



Agenda Item # 4.1

Minutes of January 18, 2012

The Sonoma County Waste Management Agency (SCWMA) met on January 18, 2012, at the City of Santa Rosa Council Chambers, 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Santa Rosa, California

Present:

City of Healdsburg	Mike Kirn, Chair (2011)
City of Cloverdale	Nina Regor, Chair (2012)
City of Cotati	Marsha Sue Lustig
City of Petaluma	John Brown
City of Rohnert Park	Linda Babonis
City of Santa Rosa	Dell Tredinnick
City of Sebastopol	Jack Griffin
City of Sonoma	Steve Barbose
County of Sonoma	Susan Klassen
Town of Windsor	Matt Mullan

Staff Present:

Counsel	Janet Coleson
Staff	Patrick Carter
	Karina Chilcott
	Charlotte Fisher
	Henry Mikus
	Lisa Steinman
Clerk	Debra Dowdell

1. Call to Order/Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 9:06 a.m.

2. Agenda Approval

Chair Kirn requested a modification to the agenda. He suggested Items #9, #10 and #12 be moved immediately after the Consent Calendar.

Matt Mullan, Town of Windsor, moved to approve the modified agenda. Steve Barbose, City of Sonoma, seconded. Agenda approved.

3. Attachments/Correspondence

Chair Kirn called attention to the Director's Agenda Notes, Reports by Staff and Others; January and February 2012 Outreach Events, Eco Desk (English and Spanish) 2011 Annual Reports, Website www.recyclenow.org 2011 Annual Report, and Education 2011 Outreach Summary

4. On File with Clerk

Chair Kirn noted resolution approved in November 2011 authorizing the SCWMA to submit all CalRecycle Grant Applications.

5. Public Comments (items not on the agenda)

None.

6. Election of 2012 Officers

Marsha Sue Lustig, City of Cotati, nominated Nina Regor, City of Cloverdale, as Chair. Dell Tredinnick, City of Santa Rosa, seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Mike Kirn, City of Healdsburg, nominated Marsha Sue Lustig, City of Cotati, as Vice Chair. Linda Babonis, City of Rohnert Park, seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Susan Klassen, County of Sonoma, nominated Mike Kirn as Chair Pro Tempore. Linda Babonis, City of Rohnert Park, seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

The new officers for 2012 are; Nina Regor, City of Cloverdale, Chair; Marsha Sue Lustig, City of Cotati, Vice Chair; Mike Kirn, City of Healdsburg, Chair Pro Tempore.

Consent Calendar (w/attachments)

- 7.1 Minutes of November 16, 2011
- 7.2 Home Compost Education and Pesticide Use Reduction Program Report 2010-2011
- 7.3 Beverage Container Recycling Program Purchase

Jack Griffin, City of Sebastopol, moved to approve the consent calendar. Steve Barbose, City of Sonoma seconded. Consent calendar approved unanimously.

Regular Calendar

9. Clean Harbors Contract Amendment (continued)

Lisa Steinman reported that since June 2002 the SCWMA and Clean Harbors have had a contract to operate the Household Hazardous Waste Facility and Mobile Toxic Collection programs. The contract expires January 6, 2013, but has an option to extend. At the November 2011 Board meeting SCWMA staff recommended extending the current contract through January 6, 2014. The Board recommended staff bring back options including discussion of distributing a Request For Proposal (RFP) versus extending the agreement. Background information and option details were presented to the Board.

Boardmember Discussion

John Brown, City of Petaluma, inquired about the funding source for Clean Harbors. Charlotte Fisher answered the funding comes from the surcharge tipping fee.

Dell Tredinnick, City of Santa Rosa, requested the name and service area of the other service provider. Ms. Steinman replied the provider was Phillip's Services and they work all over the United States.

Matt Mullan, Town of Windsor, questioned if staff was aware of the company PG&E uses for their hazardous mitigation around their franchise areas. Lisa Steinman responded she was unaware of P.G. & E.'s provider. Henry Mikus, Executive Director, stated Mr. Mullan had given him the company's information.

Matt Mullan, Town of Windsor, inquired if the outreach to potential vendors would include the current landfill operator, Republic Services. Lisa Steinman replied the distribution of the RFP would include anyone expressing interest.

John Brown, City of Petaluma, commented that ten years is a long time to maintain a contract without looking at other alternatives. He also inquired if staff had considered keeping the existing contract without the CPI increase. Lisa Steinman advised that the contract is negotiable; the CPI doesn't have to be offered.

Public Comment

None.

Board Comment

Matt Mullan, Town of Windsor, remarked ten years has been invested in this contract and with ten annual amendments there are negotiations over the basis for an increase. Most long term contracts are written with terms clear to both the contractor and the contracting agency what the services being provided and how adjustments are made on an annualized basis. The contract and services being provided should be scrutinized. There is an obligation as a Board to be competitive.

Steve Barbose, City of Sonoma, said the contract provides for an increase based on the CPI. Point made by Petaluma and Windsor with respect to the economic reality leads to the suggestion staff approach the contractor to get a flat contract in exchange for extending the term.

Susan Klassen, County of Sonoma, is in support of staff contacting the provider to present that offer before going through the RFP process.

Marsha Sue Lustig, City of Cotati, wondered if a long term contract would be impacted by the unknown status of the Landfill.

Henry Mikus, Executive Director, explained the real limit refers to the SCWMA not the Landfill.

Susan Klassen, County of Sonoma, commented she did not see the status of the landfill as an impediment at this time

Steve Barbose, City of Sonoma, moved to direct staff to negotiate with existing provider for a flat contract and bring back findings to the next meeting in order to make a decision on the RFP at that time. John Brown, City of Petaluma, seconded. Town of Windsor opposes. Motion carried.

10. Oil Grant Planned Expenditures (continued)

Lisa Steinman reported the SCWMA currently has overlapping funds through CalRecycle's used Oil Block Grant and the new Oil Payment Program. Due to this overlap there is a one-time surplus that must be spent by the end of FY11-12. The total funds currently available for expenditures are \$221,612. Staff proposes a combination of a contract amendment with C² Alternative Services (C²) as well as other projects to utilize the money. C²'s proposed budget for additional services is \$74,730.00 and is included in the agenda item. Due to the additional oil funds available staff is requesting the Board delegate signing authority for oil program related expenses, outside of the C² contract, to the SCWMA Executive Director. This would allow staff to expand radio advertising, print additional car care brochures, purchase storm drain labels and take advantage of any additional advertising and outreach opportunities as they become available.

