



## Minutes of August 19, 2015 Special Meeting

The Sonoma County Waste Management Agency met on August 19, 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     | Shirlee Zane      |
| Town of Windsor      | Deb Fudge         |

**Staff Present:**

- |              |                 |
|--------------|-----------------|
| Counsel      | Ethan Walsh     |
| Staff        | Henry Mikus     |
|              | Patrick Carter  |
|              | Karina Chilcott |
| Agency Clerk | Sally Evans     |

**1. Call to Order Special Meeting**

The meeting was called to order at 9:25 a.m.

**2. Agenda Approval**

**John Sawyer, City of Santa Rosa, motioned to approve the agenda and Don Schwartz, City of Rohnert Park, 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-

**3. Report on Closed Session: Conference with Legal Counsel-Existing Litigation**

Ethan Walsh, Agency Counsel, reported out of closed session the Agency Board unanimously voted by a 10-0 vote to authorize Agency Counsel to defend the action brought by RENALE against

the Agency challenging the approval of the Central Site Alternative. Mr. Walsh noted the other two items on the closed session agenda will continue after open session.

**4. Adjourn Closed Session to the End of the Regular Meeting**

**5. Public Comments (items not on the agenda)**

None.

**6. Consent (w/attachments)**

6.1 Minutes of June 24, 2015 Regular Meeting

6.2 Compost Shutdown Progress Report

Mr. Sawyer abstained from the minutes, as he was not present at the last meeting.

**Mr. Schwartz motioned to approve the consent agenda and Susan Harvey, City of Cotati, seconded the motion.**

**Vote Count:**

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

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

**Regular Calendar**

**7. JPA Future Status Report**

Henry Mikus, Agency Executive Director, stated some things had happened since the JPA Future Status Report was completed, he would provide a status update, and asked others to report their information. Mr. Mikus added that at the June Board meeting, the Board asked staff to contract with R3, the consultant who previously did the Agency's service delivery analysis.

Mr. Mikus explained the Board wanted R3 to analyze three items: the SCWMA continuing, the County of Sonoma assuming responsibility for the Agency's programs, and a hybrid between Republic and the Regional Climate Protection Authority (RCPA). R3 was also to research and provide specific examples of opt-out provisions language from other JPA agreements.

Mr. Mikus reported R3 was contacted and provided a cost proposal that was shared with the Executive Committee. Mr. Mikus noted the Executive Committee examined the proposal, felt the cost was high, and had a discussion regarding how the tasks could be accomplished through other means. The decision was made to not use R3, but instead have staff and the Executive Committee meet with the County directly to start a conversation about costs, and for staff to research opt-out provisions.

Mr. Mikus stated that since that Executive Committee meeting, meetings with County staff and RCPA Executive Director Suzanne Smith have occurred to discuss the development of a plan for a scenario involving those organizations taking the Agency's responsibilities.

Mr. Mikus stated that in an initial meeting with the County, the County had not made a decision or expressed interest in an all-County option, and noted the email he shared with the Board said the County would explore that. Mr. Mikus added there have been some meetings on these subjects recently, and inquired if Chair St. John additional information to report.

Chair St. John explained the Executive Committee felt there was little for R3 to evaluate, and until the Executive Committee can describe hybrid option in detail, it was premature to involve R3.

Chair St. John noted there had been positive conversations regarding the governance of a hybrid agency with County and RCPA staff. Chair St. John proposed the Board allow him and Vice Chair Schwartz to continue the discussions and within a month bring back to the Board a clear definition of what that option would look like and potential impacts on costs. Chair St. John added that at this point the discussions seemed favorable and that there may be some moderate cost savings through this option. Chair St. John noted there were some questions raised at this meeting that need further research, particularly the issue of the purpose of a regional agency.

Susan Harvey, City of Cotati, stated that based on this Staff Report, it appeared the concept of a JPA model is completely eliminated, because the only two options discussed were the hybrid and County options. Ms. Harvey added that even in the other two models, it seems that the whole concept around policy had been lost, and it had been stated in the past that policy will drive diversion.

Chair St. John stated that the JPA option was not off the table. Chair St. John noted the direction he took from the Board at the June meeting was that the option needed to be included.

