



Minutes of January 15, 2014 Meeting

The Sonoma County Waste Management Agency met on January 15, 2014, at the City of Santa Rosa Council Chambers, 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Santa Rosa, California

Present:

City of Cloverdale	Bob Cox
City of Cotati	Diane Thompson
City of Healdsburg	Jim Wood
City of Petaluma	Dan St. John
City of Rohnert Park	John McArthur
City of Santa Rosa	Jennifer Phillips
City of Sebastopol	Sue Kelly
City of Sonoma	Steve Barbose
County of Sonoma	Shirlee Zane
Town of Windsor	Debora Fudge

Staff Present:

Counsel	Janet Coleson
Staff	Patrick Carter
	Karina Chilcott
	Henry Mikus
Clerk	Rebecca Lankford

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:04 a.m.

2. Agenda Approval

Janet Coleson, Agency Counsel, noted the vote requirement for Item 10 had changed from 'Unanimous' to 'Majority'.

Bob Cox, City of Cloverdale, moved to approve the Agenda. Steve Barbose, City of Sonoma, seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Vote:

Cloverdale- Aye	Cotati- Aye	County- Aye	Healdsburg- Aye
Petaluma- Absent	Rohnert Park- Aye	Santa Rosa- Aye	Sebastopol- Aye
Sonoma – Aye	Windsor- Aye		

AYES -9-

NOES -0-

ABSENT -1-

ABSTAIN -0-

3. Public Comments (items not on the agenda)

Ernie Carpenter, waste consultant, attended a No-Name Garbage Group meeting last week and would like to address a couple of issues addressed there. First, the Agency must move faster and become more focused on the compost program. Second, he does not believe Agency Staff is leading the Board in a direction where the compost program and contract are a priority.

Margaret Kullberg, Site 40 neighbor, stated she owns 90 acres of vineyards and that there are more than 500 acres of vineyards in addition to organic dairies and other agricultural businesses in the vicinity. Ms. Kullberg declared that a compost facility at Site 40 would be in the middle of beautiful farmland; with the green waste and food waste causing odors, pigeons, viruses and other nuisances. Ms. Kullberg also noted her belief that the traffic impact on Highway 116 would be insurmountable with little thought being given to the effects of increasing the traffic. Ms. Kullberg asserted her disbelief that the County would consider making modifications to the site zoning as the Central Site Alternative is consistent with the Sonoma County General Plan.

9: 13 Dan St. John, City of Petaluma, arrived.

Board Members Introductions

Public Comments (Con't)

Robert Bogel stated that the California Department of Conservation has classified Site 40 as prime farmland, with State and Local importance. Mr. Bogel expressed that area residents and agricultural businesses object to the irreversible conversion of the property to a compost facility. Mr. Bogel recounted that the Draft Environmental Impact Report identified six significant and unavoidable health and environmental impacts arising from a potential compost operation at Site 40, while only one significant and unavoidable impact has been identified at the current site. Mr. Bogel believes that the neighbors of Site 40 are looking to the Agency to be the stewards of the County's perishable natural resources and to not seek ways to justify a project that would result in known significant damage to the environment, horticultural operations, and expose residents to carcinogens. Believes the Central Site Alternative needs to be more closely considered.

Mike Frey, Surfrider Foundation, wanted to discuss the Carry-Out Bag Ordinance. Mr. Wood noted this was an Agenda Item and informed Mr. Frey there would be an opportunity to speak on this issue when the item was in front of the Board.

Roger Larson, Happy Acres, expressed his empathy for the neighbors of Site 40, stating he understands the "not in my backyard" mindset, however, he noted that the grapes near the Central Site are no different than those near Site 40 and that there are indeed other issues with the Central Site that cannot be overlooked, such as size.

4. Election of 2014 Officers

The schedule of officers proposed using the approved alphabetical rotation are: Jim Wood, City of Healdsburg as the Chair, Dan St. John, City of Petaluma as the Vice Chair and John McArthur, City of Rohnert Park as the Chair Pro Tempore.

Shirlee Zane, County of Sonoma, inquired as to the position of the County within the rotation.