Board Discussion

Dell Tredinnick, City of Santa Rosa, is aware that Kragen Auto Parts was purchased by O'Reilly and wondered if outreach continued. Connie Cloak, C², reported O'Reilly is very cooperative and is negotiating to do filter exchange events as a way of promoting filter recycling.

Matt Mullan, Town of Windsor, wanted to confirm his understanding that the contract would expire on June 30, 2012. Ms. Steinman replied yes.

Matt Mullan, Town of Windsor, asked if the intent was to bid competitively. Ms. Steinman said this item will be back to the Board next month for direction.

Chair Regor, asked what would happen if the money is not spent by the end of the fiscal year. Ms. Steinman responded the SCWMA would be required to return the grant funds to CalRecycle.

Chair Regor, inquired if it was feasible to do these projects listed by the end of the fiscal year. Ms. Steinman replied it was possible.

Public Comment

None.

Matt Mullan, Town of Windsor, moved to adopt the resolution giving signing authority to Executive Director and adding direction to staff to prepare this contract for competitive bidding in FY 12-13. The motion was seconded by Mike Kirn, City of Healdsburg. Jack Griffin, City of Sebastopol, opposed. Due to lack of a unanimous vote, the motion fails.

Board Comments

Jack Griffin, City of Sebastopol, requested hearing staff's recommendation next month with respect to the future contract and not necessarily decide without hearing the recommendation first.

Steve Barbose, City of Sonoma, supported moving forward with the recommendation as presented and waiting for the recommendation for the bid process to be proposed by staff.

Jack Griffin, City of Sebastopol, moved to approve staff's recommendation as presented. The motion was seconded Steve Barbose, City of Sonoma.

John Brown, City of Petaluma, thinks it would be appropriate to resolve the question of future contract extensions including the use of the RFP process whenever feasible or possible.

Matt Mullan, Town of Windsor, added he was interested in giving staff time for a competitive process, particularly with respect to the consideration of the current contract being discussed.

Chair Regor, stated her understanding is staff will proceed forward with the recommendation outlined in this item and return at the next regularly scheduled Board meeting with a proposal for an RFP process.

Dell Tredinnick, City of Santa Rosa, requested clarification of his understanding that staff will be presenting an item generally about SCWMA bid process and won't be in reference to a specific contract.

Chair Regor replied that was her understanding.

Henry Mikus, Executive Director, reminded the Board that a comprehensive listing of all SCWMA contracts was presented specifically for this type of discussion and will be presented as a part of agenda item at next month's meeting.

Chair Regor called for a vote to the motion on the floor. There were no opposing votes. The motion carried unanimously.

12. Public Hearing for Receiving Comments on Draft EIR

Patrick Carter reported that in August 2007 the SCWMA Board entered into an agreement with Environmental Science Associates (ESA) to assist the SCWMA in the selection, conceptual design and preparation of California Environmental Quality Assessment (CEQA) documents for a new compost site in Sonoma County. Numerous staff reports have been provided since that time. In June 2008, SCWMA Board selected a preferred site (Site 5a) and two alternative sites (Sites 13 and 14) for further study. In May 2009, Site 40 was added to be studied at an equal level of detail as Site 5a. In February 2010, the Central Disposal Site was added to the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to be studied at an equal level as Sites 5a and 40. Site 40 was ranked as the preferred site. On December 21, 2011, the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR was mailed out to interested parties and relevant public agencies. The Notification of Completion was delivered to the California State Clearinghouse, which began the forty-five day comment period in accordance with CEQA guidelines. On December 23, 2011, a notice was published in the Press Democrat announcing the availability of the Draft EIR.

Paul Miller, Environmental Services Associates, furnished a presentation providing a broad overview of the information contained in the Draft EIR.

Public Comments

Marilyn Herzog, Sleepy Hollow Dairy, 7689 Lakeville Hwy., Petaluma, CA 94954

Good morning my name is Marilyn Herzog. My husband and I own Sleepy Hollow Dairy on Lakeville Highway. Our family has owned our land since 1923 and this land and neighboring lands are all devoted to productive green agriculture. Site 5a makes no sense. County residents have gone to the voting booths twice and voted overwhelmingly to preserve open space and maintain agriculture. This is the priority of our County residents. Originally, it was told that the Central Site could not support and meet the projected growth of the composting operation. That is simply no longer the case. Central can potentially take care of the projected 200,000 tons per year. Central is environmentally superior to the other sites. Drainage ponds are already in place there. Noise is handled at central without much opposition. The trucks that haul to Central are split and so after dumping the recycling at Central they would then have to drive another 10 to 15 miles to dump the green waste at Teixeira, Site 40 or 5a on Lakeville. That does not make economic or environmental sense and it creates excess traffic. Both Lakeville and Adobe Roads are main commuter arteries. They serve as gateways to Sonoma County. Lakeville is a designated scenic corridor in comparison there is not much commuter traffic on Meham Road. Lakeville Highway is a highly trafficked road and over 20,000 cars and trucks a day go through the middle of our ranch. In 2011 there were 30 traffic crashes on Lakeville alone. Adding more big trucks turning on to this road is the recipe for more traffic accidents. When 101 is closed for accidents all of the traffic diverts to Highway 37 and Lakeville and traffic can be backed up for miles. You have an existing site that works and will continue to work and there is absolutely no need to move from where you are. Thank you.

Jim and Luci Mendoza, Ranchers, 601 Stage Gulch Road, Petaluma, CA

Luci Mendoza – Hi, we have the ranch immediately adjacent to the Site 40 and while they're counting on wastewater from Petaluma that water is delivered between May and October from the plants on Lakeville. It is intermittent at best. There is no water on weekends most of the summer and there's no water during the winter months. So will they be paying for, will the waste agency be paying for additional pumping costs to maintain the system and get water the rest of the year? The well on the property is not the best and there is, would definitely need to be ground water testing and it could impact our surrounding wells and the dam is only permitted for stock water use and landscape water not an irrigation, not for compost or commercial use. Traffic is going to be a major issue. You're going to need signals probably at both Lakeville and Adobe. Left hand turns out of there are impossible during commute time and when there are accidents, like Marilyn said on other sections of the road traffic is routed on Stage Gulch.

