



Minutes of July 16, 2014 Meeting

The Sonoma County Waste Management Agency met on July 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 (Via teleconference)
City of Healdsburg	Jim Wood
City of Petaluma	Dan St. John
City of Rohnert Park	Don Schwartz
City of Santa Rosa	Jennifer Phillips
City of Sebastopol	Sue Kelly
City of Sonoma	Steve Barbose
County of Sonoma	Shirlee Zane
Town of Windsor	Debora Fudge

Staff Present:

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

- 1. Call to Order**
The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m.
- 2. Open Closed Session**
- 3. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL- ANTICIPATED LITIGATION**
Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(2) and (e)(5)
Two cases
- 4. Adjourn Closed Session**
- 5. Agenda Approval**
There were no changes to the Agenda.
- 6. Public Comments (items not on the agenda)**
None
- 7. Consent (w/attachments)**

7.1 Minutes of the May 21, 2014 SCWMA meeting

7.2 Minutes of the June 23, 2014 SCWMA meeting

Henry Mikus, Executive Director, stated that Susan Klassen, the County representative at the May 21, 2014, had asked for a revision to Item 7.1 (Agenda packet page 14). She asked for the language in her comment during Board Discussion to read, "...the NCRWQCB had stated that it was not their intention to shut down the landfill, however, they (the County) did ultimately shut it down for five years."

Shirlee Zane, County of Sonoma, inquired why the June minutes were substantially different and shorter than those of the May meeting; noting the robust discussion that took place during the June meeting.

Mr. Mikus responded that the format of the June meeting minutes is similar to what was used for the December meeting; a summary was compiled by the meeting facilitator which was used to create the minutes.

Ms. Zane stated that a standard format should be used for all meetings as the June minutes appear very bare bones, in spite of the fact all morning was spent in robust discussion.

Mr. Mikus inquired if it were the will of the Board to remove the minutes from the current agenda in order to allow staff to develop more elaborate minutes for presentation at the August 2014 Board Meeting.

Ms. Zane stated the word is not elaborate, it is accurate. She does not believe the minutes reflect what happened at the June 23, 2014 meeting.

Jim Wood, City of Healdsburg, stated his belief that the June 23, 2014 was presented more as a workshop than a formal meeting; noting that in Healdsburg minutes for workshops do not typically include all comments.

Ms. Zane stated that she believes the minutes presented are more similar to an Agenda with a couple of motions than they are actual minutes. She would like to see some consistency and believes that it is unfortunate that some of the nuances of a very robust and healthy discussion were not captured in the minutes.

Deborah Fudge, Town of Windsor, stated that she believed the summary of actions and decisions which were provided to Board Members were adequate despite limited comments being noted.

Bob Cox, City of Cloverdale, moved to approve the Consent Calendar, with the noted amendments as requested by Ms. Klassen. Steve Barbose, City of Sonoma, seconded the motion.

Ms. Zane, Jennifer Phillips, City of Santa Rosa and Don Schwartz, City of Rohnert Park, abstained from the vote of Item 7.1 the Minutes of May 21 2014, due to their absences.

Chair Wood, Ms. Phillips and Mr. Schwartz, abstained from the vote of Item 7.2 the Minutes of June 23, due to their absences.

The motion passed with the noted abstentions.

7.1 Vote Count:

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

AYES -7- NOES -0- ABSENT -0- ABSTAIN -3-

7.2 Vote Count:

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

AYES -7- NOES -0- ABSENT -0- ABSTAIN -3-

Regular Calendar

8. Compost Zero Discharge Project Update

Mr. Mikus reported that the Zero Discharge plan was submitted to the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB) on July 11, 2014. Based on conversations with NCRWQCB staff, Agency staff is optimistic a response will be received within a couple weeks. The plan included the construction of a new pond to contain water from the entire site, including interim measures to reduce the volume of water generated and improve the quality of the water. The other parallel track is to work toward the certification and construction of a new compost site. Both the construction of a new pond and the construction of a new site have preliminary completion estimates of late 2016. The plan contains milestones against which progress can be measured. At any point in the process, by a decision of the Agency Board or by the NCRWQCB, work on the ponds may be halted, composting activities on the site may be suspended, and all compost feedstock may be out-hauled to other compost facilities.

Mr. Mikus reported that the pond design was included in the submittal to the NCRWQCB, but needed minor changes for the public procurement process. After bids are received and evaluated, staff will present the costs to construct the pond.

