



Minutes of April 16, 2014 Meeting

The Sonoma County Waste Management Agency met on April 16, 2014, at the City of Santa Rosa Council Chambers, 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Santa Rosa, California

Present:

City of Cloverdale	Bob Cox
City of Cotati	Susan Harvey
City of Healdsburg	Tom Chambers
City of Petaluma	Dan St. John
City of Rohnert Park	John McArthur
City of Santa Rosa	Jake Ours
City of Sebastopol	Larry McLaughlin
City of Sonoma	Steve Barbose
County of Sonoma	Susan Klassen
Town of Windsor	Debora Fudge

Staff Present:

Counsel	Janet Coleson
Staff	Henry Mikus
	Patrick Carter
	Lisa Steinmann
Clerk	Rebecca Lankford

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m.

2. Agenda Approval

There were no changes to the Agenda.

3. Public Comments (items not on the agenda)

Jens Kullberg, owner of a vineyard across the street from Site 40, stated that Stage Gulch Rd. is a two mile narrow, curvy, hilly strip of road which runs between Lakeville Highway and Adobe Rd. Mr. Kullberg noted that last winter there were three vehicle accidents, all of which resulted in power outages and four fires on Stage Gulch Rd. He also asserted that in the last five years there has been a 40% increase in traffic on Stage Gulch Rd. Mr. Kullberg stated that while Adobe Rd. is relatively straight, it is in poor condition and an additional 352 cars per day during the week and an additional 484 cars during weekends will significantly increase the damage to the roads. Mr. Kullberg also noted that the hauling of material to Site 40 from the Central Landfill will result in an increase of 605 metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions per year which will require mitigation.

4. Consent (w/attachments)

4.1 Minutes of February 19, 2014

4.2 Minutes of March 19, 2014

Jake Ours, City of Santa Rosa, Tom Chambers, City of Healdsburg, Larry McLaughlin, City of Sebastopol and Susan Klassen, County of Sonoma abstained from the vote of Item 4.1 the Minutes of February 19, 2014, due to their absences.

Ms. Klassen and Mr. Chambers abstained from the vote of Item 4.2, the Minutes of March 19, 2014 due to their absences.

Bob Cox, City of Cloverdale, moved to approve the Consent Calendar. Susan Harvey, City of Cotati, motion. The motion passed with the noted abstentions.

4.1 Vote Count:

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

AYES -6- NOES -0- ABSENT -0- ABSTAIN -4-

4.2 Vote Count:

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

AYES -8- NOES -0- ABSENT -0- ABSTAIN -2-

Regular Calendar

5. June and July Strategic Planning Meetings

Henry Mikus, Executive Director, explained that from the Agency’s Strategic Planning Session in December 2013 the focus was the Agency’s future. At that meeting the Board directed staff to conduct an RFP for a consultant to analyze the current tasks the Agency performs to determine whether they are legal or regulation requirements, what health and safety issues are at issue, and what risks or issues may occur if tasks were handled differently or not at all. The consultant was also tasked with analyzing alternate service delivery methods. Mr. Mikus noted that the Board had expressed the desire to not have another Strategic Planning Session until this analysis was completed; R3 Consulting has indicated that their report will be ready for presentation at the May 2014 Agency Meeting. This will allow for the Agency to hold the next Strategic Planning Session in June, and a possible subsequent meeting in July. Mr. Mikus stated that Sheri Lund, the facilitator, had indicated that three Strategic Planning Sessions would likely be needed for the Agency to develop a plan. Agency staff is asking for Board approval to schedule the Strategic Planning Meeting in the place of the regularly scheduled Agency Meetings, with the possibility of an all day session. Mr. Mikus noted that Agency Staff believe continuity with the facilitator will be vital, and are also asking the Board to approve funding for Ms. Lund’s services in the amount of not to exceed \$45,000

Board Questions

Deb Fudge, Town of Windsor, noted that both she and Shirlee Zane, County of Sonoma, have meetings at 1:30pm on the suggested dates which would prevent them from attending an all day session.

Susan Harvey, City of Cotati, reported that she would be available for the suggested June meeting date but not July.

Dan St. John, City of Petaluma, noted that during the first Strategic Planning Session there was a discussions about involving other agencies and businesses which are directly involved with the solid waste program, or Central Landfill; he inquired what is being done to bring this group together and engage them in the process.

