



MINUTES OF JUNE 17, 2009

The Sonoma County Waste Management Agency met on June 17, 2009, at the City of Santa Rosa Utilities Department's Subregional Water Reclamation System Laguna Plant, 4300 Llano Road, Santa Rosa, California.

**PRESENT:**

City of Petaluma	Vince Marengo, Chair
City of Healdsburg	Mike Kirn
City of Rohnert Park	Dan Schwarz
City of Santa Rosa	Elise Howard
City of Sebastopol	Jack Griffin
City of Sonoma	Steve Barbose
Town of Windsor	Robin Goble
County of Sonoma	Susan Klassen

**ABSENT:**

City of Cloverdale  
City of Cotati

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Executive Director	Mollie Mangerich
Counsel	Janet Coleson
Staff	Patrick Carter
	Karina Chilcott
	Charlotte Fisher
	Lisa Steinman
Recorder	Elizabeth Koetke

**1. CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS**

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

**2. ATTACHMENTS/CORRESPONDENCE**

Chair Marengo, called attention to the Director's Agenda Notes.

**3. ON FILE WITH CLERK**

Chair Marengo noted the resolutions from the May 20, 2009 meeting on file with the clerk.

**4. PUBLIC COMMENTS (items not on the agenda)**

There were no public comments.

CONSENT

- 5.1 Minutes of May 20, 2009
- 5.2 Carryout Bag Legislative Update
- 5.3. Compost Relocation Update
- 5.4 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment to ESA Contract

**Dan Schwarz, Rohnert Park, moved to approve the consent items. Susan Klassen, County of Sonoma, seconded. City of Cloverdale, City of Cotati, and City of Sebastopol, absent.**

*Jack Griffin, Sebastopol, arrived at the meeting at 9:04 a.m.*

## REGULAR CALENDAR

### PLANNING

#### **6.1 PUBLIC HEARING FOR RECEIVING COMMENTS ON THE 2009 COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

##### **Open Public Hearing 9:05 a.m.**

Patrick Carter explained the process for public comments being accepted on the draft Supplemental Program Environmental Impact Report (SPEIR) during the public hearing part of the meeting and written comments being accepted until July 24<sup>th</sup>. All comments received during the comment period will be considered and addressed in the Final Supplemental Program Environmental Impact Report.

Matthew Fagundes, ESA, was introduced and gave a PowerPoint presentation outlining the approval process as well as giving an overview of the Draft SPEIR. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation was distributed at the meeting and is filed in the Minutes binder at the SCWMA office.

Chairman Marengo asked when the document would be certified.

Mr. Carter said they are aiming for September, 2009.

##### **Public Comments Accepted:**

**Comment 1:** Brant Arthur, Climate Protection Campaign, working with the Community Climate Action Plan. *“Since 2001 this agency has partnered with the campaign to protect the climate. This includes reading the green house gas emissions targets from all nine cities and the county that was set in 2005. This is a challenge that we absolutely must meet. Sonoma’s Community Climate Action Plan developed with numerous partners outlined some of the important steps that we need to take with regards to solid waste. These include working towards the ideal of zero waste where nothing is landfilled and no fossil fuels are used to manage or transport waste. Supporting legislation; local, state and federal levels that extend producer responsibility for waste disposal. Banning plastic bags, which has been thoroughly discussed. Collecting and using landfill gas for energy production. In regards to the EIR, we intend to submit written detailed comments before the deadline next month. We already have a few questions about a few aspects of the draft report; could the draft EIR provide more detailed estimates of the green house gas emissions for the various project alternatives described in Section 10? They seem to be a little bit too general at this point. Shouldn’t one of the alternatives listed in the draft be based on the best practices for solid waste climate protection found in the Community Climate Action Plan? We look forward to submitting our comments in July and following this topic closely in the crucial years ahead. Thank you.”*