Mr. Mikus stated that staff was working to resolve the California Tiger Salamander issue, including direct talks with the California Fish and Wildlife Service. The most likely path on that issue was to perform a Habitat Conservation Plan. The Agency would likely be required to purchase mitigation credits. The process of performing the Habitat Conservation Plan and purchasing credits was expected to take about one year.

Mr. Mikus reported that one interim measure in place during the previous rainy season was the pumping and hauling of compost contact water from the compost site to the Laguna Waste Water Treatment Plant. While it was brought to staff's attention that the compost contact water has the potential to be problematic in their disinfection system, Laguna staff understands the importance of accepting this water and will work with Agency staff to maximize the volume of water received without jeopardizing their operation.

Mr. Mikus added that Sonoma Compost Company has committed to additional Best Management Practices, including doubling the number sediment traps.

Mr. Mikus mentioned that Agency staff was in the process of receiving outhaul pricing and that staff was participating in a meeting that afternoon to attempt to resolve some issues around that process.

Mr. Mikus reported that with the engineering information on the new site process expected to be presented to the Board in October, the Board may be in a position to choose a new site as early as the November 2014 meeting. One of the other issues preventing construction of the new site is the term of the Agency, and Mr. Mikus reminded the Board that the June Strategy Session included a goal of deciding the Agency's future in 2014.

Board Questions

Ms. Zane asked about the contractual obligations of the Agency and Sonoma Compost Company. As there were significant financial implications to the Agency, she felt uneasy making certain commitments to interim measures without knowing all the costs and without knowing whether the responsibility rested with Sonoma Compost or the Agency. She stated the outhaul costs were roughly known, but the interim measures were largely unknown.

Mr. Mikus reported the expenses already committed to be \$311,995, which includes reimbursing Republic for the large pond design, DEI consultant assistance, PRMD CEQA analysis assistance, engineering contingency design, and other contingency funding. An additional interim measure to combine the existing ponds into one larger pond has a not-to-exceed cost of \$400,000. Future decisions would be to construct a new pond, which had an initial estimate of approximately five million dollars. Partial outhaul to decrease the compost footprint by 20% would be an additional expense of approximately \$190,000 per year. Total outhaul is estimated to be \$1,840,000 per year of additional expense. The budget contains \$750,000 for pump and haul costs, but that is not a new request for this meeting.

Ms. Zane asked for a total cost of interim measures.

Mr. Mikus replied that the estimate was difficult to calculate because some decisions were yet to be made, but the total cost to build a new pond was approximately \$5.7 million. About three years of outhaul is approximately the same cost as the pond construction.

Mr. Mikus added that the agreement with Sonoma Compost Company stipulates that any new changes to environmental laws or regulations requires them to cover the first \$50,000, and beyond that, it is the Agency's responsibility.

Stu Clark, consultant for DEI, explained that the Zero Discharge Plan contains a number of decision points for the Board, so that if at any point the Board is unable or unwilling to commit to a course an action proposed in the plan, the Board can choose to outhaul. Mr. Clark mentioned that moving forward with a new site will be a large demonstration to the Water Board of the Agency's commitment toward Zero Discharge. The August 20 SCWMA meeting will be a key decision date for an outhaul or pond discussion.

Mr. Barbose inquired whether site selection would precede the decision on pond construction, and whether the pond would be suitable for the new site if it is at the Central Disposal Site.

Mr. Clark replied that the design of the pond would be complete prior to site selection, but that construction of the pond would presumably occur after site selection.

Dan St. John, City of Petaluma asked whether the permit or environmental regulations changed since the bid for compost operations.

Mr. Mikus replied that the environmental change was the Waste Discharge Requirements issued to the County in March 2013, which asked for a Zero Discharge plan, and the March 18, 2014 Zero Discharge requirement by October 1, 2014.

Mr. St. John asked about the water balance related to the reduction of the compost site footprint.

Mr. Clark stated that the water balance took into consideration the following factors: rainfall amount, absorption, evaporation from pond, rainfall on the pond itself, and water use by Sonoma Compost and Republic. These were modeled for an average rainfall year and for the wettest year on record (1983). The pond was more than adequate for the average year, and could contain 97% of the rainfall for the 1983 rainfall amount. In the 1983 rainfall amount, about 3 acre-feet would need to be pumped and hauled during the rainy season.