Mr. Mikus responded that as he recalls the Board's direction, staff was to proceed with the Agency Service Analysis, not the advisory group.

Mr. St. John stated that he believes once the service report comes back the Agency will be able to set out a series of steps that need to occur in terms of further analysis.

Mr. Mikus stated that the report will be presented in May with the next steps being discussed at the Strategic Planning Session in June.

Mr. St. John asked for the Board to consider if the Strategic Planning Sessions require the services of a professional facilitator.

John McArthur, City of Rohnert Park, asked if Agency Staff could facilitate the Strategic Planning Sessions.

Mr. Mikus state that staff could facilitate the Strategic Planning Session, however, a professional facilitator provides an objective focus, allowing staff to actively participate in discussions.

Steve Barbose, City of Sonoma, stated that having started the Strategic Planning Sessions with a facilitator he believes the Agency should continue along that path, noting that it will likely work better if staff is not trying to facilitate dialogue and answers questions or concerns.

Susan Klassen, County of Sonoma, voiced her support for having a facilitator. She noted that the suggested June meeting date is during the first week of budget hearings for the County, which may hinder Ms. Zane's and her ability to attend.

Ms. Harvey asked for additional information regarding the advisory group, such as: who would be members of the group, how many people, how would they be selected, etc.

Mr. St. John noted those questions should be addressed at the next Strategic Planning Sessions. He believes that based on previous discussions the group would consist of land owners, operators of the facility, and others who have a direct business/ professional interest in the Agency's operations.

Ms. Harvey inquired about the role of the group, including their ability to make decisions and vote.

Mr. Mikus responded that he believed the group would be used solely as a resource, providing input and recommendations.

Public Comments

None.

Board Discussion

Mr. Barbose, motioned to proceed to schedule, at least the first Strategic Planning Session and leave the second for decision after the Agency has received additional information. Mr. McArthur seconded the motion.

Ms. Klassen asked if the motion included the authorization for funding.

Mr. Barbose responded affirmatively. Mr. McArthur seconded.

The motion passed unanimously.

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-
-----------	----------	------------	-------------

Mr. Mikus inquired if the motion was to host the Strategic Planning Session during the regularly scheduled Board Meeting, or, if an alternate date in June is desired.

Mr. Barbose indicated that his intent was to obtain an agreement that the next Strategic Planning Session will happen, the date should be left for determination as some Board Members have expressed scheduling conflicts with June 18th.

6. Reserve Policy

Patrick Carter, Agency Staff, provided an overview of the Agency's Reserve Fund Policy as discussed at the March 2014 Board Meeting. Mr. Carter noted that the Reserve Policy was revised and approved during the June 2011 Agency Board Meeting. Mr. Carter addressed which cost centers contribute to which reserve accounts, fund balances, and carry-over percentages, goals and the differences between the projections and the goals; Mr. Carter provided charts in the staff report to illustrate the money flow noting that they are for discussion purposes regarding whether the reserve policy is adequate, or whether items need to change. Mr. Carter noted that at this time staff is not asking the Board to take any action.

Board Questions

Mr. Barbose asked to confirm that the Wood Waste and Yard Debris cost centers roll over into one reserve account.

Mr. Carter responded affirmatively, noting that there are not separate Wood Waste or Yard Debris reserve accounts. Mr. Carter likened the accounts to a checking and saving account; when there are adequate funds in the checking account funds can be transferred to savings.

Mr. Barbose inquired why the totals for the projected year end balances for Wood Waste and Yard Debris do not equal the Organics Reserve total.

Mr. Carter explained the Organics Reserve has been accumulating for over ten years, noting the projected amount in the report is just for the current fiscal year.

Jake Ours, City of Santa Rosa, asked if the Organics Reserve has a monetary cap.

Mr. Carter responded that the Organic Reserve has not had a cap implemented due to the unknown cost of a new facility.

Mr. Ours asked if the Agency has an idea of the costs of the new facility and commented that he did not like the idea of an open ended reserve fund. He believes there should be goals.

Mr. Mikus noted that based on some preliminary work the cost for a new facility will likely range from \$10,000,000 - \$15,000,000; it has been understood that the Organics Reserve would help offset the cost as much as possible, which is why it is open ended, noting the more money the better.

