



A Public Agency

# CONSENT CALENDAR

**DRAFT MINUTES**

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

September 28, 2023– 2:00 p.m.

San Mateo County Transit District Office, 1250 San Carlos, CA 94070

**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(2:39PM)		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				

Member Taylor attended via zoom from at 413 Ivy Dr in Menlo Park, 94025

**2. Public Comment (Closed Session)**

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 everyone to the meeting and gave the following updates.

- Staff is currently participating in council meetings and study sessions regarding the 2024 rates, and they are happy to participate at member agency meetings as desired.
- Staff Joanne Nghiem has been promoted to Associate Engineer.
- Andy Zhang has departed RethinkWaste as a Fellow and accepted a position at the California Public Utilities Commission.
- Jayden Hanan has departed RethinkWaste as a Fellow and accepted a position at Peninsula Clean Energy.
- Two new fellows have joined the team - Alexandra Edwards as an Environmental Education Fellow, and Lina Pietrzyk as a Public Outreach Fellow.
- There is still one vacancy in the fellow positions. He noted that with the 2024 budget there will be some changes with the fellow positions presented for Board consideration.
- On June 23 there was an Op Ed in the San Mateo Daily Journal to educate the public on the importance

of SB 1383.

- The environmental education team won an award at the recent California Resource and Recycling Association (CRRRA) conference in August for Outstanding School Recycling Program. Chair Aguirre spoke at the event and Burlingame’s City Manager Lisa Goldman gave a welcome speech to the 1,000 conference attendees.
- On October 21, RethinkWaste is hosting our annual Rethink Recycling Day at Shoreway; he invited Board Members to attend and encouraged everyone to get the word out in their community.

**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.*

- A. Approval of the Minutes from the June 22, 2023, Board of Directors Meeting
- B. Approval of Quarterly Investment Report for the Quarter Ended June 30, 2023
- C. Resolution Authorizing a change in Officers of the City Redwood City to Manage the SBWMA’s Financial Investments in Association with Administrative Services Agreement, effective July 1, 2019

Motion/Second: Romero/Rak

Roll Call Vote: All in favor 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								

**5. Administration and Finance**

- A. Resolution Approving \$2,558,887 Financing Plan Property Purchase of 1245 San Carlos Avenue, Suite E, San Carlos, California

Executive Director La Mariana gave an overview of the staff report and background and noted that there were two options presented in the packet. The Finance Committee recommended a 50% deposit of the purchase price, since the committee’s discussion the lender recommends slightly more than 50% in order to avoid having the lender involved in the build out of the property.

Member Froomin noted that in the staff report the difference was more than the \$850,000 estimated for the buildout, and he wondered what the difference was.

Executive Director La Mariana noted that the difference is the \$850,000 plus the 25% deposit for the actual property.

Member Royse commented that increasing the down payment would be in line with the Finance Committee’s original recommendation, as they chose 50% in order to mitigate the effects of the current high interest rate, and the savings in interest trumps having the cash on hand. He had no objections to the staff recommendation.

Member Romero commented that he thought the construction cost number was a low number in today’s construction costs economy, so he thought the board should be prepared for staff to have to return to the board for an increased construction costs budget. He also noted that the proforma in the packet reflects a 6.75% interest rate, and actual rate today is 7%, so he wanted to make the public aware of the difference. Lastly, he asked what the benchmark is on the refinance for the treasury note.

Member Froomin noted that the first year we can refinance without a penalty is the third year. He asked

what it meant in the letter that the term is 25 years but the amortization is 30 years.

Member Romero answered that it means a smaller monthly payment, with a balloon payment at the end.

Member Taylor lost connection and was absent for this vote.

Motion/Second: Froomin/Royse moved approval of option two.

Roll Call Vote: All in favor 8-0-0-3

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					

Member Royse noted for the record that all the Member Agencies individually approved this as well.

Executive Director La Mariana added that all 11 Member Agencies have voted by a vote of 57 affirmative and zero opposed to this purchase.