Mr. St. John asked about progress finding opportunities for using the water off the site.

Mr. Clark responded that off-site use would require additional permitting, but was absolutely something staff was pursuing. The water stored in the pond and used on or off-site displaces groundwater use.

Ms. Zane again expressed reservation on approving of the interim plan which she did not feel contained enough financial information. If the purpose of this meeting was to present information and request decisions in August, that was sufficient, but Ms. Zane felt that a better picture of the financial implications of this plan was needed.

Mr. Mikus replied that staff was requesting a decision of the Board at this meeting regarding the combination of the two existing ponds due to the short timeline for implementing that project. The August meeting would be the first decision point regarding pond construction or overhaul and more information would be presented then. Building a new site, or contracting for construction of a new site would be decisions for future meetings.

Mr. St. John and Ms. Zane had questions about the annual cost of hauling the compost contact water.

Mr. Clark responded that the budgeted amount of \$750,000 assumed the large pond would be constructed prior to October 1, and that there were no options other than waste water treatment plant disposal. Since the budget was approved prior to information regarding the larger pond construction and the Laguna treatment plant's limitations on the volume of water it can accept, the actual amount is expected to be less than the \$750,000 amount.

Public Comments

Nea Bradford asked whether the County and Cities were looking to construct a site on Mecham which will not be state of the art when it is finished in order to maintain a revenue stream, and if so, is there another source of revenue in the County to replace that lost revenue.

Chair Wood responded that the Board was not a decision point at this meeting, and that was not expected until October, and that the revenue question was more appropriately directed to the County.

Jonathon Kathrein reported that there is a train that goes through Sonoma County that hauls freight. One ton of freight can travel over 400 miles on one gallon of gasoline. There are spurs throughout the County, to which the franchised hauler to back up, load the material into trains, and delivered to any compost facility on the rail.

Roger Larsen asked whether other endangered species would cost one million dollars each and noted that every gallon of water in the pond has to be hauled, which has greenhouse gas implications. Mr. Larsen questioned whether the amount of water to be used on site was realistic and stated that it would not occur during rain events.

Rick Downey, Republic Services, stated that the new big pond is not be confused with the two ponds which may be combined. Mr. Downey stated that even with improving the existing ponds, there will be a discharge, unless there is another drought year. The discharge would technically still be a violation, which concerns Republic.

Ernie Carpenter hoped rail haul would have an opportunity to participate in this process.

Board Discussion

Chair Wood hoped that rail would receive consideration.

9. Compost Zero Discharge Ponds Consolidation

Mr. Mikus reported that there are two ponds at the edge of the compost site that have a capacity of about one million gallons. One of the interim measures the NCRWQCB was interested in was to increase the holding capacity of those ponds to allow a greater volume of water to be pumped and hauled off site. Tetra Tech was authorized in May to examine creating additional capacity in those ponds by combining both ponds into one larger pond. The staff report indicated the possibility of a design/build through Tetra Tech, but that no longer seemed feasible. Staff requested authorization to construct the pond through measures that were both expeditious and legal with a not-to-exceed amount of \$400,000. The County would have the opportunity to review the design prior to construction.

Board Questions

None

Public Comments

Roger Larsen asked whether this pond would have the same liner specifications as the larger pond.

Mr. Mikus replied that the new pond would likely contain a single liner, which is less than what is proposed for the new larger pond, but better than the clay that currently lines those ponds.

Board Discussion

Ms. Zane asked for clarification regarding the contingency that the pond construction was subject to approval of the Zero Discharge Plan by the NCRWQCB.

Mr. Mikus confirmed that the pond would not be built if, for example, in August the decision was made to outhaul the material. He stated that it would not make sense to spend that money on the operation in that scenario.

Mr. St. John moved the item for approval. The motion was seconded by Susan Kelly, City of Sebastopol. The motion was amended to Authorize expenditure of a not-to-exceed amount of \$400,000 for combining the two small ponds into a single larger storm water detention structure. This item would be contingent on surety that the “Zero-Discharge” plan is acceptable to NCRWQCB and the new large pond development project will proceed. The authority to enter into an agreement with a firm for the construction was delegated to the Executive Director, if it meets the best interests of the Agency by entering into an agreement prior to the August Agency meeting. The amended motion was accepted by Mr. St. John and Ms. Kelly.