Public Comments

None

Board Discussion

Mr. St. John asked what the term “permit by rule” means as it is used in the policy for the HHW Reserve Fund.

Lisa Steinmann, Agency Staff, replied that permit by rule is used for Community Toxics Collection, noting they are permitted through the local CUPA not the State.

Mr. St. John stated that there is too much held in the account, noting that the Agency has a policy for 10% or 15% and that is what the Agency should maintain allowing the additional monies to flow into their respected reserve account.

Mr. St. John inquired if funds can be transferred from other accounts into the Organic Reserve, or between reserve accounts in general.

Mr. Carter stated that Agency Counsel is advising him that funds cannot be transferred out of the Organic Reserve into other accounts; however, funds from other accounts may be transferred into the Organic Reserve.

Mr. Ours stated the he believes there should be goals set for all of the reserve accounts.

Ms. Harvey expressed her concern regarding setting a target for the Organic Reserve until there is a clearer understanding of the anticipated costs for the new facility; however, she stated she agrees a cap should eventually be established.

Mr. Barbose suggested discussing the Reserve Policy at one of the Strategic Planning Sessions.

Mr. St. John expressed his pleasure in being a part of an organization with healthy reserve funds.

7. FY 14-15 Final Budget

Mr. Carter presented the Fiscal Year 2014-2015 Budget. Mr. Carter noted that as reported in the Draft Budget there were concerns regarding the HHW Contact costs and increased operational costs of the compost facility. The Agency has received bids for the HHW contact and the highest is lower than what had been presented in the draft budget. Mr. Carter also noted that the HHW expenditures for disposal, particularly regarding paint, have decreased drastically. Mr. Carter reported that the deficit being presented for the HHW cost center is approximately \$40,000, down from approximately \$200,000; noting that \$40,000 is projected as a worst case scenario.

Mr. Carter reported that the Yard Debris cost center is not able to be balanced as easily as HHW was and will require additional Board input. Mr. Carter reported that the net cost for the Yard Debris cost center is projected to be more than \$450,000, due mostly in part to the assumption of the approval of Sonoma Compost Company's request 1st Amendment to their contract. Mr. Carter stated that Agency Staff are not proposing any tip fee increases for this fiscal year as they may not be needed if the Board does not approve SCC's 1st Amendment; Carter noted that Agency Staff do not want to raise tip fees to cover costs that do not exist. Mr. Carter reiterated that Agency Staff is fiscally conservative; noting that the worst case scenarios are being presented and that just because funds are allocated does not mean they will be spent. Mr. Carter addressed specific questions from the March 2014 Board Meeting including EFS costs which are expected to be recurring as well as reviewing and rebidding the Agency's Liability Insurance.

Board Questions

Mr. Barbose asked to clarify that the proposed 1st Amendment to Sonoma Compost Company's contract is factored into the presented budget.

Mr. Carter responded affirmatively.

Mr. Mikus noted that the 1st Amendment was included to provide Board members with an overall picture of the fiscal year.

Ms. Harvey inquired how the EFS contract costs are established, stating that she is concerned about the potential increase in the cost of services.

Mr. Carter replied that the basis of the cost is proportionate to the number of claims sent to the Auditor's Office for processing. He does not believe there will be a dramatic increase in fees.

Mr. St. John inquired what it would take to transfer funds from cost center which are in excess of their goals into their designated reserve accounts.

Mr. Carter responded that Agency Counsel is advising him that change could be made at this time if it is the will of the Board.

Mr. St. John inquired what Laguna refers to in the staff report; noting that 10,000 tons of yard waste is being sent there every year.

Mr. Carter responded that Laguna refers to the Laguna Waste Water Treatment Plant.

Mr. St. John asked if the yard waste is being delivered to LWWTP directly from the transfer stations.

Mr. Carter replied that the material is coming from the compost facility, where it is ground then sent to the LWWTP and added to their compost as a bulking agent.

Mr. St. John clarified that the Agency pays more for this processing because SCC incurs the cost to process the material without the means to sell the product to the public.

Mr. Carter responded affirmatively.

Mr. St. John noted that the revenue from HHW operations funds itself, and contributes funds to the education account.

