

MINUTES

**SOUTH BAYSIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

March 14, 2024 at 2:00PM.

San Carlos Library Conference Room A/B, 610 Elm Street Suite 202, San Carlos, CA 94070

Call to Order: 2:09PM

1. Roll Call

Agency	Present	Absent	Agency	Present	Absent
Belmont	X		Redwood City	X	
Burlingame	X	3:04PM	San Carlos		X
East Palo Alto	X		San Mateo	X	3:25PM
Foster City	X		County of San Mateo	X	
Hillsborough	X		West Bay Sanitary District	X	
Menlo Park	X				

Robert Roth represented Belmont
Joanna Chen represented Menlo Park

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. Executive Director's Report

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

Congratulations to Staff Au who sits on the NCRA Board and was on the planning committee for the recent NCRA Recycling Update event held last Monday.

March 28 is the Board/TAC retreat at the Belmont Sports Complex from 1 to 4PM, and he went over the format for the retreat.

Upcoming Important Dates: 4/25 Board Meeting

He introduced Reagan Chung who will be the new Recycling and Compliance Program Manager starting April 8.

Staff is spending a lot of time on the buildout of the new office, steel is ordered and things are moving. Staff's target to move is July.

We will continue to meet at the SamTrans building until November.

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 TAC, 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 September 14, 2023, TAC Meeting

Motion/Second: Lee/Cooke

Voice 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								

5. Creation of an Ad-Hoc TAC Committee to review the Organics Processing Request for Proposal submissions and recommend award to the Board of Directors

The Board elected TAC members to serve as the review committee for proposals received in response to the RFP. Staff is recommending 3-5 members sit on the ad-hoc committee to review the proposal.

Members Jack Johnson, City of San Mateo, Gordon Tong, County of San Mateo, and Sergio Ramirez, West Bay Sanitary District will serve as the ad-hoc review committee.

Motion/Second: Cooke/Lee

Voice 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. Senate Bill (SB) 1383 Program Update

- Outreach and Technical Assistance Update Presentation by Mia Rossi, Community Outreach Manager Recology San Mateo County

Staff gave an introduction of the agency's SB 1383 Technical Assistance programs, thanked Staff Chandok for her assistance with 1383 outreach in the absence of a program manager, and introduced Mia Rossi from Recology.

Mia Rossi gave a presentation on Recology's 1383 activity in 2024 including, outreach, waivers and route

reviews.

Staff Au noted that Recology would be continuing to speak on 1383 at TAC meetings going forward.

Member Michael asked if there is a general type of business that are getting approved for a waiver.

Mia answered that most waivers that are being approved are low volume generators that are less than 64 gallons of garbage per week. The space constraint waivers are more limited.

Member Henry asked for stats on applications for waivers versus approvals and denials.

Mia answered that Recology just started the waiver process in February, they have approved 8 so far and approximately 20 have gotten denied. Recology tries to approve or deny a waiver application within 2 weeks.

Member Lorenz noted that it could take up to 6 weeks for customers to get their letter of approval or denial because RethinkWaste gets the request first.

Member Lee asked for plenty of notice for route reviews as has been done in the past now that Recology has taken over that process.

Member Henry added that it would be nice for the Member Agencies to have a script for when customers have a question on route reviews.

RethinkWaste staff will put some talking points together for city staff.

Member Tong asked what the process is after a waiver is denied.

Mia answered that a Waste Zero specialist reaches out to the customer to get them started on service.

Chair Lorenz noted that her understanding was that a waiver approved for space constraints was only good for 5 years, and asked if it's clear to customers that the state wants them to make arrangements for space for compost when those 5 years are over.

Mia answered yes that information is in the letter, and they are notified that a space waiver is temporary.

Member Tong asked if there is any data that supports how effective the door tags have been.

Mia answered that it's hard to say, but in a lot of cases people don't even realize they're doing it wrong, and when they receive a tag they are also receiving a phone call, so that's another opportunity for educations.

- Discussion on Enforcement

Staff Au noted that starting this year, jurisdictions are required to implement enforcement of the 1383 regulations, so she wanted to check in with the TAC members on where they are with enforcement, and if they needed any assistance from RethinkWaste.

Member Johnson noted that San Mateo hasn't done anything on SB 1383 enforcement yet, they still have 3 businesses refusing to comply with AB 1826, and they are struggling with how to enforce with these 3 businesses. He noted when he gets the list from RethinkWaste he plans to send a warning letter sometime in April and commented that the cities need to be serious about their obligations to enforcement. He asked that the Recyclist data include all the work that SCS and RethinkWaste have done with the customers up to 2024, so there is a record of how much work has been done to date.

Chair Lorenz asked that Recology and RethinkWaste coordinate the timing of the member agencies' enforcement letters and making sure the data is clean so that the Cities aren't all sending out their letters at once and overwhelming Recology's call center or the cities with upset customers calls.