- B. Resolution Approving the Final Contract For Acquisition of 1245 San Carlos Avenue, Suite E, San Carlos, California 94070 by the South Bayside Waste Management Authority (SBWMA) and Authorizing the Executive Director to Execute the Contract

Executive Director La Mariana noted that this resolution allows him to sign the sales contract.

No further discussion.

Motion/Second: Royse/Froomin

Voice Vote: All in favor 8-0-0-3

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 Authorizing the Executive Director to enter into a Professional Services Agreement with Gelfand Partners Architects for Architectural, Engineering and Design Services for the SBWMA’s New Office Buildout at a Not To Exceed Amount of \$152,183

Executive Director La Mariana gave an overview of the staff report and noted the tight turnaround to be ready to move in by July 1, 2024, which is why a non-binding RFP was conducted at the same time as the decision making process to purchase the property.

Member Froomin asked in regards to costs he wanted to confirm that the contractor needs to notify us if costs are going to be larger than what was just approved with the financing.

Executive Director La Mariana answered yes, there needs to be a control point.

Member Taylor now present 2:34 PM.

Member Royse asked if the scope of the service was the same, or what there any reasoning as to the wide range of the bids.

Executive Director La Mariana said that staff was surprised by the range too, some did include other services not included in the RFP, but mostly it was the difference between estimations in staff time needed.

Member Romero pointed out that this contract is just for the architecture and design services, he thought it might be possible to limit costs by adding upfront value engineering.

Executive Director La Mariana noted that staff considered it, but by going this route it allowed staff to tap into the vast scope of professional contacts of the architecture firm and that was a desirable outcome from staff's point of view.

Member Froomin asked if it was worth waiting on this contract to see if there was savings in time and or money by going with a design build contract.

Member Romero commented that it's gone both ways in his experience sometimes it saves time or money sometimes it doesn't.

2:39 PM Member Brownrigg not present.

Executive Director La Mariana said that it seems like staff is further down the road than going back for a design build contract, but we did discuss this approach internally, and the speed at which this needs to be completed was the deterrent.

Chair Aguirre asked if there was a plan in case the building isn't completed on time.

Executive Director La Mariana answered there is slight wiggle room with the city of San Carlos, and if needed staff will work remotely until the space is ready.

Member McCune commented that as an architect he didn't think either a design-build single contract or a design then build separate contracts was a superior approach, and he thought what was presented here was a fine approach. He asked who from the agency would be managing the project, because the most important thing is to have an owner's representative looking at the complete scope, schedule and bundle package.

Executive Director La Mariana answered the staff has secured the firm Common Goal Consulting to be the project manger and Rob Kalbrenner will be the project manager. He is the former Capital Projects Manager for the County of San Mateo.

Motion/Second: Romero/Froomin

Roll Call Vote: All in favor 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

- A. Resolution Approving the SBWMA Final Report Reviewing the 2024 Recology San Mateo County Compensation Application

Staff Mangini gave a PowerPoint presentation explaining the process of reviewing the compensation application submitted by Recology each year. He explained that it is a two-part approval - 1) approving the report that reviews Recology's compensation application for 2024; and 2) the revenue requirement for each member agency to cover the approved compensation adjustment. He noted that this is a large increase mostly index driven by the current economic climate, as well as increased tip fees which are mostly driven by the new operating agreement with SBI. The latter is driving 19% of the 25% increase. He also noted that not included in the report is Recology's request additional compensation for Covid expenses.

Counsel Savaree explained further that this is the second time Recology has come to the board asking for additional compensation related to Covid expenses. The first time in 2022, the staff recommendation was to deny the request because the additional costs were not covered in the contract language. The board showed sympathy and split some portion of the Covid related expenses with Recology. This year, Recology is again asking for consideration to be reimbursed for an additional \$836,000 in Covid related costs from between 2020 and 2022. The board will need to consider two things in hearing this request - 1) does the Board want to waive the twelve-month limit and go back to 2020; and 2) does the Board believe these costs were caused by either a catastrophic event or a change in law under the provisions of the contract.

