



Minutes of May 20, 2015 Special Meeting

The Sonoma County Waste Management Agency met on May 20, 2015, at the City of Santa Rosa Council Chambers, 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Santa Rosa, California.

Present:

City of Cloverdale	Bob Cox
City of Cotati	Susan Harvey
City of Healdsburg	Brent Salmi
City of Petaluma	Dan St. John
City of Rohnert Park	Don Schwartz
City of Santa Rosa	John Sawyer
City of Sebastopol	Larry McLaughlin
City of Sonoma	Madolyn Agrimonti
County of Sonoma	Susan Gorin
Town of Windsor	Deb Fudge

Staff Present:

Counsel	Ethan Walsh
Staff	Henry Mikus
	Patrick Carter
	Lisa Steinman
Agency Clerk	Sally Evans

1. Call to Order Regular Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

2. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - EXISTING LITIGATION GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.9(d)(1)

Renewed Efforts of Neighbors Against Landfill Expansion vs. County of Sonoma, Sonoma Compost Company, Sonoma County Waste Management Agency
Case 3:14-cv-03804-THE

3. Adjourn Closed Session

4. Agenda Approval

No changes to the agenda.

John Sawyer, City of Santa Rosa, motioned to approve the agenda and Bob Cox, City of Cloverdale, seconded the motion.

Vote Count:

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-

Motion passed unanimously.

Chair St. John reported the Board has continued closed session, and will resume closed session after the regular meeting. Chair St. John added the Board has anticipated a number of public comments at this meeting, and did not want to make any final decisions on the closed session matter without having first heard public comment. Chair St. John explained that public comment on matters not on the agenda, including the closed session issue on the landfill litigation, is appropriate at this time, and asked that those wishing to comment on the regular or consent calendar wait until that item is called.

5. Public Comments (items not on the agenda)

Paul Kaiser, Singing Frogs Farm in Sebastopol, stated they produce high quality vegetables sold only in Sonoma County, and added they keep their food and composting local. Mr. Kaiser expressed his support for Sonoma Compost to remain local, operational, and meeting all environmental guidelines. Mr. Kaiser stated Sonoma Compost supports hundreds of local businesses, and thousands of local people in landscaping and food production, and added they are a large part of helping keep the County’s greenhouse gas emissions down as well as the quality of food and life up.

Tiffany Renee, Petaluma Grange, thanked the Board for waiting to hear public comment, and added she believes this is a very important issue for the County. Ms. Renee stated she is representing the Petaluma Grange and their members, and added they have several farmer members who utilize Sonoma Compost products, whose growing productions and cost of doing business would be affected without Sonoma Compost. Ms. Renee expressed that importing compost from other areas would be an unfortunate circumstance for farmers in the County. Ms. Renee stated Sonoma Compost provides an excellent product, and shared that she purchased over 10 yards for her small 1/8th acre in Petaluma, and finds that it creates the best food she’s ever had.

Ms. Renee expressed she also sees this as a water issue, as biomass in the form of green waste going to Sonoma Compost has quite a bit of water in it. Ms. Renee added that to export green waste out of the area means water is being exported, and it's a ridiculous mistake given the drought circumstances. Ms. Renee asked the Board to consider all the issues, including the County’s food cycle and food economy, and added that the bottom line for the farmers is that it’s the best possible grow through Sonoma Compost’s product. Ms. Renee asked for the continued expansion of Sonoma Compost to the greatest possible extent until a new facility is created.

Ursula Schnell, Santa Rosa Resident, stated she has been a Sonoma County resident for 3-4 years, and chose to live here due to all the progressive ideas and wonderful things happening. Ms. Schnell shared she recently filled in her pool to help with the drought and build a garden, and chose Sonoma Compost fill and soil. Ms. Schnell shared that after a lot of research, Sonoma

Compost was the only choice due to their high quality, as soil scientist Will Bakx is passionate about the business and what he does.

Ms. Schnell shared that when she first moved to Sonoma County, her spouse was recovering from cancer, and they were supported by Ceres food and touched by Sonoma Compost before they realized they existed. Ms. Schnell added that Sonoma Compost helped create the garden that Ceres grew their food on. Ms. Schnell shared the life expectancy of her spouse was two years and they now are going on five years, and she believes it's due to the food they eat, provided by Ceres and due to Sonoma Compost.

Ms. Schnell explained that famous basketball player Will Allen has created composting in Chicago, Milwaukee, and other areas and getting awards, grants, and honorary doctorate degrees for the work he is doing in the urban composting and gardening movement. Ms. Schnell asked why Sonoma Compost is being sued instead of receiving awards and support.

Randy Stephens, Sonoma County Resident, stated it's been claimed that proximity to the Central Landfill and Sonoma Compost are detrimental to property values, and he lives exactly two miles from there and assures that nothing is detrimental to property values in his neighborhood. Mr. Stephens stated he believes being close to Sonoma Compost increases the value of his property, as he doesn't have to travel far to remove his yard waste and obtain their materials.

Ron Bartholomew, Sebastopol Resident, stated he has been a volunteer with Ceres Community Project for the last seven years, and explained Ceres is an organization that had 500 youth volunteers last year and provided 85,000 meals to 600 families in Sonoma County. Mr. Bartholomew added that Sonoma Compost donated all their compost for their organic garden behind O'Reilly Publishing in Sebastopol, and it's a community company that should be commended for the work they do in the community. Mr. Bartholomew implored the Board to find a way to keep Sonoma Compost in the county.

Reuben Weinzveg, 25 year Sonoma Compost Customer, expressed he is pleased with the efficiency of being able to take his trailer full of yard waste, and at the same time fill it up and bring it home to compost his garden. Mr. Weinzveg stated that this issue has been on the table for three years, and compared what is happening today to that of rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic. Mr. Weinzveg added that he feels the bickering and lack of leadership that goes on between the large and small Cities in the County has resulted in this tragedy.

Caitlin Hachmyer, owner of Red H. Farm, a diversified vegetable production in Sebastopol, shared that each year she uses over 100 yards of Sonoma Compost product. Ms. Hachmyer stated the success of her business relies directly on the hard work of the Sonoma Compost team and the countywide organic waste system, and added she knows this to be true of many of her small scale grower and large scale grape grower colleagues as well.

Ms. Hachmyer stated she holds a Masters Degree in Urban and Environmental Policy and Planning from Tufts University in Boston Massachusetts, and cities like Boston are just beginning to think about and implement the earlier stages of municipal organic waste system. Ms. Hachmyer added that Massachusetts is in constant competition with California regarding progressive policy, and pointed out that mandated organic waste composting only began in late 2014, and only applies to commercial facilities. Ms. Hachmyer highlighted that the waste system of the San Francisco Bay

Area and the North Coast are absolutely the leaders in the field, and the innovators being looked to as an example from across the country.

Ms. Hachmyer stated that among international dialogue concerned with greenhouse gas emissions, hunger, and food waste, Sonoma County leads in functioning policy and infrastructure. Ms. Hachmyer added that shutting down Sonoma Compost would be a little step backwards, and as leaders in sustainability, this would not just hurt the agricultural community, it will reflect negatively on the entire community and on those who lead it. Ms. Hachmyer asked that Sonoma County continue to be a national leader in sustainability, and encouraged the Board to do whatever possible to keep Sonoma Compost open.

Mike Mc Morrow, Santa Rosa Resident, stated that since the County's Landfill filled up, the County has been outhauling all the trash at a cost of what he believes to be close to \$200 per ton. Mr. Mc Morrow stated there's a hundred tons of waste that goes into Sonoma Compost each year, which is going to add to what's being outhauled, making the cost enormous. Mr. Mc Morrow highlighted that Sonoma Compost is a gem and a model, and asked the Board not cave.