Member Henry commented that if data is only getting uploaded quarterly, and a customer signs up for service in between the quarterly updates, then they could receive a call/letter for out of compliance when they really aren't.

Staff Au noted that the system Recology uses and Recyclist are two different systems, so it does take some time to match everything up so it's not a perfect system which is why we go back to Recology, to try and catch those types of issues.

Member Tong asked if there was a timeline for enforcement.

Staff Au noted that she would go back and look at the regulations and follow up with the TAC.

Chair Lorenz agreed that sometime between now and our EAR we need to do at least one round of compliance letters, and it would be nice if that letter could include the number of times the customer has been contacted before.

- Procurement Discussion on Possible Collaboration with Peninsula Clean Energy, Gordon Tong
TAC Member San Mateo County

Staff Au introduced the item and noted that AB 2346 (Lee) has been introduced this year. It is co-sponsored by StopWaste and would add additional methods for meeting the 1383 procurement requirements. Staff is tracking this bill closely, and a number of 1383 bills that are proposed in the legislation this year.

Member Tong presented on the possibility that electricity derived from renewable natural gas could possibly meeting procurement requirements for SB 1383, and he wanted to gauge interest in pulling the agency cities together to work with PCE to put a power procurement package together that is comprised of 100% natural gas. Then the cities could meet their requirements by purchasing natural gas. He noted that more research is required; PCE has noted that they are willing to look into this, but there will be a cost associated with the RFO, as well as the power itself would cost more than traditional power because it's such a niche power product. He also noted that ABAG has a natural gas community choice program, and they are starting a program specifically to meet 1383 requirements, so this is a different model, but could meet all of the requirements without buying compost. Both options are two to three times more expensive than what the jurisdictions are paying now for traditional power.

Member Cooke noted that Hillsborough would be interested especially in partnering with PCE. She asked how the cost structure would work, since the cost goes to the users.

Member Tong commented that the city would have to purchase the power for the city owned buildings that they use, it couldn't be passed on to the residents. They looked at it for the County owned buildings against their procurement targets for unincorporated county, and it would be more than enough to meet all of their 1383 procurement targets, which may not be true in a city with more people and fewer buildings.

Member Cooke asked about the cost to PCE.

Member Tong noted that PCE has indicated there is a cost at least to study it, but we don't know what the overall cost of this would be yet, but PCE has made it clear that they don't want to bear the brunt of the cost of this program because it's a waste issue.

Member Johnson noted that San Mateo would be interested and thought that it would qualify for local assistance grants.

3:25PM Member Johnson now absent

Chair Lorenz noted that Foster City is interested and would like to put the local assistance grant money towards this. She also thought if they paid extra PCE could have it distributed to the eco 100 customers and increase the amount that counted. She also wanted it to be scalable based on how the legislation might change.

Member Tong noted this is very early days, but they may ask for a long-term commitment which is more normal in the power community.

Member Roth asked about the possibility of turning food waste into renewable natural gas using Silicon Valley Clean Water (SVCW).

Executive Director La Mariana noted that we did a one year pilot with food and organic waste with SVCW. It was technically successful, but there are some costs that SVCW is charging that don't make it viable because it costs more than organics processing, we do have long term plans to do something with this material at a higher and better use.

Member Tong noted that this is a different option than the PCE and ABAG approach that might cost more but should be simpler.

Executive Director La Mariana commented that the concept sounds exciting, and if our facility's power needs could be credited towards a member agency's procurement requirements we'd be interested. In the meantime we have to pursue other currently viable options because this option is down the road.

Member Henery commented that EPA has two buildings so they aren't helpful in the PCE or ABAG options but thought subsidizing the Organics-to-Energy program in order to meet 1383 procurement could work.

Member Ramirez suggested bringing this up at the retreat, to try to get the crossover of board members between our board and SVCW board so that the board members put pressure on staff to make it work.

The committee gave Member Tong direction to continue the research, but they are not quite ready to commit money yet.

7. Contractor Updates

- Recology
No Report
- SBI

Dwight Herring of SBI gave the following updates, noting this was SBI's first report out to the TAC:

- Currently SBI has 112 personnel on site
- They are recruiting for 2 positions -a transfer station supervisor and a driver
- All of their new equipment has been delivered except a few coming in April, so they are using rentals
- The PRC is now open 7 days a week
- Bale commodities are moving, and bale storage is manageable. They have two brokers for materials
- Volume is increasing despite rate increases.
- Engaged in Shoreway beautification project, moving to interiors
- Working with staff on MRF Phase II.

8. Committee Member Comments

Invitation to all to join the RethinkWaste April 27th Earth Day Celebration.

Member Tong noted that the San Mateo County Office of Sustainability is now the San Mateo County Sustainability Department

9. Adjourn 3:51PM