Deb Fudge, Town of Windsor, stated that while RCPA seems to be an option certainly worth considering, she wants to make sure the JPA doesn't fall off the table, because there are so many things that are a float right now and situations could change.

Shirlee Zane, County of Sonoma, stated that from the County's perspective, the fiscal administrative side still needed to be looked at. Ms. Zane added that in terms of models that involve the County, there would be an assumption that a contractual arrangement would be reached with the city partners and Republic Services to operate the HHW and organics program and some type of agreement under master operations agreement with Republic regarding compensating for any type of disposal fees for any type of arrangement to offer and run those programs.

Chair St. John stated that there were more details that need to be brought back to the Board, including discussions of flow commitment and how assignment of compost and HHW could take place.

Don Schwartz, City of Rohnert Park, reiterated what Chair St. John stated regarding the direction from the last meeting was to assess the cost and governance for the two options for which there was no data, and it was not the intent to take something off the table.

Mr. Schwartz stated the questions are about the governance model; if it should have a JPA and how it would be structured. Mr. Schwartz explained there could be a JPA that is not operated by an agency and staff could contract with someone else for operations. Mr. Schwartz noted that one of the questions he saw on the matrix from the cities is what was the most cost effective way to operate as a governing body.

Mr. Schwartz asked Agency Counsel to apply the library JPA model issue raised in the staff report regarding the County directly operating as a JPA. Mr. Schwartz noted it was discussed in his city that there is the assumption that if the Board wanted to, they could just hand the whole operation, including governance, over to the County. Mr. Schwartz noted that the RCPA option seemed to imply responsibilities would be handed to them, but his understanding was that the regional agency had to be a JPA, even if operational functions were performed by another body.

Mr. Walsh replied that was how he read the statute that authorizes the formation of a regional agency. Mr. Walsh added that it states a regional agency may comprise of member agencies who are part of that larger regional agency, which would suggest that you have to have a JPA and could not necessary contract just with one entity that would serve as the regional agency. Mr. Walsh stated there would need to be a JPA formed, and added that to an extent it may be a semantic issue of how they could set up the mechanics of it, and it wouldn't preclude having the County or RCPA having responsibility over programs. Mr. Walsh stated that RCPA is currently a two body, legislatively-formed entity; RCPA and the Sonoma County Transportation Authority. Mr. Walsh added he didn't see a reason why there couldn't be another legal entity under that umbrella.

Mr. Walsh added that if this were to move forward, the question is how those responsibilities would be transitioned from the Waste Management Agency to whatever future entity is responsible for the various tasks the Agency does. Mr. Walsh added there are mechanical issues that would need to be worked out, and added he didn't want that to interfere with the policy discussion and the best way to approach it. Mr. Walsh noted there would have to be further discussion if the County was going to take the larger role in this, and that he would want to discuss the best and cleanest way to transition with County Counsel.

Mr. Schwartz inquired if an option, for example, could be to have a JPA that is affiliated with RCPA, and the JPA could contract with RCPA, the County, create its own staff, or any combination of those things for particular services.

Mr. Walsh replied those are all options that were on the table.

Chair St. John confirmed with Agency Counsel that, as Chair, he could appoint an ad hoc committee. Chair St. John appointed Ms. Fudge, Mr. Sawyer, Mr. Schwartz, and himself to the ad hoc committee to develop a hybrid model.

## **Public Comments**

None.

## **8. Exec Committee Role and Composition**

Mr. Mikus stated the Executive Committee helped with agenda preparation for the last several years, and added that Agency Counsel had suggested rethinking that process.

Mr. Walsh stated his understanding is that for some years there had been an informal executive committee that consisted of the Chair, the Vice Chair, and the Chair Pro Tem, which took on some additional responsibilities. Mr. Walsh noted that under the Agency's Rules of Governance, the Chair has the responsibility to meet with the Executive Director to establish the agenda for each meeting.

Mr. Walsh stated that his understanding was that when the Agency hired an independent Executive Director the Vice Chair and the Chair Pro Tem started to take a more involved role in the formation of the agendas. Mr. Walsh noted that over the past few years they occasionally were involved in other issues.