Steven Anderson, independent landscaper and gardener in Sonoma County, stated he has spread countless yards of compost for vegetable and flower gardens, and added that it's the single most important supplement you can put into the soil. Mr. Anderson shared he had a client last year who was starting a garden very late in the year, yet with the use of Sonoma Compost products, her garden surpassed others in the area. Mr. Anderson stated Sonoma Compost is a great facility to have locally, and added that Will Bakx is a passionate soil scientist. Mr. Anderson highlighted that the compost helps maintain the soil moisture, therefore helping the drought situation and producing the finest quality vegetables. Mr. Anderson added it would be a real tragedy if anything happened to Sonoma Compost, because it maintains itself and has excellent products. Mr. Anderson recommended that everything possible be done to keep Sonoma Compost.

Sheila Baker, Petaluma Resident, shared she is currently gardening with Arroyo Community Garden, and added that they are amongst other gardens who use and depend on Sonoma Compost in this County. Ms. Baker shared that the senior housing unit she lives in has a couple garden boxes, one of which is their best box and donated by the Master Gardener's Program with Sonoma Compost material, and they are successfully growing vegetables. Ms. Baker added she has volunteered with other community gardens in the county, and there is no community garden success without Sonoma Compost.

Doug Bosco, Santa Rosa Resident, shared he has been using Sonoma Compost for decades and uses it for the community garden where he lives. Mr. Bosco stated he has attended countless meetings on the subject of garbage and compost, most sponsored by the Climate Action Campaign, and commented that if talk could solve this problem it would've been solved a long time ago. Mr. Bosco added that every aspect of this has been repeatedly hashed over and the Board is faced with the reality to change the equation, as there's neighbors in lawsuits and a water quality issue. Mr. Bosco shared that for a while he thought perhaps the freight train could be used to export yard waste, as it would at least cut down on the greenhouse gas emissions of trucks, but after some research found out it's not a possible solution, as there are no places on the rail to take that quantity of compost.

Mr. Bosco shared that while he was in Europe this summer he visited a site near the Frankfurt Airport, where there is a brand new facility called an In-vessel facility. Mr. Bosco explained that it

takes over 100,000 tons of yard waste, similar to this county's situation, and in twenty-one days process it into high quality compost, without a drop of water being emitted from that facility and every ounce of water is recycled. Mr. Bosco added there are no odors from that facility, it's energy self-sufficient, and produces five megawatts of power. Mr. Bosco stated there are fifty of these facilities in Europe, and questioned why technology has not been looked at as a solution to this problem. Mr. Bosco shared that a chief engineer of the facility in Europe visited the Central Landfill when she was in the USA and thought Sonoma Compost did an excellent job, but it was her feeling that the Central Facility is technologically outdated. Mr. Bosco stated that this facility could be built on three and a half acres in one and a half years, and could be done with the same people from Sonoma Compost. Mr. Bosco stated that he believes there are other solutions the Board could look at.

Naomi Bosch, Sonoma County Resident, stated she grew up attending the Oak Grove Union School District, where a dedicated team of educators have created an innovative program of early grade environmental education, supported in part by Sonoma Compost. Ms. Bosch added that Sonoma Compost contributes rich material for school gardens. Ms. Bosch shared that her early grade experiences engaging with topics like gardening, soil water quality, and waste management are part of the reason she decided to pursue a degree in environmental analysis in college; with the specific intent of becoming an environmental educator advocate to help connect more schools to the kind of resources that made her education so rich and meaningful.

Ms. Bosch shared she is 22 years old and has not known this county without the presence of Sonoma Compost. She added that the services they provide represent an integral and irreplaceable part of Sonoma County's infrastructure. Ms. Bosch stated she believes that their presence in her life has helped make her a more informed, politically active and socially conscious citizen, and added that Sonoma Compost represents the kind of resource she wants to see more of in the world as an educator and resident of Sonoma County. Ms. Bosch added that through their business innovation, creativity, and strong environmental and social responsibility, they provide valuable material goods and model sound environmental life principals for the people of Sonoma County.

Bob Besso, Santa Rosa Resident, stated he has been a Santa Rosa resident for about a year and a half, and lived in San Francisco prior to that. Mr. Besso shared he worked for the San Francisco Waste Collection Company Recology in San Francisco for thirty years as the recycling program manager. Mr. Besso explained he was responsible for both the recycling and the composting operations for the entire city. Mr. Besso shared that it's not easy to run a composting program, and added that Sonoma Compost started at about the same time he began his employment with Recology. Mr. Besso added that Sonoma Compost has operated under some very difficult conditions, yet they have been successful in producing a quality product that's certified by OMRI.

Mr. Besso expressed the importance of keeping organic material out of the landfill, as it creates methane, as well as the importance of composting in the sequestration of carbon in the soil. Mr. Besso highlighted the importance of compost in providing the ability to meet State mandated waste diversion goals, and added that Sonoma Compost has earned the right to continue their operation, as they know what they are doing and are doing it well. Mr. Besso added that Sonoma Compost is needed in the county to help with local organic, and Sonoma Compost needs the Board's support to continue their operation.

Pam Davis, Sonoma County Compost, acknowledged those present in support of Sonoma Compost, and added that many Board members have been taking an active role in trying to find solutions and have been working closely with Sonoma Compost. Ms. Davis stated the Board and staff have been amazing, and together have come up with a lot of outside the box ideas. Ms. Davis added that some have been viable, and others have not. Ms. Davis shared that many Board members have worked hard to help identify some positive solutions regarding ponds, and have worked together and developed a Zero Discharge Plan that the Water Board has accepted, which included shrinking the site, outhaul, and pumping of water. Ms. Davis added that there's been talk about use of the pipeline, and some of the things have turned out to be feasible, and some not so much. Ms. Davis stated the people in the room have really worked hard to come up with some solutions, and she wanted to acknowledge and thank them for their work on that.

Ms. Davis cautioned that there are some unintended consequences of having to shut down the compost program, and added there is an economic impact, as there are tens of thousands of customers who use the products. Ms. Davis stated some are small backyard farmers who buy one or ten yards per year, and others buy thousands of yards every year. Ms. Davis stated that there could potentially be the loss of an important local resource, and added she concurs that it takes something to produce this product. Ms. Davis stated garbage companies and landfill operators are not necessarily going to be looking at this as a resource, but more as a waste management problem. Ms. Davis highlighted that they have created a successful business that's producing 90,000 cubic yards of compost every year, and added there's a market for that material, and not many other compost operations can claim that.

Ms. Davis stated there is a large cost for outhaul to be faced, and added that if this was a water quality issue it would've been worked out by now, as there is a Zero Discharge Plan before the Water Board. Ms. Davis stated she believes it runs a little deeper than that, and urged the Board to continue to work with the County and Sonoma Compost to find a solution to keep compost in the county and move forward with identifying the site selection and completing the EIR for the new facility. Ms. Davis asked that a group of naysayers not be allowed to dictate policy and shut down this important resource. Ms. Davis added that Sonoma Compost helped identify the new site, and added that the Central Disposal Site was not even considered in the EIR, and they were able to identify the site and pay for engineering to show that site was feasible. Ms. Davis added that part of that had to do with new technology and looking at aerated static piles. Ms. Davis added that Sonoma Compost has looked at the technology, and added it's an issue of permitting and moving forward.

Wendy Krupnik, Northcoast Chapter of Community Alliance with Family Farmers, urged the Board to find a solution that will maintain in-county composting contracted by Sonoma Compost. Ms. Krupnik highlighted that Sonoma Compost has always gone above and beyond to provide an outstanding product and a service to the community in many ways. Ms. Krupnik stated that Sonoma County cannot afford to lose this precious asset, and added they have filled a critical need to the local food and farming community and food system. Ms. Krupnik questioned where the food is going to come from if Sonoma County does not grow its own food. She questioned what it will do to the local economy and to the big picture if it's imported from places like Chile and Mexico. Ms. Krupnik stated that Sonoma Compost produces certified organic products which boosts soil fertility, water holding capacity, and reduce erosion. Ms. Krupnik added that local composting plays a critical role in moderating climate change and losing local composting would be a devastating set back, increasing greenhouse gas emissions, while reducing carbon uptake in the soils. Ms. Krupnik asked that Sonoma Compost remain open.