Jim Mendoza – Furthermore, over the last 30 years we've trafficked cows across that road

during those months. During irrigation season four times a day. This increased amount of traffic is going to endanger us, it's going to endanger our animals and we've tried to get an underpass put in there for years. It's going to take another environmental impact report and it's going to be very costly to us and very costly to somebody. But it is going to affect our business and essentially it's going to negate us from using half of our ranch and we are a ranch. We are considerate about air pollution and things like that but, we can discuss that later. That's our main concern and the water situation can be very volatile. The City of Petaluma's pumps are old and decrepit and they're going to have to rebuild them to supply you with water. But we deal with them every year. They shut us off for weeks sometimes they tried to shut us off for a month a few years ago. So the water delivery is inconsistent and I'm sure they're going to rely on your agency to help them pay for their problems because they don't have the money to pay for it. So you're the one. So that's something to think about. Thank you.

Dr. Frank Mitloehner, UC Davis

Good morning ladies and gentlemen my name is Frank Mitloehner. I'm an Associate Professor and Air Quality Specialist at UC Davis and I'm the Director of the Air Quality Center there. I'm challenged bringing my comments down to three minutes. So part of what I do is dealing with composting facilities and what I can tell you is that throughout my world I'm often asked to be an expert in lawsuits dealing with similar situations as the one that you are about to face. I'm also often confronted with regulatory agencies that try to find out whether or not composting facilities should go into their county or jurisdiction. The reason why compost facilities have the potential to cause friction amongst stakeholders is that indeed there are emissions coming off those facilities and these facilities or these facility emissions can be mitigated. The worst of all facility types with respect to compost are open windrows. And if you look at the EIR the draft EIR you will see that the current facility emits large amounts of what's called ROG's Reactive Organic Gases also volatile organic compounds. This can form smog but most importantly to the immediate neighbors there are also in many cases odors and that is what gets people into court. People complain about the odors which can be very pungent. So open windrow facilities are in any case are as the name indicates are open as they are mechanically turned and because of that compost material can leave the facility and get into the neighborhood. Aerated static piles are often times also open and not encapsulated so open but in contrast to the windrow they have air pipes inside which pump air into the compost. The compost is always in the aerated process it needs oxygen to allow the microbes to do their work. What I've seen in this EIR is that an in vessel ASP is proposed. In vessel means that the aerated static pile will be capped and that's a better version. That's a much better version compared to the windrow alternative. The windrow is basically a situation where you have material that can blow off and will volatilize off the gases and also part of the compounds, in my opinion the worst of all possible solutions. The aerated static pile is improved because now you have more control of the microbes in processes. Decomposition will occur at a better rate. In vessel aerated static pile is a further improvement because now you have it capped. But in my opinion the best solution would be a total in vessel solution where the entire material goes into something that looks like a silo turned on its side. You put the material in on one side it makes its way through the in vessel facility within a week period and it comes out fully composted on the other end. Under those conditions you have basically no nuisances and that's really the reason why I am here. The reason why I am here is because neighbors of Site 40 asked me to ascertain whether or not there could be potential effects to neighboring organic dairies and/or wineries and my assessment is that yes indeed there could be those effects. If windrow were the only option offered I'm fairly certain there would be impacts both on particulate matter, on reactive organic gases, on odors, potentially on other criteria pollutants as well and also on pests. So I think it's much more important that the question of windrow versus aerated static pile is the question, in vessel or not in vessel? Will the compost be covered or not? That will be absolutely critical for the air quality of the specter. In my opinion there are avoidable consequences and avoidable consequences could be that the in vessel practice would be mandated. I think that would be a feasible way to process and otherwise there might be

consequences then that might not be advantageous. Of course, I'm happy to help you in any way. In three minutes I can't do much but we have dozens of faculty members within the University of California that would be happy to assist you in any anyway, shape or form. So thank you very much.

Robert Weaver, 1388 Sutter St., #800, San Francisco, CA 94109

I'm with Stage Gulch Vineyards. My name is Robert Weaver and Stage Gulch Vineyards is the property that is directly downwind from Project 40. I say directly downwind because if you take a look at the roads that are on the vineyards those go with the prevailing wind. The prevailing wind in this area is around 10 miles per hour day in and day out. In the summer time the winds are between 15 and 20 miles. In the time that I'm going to get to speak, three minutes, it takes less time than that at 20 miles per hour for the wind to go from the project Site to the vineyard. Now what in fact does that have on us? The impact that it has is the same impact that when this was a dairy and manure was spread on the front area it would come over to the vineyard. It would impact the grapes. Impact the grapes so much so that we had sometimes trouble selling grapes. So that we coordinated with the old operator of the dairy, Frank, to when he could actually spread manure on his area. Now what's going to happen here is whatever volatiles, ROG's, dust, everything that is going to be generated here is going to come onto our vineyard. That's a given. One problem we have with the draft EIR is it looks inward. It doesn't look outward and it needs to look outward because we are not the only farming operation in this vicinity and were not the only farm operations down wind. In this chart this is Site 40, this is our vineyard here, there's a vineyard here, there's a vineyard here, there's a vineyard here, this is the organic dairy you just heard about immediately adjacent to that property and there's actually row crops out there. This is farmland. The comment made by the fellow that made the presentation concerning the draft EIR was that it was potentially in conflict with the general plan of the County and with the zoning. There's no potential about it. It's directly in conflict. This entire area, if you take a look at the map to the left, all of that area, all of that property is farmland of statewide importance of local importance. The County has made the determination that this is land that needs to be protected. The LESA analysis that was performed that's supposed to take into consideration areas around the property not just the project itself, I don't know how far it went out because it's really unclear. It's supposed to go out a quarter mile plus from an area bounded by a rectangle from the entire project area. I don't know if it took into consideration the road or not, it certainly should have. Which means it takes into consideration this vineyard and other properties also. But even if it didn't it came out with a determination that it was significantly going to impact the environment. And what that means is that the significant effect that they determined means that there's substantial adverse change in the environment that needs to be addressed. It was not addressed anywhere. The only mitigation that was mentioned at all in the report was we're going to change the designation from farmland into something else.