Staff Mangini concluded his presentation with a chart noting the historical revenue requirement increases since the Recology contract began in 2010.

Member Rak asked what the percentage increase is in 2024.

Staff Mangini answered 11%.

Member Romero asked if the Covid cost was being considered with this item.

Staff Mangini noted that it's not included in this item, if it is considered would be a separate item, but if the board chose to reimburse Recology for those costs it would raise rates another 0.6%.

Member Loraine asked how using RethinkWaste's rate stabilization fund could affect rates.

Staff Mangini noted that the TAC was very clear about using the rate stabilization fund to lessen the rate impact this particular year, the policy does state that the action would be taken at the time of the budget but the board could chose to use a reserve fund any time.

Member Loraine asked how long it took for RethinkWaste to build the current reserve levels.

Staff Mangini noted that the policy states that rate stabilization reserve and the emergency reserve receive up to 10% of total expenses at the time of the budget each year. For many years 10% was being added each year, the last couple of years at the recommendation of the finance committee it was dropped to 9% because the fund was stable at \$5M. He noted that the finance committee has not seen the reserve projections for 2024 yet, but it's projecting to be about \$21M in unrestricted reserves which is about \$1M more than was in the budget.

Member Loraine noted that would support using at least some of that reserve and applying to help relieve at least some of this rate increase. He noted that even if we use it all it's still a drop in the bucket and wouldn't make that big of a difference. He proposed using about ½ of it to set up a fund to support rate payers who meet income thresholds who may need it the most in our community.

Member Rak noted that San Carlos has done this separately with their own funds and have tied the needs-based request to those who are eligible for the PG&E rate reduction, so the qualification is a lot simpler. He encouraged San Mateo to investigate what they can do in this regard.

Member Froomin noted that in Foster City we looked into this with water rates, and there was a scenario where you could use money that came from rate payers to fund rate reductions for others, so that's something to be aware of as we consider this. He also asked if there was a bond covenant concern if reserves are used.

Staff Mangini noted that in 2016, there was a situation where we didn't meet our bond covenant, our policy allows for use of the reserves to increase revenue in order to meet bond covenants. So, if we use all of the reserve and then don't have enough revenue that could be problematic.

Member Froomin in reading from the reserve policy in the franchise agreement asked if using the reserves in this way constitute a scenario that was allowable by the reserve policy.

Executive Director La Mariana noted that it's a separate policy stand alone from the franchise agreement.

Member Brownrigg commented this is a one-time shock to the cost structure, and he supported smoothing that shock to the system rather than having it hit the rate payers all in one year, and supported consideration of the reserve fund. He also noted in response to Member Loraine's idea to use the money to help buy down rate increases for those most in need, noting that one pool of money across all member agencies could cause accounting problems.

Member Froomin asked how using reserve money would work.

Staff Mangini noted that the way he looked at it, would be to reduce tip fees across the board, which would then get allocated to each member agency through the normal process.

Chair Aguirre asked if they should now hear Recology's request on the Covid item.

Counsel Savaree noted that it would be up to the board but addressed Member Romero's concern about this request being a separate item. She noted that franchise agreement requires that any special circumstances costs come the board as part of the compensation application.

Member Royse made a motion to consider the three elements as separate items – 1) the Covid reimbursement to Recology; 2) the Recology 2024 compensation; and 3) the use of the rate stabilization reserve.

Member Froomin seconded the motion.