Tim Schaible, Canvas Ranch, shared they have a forty acre ranch and farm, and produce ten acres of organic vegetables and about twenty acres of ancient wheats. Mr. Schaible highlighted that agriculture in Sonoma County is the biggest draw for visitors outside the County, and added that losing Sonoma Compost would be a major mistake. Mr. Schaible stated he hopes the Board will understand that Sonoma Compost needs to remain, and added that his ranch uses 150 yards of compost every year, which goes into their fields to replenish their pastures and into their ten acres of produce to produce wonderful vegetables. Mr. Schaible asked the Board to reconsider keeping Sonoma Compost here.

Christine Condon, stated she's a Sustainability in Green Building Consultant for a firm located in Santa Rosa, and is aware of the carbon footprint from hauling anything out of the County. Ms. Condon stated that her perspective in speaking today is as having worked as a biodynamic consultant for Sonoma Compost, helping them through the rigorous certification process to meet the demands of the local vineyards that need local sources to be certified as biodynamic vineyards.

Ms. Condon added that in walking around the Sonoma Compost site with a representative from Demeter, which is the certifying organization for biodynamics, the representative continuously commented on how meticulously clean and beautiful the Sonoma Compost facility was kept. Ms. Condon stated she understands there are challenges and a lot of technologies and options available, but she doesn't think the county can afford to lose this resource and the expertise of Sonoma Compost. Ms. Condon added that Sonoma Compost has a lot of local connections and a local perspective at this point in time, as the county moves towards a sustainable Sonoma County. Ms. Condon urged the Board to find a solution and to not allow there to be a gap in service.

Ms. Condon shared she personally uses the products, and added they meet the rigorous OMRI and Demeter certification standards, and produce a beautiful product. Ms. Condon stated many people all over the county and in the region use Sonoma Compost products. Ms. Condon stated there is a high level of demand they have met, and they have used innovated approaches to experiment with new technologies, including aerated compost piles, and pilot studies for working with food waste. Ms. Condon stated that working as partners with Sonoma Compost can only get better, and urged the Board to work with Sonoma Compost to find solutions to continue their operation without a gap.

Joy Ambra, Petaluma Resident, shared she recently attended a free event held at the Petaluma Seed Bank, to learn about the importance of compost and what it takes to make it. Ms. Ambra added that she has been using it for fifteen years and didn't understand all the intricacies of how it's produced. Ms. Ambra shared that Will Bakx from Sonoma Compost spoke regarding the depleting soils of the world and what an impact this is. Ms. Ambra shared she believes the company should be commended for their continuing education and forward innovated methods, and hopes it continues to say instead of being reprimanded.

Evan Wigg, Farmers Guild, Sonoma County Food Systems Alliance, said he is also representing approximately 2,800 people who signed the petition put out about a week and a half ago. Mr. Wigg stated the petition is simply asking to find solutions to keep Sonoma Compost alive and the county's green waste stream sustainable. Mr. Wigg stated keeping compost local in Sonoma County is imperative not simply to the sustainability and the viability of local agriculture, gardeners, and landscapers but also to maintain the spirit of Sonoma County. Mr. Wigg shared he

is lucky to work with farmers and sustainability advocates across the state and hopes Sonoma County remains an example of something other counties and communities can look to as an example of something they can strive towards. Mr. Wigg stated if he has to say Sonoma County imports compost to grow local food, he would see that as a hard hit and a sad point when it comes to Sonoma County remaining a leader.

Mr. Wigg urged the Board to read the petition, which is not only to keep Sonoma Compost, but suggests a viable option to maintain the production of Sonoma Compost on a reduced level until they can find a new space. Mr. Wigg asked the Board to take into account the many credible people who have shown up and those who have signed their petition but are unable to attend because it's a workday, and added that the number of people who signed their petition rises by dozens every day.

Anna Simson, Sonoma County Resident, stated she's a mother who is interested in doing things she can be proud of for her son when he gets older. Ms. Simson shared she lived in Oakland, and it's not that easy to grow a tomato in Oakland. Ms. Simson shared she moved to Sonoma County approximately five and a half years ago, went to Sonoma Compost and had a lot of compost put in her yard. She added that while she's not a fantastic gardener, her tomatoes grew seven feet tall. Ms. Simpson stated that Sonoma Compost has an amazing product, and added that she doesn't know about the other issues, but wanted it to be noted she is in support of the great product they are making.

Leandra Swent, former officer manager for Sonoma Compost, shared she held that position twenty-five years ago, when it was a very small operation. Ms. Swent highlighted Will Bakx built the compost facility from scratch, to the successful business it is today. Ms. Swent added it's not only due to his extensive soil science knowledge, but also because he has a key role in the community. Ms. Swent stated that Mr. Bakx is loved throughout this county due to his countless hours of volunteer work and giving back to the community.

Ms. Swent shared that while she no longer works with Mr. Bakx, she has remained a close friend of his over the years, and has personally seen the time and dedication he has put into the business, and added he is becoming one of the most knowledgeable soil scientist about the state of our composting facilities. Ms. Swent stated that Will Bakx is a leader in this community to be proud of and a person the community wishes to see stay active and representing Sonoma County and moving forward in the next generation of composting facilities. Mr. Swent added that it's believed that Mr. Bakx and his team at Sonoma Compost are the best people to move this project forward and continue to put Sonoma County on the map for a truly successful composting program. Ms. Swent asked that Sonoma Compost be kept working through this transition time and to support Will Bakx in bringing an improved facility.

Hillary Smith, Penngrove Resident, stated Sonoma County is filled with home gardeners, small farmers, and landscapers. Ms. Smith stated she happens to be all three, and added she has a small gardening business called Earthly Delights Gardening in Petaluma, works for The Cyper School, which has the community's autistic children, and they have a small farm on Park Service Land on Casa Grande Road. Ms. Smith added she gardens at home and has been using products from Sonoma Compost for fifteen years, and as many in the room, can speak to how amazing it is. Ms. Smith shared she has been stuck using other products on a few occasions, and it's like sawdust in comparison.

Ms. Smith shared it's an emotional issue for her, and stated she thinks of community service when she thinks of Sonoma Compost. Ms. Smith shared she took a soil science class at the Junior College and toured the facility with her class, and added that Sonoma Compost provides free compost all over the county. Ms. Smith stated the county's food and wine also benefit from Sonoma Compost, and added that the soil, water, resources, and people need Sonoma Compost. Ms. Smith asked the Board to do everything they can to save Sonoma Compost.

Erin Axelrod, 27 year resident of Sonoma County, stated she's a long time gardener and farmer, and she can't imagine a place where the county's green waste gets shipped out. Ms. Axelrod added it's only a waste if you waste it. Ms. Axelrod shared she wanted to call attention as a long time advocate of compost and recipient of countless yards of compost, that the amount of compost disbursed is protecting the water ways at a regional level, increasing the soil water holding capacity, and increasing organic content. Ms. Axelrod added the benefit is so much larger across the communities and actually decreasing the potential for nutrient and sediment loads in the water ways.

Ms. Axelrod called attention to the Marin Carbon Project, which has verifiably hard data that shows that compost application on rangelands in the communities can actually draw down and sequester carbon. Ms. Axelrod stated that compost is actually a solution to some of our climate crises.

Ms. Axelrod shared that earlier this month she led a group of forty-five business leaders on a tour of compost application on rangeland solution, and added that business leaders like Nutiva, the three hundred million dollar super foods company, are looking to use compost application as a solution to mitigate their greenhouse gas emissions. Ms. Axelrod added that the limiting factor is access to high quality compost. Ms. Axelrod stated that if institutions like Sonoma Compost are lost, the opportunity to actually help address one of the biggest ecological challenges and crises is lost. Ms. Axelrod recommended keeping Sonoma Compost as a keystone business in the community and a key solution to some environmental challenges.

Barry Vesser, Center for Climate Protection, thanked the Board for patiently listening to all the comments, and pointed out that it's clear from so many people's comments that Sonoma Compost is a precious resource in the community no one wants to lose. Mr. Vesser stated that Sonoma Compost contributes to the local economy and environment, and added that additional greenhouse gases that would be generated by having to outhaul compost would be moving in the opposite direction, and not in accord with the County's climate goals. Mr. Vesser stated he recognizes that the Waste Management Agency is between a rock and a hard place. Mr. Vesser pointed out that there's State compliance, legitimate pond discharge issues, and there is a fabulous business gem that is doing a real service for the community.