Mr. Walsh recommended to the Board that as issues come up, it would be the Chair's prerogative to establish committees, as needed. Mr. Walsh believed the most appropriate way to deal with issues would be to establish ad hoc committees at the Board meetings to deal with specific issues that come before the Board that need to be dealt with before the next meeting. Mr. Walsh added that once those issues are completed the ad hoc committee would be disbanded, and as other ad hoc committees are needed, they can be established on a case by case basis, rather than just having a default of the Chair, Vice Chair, and the Chair Pro Tem be responsible for all potential issues.

Mr. Walsh added that the Chair would have primary responsibility for setting the agenda with the Executive Director, with the understanding that on an as needed basis the Chair could call someone in to assist periodically or if someone had input on the agenda, they could discuss that with the Chair.

Madolyn Agrimonti, City of Sonoma, stated there are executive committees within boards and there are standing ad hoc committees, and it almost felt like this Executive Committee has turned into a standing committee for any issue that comes up. Ms. Agrimonti noted she had not been on the Agency Board long but was in agreement with Mr. Walsh, as there are different issues that could possibly be addressed by other Board members who may have an interest in a given area.

Mr. Walsh replied that the executive committee was never formally established, according to his conversation with the Agency's previous legal counsel. Mr. Walsh thought the Executive Committee's role had evolved over time, and his concern was that it evolved too much towards becoming a standing committee. Mr. Walsh noted that if the Board wanted to have a standing executive committee they could do that, but they would require regular meetings in accordance with the Brown Act and would require an amendment to the Agency's Rules of Governance. Mr. Walsh noted that given the nature of the types of issues they have come up, the Chair could assist with the agenda setting, and as issues come up on a case by case basis, it made sense to have ad hoc committees.

### **Public Comments**

Roger Larsen, Happy Acres, stated it appeared the Board was giving up their power to the committee. Mr. Larsen inquired how the JPA has existed working the way it had been working without an executive committee, without two people who were not even elected making decisions for those who were. Mr. Larsen stated he saw a newspaper article this week where a non-elected from this Board said what all ten Board members were doing, were working hard on, and decided to do. Mr. Larsen felt that the Board members have given up looking into and hearing what the citizens say. Mr. Larsen added that if this is left to a committee, the Board won't

have to listen to Mr. Larsen as much anymore, as the committee will make the decisions without any input from the public, or with a lot less input from the Board, which was something he believed they should all think about.

Chair St. John stated he believed Mr. Larsen had a misunderstanding, as the committees don't make the decisions. They advise the Board, and the decisions are made by the Agency Board.

Mr. Larsen replied he did not believe he had a misunderstanding based on discussions he had with Chair St. John.

Chair St. John stated that he was only clarifying a statement so the public did not have the misunderstanding. Chair St. John added that the ad hoc committees and the standing committees, which there are none, bring their recommendation back to the Agency Board, and the Board makes the decisions.

## **9. Do-it-Yourself Composting Education Outreach Ideas**

Karina Chilcott, Agency staff, stated that at the June 24<sup>th</sup> Board meeting staff was directed to develop details and a budget for a variety of a short list of Do-it-Yourself on Site Composting activities.

Ms. Chilcott stated the first project for the Board's consideration was a professional composting workshop. Ms. Chilcott explained the Agency could contract with the Community Alliance with Family Farmers (CAFF) to conduct a six hour workshop targeting small farmers in Sonoma County interested in learning about on site composting techniques. CAFF could organize a green waste database matching landscapers and farmers with green and brown materials. Agency staff could be responsible for administering a competitive grant program where farmers could apply for two hours of on-site consultation with Soil Scientist, Will Bakx. The overall cost to the Agency to fully implement this project would be \$10,766, and it was estimated that 44 tons of organic material annually could get composted within Sonoma County.

Ms. Chilcott stated the second project for the Board's consideration is conducting worm composting in schools. The Agency could contract with the Compost Club, a non-profit, who would conduct thirty school worm composting presentations in K-6 schools, middle schools, and high schools in Sonoma County. The Compost Club would calculate how much food waste was generated on campus and estimate the number of worm bins needed. The Compost Club estimated that from historical data seven schools would initiate a school-wide worm compost system, while 75% would prefer worm composting as a classroom enrichment activity. The overall cost to the Agency for this project would be \$3,996, and an estimated that 157.5 tons of organic material, primarily food waste, could get composted annually within Sonoma County. Ms. Chilcott stated that the Compost Club would collect matching funds from the Rose Foundation and various local clubs and foundations.