Mr. Carter confirmed and clarified that the Agency tipping fee is \$5.95 per ton; approximately 80% is allocated for HHW operations, 18% for education and 2% for planning.

Mr. St. John inquired how the allocation percentages were determined.

Mr. Carter responded that Agency Staff determine the allocation percentages, which may vary annually depending on budgetary needs.

Mr. St. John inquired if the presented budget includes potential costs for obtaining zero discharge complians.

Mr. Carter replied there is funding for zero-discharge compliance in the Organics Reserve, which at this time addresses the costs for pumping and hauling but not construction.

Public Comments

None

Board Discussion

Ms. Klassen motioned to approve the Fiscal Year 14-15 budget, as recommended by staff, with the modification of transferring funds from cost centers in excess of their stated goals into their designated reserve account. Ms. Harvey seconded the motion.

Mr. Barbose asked if the motion as it stands is contingent upon the approval of the Amendment of SCC's contract.

Ms. Klassen stated that she did not make the motion contingent on the approval of the Amendment; she noted that she was presuming that the funding would be in the budget with the understanding that if the Amendment is not approved that the money will simply not be spent.

Mr. Carter confirmed Ms. Klassen's presumption.

The motion passed unanimously.

Cloverdale- Aye
Petaluma- Aye
Sonoma – Aye

Cotati- Aye
Rohnert Park- Aye
Windsor- Aye

County- Aye
Santa Rosa- Aye

Healdsburg- Aye
Sebastopol- Aye

8. **Compost Zero Discharge Report**

Mr. Mikus reminded the Board that the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board sent a letter dated March 18, 2014 setting October 1, 2014 as the date for compliance with the zero-discharge requirements; Mr. Mikus stated the letter notes fines up to \$10,000 per day and \$10.00 per gallon for amounts greater than 1,000 gallons. Mr. Mikus reported that there have been multiple meetings between the Agency, Sonoma Compost, Republic, and the County. Republic has located a site by the low end of the compost deck near the current ponds where a pond large enough to facilitate the needs of zero discharge compliance could be built. Due to the short timeframe Republic has taken the initiative of having design drawings completed along with having a consultant address the CEQA work. Mr. Mikus reported that the funding for this project is estimated to be about \$3,000,000, noting that costs will be more definitive by the May 2014 Board Meeting, which is when the Board will be asked to act on funding.

Rick Downey, Republic Service, noted that after the last Agency Board Meeting he gathered his team to scour the Central Landfill Site to find a location which could accommodate a solution to the zero discharge requirements, which is approximately 30,000,000 gallons of water. Mr. Downey noted that water retained in the pond will be used onsite which will ease the strain on the current well.

Board Questions

Ms. Fudge inquired what the future of the pond would be if the compost facility moved either off site or to a new location at the Central Landfill.

Mr. Downey responded that is something that would have to be analyzed in the EIR and CEQA noting that there are possible benefits but that he cannot guarantee what they would necessarily be.

Ms. Fudge asked how the loss of seven acres will effect landfill operations.

Mr. Downey replied that it will have some impact but he believe at this time the pond will best serve the citizens of the County.

Mr. St. John inquired if the pond will be useful for the proposed new compost site at the Central Landfill.

Ms. Downey replied that it does have potential to be useful.

Mr. St. John stated that he finds this development very encouraging, noting that it provide 100% containment of discharge with additional benefits such as irrigation. He inquired if the site is capable of utilizing 29,000,000 gallons of water annually.

Mr. Downey responded that it has been estimated that the site will be able to use about 20,000,000 gallons with other uses being considered.

Mr. St. John asked if cost-sharing has been discussed, as the pond will ultimately provide a benefit to the landfill operation.

Mr. Downey noted that it is something that could be discussed, but, ultimately the pond would not be built if the compost site did not have to meet the zero discharge requirements.

Mr. Chambers inquired if uses for the extra water not used on site had been identified.

Mr. Mikus stated that some landfill neighbors have expressed interest in using the water for agricultural irrigation. SCC will be hiring a consultant to obtain permits and address possibilities of using contained water off-site.

Mr. Chambers noted that Healdsburg has experienced difficulties in obtaining approval to use treated water for dust control.

Mr. Ours noted that Santa Rosa sells treated waste water and that the regulations surrounding discharge are very rigid.