Mr. Vesser expressed he hopes the Board will consider all means necessary to keep Sonoma Compost open, and hopes the Board will consider the following: A reduction in the scale of the operation to keep the facility open. Allow the current pond to be able to meet the discharge requirements. Give Sonoma Compost more time to either expand the pond or to find new facilities, as the operation reduction would allow meeting current discharge requirements.

Mr. Vesser encouraged the Board to negotiate as aggressively as possible with the State Water Board and let the Center for Climate Protection know how they can help to allow the composting

operation to go forward, as it provides a lot of benefits in the community. Mr. Vesser commented that it seems like there should be a way to find the win-win.

Roger Larsen, Happy Acres Resident, stated he has been at these meetings for over two years, trying to get an economically and environmentally appropriate composting facility built in this County. Mr. Larsen stated he believes composting is important and should be done locally, and disagrees it should be done at the top of the hill and at the expense of Stemple Creek.

Kathy Ferrando, Happy Acres Resident, thanked the Board for all the listening they have done over the past two years, and added she agrees with Mr. Larsen, and really believes in composting, in local sourcing, in an environmentally sensitive and appropriate place. Ms. Ferrando stated it would be great to have a brand new state of the art composting center, but in the meantime they have to live with the current situation, and the situation is not environmentally okay. Ms. Ferrando stated that the water at Stemple Creek and into Tamales Bay cannot continue to be polluted, and as a neighbor it's very difficult to live with the odor that's there. Ms. Ferrando stated they appreciate the Board's consideration of their request, and added that they very much support local composting and love the fact that all the people have turned out as democracy in action.

Dennis Rosatti, Executive Director of Sonoma County Conservation Action, stated his organization sent a letter dated May 6th, encouraging the Board to continue their leadership in keeping the green waste stream in Sonoma County. Mr. Rosatti added it's recognized that this issue is very complex, and added that no one wants to see county or state water ways polluted, but he's reassured that Sonoma Compost is working with the State Regional Quality Control Board on their discharge issues and hopes a solution can be found for a more permanent temporary solution until the new site is built.

Mr. Rosatti stated his organization wants to encourage the Agency to do whatever possible to finish the EIR process and find a new site for the compost operations going forward. Mr. Rosatti stated it's hoped that Sonoma Compost is the operator, as they have been a good community partner and a local business. Mr. Rosatti added that Sonoma Compost is working really hard to deliver a high quality compost product, and shared that a number of people he's talked to at meetings the last few weeks have said they are in the landscaping business and can't find another product anywhere near as equal to Sonoma Compost for what they can provide and deliver the cost of.

Mr. Rosatti encouraged the Agency to finish the work and select a new site, as it will alleviate a lot of the problems going forward, and most importantly keeping the green waste stream locally, as there's definite absolute environmental cost to outhaul. Mr. Rosatti encouraged the Agency to enable the current permit for composting to stay active in the interim, and added he believes Sonoma Compost is willing to get creative in order to accommodate the many different forces acting upon them. Mr. Rosatti highlighted that most importantly, the Agency has the support of a wide variety of community organizations, agencies, and people in this process to keep the green waste stream in Sonoma County. Mr. Rosatti stated he recognizes how complicated and challenging the issue is with all kind of lawyers and sides, and want to support and find a way to keep the green waste stream in Sonoma County.

Mattie Bosch, Bosch Landscapes in Sebastopol, stated she's a compostaholic and this issue affects her very deeply, as she can't imagine being without the green waste composting program. Ms.

Bosch stated that the projects built for their landscape clients depend on the quality Sonoma Compost provides. Ms. Bosch said she would be in dismay if they were reduced to using inconsistently smelly alternatives. Ms. Bosch stated that as a creatives consultant and a small business owner, she's learned the hard way that when her head is down in the trenches, she can sometimes lose the big picture and end up solving for the wrong problem. Ms. Bosch added that she is present at this meeting because she's concerned that Sonoma Compost, an irreplaceable natural resource, could be wasted simply for the sake of a quick fix.

Ms. Bosch shared she remembers back before Sonoma County began the composting program, there were several quick fix proposals for diverting the debris from the landfill, but Sonoma Compost solved for the longer view and didn't see it as a waste problem but as a valuable resource. Ms. Bosch stated that their plan proposed local value benefits and a high quality finished product that generates revenue rather than incurring cost for disposal. Ms. Bosch commented that it's now taken for granted, but back then it took wise leadership to go where no county had gone before. Ms. Bosch added these are the kinds of solutions that make the name Sonoma County synonymous with natural beauty and quality of life. Ms. Bosch stated she remembers the pride she felt back then, when Sonoma County chose to work with Sonoma Compost, and time has proven it was a wise decision.

Ms. Bosch stated that sustainable solutions like this are now becoming more accepted as healthy strategies that add muscle to the County's infustructure, build a local economy, and respect valuable resources. Ms. Bosch explained that when most people think of gardens they think of pretty flowers and plants, but a wise gardener understands that what goes on below the surface is crucial to success. Ms. Bosch added that building good soil helps increase the garden's ability to thrive and endure and survive under stressful conditions. Ms. Bosch stated that it is unknown what the future will bring, but one can be assured that growth and change will bring the County more challenges and more problems to solve. Ms. Bosch suggested that in order to thrive during growth, it would be wisest to begin, dig in, and continue building on the strength and resilience already gained from valuing resources and solving for the right problem. Ms. Bosch stated that Sonoma Compost is a proven asset, and their expertise, experience, and commitment is irreplaceable. Ms. Bosch added that they are much too valuable of a resource to be wasted for a quick fix.

Chair St. John thanked the twenty-seven individuals who shared their comments and those in attendance. Chair St. John acknowledged the Board has to make a very difficult decision, and added that closed session was continued so the Board could hear the public comments before having to make a decision in closed session on the legal matter.

6. Consent (w/attachments)

- 6.1 Minutes of April 15, 2015 Regular Meeting
- 6.2 Compost Zero Discharge Plan Update Report
- 6.3 3rd Quarter Financial Report
- 6.4 Load Check Agreement
- 6.5 E-Waste Collection Agreement

Public Comment

None.

Susan Harvey, City of Cotati, motioned to approve the consent calendar and Bob Cox, City of Cloverdale, seconded the motion.

Vote Count:

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-

Motion passed unanimously.

Regular Calendar

7. FY 15-16 Final Budget

Patrick Cater, Agency staff, stated not much has changed from the draft budget presented to the Board last month. Mr. Carter added that Staff has looked at different costs related to the composting program; being a hundred percent outhaul or continuing the existing program. Mr. Carter explained that staff has looked at those costs and what revenues would be necessary to cover those costs and have a balanced budget without structural deficits. Mr. Carter added that staff has taken the worst case solution and put that into this budget, so the Board has flexibility to make whatever decisions it needs to regarding that program, and not have to amend the budget significantly.

Mr. Carter stated it's a flexible budget and added that if the revenue is not needed or if there's a solution that doesn't incur as many costs as included in the budget, staff will not use those funds and there will not be a need to increase the tip fees for the yard waste and wood waste cost centers to account for those extra costs. Mr. Carter stated the budget reflects the direction given by the Board, and staff can answer any Board questions.

Mr. Schwartz asked if there's money in the budget for hiring an outside construction manager should it be decided to add that resource if a new facility were to be constructed.

Mr. Carter replied that was not put into this budget but it could easily be amended, as there are funds in the Organics Reserve to cover those costs.

Public Comment

None.

Mr. Sawyer motioned to approve the FY 15-16 Final Budget and Ms. Harvey seconded the motion.

Vote Count:

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-

Motion passed unanimously.