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								

Carl Mennie Regional Vice President of Recology presented to the Board on Recology's request for expense reimbursement related to Covid expenses. He noted that Recology wanted to focus their request on the \$774,000 payroll expenses, and not talk about supplies, and in the spirit of compromise he was willing to consider getting reimbursed for these costs in 2025. He noted that in 2020 the Federal Government passed the Families First Coronavirus Recovery Act which included requiring up to 80 hours of paid leave for Covid related events to employees. When that ended the state of California passed its own act which extended the requirement through 2022, that is why there are three years of expenses in this request. He noted that the difference of opinion is the interpretation of applicable law that is in the franchise agreement. It is the SBWMA's opinion that that because this law isn't specific to solid waste and recycling, it doesn't qualify as an applicable law qualification under the framework of the franchise agreement. He noted that in Recology's opinion, the request for reimbursement of these costs is reasonable, they couldn't have been anticipated, and Recology had no mechanism for controlling these costs.

Member Royse asked if Recology applied for any state or federal aid related or any public funds to mitigate the costs of Covid to Recology.

Carl Mennie answered that Recology was not eligible for any payroll protection loans because they are an essential service and didn't have any layoffs. We did delay some payroll tax payments which was essentially an interest free loan that was taken advantage of.

Member Royse commented that he was struggling with reconciliation of the legal opinion of Recology that the member agencies are obliged to pay this, versus the legal opinion of RethinkWaste that the member agencies are obliged to pay.

Counsel Savaree explained that the reason that staff has taken the position that the contract doesn't allow for this kind of request, is because there are limits to the kinds of changes in law that would be eligible for the rate payers to be responsible for. Those are limited to changes in law that have jurisdiction over solid waste. Recology believes that is not correct and the language applies to a change in any law that affects the cost of doing business. So, it's a difference of opinion.

Member Royse commented that there has been public opposition to all of the rate increases this year, so he wanted to make sure the agency was not accused of paying for a cost it didn't need to but was thought an argument could be made for spending some funds to avoid litigation.

Member Brownrigg noted that he is struggling with why this wasn't brought up in the first year.

Carl Mennie answered that Recology thought there was going to be a different avenue to recover the 2020 costs, and then cost really ramped up over the three years. In 2020 Recology didn't know the full extent of the cost liability at the time of the compensation application because laws were passed with a retroactive nature to them.

Member Brownrigg asked for clarification on staff's position that labor laws are not laws that Recology can ask for a "change in law" reimbursement for under the language of the franchise agreement.

Counsel Savaree answered yes, staff's interpretation of the contract language is such that every law an employer would be responsible for would not be one that the rate payers would be responsible for.

Member Rak commented that, from a City's perspective, as an employer we can't raise taxes to comply with a new law, we have to budget around that new cost. He also noted that he was struggling with the three year nature of the request, and why that wasn't brought up earlier.



Member Loraine asked if the previous decision the board made to reimburse some costs during the pandemic was materials based as opposed to payroll. And if so, what is the difference with this request and the previous request.

Member Brownrigg noted that the first request was for materials that were required for Recology to do the work that they do during the pandemic, and for him he felt that those couldn't have been anticipated. He felt that the SBWMA should cover at least a portion of that expense. He added that the whole notion of this contract is it is a fixed contract with very specific growth indicators that are COLA based. This request is payroll related and there are any number of things that could increase payroll, and he felt that the contractor signed up for that risk when agreeing to this contract.

Member Romero asked if Recology could have applied for the payroll protection plan (PPP), and just didn't.

Carl Mennie answered that Recology reviewed as a company and decided that they wouldn't be eligible.

Member Romero made a motion to deny Recology's request for reimbursement for payroll expenses related to Covid-19.

Member Froomin seconded the motion.

Member Brownrigg commented that he is in support of the motion, but this is hard, because the SBWMA really values this partnership, and respects the employee owners and their hard work every day, but we do have to be fiduciaries and be true to the contract we signed, but this isn't an easy vote to make.

Member Royse commented that he agrees, but also thought it was a violation of public trust to pay for something when legal counsel advises we are not obligated to, and he had trouble reconciling that, so he was in support of the motion.

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								

The board then discussed item 2 approval of the SBWMA's report reviewing Recology's compensation application and member agencies revenue requirement.