Bob Bogel, 1190 Stage Gulch Road, Petaluma, CA

I'm Bob Bogel a resident on Stage Gulch Road. I think the key element that we're looking at here is that this project proposes conversion of prime farmland of statewide importance for use as a processing plant to convert green waste and food scraps to compost. We can always choose various locations for composting plants we can't choose the location of prime farmland of statewide importance. The EIR addresses concerns respecting the plant itself and what is occurring at the plant however, as was stated earlier it really ignores the impact on grape quality production, organic dairy farmers and olive growers, all of which are in the immediate area and would be effected long term by this operation. We also talked a bit about water, the report states that the water consumption will run from 52 to 104 thousand gallons a day depending on which system is going to be implemented and again they're going to, the plan is to use the City of Petaluma's recycled water and as was stated earlier the likelihood is that will be available in the future. Well it's the same water that we know is used by local farmers for their irrigation purposes and they can't always get what they need as it is now. My concern in

with regard to that is what if water availability becomes a problem for whatever reason? What if it simply falls to the point where there's just not enough for everybody that needs it? Is the County going to allow 560 tons of waste per day to accumulate and perhaps rot on the Site or are they going to cutoff the farmer's supply of water to keep the composting facility going? Neither of those options are really attractive or acceptable. And it could happen. It's a reality. Among health risks that are quoted in report is that it's stated that the Site will lead to toxic air contaminants exposure exceeding air quality threshold and constitute a significant impact to the close neighbors. I read the mitigation part of it. I'm not sure whether that was thoroughly mitigated to acceptable levels or not. It just wasn't that understandable however, there's no question during the one year construction period that they will exceed irrespective of any mitigation efforts that may be made. Also, there's a cancer risk. Five carcinogens will be produced by the Site and cancer risks to closets neighbors will remain significant even after mitigation measures. With regard to traffic the report says that the impact is going to be less than significant and at the same time states that the traffic in the near term will jump from 20 vehicles, less than 20 vehicles a day entering the Site to about 500. And that 150 of those will be the heavy haul trucks.

Jim Haire, Grape Grower, 5933 Haire Lane,

My name is Jim Haire. I'm a grape grower in Carneros which is the southern ends of the Napa and Sonoma Valleys. I've been using compost from Jepson Prairie over by Fairfield for about eight years and its makeup is food waste and green waste. Three things quickly I just want to say and you've heard some of them. If you have vineyards in the area of your proposed project dust is a problem and that problem would more than likely be one of the ones important is that dust will have a taste in the juice that's going to be tried to make into wine and into stock fermentation and other things. Number two is I haul all my own compost. I've been at the Site of Jepson Prairie and at times the smell will knock your socks off. Three, if you have grapes that are in the process of ripening and are ready to be picked the birds are unbelievable. We fight birds every year. So when you have a facility like this I'm sure like Jepson Prairie is going to draw in thousands and thousands of birds especially the starlings. You have got a problem. Thank you for your time.

Tito Sasaki, North Bay Agricultural Alliance

Good morning my name is Tito Sasaki of North Bay Agricultural Alliance. Our members own farm and manage over 50,000 acres of land in the southern Sonoma County and adjoining Marin and Napa Counties. All our members are very much concerned about your project, about the selection process. Because we all appreciate your efforts to improve the composting operations at the county landfill. The selection apparently pending for Site 40 worries us. As far as the completeness and accuracy of the draft EIR we like to have some more time to study carefully your documents and make appropriate reason comments on those aspects. Just one minor question that I have is that the main conclusion was that Site 40 as well as Site 5a is better than Central Site in terms of meeting the 3 objectives. But the 3 objectives is number 1 is relocate the facility from the central facility so naturally the central facility doesn't meet that objective and I'm just wondering if that's the point of this arrangement by the consultant and if so why is this location from the central facility still one of those objectives one you voted to include the central facility as a viable alternative? There's some contradiction there. I don't understand. Is this a mistake there? Any explanation for that? **Chair Regor responded:** It needs to move from its current Site. **Sasaki:** Pardon. **Chair Regor:** It needs to move from its current Site. It can't stay there permanently. **Sasaki:** You say it cannot stay there. **Chair Regor:** Right because of the landfill operations and where it is right now. **Sasaki:** But still you are examining the Central Site as a viable location. **Chair Regor:** Right, at a different location on the Central Landfill. **Sasaki:** Okay so the objective means that that's small Site. **Chair Regor:** Exactly. **Sasaki:** So it's kind of, so that even the **Chair Regor:** But our purpose is to hear your comments I don't want to take up your time. **Sasaki:** Okay, then in that case then all 3 should have equal superiority in a sense. As far as the objection or concern at

Site 40 is primarily that it is a very important piece of agricultural land and many people have already addressed that one that's why we prefer you concentrate your effort on examining the Central Site more in depth. Thank you.

Craig Jacobsen, 5070 Lakeville Hwy., Petaluma, CA

Good morning my name is Craig Jacobsen. I live on Lakeville Highway. Every morning I leave my driveway at 6:30a.m., 6:45a.m., and I'm there for 2, 3 minutes sometimes trying to make a right turn and you add as many trucks as you're talking about in and out it's going to affect all of the, everyone on either Lakeville or Adobe. I have an organic field just downwind of Site 5a that ends up going to the Mendoza Dairy. You know I haven't studied this but if the grape people are worried about dust and those kinds of things on their crops I'm sure that would be a factor on the organic side also. Stage Gulch Road if you add that many vehicles in order for the Mendoza's to stay in business they're going to need an undercrossing for their livestock to get to the other half of their ranch. I just don't understand sending trucks an extra 13 miles; 10 to 15 miles whatever it is to these other Sites. The diesel, the wear and the tear of the tires all that stuff that's going to add to more recycle. Thank you.

Gigi Hendricks, Ranch, 6614 Lakeville Road, Petaluma, CA

Hi my name is Gigi Hendricks. We live at Rockin H Ranch right on Lakeville Highway or Lakeville Road which is turned into a highway. Again I don't want to be redundant our neighbors have very eloquently stated our case here. It is just, it's inconceivable to me it just seems like the most inappropriate place to put a, basically a dump on this beautiful bucolic wetlands. I mean we are a wetlands on the Petaluma River. Everybody has worked so hard this past decade to make that a pristine recreational area for boaters for water skiers and to have the smells coming off of a plant like this would severely impact I think all that recreational river traffic as well as just keeping the river clean and pristine from any leeching into the ground of wastes again it's just, it seems insane to put something on the Petaluma River, just adjacent to the Petaluma River like this. Secondly, we can't say enough about the horrendous traffic problem. This is a two lane road. It's turned into a highway. We all live there. We have properties, homes, vineyards, farms. We've worked so hard to make that a no passing zone and to keep it a 55 miles per hour area and to have all this truck traffic as we have all already mentioned and trucks backing up with the beeping, beeping all night all day in this facility in this plant would just be horrendous. It will turn it into a nightmare because it's already well documented as one of the most dangerous corridors in California. So we certainly don't need more truck traffic. There using as it is as basically a shortcut so that they can divert and not go all the way to 101. They use Lakeville from 37 to 101 and it's horrendous. It's a horrendous problem for all of us. So we ate to see any more traffic there. And they had mentioned we are in a flood zone. So this project would be located within the 100 year flood plain. I see that as a problem. Levees break. It's going to displace the flood waters. God knows what will leech into the river as a result of problems like that. So I don't understand putting a facility like this in a flood plain. It just makes no sense. And the property certainly hasn't been zoned as we've mentioned for any kind of a dump facility. These are farmlands, these are residential areas, we've all put considerable money, time, oop. In any event think, think, please think.