8. New Compost Site Report

Mr. Mikus stated this report is similar to what was presented to the Board in April, but it was requested the report be cleaned up, simplified, and brought back before the Board. Mr. Mikus referenced the chart on page 102 of the agenda packet and explained it was the chart staff presented at the prior meetings, and added the chart has been adjusted to try and get the cost analysis a little clearer. Mr. Mikus shared there was concern last time that some of the numbers didn't match exactly with the construction cost estimates prepared by the engineer, and added it makes sense, because the cost estimate presented by the engineer is a onetime lump sum to build a site.

Mr. Mikus explained the revised chart looks at how that total cost would affect the annual expenses, which means the annual fees to be paid to an operator, which is the revenue needed from tip fees, and is somewhat of a different matter. Mr. Mikus explained that analysis has to take into account amortizing cost constructional growth for a fixed period of time, in this case, twenty-five years. Mr. Mikus added that it has to recognize that there are annual operating expenses such as diesel fuel, labor expenses, and utilities. Mr. Mikus further added that it also has to recognize that there are other items such as certain categories of capital equipment that cannot be amortized over twenty-five years, and needs to be amortized over a much shorter period of time.

Mr. Mikus explained that in order to make the chart match the cost estimates, staff started with the all inclusive total cost estimate, took out the upfront equipment cost, because it would be amortized differently, and came up with a net construction and development cost. Mr. Mikus stated that the construction and development cost for Central to full build-out would be \$41.8 million dollars, which would then have to be amortized over twenty-five years. Mr. Mikus added that amortization at 6 or 6 ½ percent over twenty-five years was \$3.2 million dollars per year. Mr. Mikus stated that the equipment cost amortized over ten years as opposed to twenty-five was just under half a million dollars, and added that the estimate for the annual operations cost was \$2.7 million, giving an annual operating cost of almost \$6.5 million dollars.

Mr. Mikus highlighted that the annual cost or operating cost per ton at over 200,000 tons is \$32.34, and pointed out that is somewhat higher than the fee the Agency is currently being charged by Sonoma Compost for them to process the Agency's materials. Mr. Mikus stated that subsequent to that, the county per ton land lease fee of \$1.50 per ton and the MOA fees have been added to give what a net per ton fee might be for building the full build-out. Mr. Mikus stated that is compared to the current situation of approximately \$35 per ton at the gate.

Mr. Mikus stated the Board asked that staff be a little more defined on how phasing is shown, and added that last time cost estimates were presented for a four phase build-out. Mr. Mikus added that in order to make an equivalent comparison as far as what costs would be on day one, Staff used what it would cost if Central were built, and it were phase one only. Mr. Mikus stated that a similar analysis was done starting with the engineers cost estimate of \$28 million, less the same upfront equipment cost, and it gave a construction development cost of approximately \$25 million dollars, which would have to be amortized. Mr. Mikus stated that would be \$1.9 million per year. Mr. Mikus added the equipment is the same, which is approximately \$449,000.

Mr. Mikus stated that the yearly operations would be somewhat less, because it would be processing less material initially, and added that based on 100,000 tons at start up, that came out to \$46.64 per ton. Mr. Mikus further added that adding the County land lease fee and the MOA would be \$67.24. Mr. Mikus stated he hopes that has made a little more sense as to how the cost estimate drove the analysis of the per ton cost and what might be expected to have to pay to an operator if a design build operate scenario was done.

Ms. Harvey pointed out these are per ton figures, and doesn't see anywhere where it says at the rate payer level how much that generally means at the can.

Mr. Mikus replied this would represent a net raise of approximately \$20 per ton over what's being paid now, making it a \$1.00 to \$1.75 range, if he remembers the chart correctly.

Mr. Schwartz thanked Mr. Mikus for improving the report since the last time. Mr. Schwartz stated his understanding is the Board has expressed considerable interest in doing the phased approach over the long run, and the total cost for that is on page 103, which is \$52 million. Mr. Schwartz asked for confirmation that the approach that seems most likely, which is a full phase approach, is not reflected in the original chart on page 102.

Mr. Mikus replied that the reason for that is because this is a snapshot in time and comparing two scenarios. Mr. Mikus added that the common point where you have that is day one start up, and as time goes on that changes and they tend to divert from each other, and you can no longer make a real easy comparison.

Mr. Schwartz asked which line on the chart is the most comparable to the \$52 million dollar number.

Mr. Mikus replied the chart just looks at full build-out, which is the engineers estimate, and added that the comparison is how it would work if you only built phase one. Mr. Mikus stated that's what needs to be discussed, what it's going to cost; what the contractor is going to charge when you start the process.

Mr. Schwartz replied he would hesitate to agree with that statement, that the Board would just look at what you're going to start at, when talking about a twenty-five year commitment. Mr. Schwartz added that for his city that's not an accurate statement.

Ms. Fudge stated she wished to clarify Mr. Schwartz assumption, and added that the \$52 million dollar figure was dropped \$10 million at the last meeting, so when June estimates were revised, it showed to be lower, at \$42 or \$44 million.

Mr. Schwartz asked why it says \$52 million on the chart.

Mr. Mikus apologized for disagreeing with Ms. Fudge and explained that the \$54 million was from October; which was the estimate before some of the double counting was reconciled. Mr. Mikus explained that the \$52 million is the summary of all four phase build-outs, and pointed out that there are four sheets in the packet that show each phase at a time. Mr. Mikus added that there's clearly a loss of efficiency with phasing. Mr. Mikus stated that when staff first got the numbers a month ago, there was a concern about them, and there was a conversation with the engineer and the numbers were looked at.

Mr. Mikus stated that to obtain a quick sense if the numbers made sense or not, he looked at four basic categories. Mr. Mikus said he looked at some of the concrete work, asphalt work, engineering design, and construction management. Mr. Mikus stated he could see those were the places where things might change if a phase were done rather than a full build-out. Mr. Mikus explained that if you look at the asphalt numbers, there's a lot more money in asphalt when you phase than when you do it once, because as you build a piece of the site, you have to take some out and add some back in as is the case with concrete, construction management, and design, therefore there's a big difference in cost in phasing due to the loss of efficiency.

Mr. Schwartz inquired if phase one costs would handle all the green waste that's currently coming to the facility.

Mr. Mikus replied affirmatively.

Mr. Schwartz stated that in comparison to the number on page 103, not including increased MOA fees, operator profit, and administrative costs, it's \$9.00 per ton more to compost in the county as opposed to outhaul. Mr. Schwartz stated that page 103 says it's \$58.00 per ton to cover the cost of out-hauling, in comparison to the \$67.00 per ton on page 1, which both match currently, so it's a \$9.00 per ton difference, not including increased MOA fees or other county fees, and the charges from the operator. Mr. Schwartz noted that the cost is \$9.00 per ton plus to compost as opposed to outhaul.

Mr. Mikus replied that is the case if it's built as a phased approach.

Mr. Schwartz acknowledged that the dynamics change if it's all built at once; making it \$58 million in comparison to \$53 million. Mr. Schwartz noted that the \$53 million estimate does not include the higher rent cost over time, any profit, or administrative costs. Mr. Schwartz inquired regarding the assumptions as to what the increase in volume would be from 100,000 to 200,000 tons over time, and asked Mr. Mikus to explain how those numbers are reached.

Mr. Mikus replied there is no way to be sure, and added that when the analysis was done last month, staff divided the 25 years into quarters based on building another phase every six years. Mr. Mikus added that is one of the variables that makes it difficult to predict twenty-five years in the future, as it's unknown if phase two would be built in two or ten years. Mr. Mikus added that staff tried to have a discussion with some of the people involved, and added he spoke with Rick Downey about how they anticipated the Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) generating more green waste, and how they would meet some of the diversion needs. Mr. Mikus added that staff tried to use some of Mr. Downey's input to look at how the phase build-out might be offered. Mr. Mikus

added that it seemed like the easiest and most sensible way is just to assume it would happen in progress over time and equal time increments.

Mr. Schwartz stated that in the absence of that information that seems reasonable as anything else, and added that if this is going to be built in phases it should be done consciously knowing more is being paid to compost then to haul by over \$9 per ton at least during the first phase, if the numbers are reasonably accurate.