The third project was a video series for composting and worm composting. Ms. Chilcott stated the Agency could contract with the University of California Cooperative Extension (UCCE), to produce a series of ten-one-to-two minute professionally produced videos; five on composting and five worm composting. The videos would also get dubbed with Spanish, under contract with C2 Alternative Services. Publicity for the videos would focus on social media outlets such as Facebook, Google+, Instagram, and You Tube. The overall cost for this project would be \$44,554,

and was estimated that 3,877 tons of organic material annually could be composted within Sonoma County.

Ms. Chilcott stated the fourth project was conducting composting and worm composting workshops. The Agency could contract with UCCE to coordinate five regional workshops, three Spanish workshops, and six “go where the people are” style composting workshops. As an incentive for attending a workshop, attendees could be provided with an Agency-sponsored \$25 off coupon to purchase composting products such as bins and worms. Considering the complexity of managing logistics for composting products and worms, the Agency could contract with Triformis, a third party contractor, to manage logistics. Triformis would be responsible for comprehensive management with fulfillment delivery; receiving, tracking order, processing payments, and quality control. Agency staff could partner with UCCE to advertise the workshops, provide post cards at Master Gardner information tables, social media, utility bill inserts, etc. Spanish language advertising would be conducted by C2 Alternative Services. The overall cost for this project would be \$27,421, and it’s estimated that 310 tons of organic material could get composted within Sonoma County.

Ms. Chilcott noted that some projects described in this report will require permits from the Sonoma County Department of Environmental Health, specifically the rotation of green waste to the farmers property, collection of food waste for worm composting, composting food waste, etc. Ms. Chilcott added that each composting site proposed to compost would need to be reviewed on a case by case basis, to determine requirements needed.

Shirlee Zane, County of Sonoma, commended Ms. Chilcott for her good work. Ms. Zane noted that Option 3 has the most diversion for the money and avoids the outhaul.

Mr. Schwartz inquired regarding Option 3, referenced page 75 of the Agenda Packet and asked Ms. Chilcott to explain the diversion calculations.

Ms. Chilcott replied she asked UC Cooperative Extension to help with the anticipated diversion, and they estimated 5,000 people based on a video series produced by the Orange County Master Gardeners.

Mr. Schwartz asked if Orange County had a 64% success rate.

Ms. Chilcott replied that Master Gardners says it’s 64% of respondents, based on a survey every two or three years regarding composting activities.

Mr. Schwartz asked where the funding for this would come from.

Patrick Carter, Agency staff, stated would be the Organics Reserve.

Chair St. John inquired if this is budgeted.

Mr. Carter replied this was not budgeted.

Bob Cox, City of Cloverdale, noted options 1 and 2 do not mention they would be bilingual, and inquired if that was a possibility.

Ms. Chilcott replied the plan would be to have Hugo Mata at the professional composting workshop to provide translation if needed; if farmers wanted to send their supervisors and they would feel more comfortable in Spanish language. Ms. Chilcott added that Spanish wasn't considered for composting in the schools.

Mr. Mikus added that as part of the Agency's mandatory commercial recycling program, staff has been at school, and staff's experience has been that most schools have their own staff or students who provide translations.

Deb Fudge, Town of Windsor, thought all four programs were important because they affect different segments of society. Ms. Fudge added that it was always great to reach school children, especially when there will be at least two years with no composting in county to keep the awareness in the public eye.

John Sawyer, City of Santa Rosa, expressed that composting is the right thing to do and inquired if this activity would change the cost currently incurred in outhaul.

Mr. Mikus replied the reason this came up for consideration at the last meeting was the Board wanted to identify segments of the population that would have some consequences due to the outhaul. Mr. Mikus noted there was a paragraph under financial impacts that detailed what staff thought the outhaul reduction would be.