Mr. Mikus responded that the County of Sonoma would rotate into an officer position utilizing the alphabetization of "Sonoma", as has historically been the case.

Jennifer Phillips, City of Santa Rosa, moved to approve the schedule of officers as presented. Debora Fudge, Town of Windsor, seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Vote:

Cloverdale- Aye	Cotati- Aye	County- Aye	Healdsburg- Aye
Petaluma- Aye	Rohnert Park- Aye	Santa Rosa- Aye	Sebastopol- Aye
Sonoma – Aye	Windsor- Aye		

AYES -10- NOES -0- ABSENT -0- ABSTAIN -0-

Consent (w/attachments)

- 5.1 Minutes of November 20, 2013
- 5.2 Minutes of December 18, 2013
- 5.3 E-Waste Contact Extension

Ms. Phillips, Mr. St. John abstained from the vote of Item 5.1 the Minutes of November 20, 2013, due to their absences.

Diane Thompson, City of Cotati, abstained from the vote of Item 5.1, the Minutes of November 20, 2013, and item 5.2, Minutes of December 18, 2013, due to her absence.

Mr. Barbose move to approve the Consent Calendar. Ms. Fudge seconded the motion. The motion passed, with the noted abstentions.

5.1 Vote Count:

Cloverdale- Aye	Cotati- Abstain
County- Aye	Healdsburg- Aye
Petaluma- Abstain	Rohnert Park- Aye
Santa Rosa- Abstain	Sebastopol- Aye
Sonoma – Aye	Windsor- Aye

AYES -7- NOES -0- ABSENT -0- ABSTAIN -3-

5.2 Vote Count:

Cloverdale- Aye	Cotati- Abstain
County- Aye	Healdsburg- Aye
Petaluma- Aye	Rohnert Park- Aye
Santa Rosa- Aye	Sebastopol- Aye
Sonoma – Aye	Windsor- Aye

AYES -9- NOES -0- ABSENT -0- ABSTAIN -1-

5.3 Vote Count:

Cloverdale- Aye	Cotati- Abstain
County- Aye	Healdsburg- Aye
Petaluma- Abstain	Rohnert Park- Aye
Santa Rosa- Abstain	Sebastopol- Aye
Sonoma – Aye	Windsor- Aye

AYES -10- NOES -0- ABSENT -0- ABSTAIN -0-

Regular Calendar

6. **Compost “Zero Discharge” Project Status**

Mr. Mikus provided a review of the Agency’s proposed plan for capturing the first flush of a rain event, including the rental of tanks, hauling, treatment and discharge of the storm water. Mr. Mikus noted that Sonoma Compost Company (SCC) is responsible for the first \$50,000 of costs for this project and the Agency is responsible for the remainder. Mr. Mikus asked the Board to approve an expenditure of up to \$90,000 from the Organic Reserve Account, noting the actual cost maybe more or less depending on the amount of rain received during the season.

Board Questions

Steve Barbose, City of Sonoma, inquired if the amount requested was just for the rental of the holding tanks.

Mr. Mikus indicated the amount requested includes the rental of ten 20,000-gallon tanks as well as the hauling, treatment and discharge of the storm water.

Mr. Barbose asked if Agency Staff had explored the option of purchasing the tanks.

Mr. Mikus responded that purchasing the tanks had not considered due to the limited amount of time left at the current composting site.

Mr. Barbose suggested Agency Staff explore the possibility of purchasing the tanks, as they will likely be used multiple years.

Mr. St. John inquired how much time is left at the current site.

Mr. Mikus responded that once a new site is chosen it is estimated the operation will continue for another 2 - 3 years at the current site.

Mr. St. John asked for clarification regarding what was being asked of the Board, a budget amendment or a contract amendment.

Mr. Mikus replied the Board was being asked to approve a budget amendment, as the current contract with Sonoma Compost Company makes them responsible for the initial cost up to \$50,000. The amount requested for approval will cover the reimbursement of expenses as outlined in the contract with Sonoma Compost Company.

Mr. St. John expressed his agreement with Barbose regarding the purchase of the tanks, noting the time remaining at the site.