Pam Davis, Sonoma Compost

Good morning Chairman of the Board and Members of the Board. I'm Pam Davis with Sonoma Compost. First, I just want to acknowledge this process has been going on for a long time and congratulations on finally getting to this point. Sonoma Compost is going to be submitting some written comments along with some engineered our engineer proposal prior to the close of the comment period. We think that our proposal is going to offer an economic solution that meets the goals of the Agency including relocation of the permanent Site with adequate capacity and supporting the jurisdictions and meeting the AB 939 goals as provided on the EIR. This proposal we believe is going to meet all the regulatory requirements and also address all of the neighborhood concerns that we've heard here today as well as meeting

environmental concerns. So we'll be submitting that to you prior to February 3rd and I appreciate your time on this long ongoing process. Thank you

Debbie Murnig, 1200 Stage Gulch, Petaluma

I'll pass. I'll submit written comments.

Tom Altenreuther, 520 Stage Gulch Road, Petaluma, CA 94954

Our family has two driveways we live right on Stage Gulch which is about less than a mile from Site 40. We have two driveways and a business parking lot that enter Highway 116. We feel that the traffic analysis done for Site 40 alternative is inadequate considering the extreme pressure the composting Site will place on this narrow windy stretch of 116. With existing 55 mile per hour speed limit entering and exiting this highway is already life threatening and the addition of a large commercial facility like your proposed Site 40 in our exclusively agricultural community would require many improvements to ensure safe movement on the road. Your traffic studies are spotty and inconclusive at best and do not address the huge influx of summer traffic and event traffic from Infineon Racetrack and increase Sonoma County contractor's hauling compost and compostable products from Marin County using Lakeville Highway. Site 40 is located on the hill above the north end of Tolay Valley. The proposed Site 40 will loom over the north end of the basin and because of the topographic structure of the basin any noises become amplified so we can hear conversations heard a quarter of a mile away. Assessment of noise and any mitigation has not addressed the unique structure of this valley and equipment with backup alarms and all night aeration fans would cause extreme disruption of the basins tranquil environment and we feel that further testing and monitoring is needed to ensure that mitigation measures are adequate. We also feel that the odor will be a huge problem not only because of prevailing winds of west to southwest but because of the unique structure of the north Tolay basin and the location of the proposed Site 40 upwind and above it. In addition to the wind late night and early morning cold air inversion will bring undesirable and unavoidable composting odors of the proposed Site 40 to our doorstep. Your proposed mitigations are again inadequate and your yet to be revealed protocols for the mitigation of the odor sound more like voodoo than science. Finally I come to the most dangerous impact of all and that is the listing of five cancer causing agents on the Site 40. You refer to these people as residential receptors and I refer to them as my children and grandchildren, Thank you.

Ernest Altenreuther, Lakeville Service Station, 5100 Lakeville Hwy., Petaluma, CA, 94954

I have Lakeville Service Station which is on the corner of 116 and Stage Gulch or Lakeville Highway and Tolay Valley Farms and to avoid being redundant I'll stick to just a couple of things. One is the environmental impact report doesn't seem to go into enough detail about nitrates entering the water from the facility. You already have partially contaminated wells in the area and this Site is going to continue to leech more nitrates into the groundwater that might bring the wells to an unusable state. The other thing is this Site being a vector for pests, insects, rodents, birds and diseases that could affect crops and animals in the area. And the other main thing that everyone has said is the traffic which is very bad at both intersections onto this section of Stage Gulch Road and I don't think that road can handle much more big trucks without being even more dangerous than it already is. Thank you.

Jens Kullberg, Stage Gulch Vineyards, Petaluma Crop Winegrowers

Hello my name is Jens Kullberg my family own and operates Stage Gulch Vineyard a 90 acre vineyard across the street from Site 40 which is also known as the Teixeira Ranch. I have some concerns about the compatibility of the compost operations since they're industrial in nature with Site 40 which is agricultural in nature. There are some deficiencies of the EIR. I have to skip some things because I'm limited here but. Chapter 5 there's no mention of fungus, insects, pathogens or bacterial disease being introduced into the air and becoming airborne. These vectors, fungus and bacteria will adversely affects around grapes. I

understand that the compost itself will be free of these problems but 200,000 tons of green waste, viticulture waste, pruning's, manure and food scraps dumped in mass are bound to contain, generate and release harmful compounds into the air. There are some terms they use in the EIR. There's 3 terms; significant which means there has to be some mitigation, less than significant means that there's some mitigation that's taken care of the problem; and significant and unavoidable which is the problem has not/cannot be solved or remedied. This is a big strike against any project Site. Page 19-6 and figure 19-1 according to the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Site 40 is classified as prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, farmland of local importance and grazing land. Under these categories of project agriculture impact is considered significant under the California LESA Model. The mitigation measure suggested is number 9.4 which is described on page 19-14 which is to cancel the Williamson Act by purchasing the property. Now how this mitigation measure will address the problem of converting prime farmland to an industrial use needs further explanation. But even with mitigation the project's impact is considered significant and unavoidable. In other words the problem of converting prime farmland cannot be solved. Under the agricultural section of all the chapters only the Williamson Act is discussed and no discussions about economical impacts to surrounding agricultural operations. On page 2-2 and 2-3, Site 5a has significant and unavoidable adverse impacts, Site 40 has 6 significant and unavoidable impacts and the Central Site has only 1, which is involved increase in ours. The vineyard prunings, pumice, viticulture products, food scraps and manure will be trucked to the compost facility. This will introduce pathogens that surrounding vineyards are not currently exposed to. My vineyard is upwind from other vineyards and is not exposed to many of the grapevine diseases plaguing other vineyards. Our isolation is an asset and would be jeopardized if the compost facility was located across the street. Also, the most, biggest concern is the value of my grapes will be adversely affected.