Mr. Mikus replied that it indicates that phase construction has some disadvantages the Board would have to consider.

Chair St. John stated that a cost for 200,000 tons for the full build-out needs to be considered, which is appropriate at the end of twenty-five years, but there are not 200,000 tons in the early years. Chair St. John stated it needs be pointed out that the estimating cost per ton under the build out scenario would be much higher in the early years, when you don't have 200,000 tons. Chair St. John pointed out that the Agency is not even at 100,000 tons now, but if the Agency were to be at 100,000 tons on day one with full build-out, that cost would be \$64.00 plus the County overhead, which would put that cost over \$84 per ton, if build-out were to take place on day one. Chair St. John pointed out there is a reason for phasing and where you start to reduce those cost because you're trying to spread those initial costs over a smaller volume in the earlier years, until you grown and get to your 200,000 tons, where you start seeing the efficiency in the build-out option. Chair St. John cautioned that they need to be a little careful on that one.

Chair St. John stated he heard Mr. Mikus say he estimated 6-6 ½ percent on the assumption that most of the \$45 million will be borrowed to build the facility.

Mr. Mikus replied he wasn't assuming it was the Agency borrowing, it's whoever would finance it.

Chair St. John acknowledged and added the interest rate seems high for public sector.

Mr. Mikus replied he tends to assume to be conservative.

Chair St. John stated that's a significant assumption in terms of the operating cost, therefore the cost per ton is a very sensitive number.

Mr. Mikus replied he ran it at 5 ½, 6, and 6 ½ percent, and the difference wasn't that significant.

Ms. Harvey stated she wants to understand what Mr. Schwartz was alluding to regarding that it may be closer to haul, but as the Board heard this morning, there is a strong desire in the community to have local composting and also technology that will deal with water and odor. Ms. Harvey added there's a cost associated with that, and while it may ultimately be more expensive to have a facility, it comes down to the desire of the people to have composting local in the county, in a regional solution, or just haul it somewhere else because it costs less. Ms. Harvey added that haul has other unintended consequences like the greenhouse gases and not having the availability of compost.

Mr. Mikus replied that there are also a lot of things you know may happen, but you can't really put a finger on. Mr. Mikus stated that for example, when comparing haul figures to construction cost, you're looking at today's numbers. Mr. Mikus added that if you talk about out-

hauling for a length of time, there's no guarantee those numbers are going to stay the same. Mr. Mikus pointed out that he would expect trucking costs to go up over time, and added it's impossible to put all that together and try to have it make some sense.

Susan Gorin, County of Sonoma, agreed there is significant community expression about maintaining the local company. Ms. Gorin stated she thinks it's really important the Board understand the difference between out-hauling and local composting, because the elected need to be able to explain to the rate payers if it makes sense. Ms. Gorin stated that if it's a small incremental cost for local composting, that is easier to explain. Ms. Gorin added that if it's a large increment, and even acknowledging Mr. Mikus comments, it's unknown if the sites to outhaul to are going to stay in operation over twenty-five years. Ms. Gorin stated there's a lot of uncertainty, and added that it has been agreed repeatedly as to the value of local composting and have all agreed that they don't want to transfer that responsibility and assume an increase in greenhouse gases. Ms. Gorin stated that the county should deal with what it generate here, but the can rate dollar figure or the total cost per tonnage needs to be reached.

Mr. Carter added that the \$58 dollars per ton to outhaul is with the lowest cost figures and using the closest facilities at the lowest price. Mr. Carter added that when talking about out-hauling more than 100,000 tons per year, further facilities will need to be used that have a longer haul distance, for more cost and more expensive disposal fees once you get there. Mr. Carter added that if it were just 100,000 tons that's one number, but if they wanted to look at all the green waste and food waste and composting that, that involves much higher numbers. Mr. Carter added that it is stated in the report potentially as high as \$98 per ton.

Mr. Schwartz stated he appreciates the number is likely to go up, but he is concerned there are no good predictions about what that might be. Mr. Schwartz added that the last five to ten year growth is unknown, which might be a reasonable way of projecting growth in the future. Mr. Schwartz agreed that outhaul costs could go up, but disagrees with staff's comment that there's not a way to run the \$52 million dollar scenario through the same kind of chart provided. Ms. Schwartz stated staff is essentially saying there is a choice of the full build-out, which doesn't make sense economically, and there is the phase one option, which also based on the current numbers doesn't make sense from just the economic perspective. Mr. Schwartz stated there's an unknown, and added he thinks staff should be capable of filling that gap. Mr. Schwartz added it's concerning to him that the Agency is not able to be transparent because they don't have even best estimate numbers about what the full \$52 million dollar cost would mean over time.

Mr. Schwartz added he agrees very much that there's absolutely an astronomical cost of out-hauling and there's a desire to keep composting, but added he hopes that decision is made with eyes open and conscious of what the rate payers are being asked to pay as opposed to just because it sounds like a good thing to do.

Mr. Sawyer inquired what staff time or consultant time it would take to tighten those figures and come up with some scenarios. Mr. Sawyer acknowledged the difficulty in looking out twenty-five years.

Mr. Mikus replied it can be done, but you start getting into exponential curve assumptions and the reality or accuracy is lost with additional assumptions.

Mr. Sawyer stated everyone's goal is to make an informed decision, and he's not sure if everything has been done to provide the kind of information necessary for the Agency Board to make the decision they can justify to the ratepayers. Mr. Sawyer added that it's beyond the ratepayers, the can rate, and they need to be sensitive to that, because this is not the only cost involved in composting. Mr. Sawyer added there are many factors, many which were heard during public comment. Mr. Sawyer asked if it's possible to get a little tighter in the numbers to be able to justify them to the community, and added the Board needs to be able to make that kind of decision. Mr. Sawyer stated that if there's some ambiguity to the numbers, even based on projections, he is looking for a way to get tighter numbers.

Chair St. John stated consultants do a great job providing estimates, but the estimate that matters is the proposal from a future operator. Chair St. John stated he believes the Agency is still talking about a term key kind of contract, whether it would be with Republic or someone else. Chair St. John added that operator is going to detail the design as they best feel it fits the needs the Agency Board establishes for air, water, and compost quality. Chair St. John added the Board would set those needs, and the operator will come in with a proposal and tell the Agency what they need to do in order to meet those quality requirements the Agency Board sets, and provide a price. Chair St. John added that's the price that matters, as that's the price that would actually be paid to an entity to do this work. Chair St. John added that point will not be reached until the Agency can get into the proposal process.

Chair St. John stated the numbers he's seeing are costs per ton, and asked for confirmation that these numbers are in the ballpark of what is seen in the market.

Mr. Mikus confirmed.

Chair St. John stated this convinces him that there is a solution that's in the ballpark, and they are not double market or ten times over market. Chair St. John pointed out the Agency has a project that is likely to provide a very market-cost product for the customers, and therefore he is ready to go to that next step and get those numbers, but not from the consultant or staff. Chair St. John stated he's ready to get those numbers from the entity that will really know what it will take and cost, and is willing to put that number on the table as a proposal for the Board's consideration for a term key contract.

Madolyn Agrimonti, City of Sonoma, stated she thinks there is some value of a snapshot, and feels that's what the Board has gotten. Ms. Agrimonti added that it's a place to start, provides the best they can at this moment, and added she's satisfied with that.

Ms. Harvey stated she believes that whichever method taken regarding the different phases, the Agency also needs to be transparent about the bumps in the per can rate. Ms. Harvey stated she keeps coming back to that because she thinks people need to know that it's \$1.00-\$1.75 today, but every five years it's going to continue to go up. Ms. Harvey added that the public needs to have an understanding of part of the picture.

Ms. Fudge stated she agrees with what was said by Chair St. John, Ms. Agrimonti, and Ms. Harvey, and added that all the bumps in the can to need to be put together. Ms. Fudge added they are going to have to start defining to the public what the increases are per can, even the ones the Board is not in control of. Ms. Fudge further added that they need to put all the increases together so the whole price can be seen.