Mr. Mikus asserted that Agency Staff would look into the possibility of purchasing tanks, noting that an expenditure of funds would still be required and asked the Board to approve the budget amendment indicating a “not to exceed” amount.

Mr. McArthur asked Agency Staff to clarify what is required to be captured during rain events, and how was first flush being defined.

Mr. Mikus responded that the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board is requiring the Agency to capture the storm water from a first flush event; first flush is defined as the first 200,000 gallons of storm water occurring as a result of rain events more than one week apart.

Shirlee Zane, County of Sonoma, supported the proposal by the other board members to have Agency Staff inquire about the purchase cost of the tanks.

Mr. St. John asked if the cost presented to the board at this meeting address other recommendations from the NCRWQCB.

Mr. Mikus replied that the cost and the issue currently in front of the Board is strictly in regards to the first flush requirement. The other issues and recommendations presented by NCRWQCB are not currently ready for action.

Public Comments

None

Board Discussion

Mr. St. John moved to approve the expenditure of up to \$90,000 from the Organic Reserve Account, and was seconded by Mr. McArthur.

Mr. Barbose indicated that he would prefer to postpone acting on this item until Agency Staff present information regarding the purchase cost of the tanks.

Ms. Fudge remarked that if the Agency doesn't take action and there is a rain event prior to a decision being made Agency Staff will have no authorization or ability to rent or purchase any tanks. Ms. Fudge stated her belief that some action should be taken at this meeting.

Mr. Mikus explained that Agency Staff needs the authorization to spend the funds required to address the first flush issue, whether that means purchasing the tanks or renting them; he noted Agency Staff would pursue the most cost efficient way of mitigating the issue.

Mr. Barbose inquired what the minimum amount of time for which the tanks would be rented. Mr. Barbose explained that if the Agency takes the minimum amount of rental time multiplied by the estimated rental cost that amount could determine the maximum amount the Board authorizes Agency Staff to spend.

Mr. St. John asked for clarification regarding the process of capturing the first flush; specifically inquiring why the tanks are needed.

Mr. Mikus explained that the process will include the storm water going into the pond, being pumped from the pond into the tanks, then from the tanks it will be pumped into trucks and hauled away for treatment. Mr. Mikus explained that the pond holds over one million gallons, the goal is to separate the first 200,000 gallons from the subsequent storm waters

Sue Kelly, City of Sebastopol, asked how long it would take for the system to be in place.

Mr. Mikus responded that it is anticipated to take about one month.

Ms. Phillips clarified that the hauling and treatment costs will remain the same regardless of whether the tanks are bought or rented; the only cost that would change would be the \$46,000 specific to the tanks.

Mr. Wood noted that there was a motion and second in front of the Board; the motion is to adopt the staff recommendation; he suggested that the motion either needed to be modified or disposed of to allow for the discussion of a new motion.

Mr. Barbose moved to amend the initial motion to include “Give the Executive Director the authority to purchase the tanks if the amount exceeds the estimated rental cost for a two year period”. Mr. St. John seconded the motion.

Mr. Mikus reported that after reviewing documentation the rental cost for the tanks for a period of one year is approximately \$90,000.

The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

Vote:

Cloverdale- Aye	Cotati- Aye	County- Aye	Healdsburg- Aye
Petaluma- Aye	Rohnert Park- Aye	Santa Rosa- Aye	Sebastopol- Aye

AYES -10-	NOES -0-	ABSENT -0-	ABSTAIN -0-
-----------	----------	------------	-------------

Mr. Wood noted there were board members who had to leave prior to the end of the meeting, asked Mr. Mikus for guidance as several items required unanimous vote.

Mr. Mikus suggested that the board address Agenda Items 8, 9 and 11 in respective order.

Ms. Coleson asked for clarification of the motion pertaining to the budget amendment.

Patrick Carter, Agency Staff, questioned the spending amount being authorized by the Board. Mr. Carter calculated the approved amount as \$272,000 (based on a two year rental estimate).

Mr. Barbose clarified the intentions of his motion by noting the length of a “two year period” was intended to be two 5-month periods, two seasons not two calendar years.