**Comment 2:** *“Ernie Carpenter, here today representing myself but I follow this issue on behalf of the owners of North Bay Corporation. I do not work for North Bay Corporation. I actually have a contract with the owners so I want to make sure we have the relationship established. My issue has to do with the current CoIWMP and this amendment in the existing CoIWMP it does*

*discuss having a multi-resource recovery facility at Central Landfill. I'm wondering what the relationship of this amendment is to that ability, and you will get written comments. Hopefully this does not eclipse the ability for the County, should it change directions to establish a MRF at the Central Landfill. If that would be the case, it's a serious omission. If you're still leaving that on the table, then I compliment you. Secondly to that issue, North Bay Corporation has proposed a MRF in the community. I'm sure you're all familiar with the term and I'm not sure how the relationship of that to the CoIWMP or what the relationship of that proposal which is at the County now is in the draft EIR, so I'm hoping to have the question answered of whether or not this allows the private MRF or whether in fact there is some language in the Supplemental EIR that would preclude that, and I apologize for not having really done my research but I couldn't find it online and now I understand right where it is and will read that and comment on it but those two things to me are critical, to make sure we have the option of a MRF, as you know the political climate of the county has just changed for obvious reasons, if you read the paper today so there may be different things happening and I would not want you to go into this EIR without being able to have every option available and it should have been proposed as an option in the beginning in my opinion but it wasn't for reasons that you can all fill in the blanks and it wasn't so here we are today and I'm hoping the idea of having a MRF is still preserved in this Supplemental EIR."*

Chairman Marengo asked Mr. Carpenter for an explanation of the acronym MRF for people that may not know what it means.

Mr. Carpenter said MRF stands for 'a multi-resource recovery facility'.

Ken Wells interjected MRF stands for 'material recovery facility'.

**Comment 3:** *"Ken Wells, Guiding Sustainability, the comments today are based on a very brief review of the document and I'll submit written comments later. I wanted to echo Brant's comments about the quantification of the green house gas emissions of the project itself and of the different baselines as well as the alternatives. I understand Program EIR does not necessarily get into project level but you can certainly quantify the differences in those. That's the first thing that I noticed, I also wanted to add to the presentation about CEQA because this has a dual role. The SPEIR is not only the document that will confirm the impacts of the changes to the solid waste plan, but the County will depend upon that in the divestiture process, they have to have that plan modified., They have to have the CoIWMP modified in order to divest itself., The current plan doesn't allow that. So just be aware this can be used for two purposes and the reason I say that is that when the Board of Supervisors goes to consider divestiture they'll need to be looking at this document to confirm which decisions they want to make and the disclosure of the various impacts and various alternatives that they have available to them in the divestiture process. This will be an important document for that process so be aware of that too as Board members, this is a first step in a very significant change in our solid waste system so the question is in terms of comments simply that we'd like to see quantification in some form or fashion so we can rank these various alternatives that are being looked at as well as the project itself and then be aware that we really want a great disclosure document so there are some very important questions coming up and it will be really important to make sure those are quantified."*

**Comment 4:** Tim Smith, citizen of Rohnert Park, said *"My only point is I believe the conduct of reading speaker cards, which was requested, cannot be required. That's my only comment. I'm not submitting a speaker card because I'm only speaking about the process itself."*

Janet Coleson, Agency Counsel, confirmed that speaker cards cannot be required they are just to aid and facilitate the collection of comments as assurance that all of the comments are incorporated into the final.

Public hearing closed at 9:30 a.m.

Steve Barbose, Sonoma, reiterated the need to fully evaluate and quantify the negative environmental impacts of the current system of hauling the county's solid waste out of county by whatever means that is, rail or truck it's a greenhouse gas emissions issue and it needs to be upfront and addressed when it comes to the Board Of Supervisors they need to be able to look at this and weigh their alternatives.

Mike Kirn, Healdsburg, asked if the SPEIR had been submitted to the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB).