Chair St. John stated that detailed information would be made available at the time proposals of the real cost were received of building and operating a phased facility. Chair St. John stated he doesn't believe any operator is going to want to build the full facility day one, and added they know they need to build it over time, to match the growth in compost as it comes in and done in logically economical phases.

Mr. Schwartz stated he would like to move the requested action and added he does not believe continuing to debate the numbers provided is going to make much of a difference in the short run. Mr. Schwartz added that he would like to add two caveats. That future cost proposals provided to the Board be presented fully flushed out with the most likely scenarios, which would be a phased approach over time, as opposed to two scenarios that are not likely to be supported. Mr. Schwartz also requested that reports presented to the Board with per ton costs have an attachment, a table, or something that clearly provides the range of per can costs are. Mr. Schwartz suggested a one page with standard information attached so the Board can make that conversion readily.

Public Comment

Mr. Larsen stated the Board's options are to spend \$45 million dollars all at once over time, break it up into smaller bits, or outhaul for the next twenty years. Mr. Larsen added the Board has not certified the EIR or selected a site, and he has again not seen the chart that includes any information on Site 40 since the Chair took it off the table last May. Mr. Larsen suggested that according to numbers provided by the Agency, a site could be built for \$18 million dollars at Site 40. Mr. Larsen stated that Mr. Mikus saved the Agency \$10 million, therefore a site could now be built with \$8 million dollars and if it were to be amortized over twenty-five years, a site could be built for \$4 million dollars.

Mr. Larsen stated it should be explained to ratepayers that rates are going to increase because a site needs to be built at \$50 million dollars, when a site could be built at \$40 million dollars. Mr. Larsen added that ratepayers will hear about that loudly. Mr. Larsen stated the Board stopped looking at any scenario except Central Landfill, without a reason not to build at Site 40, other than a Supervisor doesn't want to. Mr. Larsen suggested the Board should not be asking to see a modified report next month, but rather ask to see the numbers on Site 40. Mr. Larsen added that if the Board would have spent the same money on consultants comparing Site 40 to Central Landfill, these numbers would be so far apart you couldn't do anything but select Site 40. Mr. Larsen stated he is sure the Board knows that, and added he does not believe any Board members are foolish, but choose to go down this path because when the information on Zero Discharge was not available, it was the preferred site. Mr. Larsen added it's crazy to spend this kind of money on a composting site, added that an economically and environmentally feasible one needs to be built, and asked that the Board stop closing their eyes.

Eric Koenigshofer, The Ratto Group, stated he had not intended to speak, but chose to after listening to the discussion about the tons per year, phasing, impacts on per ton projections, issues raised about the rates at the curb, and the 200,000 tons per year of green waste assumption. Mr. Koenigshofer pointed out that Sonoma County has a half million population, at under 100,000 tons of green waste a year, and questioned what circumstances take the community to 200,000 tons a year. Mr. Koenigshofer stated that when you look at twenty-five years, the population is not going to double, so he questioned where that material would come from. Mr. Koenigshofer

added that there is a higher degree of awareness for less water use, and intensive landscaping, and it's becoming something jurisdictions are entering into in the regulatory sense.

Mr. Koenigshofer added that in looking at food waste, as with recycling and diversion in general, when you pick the low hanging fruit, that's the easy part that comes first and costs the least. Mr. Koenigshofer added that as those opportunities are exhausted, more challenging components of the diversion waste stream are reached and it gets more difficult, into the regulatory realm, and more extensive.

Mr. Koenigshofer suggested it might be time to look at the assumptions about the 200,000 tons in more detail, and what kind of programs the Agency's franchise haulers might be presenting to achieve an incremental increase in diversion that reflects what kind of new program would be necessary, before signing off on the assumptions about 200,000 tons a year.

Rick Downey, Republic Services, stated he believes a compost facility needs to be in Sonoma County, and Sonoma Compost creates a great product. Mr. Downey added that it's to be decided if Sonoma Compost should be running the compost, and expressed that what he's concerned about are several things which are at the Board's level. Mr. Downey stated that right now there is no extension of the JPA, and while that is being worked on, as of February 2017, the Agency is sunsetting. Mr. Downey highlighted that every month that goes by makes it very hard to get something accomplished by February 2017, which is the time there is supposed to be a new compost facility by. Mr. Downey added that in looking at the negotiated MOA, the current site where compost sits is no longer viable. Mr. Downey added that even if the Board decided today to keep that running, take the risk of the lawsuits and everything of that nature, it is clearly stated in the MOA that in February of 2017, compost will not be on the current footprint. Mr. Downey added that something needs to be done and things need to get moving. Mr. Downey stated that he believes that no decisions can be made past 2017 until the Board chooses to find out whether the Agency is going to exist beyond that. Mr. Downey asked if he is accurate about that, it's his understanding that you cannot choose something that's going to be twenty-five years out if you don't have a charter.

Chair St. John replied there is no discussion during public comment, but that he believes there are scenarios that would work either way.

Mr. Downey replied it would be nice to know those types of things, because in the process Republic has been at for several years, it's how he understood it from being at a lot of the meetings. Mr. Downey added that if the February 2017 date exists, Republic is hard pressed no matter who will be building the facility in that amount of time. Mr. Downey added that's the honest fact due to the amount of time it's going to take to get it permitted, and the amount of time it's going to take to build through probable CEQA challenges.

Martin Mileck, Cold Creek Compost, stated the cost of the long term commitment on a project is being compared with a very short term cost of outhaul. Mr. Mileck added he believes staff just called a place and asked what the fee to outhaul green waste is today. Mr. Mileck suggested that if there are conversations about longer commitments and guaranteed flows, you are able to get the cost of outhaul down. Mr. Mileck also added that comparisons need to take place.

Allan Tose, Site 40 Representative, stated Site 40 is no longer mentioned, and referenced a copy of the Original Draft EIR dated December 2011, where Site 40 is designed as the environmentally

preferred site. Mr. Tose added that on the subject of outhaul, the Original Draft EIR states that no countywide composting facility—no project alternative considers the removal of the existing compost facility at the Central Disposal Site, and no relocation at the Central Disposal Site. Under the alternative there would be no countywide composting facility in Sonoma County for the current collected green materials. Mr. Tose went on to read that this alternative would fail to meet all the project objectives, as composting operations would be discontinued in Sonoma County. Mr. Tose stated that outhaul is not an option or the million dollar EIR is useless.

Margaret Kullberg, Stage Gulch Road, stated there are many reasons she is in support of the Central Site location for the new ASP facility. Ms. Kullberg stated that no matter where the facility is built, it will cost the same, because everything has to be covered, has to meet Zero Discharge, and it will not cost less at Site 40. Ms. Kullberg added the current location is at a central location, with road access and lights. Ms. Kullberg stated she believes the Board of Supervisors would not accept changing the General Plan, and added that Site 40 is under the Williamson Act and the federal farm plan. Ms. Mullberg recommended that composting remain in a new area on the Central Site.

Stu Clark, DEI, stated he strongly supports the motion that has been made, added that time is of the essence and it's time to take action in June to select a site and certify the EIR. Mr. Clark agreed it's key in getting a lot of the answers the Agency is struggling with today. Mr. Clark stated he agrees with the comment about the numbers that have been presented. Mr. Clark added that from his experience he believes the numbers are in the ballpark, relative to the new site. Mr. Clark added that the real way to find out the cost and how many tons should be planned for is through a real proposal that can't be obtained until there is actually a site selected to design the facility at. Mr. Clark thanked the Board for all the effort over the years with the project and encouraged the Board to move forward diligently on selecting the site.

Kathy Ferrando, Happy Acres, stated she agrees that a site needs to be selected, and added that has to come before anything else. Ms. Ferrando urged the Board to consider more than Central, as Central has a very small area that can actually be utilized. Ms. Ferrando added that the original EIR did ask for Site 40. Ms. Ferrando stated that she doesn't care if it's Site 40, and added she wants it to the best environmentally sensitive site with the best program possible. Ms. Ferrando added she thinks ten years from now they may find entirely different ways of handling compost and doing a great job. Ms. Ferrando added that the cost needs to be looked at, and as a taxpayer she's concerned about that. She added that as an environmentalist, teacher and former principal she's very concerned about that for students and the community. Ms. Ferrando asked that the Board keep their minds open, and shared that in Los Angeles they constructed a phenomenal site in an industrial park, and added there are other options to be looked at again.