Margaret Kullberg, Kullberg Farms, Stage Gulch Vineyards, 1036 Stage Gulch Road, Petaluma, My name is Margaret Kullberg. I live across the street from Site 40 on Stage Gulch Road for 63 years. Yes, I'm 85 years old. Our ranch consists of over 200 acres which has been in my husband's family for over 100 years. My husband passed away so my son and daughter manage the 90 acres of grapes. There are some 500 acres of vineyards in the surrounding area, as well as an organic dairy and a row crop farm. Tour buses go along this Highway 116 as it's the beginning of the grape acreage in this area. Site 40 is not the place for a compost Site for many reasons. The compost consists of not only greenery, steak and vegetable scrap and meat scrap which will certainly attract rats, all kinds of viruses and strong odors when the compost is turned over. The wind will blow directly from it affecting the grape taste and we will be unable to sell them. Traffic from trucks hauling 100 to 200 tons of material is not well addressed. They say they will put a sign on Lakeville and Adobe Road saying trucks crossing. I don't think that would help the congestion. The addition of 350 vehicle trips and 500 on the weekend is anticipated with 30% being heavy hauling trucks on a small two lane highway which would be inadequate even if the road were widened. Bicyclists would not be able to travel our street easily. There was a study in the summer of 2009 where Stage Gulch was used by 30 to 80 bicyclists per day. The noise of construction would be huge 35 trucks per day and it would take a year to construct and the noise of the aerated static piles processing the compost would be ongoing 24 hours per day and sound carries very far in the country. The cost of Site 40 has not been addressed. I believe it is 6.9 million. No cost is mentioned for the one in 5a. In fact there is no mention of land or construction cost. Isn't this important in this difficult time? Doesn't the Board of Supervisors also have to locate any land purchased? My conclusion is not only Site 40 but also Site 5a off of Lakeville Highway will have the same problems with odor, traffic and pathogens affecting the grapes in the area. 5a is also in the 100 year flood plain zone and it's also under the Williamson Act. Agriculture is under the Williamson Act. Agriculture is the most important thing in this county. Milk and grapes bring the biggest income in this county and you want to put a compost Site in the most beautiful agricultural land there is in the area. I would like to invite any and all of you to take a

trip in our car to see these different Sites so you understand what we have and what our problems are. Thank you. I leave my number if you wish to call me to take the trips.

Douglas McElroy, Rodney Strong Vineyards

Good Morning. Douglas McElroy, Rodney Strong Vineyard. I'm the Director of Wine Growing for Rodney Strong. We operate a lease on the Sleepy Hollow Dairy property, 140 acres of wine grapes. I'm here to basically give you my experience with purchasing grapes and farming around areas like this. The people that have spoken to the lesser value of grapes is accurate. Winemaker's do have difficulty with grapes being grown adjacent to operations like this and as a matter of fact I have cancelled several contracts over the years of my grape purchasing which have been adjacent to operations like this because of the affects on the wine quality the off flavors that you get and the difficulty by which it is to remove them from the wine once you've processed grapes from areas like this. So I'm very concerned for our own operations but I'm also very concerned obviously for all the other vineyards around any of the Sites your proposing. The Site that I mentioned was Site 5a that we have farm around. Thank you.

J.T. Wick, Scallywag Ranch, 7670 Lakeville Hwy., Petaluma, CA

Good Morning. I represent Scallywag Ranch which is at 7670 Lakeville Highway. We're at the end of Twin House Ranch Road. A one lane ag road that leads from Lakeville all the way to the Petaluma River. Where our business partner Craig Jacobsen grows conventional and organic hay. We object to Site 5a for two principle reasons and that's not complete reading of the full EIR. First, access when we look at the easement that we all share to get out to Lakeville it seems to us that the conversion of this portion of the 5a Site from agricultural to industrial will overburden the easement by the type of use and by the intensity of use. We are an old or Twin House Ranch Road is an old one lane road that's only been paved once. It has no road base, it has sharp turns, it's really meant for just an intermittent use of farm equipment as it's used today. To increase its use to an agricultural one is really going to impose safety conflicts before you even get out to Lakeville where the IR spends a good deal of its analysis with traffic concerns. The other concern we have our objections is groundwater contamination. They don't call us Lakeville for nothing. Groundwater where we are is about 18 inches below the service of the land. So if you have another facility that already has another way of catching that leeching making sure it doesn't get into groundwater that seems far more superior. Speaking now in a different capacity, as Board Chair of Friends of the Petaluma River, we normally don't get involved in evaluation of large scale projects like this but to take a regional environmental prospective, we already have the central Site that has mitigated all of the impacts that my neighbors and friends here have addressed this morning. At the Central Site we're actually talking about a different water shed. The Central Site drains to the coastal esteros. What we would be doing here is if we went into Site 40 or Site 5a would be transferring all those environmental burdens into the Petaluma River water shed and that just seems completely unacceptable to us. So we ask you to think about focusing on the Central Site and making a compost facility work successfully there. Thank you.

Rene Cardinaux, 4233 Browns Lane, Petaluma, CA

Good morning. My name is Rene Cardinaux. I'm the southwest neighbor of Site 40 in Petaluma. We're on the downhill downwind side. So a lot of the issues that my neighbors have we won't have. But I would like to clarify a few things. At the top corner of the back of our ranch if you were to put up a pile of compost there and just leave it there I would guarantee you within a month it would be disappeared because the wind up there is steady and continuous and it just moves everything. Noise is the same thing. The amount of traffic noise we get from Lakeville Highway is pretty substantial. We're more than a mile away. I can imagine a 1000 feet away of this composting work the sound would be much greater. People that don't live on large parcels of land think 1000 feet is a long ways but not when there's sound or wind involved. It's right next door. The other thing I want to point out is the water that we get from Petaluma the reclaimed water that feeds this ranch goes right through our ranch.

We've been using this water for 25 years. The city runs a great project. But they've been doing such a great job of cleaning the water and using it that there's less and less available for agriculture. I promise you that we have serious concerns that the water will be there in 2030. We keep hoping it will because of its benefit. But we've always worried that it wouldn't be there when we need it. I don't know how the assurances can be made but the compost facility even if I supported the concept I don't want to give up water to make it work. We need that water. The other thing that I wanted to point out is that we are very worried about the operation of this plant. During the construction and during all the first mitigations of this instead of using a windrow you can put it inside this plastic. It's a great idea but it's like any other operation. If we have to be neighbors to this equipment and all that's going on is that the quality of your new operator the person you contract with to do this work we are very, very concerned about how that will continue. You may have great intent, you may write a great contract. But things deteriorate, budgets get cut and then later on we may wind up with an operation that just isn't what we thought we were going to get. So I really worry about the long term operation of this. It's typical of government agencies that things get cut in cost. That they don't want to pay this much money and all the nice things that we agreed to, they just gradually disappear. And that really concerns us as the neighbors to that potential facility. I've already written six pages of comments so I'm not going to reissue all those. I won't bore you with that. Thank you.