Mr. Carter confirmed that it was submitted to the CIWMB.

Dan Schwarz, Rohnert Park, said after hearing two speakers speak about the relationship of this document to the divestiture process he would like staff to return and explain to the Agency Board any concerns they or the county may have to the relationship between this process and that process.

## HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE

### **7.1 HHW BUILDING ENCLOSURE EXPANSION PROJECT – BID REQUEST**

Lisa Steinman explained that at the June 20, 2007 Agency Board meeting, the Board executed an Agreement with VBN Architects for the HHW Building Enclosure Expansion Project. The project involves extending the existing canopy over the entire concrete area on the south end of the Central Disposal Site HHW Building and adding walls, creating a separate area that will provide additional storage and processing space for low toxicity wastes, such as latex paint.

The expansion project will increase the operational capacity of the existing facility and will create a secondary storage area for universal waste and latex paint that is not impinging into the hazardous waste operations area.

VBN is currently in the process of preparing construction documents suitable to obtain a building permit and for bidding, including plans and specifications. One of VBN's tasks is to assist the Agency in obtaining and reviewing construction bids after the Permit and Resource Management Department's (PRMD) initial review of the plans, a request was made to Agency staff to provide a new soils analysis report, since the existing report was too old. At the February 18, 2009 Agency Board meeting, the Board approved moving ahead with obtaining a new soils analysis report by accepting the quote submitted by the lowest bidder, Taber Consultants. Copies of the completed report have been submitted to VBN and PRMD. At this time, the PRMD is in the process of reviewing the final plans for the project.

In regards to funding the HHW Building Expansion Project, \$199,755 is available through the HD 16 F California Integrated Waste Management Board grant. This was awarded to the Agency in late 2007.

At the February 18, 2009 Agency Board meeting, the Board approved staff's recommendation to submit a new scope of work for the HD 16F grant so that grant funds could be used towards construction costs for the new HHW Building Expansion instead of using the grant money for siting and planning of additional HHW facilities. The change to the scope of work was approved on March 16, 2009 by the CIWMB Grant Manager.

All construction work for this project must be complete by March 31, 2010, when the final written report detailing the tasks performed under this grant is due to the CIWMB. Due to the short timeline, staff is requesting the Agency Board's approval to advertise and receive bids for the construction of the HHW Building Enclosure Expansion Project. The proposed building

expansion will be a pre-engineered structure designed by Garco Construction, Inc., the manufacturer of the original building, to match the existing building. Garco or any company using the Garco materials would be potential bidders.

It is estimated by the VBN Architects that the construction costs for the HHW Building Enclosure Expansion Project will be \$240,000-\$280,000. \$300,000 has been budgeted in the HHW Facility Reserve for this project for FY 09-10. \$199,755 is available through the HD 16 F grant to be applied towards construction costs.

**Dan Schwarz, Rohnert Park, moved to approve the advertising and receiving of bids for the construction of the HHW Building Enclosure Expansion Project and return to the Board with a selected contractor. Steve Barbose, Sonoma, seconded. Motion approved. Cloverdale and Cotati absent.**

#### **8. BOARDMEMBER COMMENTS**

There were no Boardmember comments.

#### **9. STAFF COMMENTS**

Mollie Mangerich questioned whether the July meeting was needed. After discussion the meeting was cancelled.

Susan Klassen, County of Sonoma, moved to cancel the July 15<sup>th</sup> meeting, Jack Griffin, Sebastopol, seconded. Cloverdale and Cotati absent. The next meeting will be August 19, 2009.

Ms. Mangerich mentioned Agency staff's participation at the Sonoma-Marin Fair with an E-waste booth at the end of June. And also that she had attended a North American Hazardous Materials Management Association conference in Seattle on Product Stewardship and Household Hazardous Waste management.

#### **10. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 9:36 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Elizabeth Koetke

**Copies of the following were distributed and/or submitted at this meeting:**

PowerPoint handout