Board Discussion (continued)

Ms. Agrimonti recommended that Mr. Schwartz and Mr. Mikus get together before the next meeting if time permits to go through some of the numbers so that Mr. Schwartz feels more comfortable with the numbers. Ms. Agrimonti added that if that's not the case, at least there would have been an effort to do that. Ms. Agrimonti added that she realizes they are busy and it is unknown if that's possible.

Mr. Schwartz replied he is willing to meet with Mr. Mikus and try to do that if that's the desire of the Board. Mr. Schwartz stated he appreciates Mr. Sawyer's point regarding trying to come up

with a better way to do this and also concurs with Chair St. John's point about best numbers would be obtained through proposals, assuming site selection.

Mr. Salmi commented he thinks a meeting between Mr. Schwartz and Mr. Mikus is not going to be as valuable as obtaining a bid and real costs.

Ms. Agrimonti concurred, and added that was just a suggestion on her part.

Mr. Schwartz motioned to plan for certification of the Final EIR, make the site selection at the upcoming June Board meeting and that in the future documents on site selection include the most likely scenario fully costed out over time, and that any future documents around site selection or costs include a per can rate as part of the materials coming forward. Ms. Agrimonti seconded the motion.

Vote Count:

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-

The motion passed unanimously.

9. JPA Renewal Status Report

Mr. Mikus stated that when there was discussion about bringing this item back a month ago, the hope was that all member jurisdictions would have had an opportunity to weigh in on the matrix issues over the JPA renewal. Mr. Mikus added the plan was to look at everyone's input at this meeting, and start trying to reach consensus and address some of the serious issues. Mr. Mikus added that unfortunately despite everyone's efforts to try and schedule this level of serious and lengthy discussion, not everyone was able to do that in the last month. Mr. Mikus reported that Windsor, Cotati, Rohnert Park, Petaluma, and Healdsburg have had conversations of some sort about the matrix, and added that staff has received the matrix with the comments from Windsor, Cotati, Rohnert Park, and Petaluma. Mr. Mikus stated Healdsburg made an ad hoc committee to formulate the recommended responses, but the return date is unknown.

Mr. Mikus stated that some of the other cities have had to reschedule, and as of right now the meetings scheduled are as follows:

Sonoma, June 1

County of Sonoma, June 9

Sebastopol, June 18

Santa Rosa, June 9

Mr. Mikus pointed out that the actual responses received are included in the packet, and the plan is to put a matrix together with all the answers. Mr. Mikus added that staff felt it was important to provide the actual returns today to give everyone a sense of not only what is being said, but how it's said. Mr. Mikus added that if these dates are met, it will be possible for the Board to hold a discussion.

Mr. Cox stated Cloverdale also formed an ad hoc and met on May 19th, and their recommendations should be presented to the council at their next meeting on May 27th.

Public Comment

None.

Board Discussion

Mr. Schwartz asked Mr. Salmi if he has an estimate on dates his council will review the matrix.

Mr. Salmi replied the ad hoc met earlier during the week, and he suspects the response from the full council will be at their first meeting in June. Mr. Salmi added that he thinks it's the 6th.

Mr. McLaughlin clarified that the Sebastopol meeting is actually June 16th.

Mr. Schwartz stated he presumes the results from the other cities will be shared with the other cities if that's an interest to them. Mr. Schwartz inquired if it would be helpful for the remaining cities in responding to the matrix, to have a list of the showstopper issues in one place. Mr. Schwartz added that those tend to be the issues to be wrestled with the most. Mr. Schwartz stated that knowing where the other cities stand might be of interest, and if so, staff can be asked to consolidate the information in one place.

Mr. Sawyer asked Mr. Schwartz to repeat what he's suggesting.

Mr. Schwartz replied that some of the cities, including Rohnert Park for example, have said there are core showstopper issues for them that would possible make them not renew the JPA if they are not addressed to their satisfaction. Mr. Schwartz added that they are probably not the only city that has those sorts of issues, and it seems that getting those identified for the cities coming up might be a way to help focus the conversation on what would be the most difficult points, and therefore advance the speed in which the cities are able to address and identify the issues as part of their conversations. Mr. Schwartz said if it's not helpful the thought could be ignored.

Mr. Sawyer replied that it would be helpful for the City of Santa Rosa to get a sense of the other Cities responses as far as the showstoppers.

Mr. Schwartz asked for Board direction to make that a motion to direct staff to compile and maintain a list of the showstopper issues and to update it as each council goes through their conversations, and to provide it to the city staff as well as the Board member of that city, prior to city consideration. Mr. Sawyer motioned the recommendation, and Mr. Cox seconded the motion.

Public Comment

None.

Board Discussion (continued)

Vote Count:

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-

Motion passed unanimously.

10. City-County Payment Program Grant

Mr. Carter explained the City-County Payment Program is a grant program Agency staff has been pulling funds from since the year 2000 to promote recycling of beverage containers. Mr. Carter added there's a deposit that goes in on beverage containers, and these funds are used to promote their recycling. Mr. Carter stated staff received information from CalRecycle, who administers the grant, that they were going to be changing the structure of the grant going forward, and that it will be a two year cycle. Mr. Carter explained the Agency will receive the money and have two years to spend it. Mr. Carter reported there is some backlog of funding available, and staff wanted to bring that to the Board's attention. Mr. Carter added that if there are projects the Board has such as recycling containers needed for downtown or park, the Agency can purchase the containers with these funds. Mr. Carter added that staff can be contacted and can also reach out to the cities public works and parks to see if there is a need. Mr. Carter stated there is about \$225,000 of funding staff believes should be spent before getting into the next cycle of grants, as it makes the accounting of it easier.

Mr. Carter added that if there's not enough need for recycling containers in parks and downtown areas, they could look at other ways to fund that money. Mr. Carter shared that an option is to potentially add a part-time or time limited Staff member to increase the education about mandatory commercial recycling, which is what has been happening for the past several years, and then went back down to one staff member. Mr. Carter added that is about the amount of grant funding received every year, and it covers the cost.

11. Attachments/Correspondence:

- 11.1 Reports by Staff and Others:
 - 11.1.a May and June 2015 Outreach Events
 - 11.1.b EPR update report
 - 11.1.c Batteries and sharps letter of support
 - 11.1.d Compost letters of support

12. Boardmember Comments

Ms. Harvey asked that Mr. Carter contact Cotati's Public Works Department to see if they could utilize more recycling containers.

13. Staff Comments

None.

- 14.** Next SCWMA meeting: June 17, 2015, to take place elsewhere, as it will not take place at the City of Santa Rosa Council Chambers due to City budget purposes.

Ms. Gorin stated that week is when the City of Santa Rosa and the County hold budget hearings, and the County may have to rearrange their schedule to allow for a Supervisor to attend the June Board meeting. Ms. Gorin acknowledged it will be a really important meeting, and stated she does not offer it lightly, but inquired if other cities are in a similar situation and if there is a need to consider a different date.

Chair St. John asked that a survey be conducted as to what the situation is on June 17th in terms of availability, and that decision could be made within a week or so.

15. Adjourned to Closed Session

The Board adjourned to closed session at 11:00 a.m.

Resumed Closed Session

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - EXISTING LITIGATION
GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.9(d)(1)

Renewed Efforts of Neighbors Against Landfill Expansion vs. County of Sonoma, Sonoma Compost Company, Sonoma County Waste Management Agency
Case 3:14-cv-03804-THE

Resumed Open Session

The Board resumed open session at 11:20 a.m.

Mr. Cox, Mr. Sawyer, and Ms. Agrimonti left at 11:20 a.m.

Chair St. John stated there was no reportable action out of closed session.

Ms. Harvey motioned to adjourn the meeting and Ms. Gorin seconded the motion.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:21 a.m.

Submitted by
Sally Evans