Mr. Mikus stated the potential estimated diversion per year for all the options combined is 4,400 tons. At \$58/ton, that was a quarter of a million dollars in savings in outhaul. Another way to look at it was if the project diverted 1200-1300 tons, it would offset the cost of the program. Mr. Mikus added this comparison was only done for one year, but in reality the benefits of the program would likely go beyond one year.

Ms. Zane believed the programs were very creative and highlighted option 3, which she felt provided the most diversion for the money. Ms. Zane noted option 3 diverts about 4,000 tons per year vs. option 2, which is only diverts 157 ton per year, or option 1, which diverts only 44 tons per year. Ms. Zane stated the actual cost of diversion per ton is only \$11.49/ton for option 3 for no outhaul and 10 times as much diversion as option 4, and quite a bit more than option 1 or option 2. Ms. Zane added that option 3 really targets a significant amount, and noted that as highlighted by Mr. Cox, the Spanish is another advantage in reaching Spanish speaking households.

Ms. Harvey stated that while she agreed with Ms. Zane, she believed it is really important introduce composting to children at a young age. Ms. Harvey shared that her son-in-law works at the Water Agency and he says children are just like sponges and they do a lot conservation activities with kids.

Mr. Schwartz asked how staff planned to evaluate these programs.

Ms. Chilcott replied there were a number of things that can be counted, such as attendance at events and website hits for the videos. Ms. Chilcott noted that staff will provide the Board with a progress report.



Mr. Carter stated that when staff has partnered with UCCE for the home composting in the past, they provided surveys to people that attended. Mr. Carter noted he thinks that was where the 64% success rate came from, as they looked at people that attended and people actually were continuing that activity into the future. Mr. Carter added that he thought staff would be able to get similar metrics out of them to evaluate the program as well.

Ms. Chilcott mentioned that UCCE planned on hiring an intern to do a post evaluation survey as well.

Mr. Schwartz replied he liked the idea but doesn't trust the numbers. Mr. Schwartz noted the 64% refers to increase or start composting. Mr. Schwartz stated he was not comfortable with hiring interns to do program evaluation and asked that staff do that and report back in six months if the project is approved. Mr. Schwartz noted that these weren't expensive programs and the potential is worth it, given the potential savings. Mr. Schwartz stated he has come across issues in the past regarding optimistic assumptions and he couldn't see how the 64% number can be applied to the 5,000 realistically. Mr. Schwartz noted that he is still willing to support the program with the caveat to get a report back in six months with a professional evaluation conducted by staff.

Chair St. John stated he's reluctant to increase the Agency's expenditures at a time when the Agency has very high expenditures on unexpected items. Chair St. John acknowledged there was quite a bit of support for these programs and added it doesn't diminish the work staff has done to bring these to the Board.

## **Public Comments**

Pam Davis, Sonoma Compost, stated she had been part of a couple of meetings with the Farmers Guild and some other community groups that are interested in looking at on-farm composting, and she wanted to let the Board know there was interest from the agricultural community to look at what they can do with their own materials, but also some of the permitting for agricultural land allows materials from off-site to be brought on-site, as long as it was used on site.

Ms. Davis stated she worked with Rick Kaye at the Compost Club, and the Alexander Valley School had an amazing program and students learned business skills while they were collecting food scraps and creating compost and selling bags of compost at the farmers markets. Ms. Davis believed the Compost Club had done fabulous work in the past.

Ms. Davis expressed that she liked that the four proposals because they targeted many different aspects in the community

Stu Clark, DEI, expressed his support for option 2 and shared he was familiar with the in school worm program Rick Kaye and the Compost Club perform, and found it to be incredibly effective. Mr. Clark noted the 100% matching funds available. Mr. Clark added that it was about \$25/ton to divert 157 tons, making it a good value. Mr. Clark noted he also supported educating young students and added that regarding the issue of Spanish language, he believed that every school was able to include the entire school. Mr. Clark commented Mr. Kaye has personally designed this system and they are great worm bins. Mr. Clark shared he uses Mr. Kaye's system at home and added that for \$4,000 it would be money well spent.