Ms. Harvey expressed concern regarding spending \$3,000,000 for a pond that may not be useable at the proposed new compost facility at Central.

Mr. Downy stated the Agency will have to make a decision based on the information that is available, noting that until CEQA and other analysis are completed the usefulness of the pond at the new site will remain uncertain.

Ms. Harvey asked if the pond will allow for the compost facility to remain on the current site for longer than what was originally anticipated.

Mr. Downey stated that is an opportunity that could be discussed.

Ms. Klassen stated that while Republic maybe able to place trash on other parts of the landfill to allow for the compost site to remain in its current location for a longer period of time, she noted that the NCRWQCB wants the operation moved from the top of the landfill.

Mr. Mikus reported that hauling the discharge is estimated to cost about \$750,000 per year, noting that if the facility stays at the current location and hauls water offsite for the next three year it will cost the majority of what the construction of the pond would cost.

Mr. St. John noted that ground water is becoming an increasingly more valuable resource, any effort to eliminate the need for pumping will have residual benefits. He asked staff to look at the financial forecast for this project, how it will affect fund balances, reserves and other financial aspects.

Public Comments

Ken Wells stated that in 1993 the NCRWQCB insisted the compost facility be put at its current site due to the landfill water collection system in place.

Pam Davis, Sonoma Compost Company, reiterated that SCC is looking at options for using excess water, noting they will be working with EBA Consulting and David Smith who is a water reuse expert.

Ernie Carpenter stated that October is five months away, completing the environmental analysis will take longer than the Agency has to determine the usability of the pond at the new site. He believes the Board should direct Agency Staff to work swiftly.

Roger Larson, Happy Acres, stated that the proposed new site at the Central Landfill is at a lower elevation than the pond. He believes the Board is going down the wrong path. Mr. Larson noted that statements have been made that the land and construction at the Central Site are free, which is simply not true, the Agency is being asked to spend millions of dollars on the construction of the pond and environmental analysis; he believes the money should be spent building a new facility at a different site.

Stu Clark, environmental consultant, stated his support for the development of the pond, noting that it is expensive but that the alternatives are more expensive.

Board Discussion

Ms. Harvey inquired how long the construction of a new site will take.

Mr. Mikus replied that it is estimated, no matter which site is selected, construction will take three years.

Mr. St. John noted there seems to be a consensus amongst the Board about the construction of the pond. He inquired what environmental implications construction of the pond will have.

Mr. Mikus replied that Republic has approached PRMD for permitting and has engaged Stu Clark to complete the necessary CEQA work.

9. Compost Capacity Discussion

Mr. Carter provided a power point presentation addressing a general overview of the compost site. At the March 2014 meeting questions were raised regarding what SCC has done to ease site capacity issues; Mr. Carter reported that SCC has purchased a new grinder, loader and water trucks and well as having implemented additional storm water management practices including adding additional sediment traps. Mr. Carter explained that "overs" have become a liability to SCC, taking up room on the site. Mr. Carter reported that the site currently has 43 windrows consisting of about 18,000 linear feet of material with the density of 2.85 cubic yards per linear foot; this means windrows have a total capacity of 51,300 cubic yards. The proposed windrow turner would allow for a capacity of 51,300 cubic yards of material within 12,512 linear feet; according to SCC this will increase the active windrow capacity by 28%. Mr. Carter addressed the possibility including pros and cons of a seasonal reduction of the compost area, primarily noting the decrease in processing cycles. Reducing the compost area either permanently or seasonally would likely lead to outhaul of materials. Mr. Carter stated that the Central Site does not currently have the infrastructure to support the outhaul of Wood Waste or Yard Debris from transfer stations to other compost facilities. Mr. Carter reviewed outhaul data that was obtained during the 2012 RFQ process for the compost contract.

Board Questions

Mr. Barbose asked if the 28% increase in site capacity had been monetized.

Mr. Carter responded that it had and it would be discussed in the next agenda item, noting that SCC does predict an increase in revenue sharing.

Mr. St. John inquired what the incremental cost of diverting 10,000 tons per year directly from the closest transfer station to the closest alternative compost facility would be.

Mr. Carter responded that scenario had not been analyzed.

Mr. St. John asked what outhaul locations are considered in the provided analysis.

Mr. Carter replied that Recology in Vacaville and Republic's facility in Richmond were considered.