Mr. Carter confirmed the new approved amount of \$178,000.

7. Carryout Bag Ordinance EIR Certification

Ms. Fudge inquired about the unanimous vote requirement as it was her understanding that the Second Amendment to the JPA would eliminate that need.

Mr. Carter stated that the Second Amendment to the JPA does not address the voting requirements, unanimous or other.

Ms. Coleson also clarified that, at the time of the meeting, the Second Amendment of the JPA was not official as the Agency had not received the needed ten signed amendments from each jurisdiction. Ms. Coleson noted that the official date the Second Amendment would go into place is the date the tenth signed Amendment is received.

Mr. Carter reported the Agency is considering adoption of the Final EIR for the Waste Reduction Program for Carryout Bags. Mr. Carter noted the Draft and Final EIR's found no significant environmental impacts would result from this program, with some beneficial impacts. Mr. Carter recounted any impacts identified in the EIR, were all less than significant without mitigation measures. Mr. Carter indicated if the Board certifies the EIR, Agency staff will file a Notice of Determination (NOD) with the County Clerk, which begins a 30 day statute of limitation during which challenges to the certification of the EIR can be made. The Board must act upon the EIR prior to considering the proposed Ordinance. Mr. Carter concluded Agency Staff recommends opening the public hearing on the issue of certification of the Final EIR, receiving public comment, closing the public hearing, certifying the Final EIR, and directing staff to file the Notice of Determination with the County Clerk.

Board Questions

None

Mr. Wood opened the public hearing.

Public Comments

Cea Higgins, Sonoma Coast Surfriders, addressed the board stating that she has been coordinating efforts to clean up the Sonoma Coast for over ten years and has seen the detrimental effects of human choices on the marine environment. Ms. Higgins displayed samples of trash that she has found along the coast. Ms. Higgins expressed her belief that the plastic bag ban is past the necessity stage in Sonoma County and wants to see the Agency looking forward into the future. Ms. Higgins inquired about the opt-out options included in the ordinance, Mr. Wood referred her to speak with Agency Staff/Counsel at a different time.

Keary Sorenson, Marine Debris Clean-Up Coordinator for California State Parks, stated that he wanted to ensure it is understood that when plastic bags breakdown the release sulfur; they kill and kill quickly. Mr. Sorenson stated research indicates that there are 48,000 pieces of visible plastic debris per square mile along the California coast.

Board Discussion

Mr. Barbose motioned to open public hearings, receive comments, close public hearing, certify the FEIR, and direct staff to file the Notice of Determination. Ms. Zane seconded the motion.

Vote:

Cloverdale- Aye	Cotati- Aye	County- Aye	Healdsburg- Aye
Petaluma- Aye	Rohnert Park- Aye	Santa Rosa- Aye	Sebastopol- Aye
Sonoma – Aye	Windsor- Aye		

AYES -10-

NOES -0-

ABSENT -0-

ABSTAIN -0-

8. Carryout Bag Ordinance First Reading

Ms. Coleson indicated that Susan Klassen, County of Sonoma- Director of Transportation and Public Works, brought attention to the question of how an individual reading the ordinance would know where it is in effect, if a jurisdiction were to opt out of participating. Ms. Coleson suggested it may be beneficial to add language similar to "This Ordinance will be in effect throughout the

jurisdiction of the SCWMA with the exception of any jurisdiction that has officially opted out of this waste reduction program for carry out bags.” at the end of ‘Purpose and Intent’.

Board Questions

Mr. Barbose inquired if the language could be added without postponing the First Reading.

Ms. Coleson responded affirmatively, noting that the First Reading allows changes and amendments to the language of the Ordinance; the Second Reading must be exactly the same as the First.

Public Comments

Sarah Lecas, Sonoma County Surfrider, expressed her support for the ordinance. Ms. Lucas mentioned that as a resident of Santa Rosa she was disappointed that the city had chosen to opt out; however, talk of a city-wide ordinance that could eventually include restaurants and Styrofoam seems promising.

Mr. Sorenson addressed the Board noting the Ordinance will be economically beneficial to Sonoma County by taking money from large plastic bag manufacturers and by promoting local businesses via cloth bags.