Mr. Sawyer referenced option 1 and acknowledged the compelling argument for further education for farmers on how to do on site composting. Mr. Sawyer inquired if financial participation by farmers for the workshop could be added. Mr. Sawyer said it seems that a workshop that is almost \$11,000 is a valuable tool and there may be a possibility of having farmers and those in the agriculture community participate in that cost, especially if not having to buy compost is going to save them money in the future. Mr. Sawyer said he's in favor of options 2 and 3, and was wondering if option 1 might have some ability to recover some of those costs.

Ms. Chilcott stated CAFF was going to charge a nominal registration fee, as this was not going to be a free workshop. Ms. Chilcott referenced the budget in the attachments under budget option 1, and noted the budget includes the workshop as well as the personalized on site compost instruction, which would be the grant program through the Agency. Ms. Chilcott noted that would be minus \$6,000. Ms. Chilcott stated the workshop is not as expensive, as it's in the \$4,000 range.

**Ms. Zane motioned the Board adopt both options 2 and 3. Ms. Harvey seconded the motion.**

Ms. Fudge stated she wanted all four options, and didn't want to vote against this but strongly believed all four are needed, the cost was small, and believed the benefit will reach different people.

Chair St. John asked if the maker of the motion would consider amending her motion.

Ms. Zane replied she would look at option 4 again. Ms. Zane inquired if Ms. Fudge thought option 4 has better outcomes for farmers.

Ms. Fudge replied she thought that all four options together hit all the communities they are trying to hit and she recommended that all be pursued.

Ms. Zane replied the problem she had with option 4 when she did the cost breakdown is that option 4 is \$87/ton and the expected diversion is only 310 tons, vs. option 3, which is \$11/ton, with an expected diversion of almost 4,000 tons. Ms. Zane noted there was quite a significant difference in costs and in diversion.

Ms. Fudge replied she was looking at the big picture and trying to hit all segments of society in different ways people. Ms. Fudge noted she looked at the outcome, diversion and large cost savings for all four added together.

Chair St. John stated there was a motion and a second on the table and now are back into discussion. Chair St. John asked if they are better off calling the motion or if Ms. Zane chooses to amend the motion.

Ms. Zane replied she would not amend the motion until she knew if that was in the budget.

Chair St. John replied that question has already been asked and this was in the budget.

Ms. Zane inquired if it would be coming out of contingencies and asked how much was in contingencies.

Mr. Carter replied the Organics Reserve had about two million dollars in it currently.

Ms. Fudge explained the summary she was looking at and mattered to her was that if you take all four options together, 4,400 tons would be diverted from being hauled out, with a \$250,000 savings total for all four options.

Ms. Zane stated she didn't have a problem with option 4, but the problem she has with option 1 is that it's \$244/ton with the diversion only being 44 tons. Ms. Zane noted there was a huge difference between option 1 and option 3, as option 3 is \$11.00 per ton and almost 4,000 tons of diversion.

Ms. Zane stated that if options 2 to 4 were adopted today, they could go back to CAFF and ask for a better deal than \$244/ton.

Chair St. John acknowledged that Ms. Zane is willing to amend her motion for options 2, 3, and 4.

**Ms. Zane replied she would accept the amendment to include option 4, but would not accept option 1.**

**Chair St. John asked if Ms. Harvey is in agreement with amending the motion to include options 2, 3, and 4.**

**Ms. Harvey replied affirmatively.**

**Mr. Schwartz requested the motion be amended include that staff report back on the results of this in six months with the best professional judgment on how cost effective this has been.**

**Ms. Zane and Ms. Harvey stated they were in agreement with the amendment proposal by Mr. Schwartz.**

**Chair St. John noted there was an amended motion for options 2, 3, and 4 and requires staff to come back in six months.**

**Vote Count:**

Cloverdale	Aye	Cotati	Aye
County	Aye	Healdsburg	Aye
Petaluma	Aye	Rohnert Park	Aye
Santa Rosa	Aye	Sebastopol	Aye
Sonoma	Aye	Windsor	No

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

The motion failed.

Ms. Fudge stated she's opposed because she would like to support all the program.

Chair St. John asked if there was an alternate motion.