Mr. St. John stated he believes it would make sense to divert a transfer station haul to another location instead of diverting it after its arrival at Central.

Public Comments

Mr. Larson noted that he had sent the Board information earlier in the week regarding the increased fire hazard posed by higher windrow piles.

Martin Mileck, Cold Creek Compost, stated that the Healdsburg Transfer Station produces approximately 20% of the County's compostable material and it is located nearly half way between SCC's facility and CCC's facility. Mr. Mileck stated that CCC could take the material from the Healdsburg Transfer Station, citing a variety of potential advantages such as: CCC is permitted for food waste, they have been a zero discharge facility since 1995, and that they can take the material at a cost lower than what the Agency is currently paying.

Margret Kullberg, stated her belief that it is time for the Agency is modernize the compost facility and move into compliance with the NCRWQCB's zero discharge requirements. Ms. Kullberg stated that ASP systems are utilized at compost facilities in Oregon and Washington and are very successful. Ms. Kullberg stated that she does not understand why ASPs are not being discussed or considered for the new compost site.

Board Discussion

Mr. St. John clarified that ASPs are addressed in the EIR.

10. Sonoma Compost Agreement 1st Amendment

Mr. Carter presented the staff report for this agenda item. Mr. Carter noted that this item was initially addressed at the March 2014 Board Meeting, at which time it was requested that SCC and Agency Staff return with additional information, including a business plan and justification for the proposed equipment. Mr. Carter noted the conversation from the March meeting also focused on the Solid Waste Facility Permit compliance and zero discharge requirement compliance which are noted in the Staff Report. Mr. Carter stated that per Board direction Agency Staff has asked SCC to quantify the return on investment for the Agency.

Board Questions

Mr. Ours inquired if lower percentages of outhaul were analyzed.

Mr. Carter responded that analysis for this staff report was only conducted for 100% outhaul.

Public Comments

Ms. Davis emphasized that the increase in material processing does not mean SCC is going to increase the permitted capacity, as the site is currently limited by space. Ms. Davis stated that in terms of out haul the Agency will still have to deal with the total compost site for zero-discharge. In response to the question of changed conditions Ms. Davis stated that there has been an increase in regulations from fire officials for methane well protection and setbacks as well as storm water protection regulations which have resulted in about a 14% site capacity loss. Ms. Davis stated that SCC is estimating between a 5% and 10% increase in finished product which amount to about 8,500 cubic yards, noting that the Agency's share of that would be approximately \$63,000 per year. Ms. Davis stated that including revenues from the sale of the equipment at the end of the term and the increased revenue the Agency is anticipated to receive a return of about \$840,000. Ms. Davis noted that over the last five years SCC has averaged 25,000 tons of sold "overs", which dropped to 13,000 tons in 2013. The remaining "overs" had to be out hauled at a cost to the operation.

Mr. Barbose asked to confirm the current proposal includes 100% of the revenue from the sale of the equipment is to be allocated to the Agency.

Ms. Davis responded affirmatively.

Mr. Barbose asked if 100% of the income from the increased capacity at the site due to the purchase of the equipment is also to be allocated to the Agency.

Ms. Davis replied that the Agency would receive an amount as determined by the current profit sharing agreement in place, noting that this amount it anticipated to be approximately \$63,000.

Mr. Barbose inquired why the Agency's share is estimated to increase so drastically from the previous year.

Mr. Carter replied that the revenue sharing agreement the Agency has with SCC is that they need to reach \$367,000 in sales before they share any revenues with the Agency, after that the Agency will begin to see revenue. Mr. Carter noted he anticipated a larger share this year than from previous years.

Ms. Davis noted that historically revenue sharing had started immediately, however, that made it difficult for Agency Staff to budget for; now after SCC has reached its \$367,000 goal the Agency receives 50% of revenues.

Mr. Ours asked for clarification regarding Ms. Davis' use of the terms "value" and "cost".

Ms. Davis responded that "value" was used to identify equipment that was purchased at no cost to the Agency.

Ms. Harvey noted that with the \$1,200,000 expenditure, minus the potential financial benefit the Agency is looking at a \$400,000 investment.

Mr. Carter responded affirmatively, noting the cost would be over a 3 year period.