Member Loraine temporarily absent

Motion/Second: Froomin/Royse

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								

The Board then discussed use of the rate stabilization reserve.

Member Brownrigg commented that he does believe rate stabilization reserves are meant to be used sometimes, and he couldn't think of a better time than when there is this huge rate hike.

Member Brownrigg made a motion to use \$2.43M of the reserves to reduce the tip fee by 5% yielding an average rate reduction to member agencies of 2.2%. Noting that will leave \$2.5M in the reserve for some other shock but does soften the blow to member agencies.

Member Taylor seconded the motion.

Discussion of the motion:

Member Rak asked if a member agency has already set a hearing for rate increases, does it affect the ability to have the Prop 2018 hearing.

Counsel Savaree recommended checking with individual member agency attorneys, but she believed if it was a reduction and not an increase that would be fine.

Member Rak asked if it is or all or nothing, noting that if San Carlos wanted to use the reserves differently since their rates have already been set would that be an option.

Staff Mangini noted that he hadn't thought about applying it to each member agency, his thought was to apply it across the group, so if that was the decision the board wanted to make he would have to give it more thought.

Member Rak asked for confirmation, that if their rates didn't change the rate stabilization would be applied to San Carlos' individual rate reserve.

Staff Mangini answered yes.

Roll call Vote: 9-0-1-1

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								

**7. Shoreway Operations and Contract Management**

**A. Resolution Approving the SBWMA Final Report Reviewing the 2024 South Bayside Industries Compensation Application**

Staff Mangini noted that this item is more of a formality, as the Board has already approved SBI's contract and the rate per ton, so this is a procedural item to establish a starting point for future adjustments based on indices. He noted that what was presented in SBI's compensation application matches what was established in the contract.

There was no discussion.

Motion/Second: Froomin/Brownrigg

Roll Call Vote: All in favor 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								

B. Second Review and Approval of SBWMA Board Actions regarding the Site Optimization Study

- 1) Review and Accept SCS Engineer's FINAL Shoreway Environmental Center's Site Optimization Study and Design Development Starting Point Findings/Recommendations Report, and
- 2) Review and Approve Staff's Proposal to Retain KNN Public Finance's services in an Amount Not To Exceed the Executive Director's Authority Pursuant to SBWMA's Purchasing Policies to Work with the Finance Committee to Formulate a Recommendation On Feasible Funding Sources for an Anticipated Future Site Master Plan's Capital Improvement Projects

Executive Director La Mariana introduced the item, and showed a video that was shot on a drone that shows the scope of daily operations the Shoreway facility. He introduced Evan Williams, P.E. of Cambridge and Associates who SCS Engineers partnered with on the development on the Shoreway Site Optimization Plan.

Evan Williams noted that he would be presenting more context about how they got to the recommendations that were presented earlier this year. There are two options included in the memo. Option A is in line with the option presented earlier this year, and focuses on revolutionizing the current site, largely operationally what is on site is sufficient, where there are issues are shortage of parking spaces and the Recology administration building has issues, space to accommodate a bio-filter to meet requirements that are coming, space for covered bale storage, and identifying areas that could be elevated because there is no more land. He added the estimated cost of Option A is \$52M. The main differences in Option B is no multi-level admin building structure up front on Shoreway road, moves the Recology administrative staff to the back closer to the operation, and includes making the whole second floor (that is currently SBR offices) an area to expand the education center. The estimated costs for option B are \$45.5M. Both options achieve the same programmatic objectives.

Executive Director La Mariana noted that the action today would be to approve the findings and recommendations report presented by SCS Engineers and Cambridge and Associates. And also to authorize staff to work with KNN municipal finance to explore funding options and mechanisms for this work. He explained further that this work is going to support all of the growth the Member Agencies are experiencing in their own communities, as currently the facility is really maxed out, and is not going to be ready to handle that growth.

Chair Aguirre noted that because the facility is next to the airport, we can't go too high.