Ken Wells, AB 939 LTF, Guidance Sustainability

Good morning Chair Regor and Boardmembers, Ken Wells, Guiding Sustainability. I'm here to speak to you as the Sierra Club's representative to the AB 939 Local Task Force. As you all know the AB 939 Local Task Force is your advisory body for anything to deal with this programs we have and I would have a brief comment today that I would like to see the comment period extended. So essentially the Local Task Force could have the opportunity to discuss this and come up with some comments and responses to the draft EIR and I think I'd like to wrap up just by saying the composting program in Sonoma County is the single most important diversion program you all are responsible for in terms of tons, in terms of greenhouse gases, in terms of satisfying the draft EIR so I look forward to a successful outcome of this EIR and I would just ask for a little bit more time perhaps a month to provide an opportunity for the LTF to consider this and to prepare comments. Thank you.

Ashley Herman, Riverside Equestrian Center, 7600 Lakeville Hwy., Petaluma, CA 94954

Hi, this is in reference to Site 5a. My name is Ashley Herman and I own Riverside Equestrian Center and Sonoma Horse Park which are located at 7600 Lakeville. Twin House Ranch Road is the access to our facility. I just want to reiterate and stress that if this Site is selected for this project it will create an incredibly dangerous traffic situation. As everyone has mentioned and commented on Site 5a. Already Lakeville Highway is one of the most dangerous roads in Sonoma County. Every year there are fatalities. In particular the concern is the left hand turn lane coming off of Lakeville as well as large trucks turning left back onto Lakeville that follows directly after a blind turn and often times cars fly by there. And I am certain that if this project were to come to fruition that there would be increased fatalities. It's an incredibly dangerous prospect as far as traffic. Thank you.

Linda Yenni, Wine Realty International, 24875 Arnold Dr., Sonoma, CA 95476

Hi I'm Linda Yenni. So to avoid redundancy because I think the life style and the residence impacts to the neighboring properties have been well articulated so I'm only going to speak to the economics of this. The return on investment for a very expensive improvement on that roadway that was put in and the connectivity between the Sonoma Valley and the Petaluma Valley is paramount so I'm trusting that Sonoma and Petaluma will pay specific attention. I have a Victorian in Petaluma in the city district and a 100 acres of farmland in the Sonoma Valley. So I frequent that corridor often. I've also sold 3-5 million worth or brokered/negotiated contracts for wine grapes and so everything that was said about the impact on those grapes is very, very significant. Especially for the Petaluma gap area that has been kind of at a standstill

with the current economy. We finally see red grapes starting to rise again and they're going to be not looked at by potential buyers if there contiguous or adjacent to or within proximity of this facility, if people could go elsewhere. Most importantly I'm thinking of when we talk about visual appeal being far removed from the highway and up on the mountaintop are rolling hills and mountaintops are the highest and best used are winery terraces and facilities because they look back down on the property. So that argument I find from what I see with property values and wineries that's a highly desired and highly best used. Now a property like Green Acre the kind of property that's going to be near there what we want to see is them build a winery facility down there. So you put a green waste facility here why would anybody do that. You also have the watersheds, you have Tolay Creek. So the perfect use is for people to be able to use private funded money where they can actually afford to make these beautiful public use lands. They can look down on those restoration projects. So this project 40 I just can't even believe it's even being considered. As I drive in and I look at it every day since I heard of this which was from Margaret which at very short order if not insufficient time to look at a 1500 page EIR report. I think about not only the people you are impacting who own the properties today, that's a given, but all the people of those properties which will not develop, will not put value added to consumer cheese factories, organic cheese factories not build beautiful wineries because of this short term decision today. Thank you for your time.

Clark Thompson, 1013 Palmetto Way, Petaluma, CA

Good morning my name is Clark Thompson 1013 Palmetto Way, Petaluma and initially I'd like to address the water issue. I know that the Rooster Run Golf Course and the Adobe Creek in Petaluma are using the water presently. And as far as Rooster Run's concerned they don't always get a chance to us it because there isn't enough water and we have to go to ground water. In times of draught we know the less water used by the citizens so therefore there's going to be less water to be used by any of the users in the city. The rate payers in Petaluma have spent a fortune on the new processing plant or new whatever we are calling it. What are we calling it Joe? **Joe:** Water recycle. I'm sure the rate payers would not be happy to send the water up to Site 40 to use for composting when the need is in the city. And I know that every opportunity that the city has to use that water for irrigation of the parks, for all the other uses, they're going to use it and they have priority. So the use of this water is very questionable. Also, I know that the parcel that Dick Grey used to own next to the Central Site is now owned by the owner of North Bay Corporation, the garbage hauler and has anybody addressed that? To use that site. And another quick thing the composting, I think the gentleman from UC Davis there's probably some kind of facilities that we can incorporate into the study where it's more compact. He mentioned his last thing was some large container where the compost would come out at the end in 45 days or something. So maybe we don't need all this land that we're proposing. We're going to spend 6.9 million dollars on this property and all we're going to be using is 40 acres. I mean there's no economy of scale there. I do realize that it's in enterprise tax funds so we don't have to go to the tax payers but that's a big question in my mind. Why are we spending so much money when we already have an existing Site? Thank you and good afternoon to you.

Ernie Carpenter, 14113 Occidental Road, Sebastopol, CA 95472

Good morning Ernie Carpenter Sebastopol, CA. Welcome to the wide world of trying to redirect the waste stream. Just a couple of comments: I've long thought that continuing the use on Central Landfill was the best option and I've heard nothing that would change my mind on that. A compliment to the City of Santa Rosa they've done such a good job with the wastewater. I don't know if you oversubscribe but the pipelines, the leech runs two ways. And the most alarming thing I've heard today is the amount of water usage, if in fact Santa Rosa has water from central treatment that can be run back to Central Landfill that might take care of part of the problem. What I really want to speak to though is that and believe me I'm a late convert to this but many of those are talking about an anaerobic digester to generate power. I really don't know if that's going to work. They are several of those projects happening around

the state. But it comes to this point, the County owns Central Landfill. They're doing an analysis of reopening and presumably a merge sometime in the future it's also the current Site of the compost. Perhaps in combination with whatever the County chooses their project could continue to be the Site. The food waste could be perhaps if analysis bears it out turned into power that could be used as an anaerobic digester and cut down the amount of land that's needed at the Central Landfill. A no name garbage group has discussed this quite a bit recently with no conclusions except for waiting for the County's status. I know you've got HDR and you've got EIR and you've got potentially a new project Site. I guess what I'm saying is to avoid any segmentation our other kinds of issues I think we should look now at this entire question of whether or not it's going to be merged with an anaerobic digester to cut down on green waste and whether Central can be used by moving. Upgrade your process and we can all be happy. Thank you very much.