Mr. Mileck reiterated his offer of taking Wood Waste and Yard Debris from Healdsburg for processing at CCC at a cost lower than what the Agency is currently paying.

Board Discussion

Ms. Harvey inquired if the sort-line could be used at a new compost site.

Mr. Carter responded affirmatively noting that the Agency would retain the equipment at the end of the term and would be able to determine if the equipment is to be used at the new site or sold.

Mr. Barbose noted that he is still concerned with the uncertainty of the operation on the site and about the ability to meet the zero discharge requirements. Mr. Barbose stated that he would like information regarding the options for partial outhaul, including numbers for outhaul from Healdsburg to CCC and from Sonoma to Recology and/or Redwood Landfill.

Ms. Harvey stated that she is in agreement with Mr. Barbose and wants to continue looking at alternative for obtaining zero discharge compliance.

Mr. St. John noted that he is not ready to make a decision at this time, but, that he does see the value in what is being proposed. Mr. St. John stated that the future site issues need to be resolved; cost sharing revenues need to be reevaluated as well as ways to accelerate the pay back of equipment.

Ms. Fudge noted that she is frustrated with the process of approving requests and making decisions. Ms. Fudge asked for this item to be brought back as soon as the additionally requested information is available.

Mr. Ours stated that he also would like to see the numbers for the alternative out hauls options that have been discussed.

Mr. Barbose motioned to continue this item to the next agenda and schedule a following vote. Bob Cox, City of Cloverdale, seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

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-
-----------	----------	------------	-------------

11. Engineering Consultant Selection

Mr. St. John inquired based on everything discussed previously at the meeting if there would be any changes to the Engineering Consultant RFP in terms of the scope of work or focus.

Mr. Mikus stated that he would consider putting this item off noting that one of the items included in the scope of work is the analysis of roofing, which may be a moot point with the construction of a pond. Mr. Mikus noted at the board meeting the previous month there was a

push to move forward due to a grant opportunity, however, he thinks it may be advisable to put the decision off for a month.

Mr. St. John stated that he would like to get a professional team on board and up to speed on the technical issues, noting his belief that the Agency would want this kind of team to address issues regarding the pond and answering questions like “Will this pond work?” or “Can it be utilized at the proposed new site?” and to help clarify the NCRWQCB’s criteria for zero discharge.

Mr. Mikus stated if the process was started today he is unsure answers would be available by next month. He noted the current issues being addressed include: storm water issues, pond capacity required, viable sources of irrigation, water supply, roofing, and capacity analysis as well as a preliminary engineer site plan and construction cost estimate.

Ms. Klassen stated that she would like to see the entire scope of work.

Mr. Ours noted that it seems unclear as to what the Agency would be utilizing the consultant for and is hesitant to bring a team without any clear objectives.

Mr. Mikus understood Mr. Ours’ concern and stated that he would like the opportunity to refocus the work plan.

Mr. St. John stated that at the next board meeting Board Members are going to be asked to make a decision regarding a \$3,000,000 pond and that they will want to know if the pond can be utilized at the future site. He noted that it may be an awkward time to approve a contract, but it could be done and simply not provide the contractor with a notice to proceed.

Mr. Mikus stated a firm has conducted a water study on storm water within the previous few months. He noted the study determined that for a normal rainfall year the pond capacity would need to be 14,000,000 gallons; utilizing 1983 rainfall data for a heavy rainfall year 29,000,000 would be needed. Mr. Mikus stated he is confident the proposed pond size will work with the new site.

Mr. St. John inquired how the water would get from the new site to the pond and if pumping would be needed.

Mr. Ours stated that if Board Members are worried about the pond the scope of work should be limited to that.

Mr. Chambers stated he believes if the scope of work is to be refocused to just the pond a new scope of work would need to be developed.

Ms. Harvey inquired if there were items within the current scope of work that the Board could authorize the contractor to complete while postponing the remaining work.

Mr. St. John inquired if Agency Staff has another way of getting that type of engineering support for the “just in time” information that is being looked for.

Mr. Mikus stated that he would have to contact firms and expressed his doubt that the cost would be within his signing authority. Mr. Mikus noted the Board could approve a not-to-exceed budget.