Dennis Rosatti, Executive Director of the Sonoma County Conservation Action spoke in favor of the Ordinance noting that any opportunity that can be taken to eliminate a significant source of plastic pollution is a worthy effort.

Board Discussion

Ms. Coleson noted that a new court case had just been settled that may pave the way for the ordinance to one day include restaurants.

Mr. Barbose moved for the Board to introduce and waive the First Reading of the Waste Reduction Program for Carryout Bags Ordinance with the amendments suggested by Agency Counsel, and to approve the ordinance. Ms. Zane seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Vote:

Cloverdale- Aye	Cotati- Aye	County- Aye	Healdsburg- Aye
Petaluma- Aye	Rohnert Park- Aye	Santa Rosa- Aye	Sebastopol- Aye
Sonoma – Aye	Windsor- Aye		

AYES -10-

NOES -0-

ABSENT -0-

ABSTAIN -0-

Board Comments

Ms. Zane noted that the Agency has been working on the Ordinance for a long time; she inquired if it would really not be going into effect until September 1, 2014 and if so why.

Ms. Coleson explained that this was the first reading; the second reading will take place during the February Board Meeting, 30 days after the second reading the Ordinance will be in effect. Ms. Coleson advised that the September 1, 2014 date is stated in the Ordinance and will provide retailers sufficient time to prepare.

Ms. Zane expressed that she would like the ordinance implemented sooner than September 1, 2014 noting that she believes retailers are ready. Ms. Zane asked Ms. Phillips if Santa Rosa would be expediting their ordinance process to minimize the confusion amongst residents.

Ms. Phillips responded that the draft ordinance presented to the City Council is a mirror ordinance to the one being adopted by SCWMA.

Ms. Zane reaffirmed her belief that the Ordinance should be implemented prior to September; suggesting it be implemented in March.

Ms. Coleson explained that the language which was just voted on and approved unanimously states that the effective date at September 1, 2014; retailers will be encouraged to comply with the Ordinance's guidelines before that date, but, enforcement cannot take place prior. Ms. Coleson advised if the Board wishes to change the September 1, 2014 the Ordinance would have to be modified and reintroduced.

Mr. Barbose asked why the date could not be changed as easily as the language was added to the "Purpose and Intent" section.

Ms. Coleson indicated that due to the vote, approval and introduction of the Ordinance adding or modifying existing language would require amending the Ordinance and reintroducing it.

Mr. Wood inquired if two separate dates could be established, one for when the Ordinance goes into effect and then September 1, 2014 when the Ordinance would begin being enforced.

Ms. Coleson replied that the Ordinance would be in effect 30 days after the second reading.

Mr. Carter explained that the six months between the effective date and the date enforcement would start, was not a arbitrary decision, it was established through discussions with other jurisdictions who have implemented similar ordinances. Mr. Carter reported that other jurisdictions have been able to mitigate some enforcement issues through proper education.

Ms. Fudge expressed her desire to have the media and Agency outreach emphasize the Ordinance is officially in effect 30 days after the second reading.

Mr. Wood asked the board members if the implementation timeline was clear and if they were comfortable with it.

Mr. St. John suggested encouraging a soft roll out as soon as possible, with the goal of having issues worked out by September 1, 2014.

9. Waste Characterization Study Agreement

Mr. Carter reported that waste characterization studies are conducted periodically to help determine what is in the trash; this helps to make policy decisions regarding what needs to be targeted for diversion. A Request for Proposal was released on October 31, 2013, proposals were received from Cascadia Consulting Group, Leidos Engineering LLC, and SCS Engineers. After reviewing the proposals, two firms were interviewed based on their understanding of the project, experience and fewest changes to the proposed agreement. It has been determined by Agency Staff that SCS Engineers be the best firm for the project. While \$110,000 has been budgeted for

the study SCS Engineers has proposed a cost of \$112,956, however, there is sufficient funding available without the need for an appropriations transfer. Mr. Carter reported at this time Agency Staff recommends approving the proposed agreement with SCS Engineers.

