writing the draft report.

Jim Porter asked the board for input on the following:

- What is working on the site?
- What could be improved on the site?
- What are the programs you'd like to see on the site?
- What programs might not belong on the site?

Executive Director La Mariana gave some thoughts to get the discussion going noting that some of the

input that has been received so far includes, inadequate parking, the need for emergency storage for processed recyclables, aspirations for an expanded-on-site world-class education center, issues with traffic flow.

Member Rak commented that he felt he would need a full site tour to be most helpful in this conversation.

Executive Director La Mariana noted that he would get some dates on the calendar to reacquaint board members with the site.

Jim Porter asked for the Board's feedback on office space on site, since currently the SBWMA staff is at the San Carlos library.

Member Brownrigg commented that he too would like a refresh tour, he noted these questions are highly operational and as board members that's not necessarily our domain. So, he didn't have a strong opinion on many of these, and would respect management's opinion. He would like to see the agency being a leader in the state, and more space for partnerships with leading edge recyclable and regenerative technology and making room for electric powering the collection fleet all require more space, and he wants to ensure that space constraints don't constrain ambitions.

Member Royce agreed that he couldn't counsel on what should or should not be on the site, but he recommended looking at similar sites around the country/world for best practices to learn from. He also noted that the number one function of the site is operations, but if the site is going to play a leadership role, we need to look at partnerships, and educational opportunities.

Chair Aguirre commented that the board's role is to create policy to get things moving forward not to give technical advice, so she asked for a budget, and more details on how these things tie to the mission statement to help guide the dreams.

Member Groom suggested putting this discussion back on the agenda next meeting after the tours, she agreed with developing better signage. She also asked for refresher signage for residents, especially in multi-family units.

Member Bonilla noted that he thought the site does need to be optimized and was impressed with the thinking so far. He recommended an employee parking garage, reorganize what buildings go where, and signage for wayfinding. He also noted that he's concerned about education similar to Member Groom people are unclear about hard to recycle items like Styrofoam.

Member Dehn asked to consider a mobile education center, because Shoreway is not easy to get to, and this way the education team out to the public.

Jim Porter summarized the comments of being a leader and following best practices that the technical minds working on this project would take into consideration.

Rob Kalkbrenner commented that if any thoughts come up, get them to staff and we'll include them.

## **11. Board Member Comments**

## **12. Adjourn 4:41PM**