Executive Director La Mariana noted that actually there is an 85 foot vertical limit at the north end of the facility, which is where SCS is recommending we add the parking structure.

Member Rak asked if the height would exceed the City of San Carlos's zoning ordinance for height.

Executive Director La Mariana answered yes he believes San Carlos' height limit is currently 50 feet but, if necessary, it's possible to apply for a variance with the city

Member Rak noted that he liked option B with less costs, but still has the option for the expanded education center. He also liked the idea of freeing up space by adding a parking structure.

Executive Director La Mariana noted that currently employee parking takes up two to three acres on the site, so a parking structure allows for going vertical and recouping 2-3 acres on the site.

Member McCune noted that he was critical of this last time, and it hasn't gotten better in his opinion. He wants to see an option where the MRF and the transfer station stay the same but treat the back part of the site as a blank slate and optimize traffic patterns and material handling. He also thought a material handling study was needed to adequately address the needs of the site. He also added that he was willing to let this move forward, but it needs a lot more study including a fully adequate engineering study before any changes are made to the site.

Member Loraine noted that he agreed and there are still multiple options. He noted that the biggest difference seemed to be the education center, and he asked Mr. Williams to explain the differences between Option A and Option B.

Evan Williams replied that in Option A, there is a two-level structure elevated above the parking lot between the transfer station and the MRF, the Education Center and Recology staff would be in that building. The alternate approach does not build that building, and moves the Recology Administrative staff to the top level of the parking garage in the back, and moves SBR to the hauling operations and the Ed Center becomes the whole second floor of the existing building.

Member Loraine asked if there were education center opportunities being missed out on as a result of the lower cost option.

Evan Williams answered that the second option utilizes the ed center entrance that already exists but expands the ed center so that it can be better utilized. The Recology structure whether up front or in the back is relatively the same cost, the saving comes from using what already exists for the education center.

Member Froomin asked if the square footage for the office and the education center are roughly the same in both options.

Evan Williams answered there are relatively the same. He also noted that the current Recology building is not up to code, and their thinking was that it wasn't worth the money to retrofit the building.

Member Froomin asked what the height the 4 story parking structure building at task one would be.

Evan Williams answered if Recology will be housed in the parking structure it would be taller than just parking so it would depend on what decision was made about what was going in the structure.

Member Froomin asked if there would be an option to stay at or under the 50 foot limit with option B, or to go underground.

Evan Williams answered that the agency would want to do a cost benefit analysis, because you would need a larger ground footprint to stay under 50 feet in height. A geotechnical evaluation would need to be completed to determine if underground parking was an option.

Member Froomin noted that he thought there were things that could be done currently to maximize the use of the cart bin storage area space now before any site changes are made. He concluded by noting he likes option B.

Member Romero asked what the parking limit would be and noted that rule of thumb for a parking structure is \$60,000 per space, so this is a \$12M for just parking.

Evan Williams noted that the parking estimates were between 150 and 200, but keep in mind that we can count on regulations increasing overtime and needing space to comply with new regulations, so unless you can get more property it's going to be a challenge.

Motion/Second: Froomin/McCune for Option 2

Member Brownrigg noted that he hoped the design team would take Member McCune's early points to heart as we move forward with planning.

Roll Call Vote: All in favor 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								

**8. Public Education Outreach and Legislation**

No Items

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

- A. Agency Name/Logo Survey Results Summary
- B. 2023 Bay Area Solid Waste Rates and City Fees Survey
- C. Results of the Finance Committee Discussion of 2023-2024 Property Insurance
- D. 2023 Legislative Session Update
- E. Senate Bill (SB) 1383 Program Implementation Update
- F. Technical Consulting Contracts: April to August 2023
- G. 2022/23 Finance and Rate Setting Calendar
- H. Check Register Detail June – August 2023
- I. 2023 Meeting Planning Guide

No Questions

**10. Board Member Comments**

None

**11. Adjourn 4:28PM**