**Ms. Fudge motioned to include options 1 through 4 and Bob Cox, City of Cloverdale, seconded the motion.**

Chair St. John clarified that it would include the same provision of a six month check-in.

Ms. Zane asked if option 1 would be \$5,000 instead of \$10,000 for just being six months.

Mr. Schwartz replied the evaluation would be presented by professional staff after six months of operation.

Ms. Zane stated she wanted to make an amendment to option 1 to reduce the cost of that program.

**Vote Count:**

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

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

The motion failed.

Mr. Schwartz stated the reason for his vote was he didn't think they should be subsidizing the agricultural use of comport.

Chair St. John noted the motion failed and asked if there was an alternative motion.

Ms. Harvey asked why this had to be an unanimous vote.

Chair St. John replied it was more than \$50,000.

Ms. Fudge stated she would be willing to modify the motion to ask CAFF to try to get at least 100 participants, but she didn't want to make it a requirement. Ms. Fudge stated she was willing to raise the nominal fee to help pay for a portion of the workshop so that small farmers who are struggling already can attend, but not make it so expensive that people can't participate.

Chair St. John inquired if a motion was needed to continue.

Mr. Walsh replied it is not necessary, as there is no action being taken on this.

Chair St. John stated this will be continued with the staff direction as provided by Ms. Fudge. Chair St. John noted there were likely a number of good videos on composting and wondered if any could be used here in Sonoma County instead of producing new ones. Chair St. John noted that his City uses non-profits to do workshops on water conservation activities that use volunteers. Chair St. John inquired if there have been any discussions with non-profits such as Daily Acts, on what they could provide that may be more economically favorable.

Ms. Harvey noted that the largest expense in option 1 had to do with the individualized two hour sessions and inquired if something could be done about that, as it was \$6,000 of the \$10,000.

Chair St. John stated they will continue the discussion.

Nea Bradford, Petaluma Resident, requested to comment on the Board's motions on the four options. Ms. Bradford stated she knew an individual who had been working in the county for almost ten years with various schools and private parties in doing both worm and regular composting. Ms. Bradford suggested the Board consider the longevity of the projects. Ms. Bradford added that the individual she knows has seen a fair amount of lack of interest with worm composting after initial interest, as it gets too hard to keep up. Ms. Bradford added the composting tends to last longer, and even though option 1 is expensive, it may last longer in the future, and the opportunity to teach people how to compost on site may last much longer than the money put into worm bins. Ms. Bradford noted it may seem simple when watching the video regarding how to compost, but it really takes some expertise and someone going on site to help people get started so they are successful in making their composting operation work is really important. Ms. Bradford noted the experts going out to help individual farmers will help assure that vested money continues on long after the initial workshop.

Chair St. John asked that comments be made during the public comment session in the future.

Ms. Zane inquired if the Sonoma County Farm Bureau offers any classes on compost, and it was determined that would be added to the list for staff to look into.

**10. Attachments/Correspondence:**

10.1 Reports by Staff and Others:

- 10.1.a August and September 2015 Outreach Events
- 10.1.b RRWA Medicines Memo
- 10.1.c Donation of Green Building Products Showcase

Mr. Mikus pointed out item 10.1.b, the short memo regarding activity with the Russian River Watershed Association and the outreach they are going to be doing to the different councils on the safe medicines take-back.

**11. Boardmember Comments**

None.

**12. Staff Comments**

None.

**13. Next SCWMA meeting:** September 16, 2015

**14. Reconvene into Closed Session.**

**Mr. Sawyer motioned to reconvene in closed session in the Mayor's conference room and Chair St. John seconded the motion.**

Mr. Walsh clarified they would reconvene into open session after closed session.

**Reconvene into Open Session.**

Mr. Walsh reported two actions from closed session. Mr. Walsh stated the Board authorized legal counsel to initiate litigation on behalf of the Agency. Mr. Walsh also reported the Board accepted the resignation of the Executive Director and agreed to his request to waive the ninety day notice period and allowed him to resign effective 30 days from the date of his letter of August 4<sup>th</sup>, making his resignation effective September 4<sup>th</sup>.

**Ms. Agrimonti motioned to adjourn and Mr. Cox seconded the motion.**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:53 p.m.

Submitted by  
Sally Evans