Mike Kirn, City of Healdsburg, moved to close the Public Hearing. Steve Barbose, City of Sonoma, seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Board Discussion

Chair Regor, asked staff for the next steps in the Draft EIR process. Mr. Carter responded that SCWMA will be receiving written comments until February 3, 2012 at 4:00p.m. After completion of the comment period, all communications will be forwarded to ESA, who will address each of them in the Final EIR, which is expected to be presented in late spring or early summer.

Chair Regor noted there were requests to extend the public comment period, which the Board needs to address since the next Board meeting would fall after the close of the public comment period. Janet Coleson, Agency Counsel, recommended extending the comment period no more than a total of 60 days. Everyone who was originally notified of the comment period would need to be re-notified of the extension.

Chair Regor asked if extending the comment period would have significant affects on the overall project. Mr. Carter stated the extension would push back the process longer.

John Brown, City of Petaluma, stated he would be in favor of extending the comment period and wanted to know where the 60 days would take the comment period. Janet Coleson, Agency Counsel, answered that extending for a total of 60 days would allow for an additional 15 days for comments.

Board Comments

Dell Tredinnick, City of Santa Rosa, questioned if the AB 939 Local Task Force (LTF) felt the fifteen day extension would be sufficient.

Marsha Sue Lustig, City of Cotati, asked how the LTF is involved in the process.

Mr. Carter replied the LTF was initially involved in developing the screening criteria for the site study.

Steve Barbose, City of Sonoma, suggested the LTF call a special meeting to discuss and comment on the draft EIR.

John Brown, City of Petaluma, moved to extend the comment period an additional fifteen days. Marsha Sue Lustig, City of Cotati, seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Janet Coleson, Agency Counsel, suggested setting a concrete date to end comment period due to the holidays in February. The date set by the Board is Tuesday, February 21, 2012 at 4:00p.m.

Chair Regor, called for a brief break and upon return wanted to discuss agenda management.

Chair Regor, called the meeting back to order at 11:33a.m. Due to Boardmember time constraints, it was decided to skip Item #8 and move on to Items #11 and #13.

8. Sonoma County/City Solid Waste Advisory (SWAG)

This item was skipped and Boardmembers were encouraged to read the email that was sent about the last SWAG meeting.

11. Compost Operations Request for Qualifications

Patrick Carter informed the Board that the SCWMA received eight responses to the Request For Qualifications. Staff suggests forming a subcommittee of two SCWMA staff and two Boardmembers to conduct interviews of the top four candidates over a two day period then an additional two days to debrief and make recommendations. Recommendations would be brought forth at the February 15, 2012 Board meeting.

Public Comments

None.

Board Comments

Susan Klassen had concerns about only two Boardmembers being on the subcommittee. She suggested allowing staff to have a vote.

Henry Mikus, Executive Director, acknowledged the time constraints, but felt that two people should be able to come to a consensus to be presented to the Board.

Matt Mullan, Town of Windsor, believes the Board has given clear direction. He suggested putting trust into SCWMA staff to handle this and come back to the Board with their findings.

Marsha Sue Lustig, City of Cotati, Boardmember assistance would be appreciated, but she realizes the time constraints of all.

Steve Barbose, City of Sonoma, endorses Mr. Mullin's suggestion because he wouldn't have time to serve on the subcommittee.

Chair Regor, confirmed that the direction of the Board is for SCWMA staff to conduct the interviews and bring the recommendations to the Board.

13. Carryout Bags Ordinance Direction

Patrick Carter recommended using the Veteran of Foreign Wars' (VFW) buildings to host the stakeholder meetings. An attachment to the agenda for single-use bag ban ordinance options has been provided. Funding impact for rental of seven VFW facilities would incur a maximum cost of \$2,100.00. Since there is no VFW building in Healdsburg another venue would be arranged.

Board Discussion

Matt Mullan, Town of Windsor, asked if SCWMA would be categorically exempt if a single use bag ban was enacted. Mr. Carter answered that determination has not been made.

Matt Mullan, Town of Windsor, inquired about the use of the ordinance recently adopted in San Jose for SCWMA's purposes. Mr. Carter said the ordinance could very easily be brought forward.

Linda Babonis, City of Rohnert Park, requested a stakeholder meeting be considered for Rohnert Park. Henry Mikus, Executive Director, noted the possibility of using the VFW Building in Cotati to hold a joint stakeholders meeting for Rohnert Park and Cotati.

Steve Barbose, City of Sonoma, agrees that the San Jose ordinance should be brought forward along with staff's suggested modifications.

Public Comment

None.

Board Comments

Chair Regor, stated the Board recommends use of the seven VFW building for stakeholder meetings as well as adding additional meetings for Healdsburg and Rohnert Park. Meetings will not to be held until after the February 15, 2012 Board meeting so framework for the bag ban ordinance can be brought to the Board for discussion. Funding for rental of venues should be worded as not to exceed a particular dollar amount.

14. Boardmember Comments

Chair Regor, asked if SCWMA staff would be providing the Statement of Economic Interest (Form 700), which are due April 1, 2012. Charlotte Fisher replied staff would be sending them to the Board.

15. Staff Comments

Henry Mikus, Executive Director, introduced Anne Sherman and Melissa Bushway, project contract assistants for the Mandatory Commercial Recycling project, and reported the progress made thus far.

Patrick Carter stated the use of Beverage Container Grant funds would continue as it has in the past with Mandatory Commercial outreach education and purchasing containers with the Boards approval.

Charlotte Fisher reminded the Board the Non-profit Grant Program application has been posted on the web with a deadline of February 29, 2012. If Boardmembers know of any non-profits who might be interested they should encourage them to apply.

16. Next SCWMA Meeting – February 15, 2012

17. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 11:53 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Debra Dowdell

Distributed at meeting:
Handout of ESA's PowerPoint presentation on the Sonoma County Waste Management Agency Compost Facility Environmental Impact Report.