Board Questions

None

Public Comments

Mr. Carpenter suggested the Agency have SCS Engineers include in the study the amount of waste that is hauled out of the County.

Board Discussion

Mr. Wood inquired if Mr. Carpenter's suggestion is something that could be completed by the consultant.

Mr. Carter responded that it is something that could be explored, noting that in addition to Redwood Landfill having to be willing to disclose their customer list it would also add to the scope of work and presumably the cost.

Ms. Fudge noted there is waste that Petaluma sends to the Redwood Landfill that would not be taken into account in the characterization.

Mr. Mikus asserted that SCS Engineers recognizes that Redwood Landfill receives waste from Petaluma and therefore has included it as a location to study/ sample.

Ms. Phillips motioned to approve the agreement with SCS Engineers as presented, Ms. Kelly seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Vote:

Cloverdale- Aye	Cotati- Aye	County- Aye	Healdsburg- Aye
Petaluma- Aye	Rohnert Park- Aye	Santa Rosa- Aye	Sebastopol- Aye
Sonoma – Aye	Windsor- Aye		

AYES -10-	NOES -0-	ABSENT -0-	ABSTAIN -0-
-----------	----------	------------	-------------

Direction

Mr. Wood would like Agency Staff to explore the options for having SCS Engineers study the kinds and amount of waste being hauled to out of County refuse sites.

Ms. Thompson left at 10:27

Mr. St. John inquired how the data from the study will be used.

Mr. Carter responded that it is a tool which will aid the Agency in making policy recommendations as well as providing information to help focus education efforts.

10. JPA Agreement Amendment Discussion

Mr. Mikus reported that all governing bodies of the member jurisdictions have been presented with the proposed amendment and have given their Agency representatives the authority to vote

affirmatively. At this time it is a matter of processing and receiving signed amendments from all ten jurisdictions.

Mr. St. John noted that Petaluma has been waiting for the EIR Certification prior to moving forward with processing the Second Amendment.

Board Questions

None

Public Comments

None

Board Discussion

None

11. Administrative Penalties Ordinance First Reading

Mr. Carter reported that the Administrative Penalties Ordinance is a companion ordinance to the Waste Reduction Program for Carryout Bag, and for any subsequent ordinance the Agency may adopt in the future. Mr. Carter asked the Board to vote to introduce and waive the first reading of the Administrative Penalties Ordinance.

Board Questions

Bob Cox, City of Cloverdale, stated that while Cloverdale is in favor of the Ordinance, an issue has risen over the record keeping requirement; the City Council believe that it is another layer of bureaucracy imposed on businesses. Mr. Cox noted that at this time Cloverdale will vote in favor of the administrative penalties, however, they will reserve the right to opt out of the ordinance.

Public Comments

None

Board Discussion

Ms. Kelly moved to introduce and waive the first reading of the Administrative Penalties Ordinance as presented. Mr. McArthur seconded the motion. The motion passed with nine ayes, zero noes, zero abstentions, and one absent.

Vote:

Cloverdale- Aye	Cotati- Absent	County- Aye	Healdsburg- Aye
Petaluma- Aye	Rohnert Park- Aye	Santa Rosa- Aye	Sebastopol- Aye
Sonoma – Aye	Windsor- Aye		

AYES -10-	NOES -0-	ABSENT -0-	ABSTAIN -0-
-----------	----------	------------	-------------

12. Sonoma Compost Report

Mr. Mikus introduced Pam Davis of Sonoma Compost Company.

Ms. Davis provided a brief history of Sonoma Compost Company (SCC) and the relationship with the Agency. In 1993 SCC partnered with the Agency for the formation of an Organics Program; that year SCC diverted approximately 40,000 tons of material; in 2013 they diverted approximately 100,000 tons while producing nearly 124,000 cubic yards of finished and marketed

product. Ms. Davis noted these numbers indicated the significance of the Organics Program in Sonoma County. Ms. Davis reported that since 2009 SCC has invested more than \$1,000,000 in new equipment as well as additional expenditures for maintaining the 20 acre cement pad on which they operate. Ms. Davis indicated that the operation is currently permitted to process 108,000 tons per year, this means that they are nearing their permitted capacity as well as operational capacity. Ms. Davis expressed her pleasure with the Agency's "It's in our roots" educational focus for 2014, noting the cleanliness of materials brought to the facility requires that they have 5 full time employees to pick through material to remove inappropriate debris.