Mr. St. John stated that he would like for the consultant to go to the NCRWQCB with Agency Staff and write down the requirements from an engineering standpoint. He would like for them to: look at the new site, get familiar with the geography and topography and integrate Republic's proposed plan to determine definitively whether the pond would work for the new site and then provide a 2nd opinion to Republic's and the County's proposal.

Mr. Mikus asked for clarification as to what was being asked of him.

Mr. St. John stated that he would be open for a motion to select a consultant and if there's a desire to hold them back from certain work to allow for the review of the scope of work and revise it as needed.

Mr. Mikus provided an overview of the firms that responded to the RFP. He noted there were three respondents: Always Engineering, Tetra Tech and Brelje & Race with prices ranging from \$95,000 to \$280,000. The Always Engineering proposal did not meet the scope of work requirements outlined in the RFP; the other two responses met the scope of work with cost, time line and assistance needed from the Agency being considered in the selection of TetraTech.

Ms. Klassen inquired if the Agency has any remaining money with SCS Engineers.

Mr. Mikus responded negatively.

Mr. St. John asked what Mr. Mikus' signing authority is for contracts.

Mr. Mikus responded \$5,000.

Mr. St. John asked if the Board desired to authorize staff to award a specific consulting assignment to TetraTech in order to assist the Agency in the evaluation of the pond option.

Mr. Downey advised the Board the TetraTech is also the engineering firm Republic is using for the pond project.

Larry McLaughlin, City of Sebastopol, expressed his concern regarding whether the item is properly agendaized for action.

Janet Coleson, Agency Counsel, reiterated Mr. McLaughlin's concern.

Mr. Mikus noted that all three firms which responded to the RFP are involved with aspects of the project; Always Engineering is providing storm water management consulting, Brelje and Race is working with the County regarding the leachate pipeline and TetraTech is working for Republic.

Mr. Mikus again noted he would like to reevaluate and revise the agreement for the Board's consideration at the May 2014 Board Meeting.

Mr. Chambers noted without a clear plan or objective he believes it would be a poor use of funds to hire a consultant.

Ms. Klassen suggested, that as TetraTech is being utilized by Republic to design the pond, perhaps they would address Agency Board Member's question.

Mr. Downey responded affirmatively.

Mr. St. John suggested that the Board make the selection for the consulting firm and then direct staff to go back and develop the scope of work to be brought back for review and approval at the May 2014 Board Meeting. He stated his belief that the item has been agendized properly and noted it is not uncommon to select a consultant then negotiate service.

Mr. Coleson asked if Mr. St. John was asking to simply select a consulting firm for a future contact that has not yet been vetted without a dollar amount determined.

Mr. St. John responded affirmatively stating that it is done all of the time; he believes formally selecting TetraTech will be a show of good will.

Ms. Coleson stated she understood Mr. St. John's position but does not believe that is how the item is presented on the agenda.

Mr. Chambers motioned to continue the item to the May 21, 2014 Board Meeting. Mr. Cox Seconded the motion.

Ms. Coleson asked to clarify if the motion is to continue this item or if staff is being asked to bring it back knowing it may change.

Mr. Chambers stated the he would like the item to be as straight forward as possible regarding what is being asked of from the consultants.

Mr. Coxed seconded the clarified motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Vote:

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

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

12. Attachments/Correspondence:

- 12.1 Reports by Staff and Others:
 - 12.1.a April 2014 and May 2014 Outreach Events
 - 12.1.b Letter of Support, AB 1893, Sharps (EPR program)
 - 12.1.c Letter of Support, SB 1014, Medicine Disposal (EPR program)
 - 12.1.d Carryout Bag Ordinance Outreach Information: Mailers and Fairs

Mr. Chambers left at 12:19pm.

13. Board member Comments

Mr. Barbose stated that he supports the idea of getting to a go/no go decision regarding the new compost site at the Central Site due to the political reality that Site 40 is a highly unlikely possibility.

14. Staff Comments

Mr. Mikus reported that the 2014 Recycle Guides have been printed and are being distributed; he noted a staff member would be available to distribute them to members after the meeting. He also noted that the letter to be distributed to retailers regarding the carryout bag ordinance is set to be mailed on April 22nd and that Bag Fair Events dates have been set as May 13, 14, and 15.

15. Next SCWMA meeting: May 21, 2014

16. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:21 P.M.

Submitted by
Rebecca Lankford