Board Questions

Ms. Zane asked about the drop in processing fees from mid-2012 as indicated in Ms. Davis' report.

Ms. Davis responded that due to a new agreement SCC was able to reevaluate their processing costs and lower the fees accordingly.

Ms. Zane asked what the processing fees were at currently and if they would continue to drop.

Mr. Carter responded that per the contract with SCC fees should follow the Consumer Price Index.

Ms. Davis also noted that through the agreement with the Agency overall processing fee increases have been minimal, primarily following the CPI trend.

Mr. St. John asked what SCC's annual gross revenue is.

Mr. Carter replied that it is approximately \$2.5 million

Mr. St. John stated that the Petaluma City Council would like to increase diversion rates from the City and have cited food waste as a goal. He inquired what SCC is doing in the near term to meet those needs.

Ms. Davis replied that the current permit which the operation holds does not allow for the processing of full food waste, only vegetative scraps; Ms. Davis suggested discussing full food waste hauling options with the city's waste hauler.

Ms. Zane left at 10:50

Mr. St. John asked what SCC has done and what they can do in the future to assist the composting program as it grows.

Ms. Davis replied that SCC has been very active in discussions with the Agency and the County regarding the composting program, site selection and other issues.

Mr. Mikus noted that the reason the Agency currently has the choice between two sites is because of the effort and work SCC, whose consultant provided the information showing the Central site could accommodate the required volumes with the appropriate methods and technology.

Mr. McArthur stated that he would like a tour of the compost site noting it could be beneficial in clearly understanding what is taking place. Mr. McArthur also noted that with 20 years of

experience in waste water treatment he would like to point out that all processing systems, including the frequently discussed, anaerobic digester, create a by-product.

Ms. Davis stated that the desire has always been to receive clean, unadulterated food scraps, however, that is not the reality, so, if we want that material to stay in the County we have to look at new technology whether it be an anaerobic digester or turning the product into a lower grade, non-agricultural, product.

Mr. Mikus explained that previously the Board had authorized the Agency to contract with Sonoma Vermiculture noting that the agreement would provide a relatively quick and efficient way to develop full-food waste processing capabilities. Unfortunately, the company was unable to establish adequate flow commitments and therefore not able to obtain necessary funding for expansion beyond their initial pilot program.

Public Comments

Ms. Kullberg asserted that SCC had been advised by current users of an Aerated Static Pile system that using a certain amount of food waste is viable with the system. Ms. Kullberg recalled her belief that several engineering firms have indicated putting a pond to contain waste water/ storm water is a possibility at the current site.

Ms. Davis responded that the ASP system will work no matter which new proposed site is selected, however, at the current site permanent infrastructure is not an option.

Board Discussion

None

13. Attachments/Correspondence:

- 13.1 Director's Agenda Notes
- 13.2 Reports by Staff and Others:
 - 13.2.a January, February and March 2014 Outreach Events
 - 13.2.b Eco Desk (English and Spanish) 2013
 - 13.2.c Website www.recyclenow.org 2013 Annual Report
 - 13.2.d Education 2013 Outreach Summary
 - 13.2.e Mandatory Commercial Recycling (MCR-2) online survey feedback results
 - 13.2.f Mandatory Commercial Recycling (MCR-3) progress report

14. Board member Comments

None

15. Staff Comments

Mr. Mikus noted that the final report from Sherry Lund on the December 18, 2013 Strategic Planning Meeting was emailed to Board members on January 14, 2014.

Mr. Mikus indicated that the Agenda/ Agenda Packet format will be reformatted for the February 2014 Board Meeting.

Mr. Carter announced that Peterson Paints in Petaluma has joined the PaintCare network.

Mr. Carter advised that CalRecycle will be reaching out to Board members in the following months to complete their annual report.

16. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 A.M.

Submitted by
Rebecca Lankford