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

10. Sonoma Compost Agreement First Amendment

Patrick Carter, Agency staff, introduced the new First Amendment to the agreement with Sonoma Compost. The amendment would avoid rate increases, allow all the material to be delivered to the site, and achieve a site footprint reduction. Sonoma Compost Company would purchase a new windrow turner which would create larger windrows in exchange for eliminating the revenue sharing provision of the agreement. Mr. Carter explained that there was a discrepancy between what Sonoma Compost meant to propose regarding the revenue sharing and what was included in the agreement, which was causing them financial difficulties irrespective of the proposed first amendment, and that by eliminating the revenue sharing provision and requiring the purchase of the windrow turner, two issues could be settled simultaneously. Sonoma Compost is being paid less per ton for the material processed, and more revenue sharing than in the previous agreement. To get a 20% footprint reduction through outhaul is approximately \$190,000 per year to the Agency without a revenue offset. Forgoing the \$15,000 of budgeted revenue does not have a material impact on the Agency budget or require a rate payer impact. The amendment is contingent upon approval of the NCRWQCB of the Zero Discharge Plan.

Board Questions

Mr. St. John requested clarification about the revenue sharing for FY 13-14.

Mr. Carter replied that there was a miscommunication in the negotiation with Sonoma Compost Company where they provided an amount as the threshold for revenue sharing that was not what they intended, and that Agency staff was working with Sonoma Compost on realizing the amount due.

Mr. St. John requested to know what the deleted portion of the agreement included.

Mr. Carter answered that it contained the provisions for revenue sharing.

Mr. St. John confirmed that the amendment was only for another two and a half years.

Mr. Barbose asked whether funds had already been received from Sonoma Compost for FY 13-14. The amendment would affect future revenue sharing, not current or past revenue sharing.

Mr. Carter replied yes.

Mr. Barbose asked what the expected revenue sharing would be for the Agency should the revenue sharing were to continue.

Mr. Carter stated that he believed it would be between \$100,000 and \$200,000 per year.

Chair Wood mentioned that the potential offset to consider is the potential for an additional cost of \$190,000 per year for overhaul.

Ms. Zane requested a summary of the amendment and how it would benefit the Agency.

Mr. Carter reported that purpose was to achieve a compost site footprint reduction through Sonoma Compost's purchase of equipment in a way that did not have a ratepayer impact.

Ms. Zane requested additional clarification regarding financial information to be able to decide whether this amendment was to the Agency's advantage.

Mr. Clark replied that there were two ways to accomplish a 20% footprint reduction; one was to increase the site efficiency, the other is overhaul of material. Removing 20% of the material from the site through overhaul also has a negative effect on products produced by Sonoma Compost. The revenue the Agency is giving up may be somewhere in the neighborhood of the cost of the equipment, however overhaul does not have any offsetting costs.

Mr. St. John asked what would be the recommendation given the choice between overhaul and new equipment.

Mr. Mikus replied that staff recommends the equipment because it keeps the material locally as a resource.

Mr. St. John asked who would own the equipment at the end of the term.

Mr. Mikus replied that Sonoma Compost would.

Mr. St. John said he could support the measure if the Agency owned the equipment at the end of the agreement.

Jennifer Phillips, City of Santa Rosa, asked whether Sonoma Compost still owed the Agency the additional funds under the existing agreement.

Mr. Mikus replied affirmatively, and discussed that Sonoma Compost sold out much of their stockpiles over the winter, so in the spring they had much less material on hand when they usually have much more material to sell.

Mr. St. John asked about the certainty of the cost of the equipment.

Mr. Carter replied that the amount was the estimate provided by Sonoma Compost.

Mr. St. John asked if the quote was reviewed by staff.

Mr. Carter replied no.

Mr. St. John asked whether the equipment would be useful at the new site.

Mr. Carter replied that it had a very limited potential use at a new site.

Mr. St. John asked when the best estimate for opening a new site would be.

Mr. Clark replied that the end of 2016 was the earliest possible date.

Ms. Phillips asked how the error in the revenue sharing would have been solved irrespective of this First Amendment.

Mr. Mikus replied that it would have required an amendment regardless, and through discussions with Sonoma Compost both issues could be solved at once through this amendment.

Ms. Zane asked how Sonoma Compost disclosed this error in the agreement.

Mr. Mikus answered that it was through the process of reconciling the revenue sharing payment. Sonoma Compost provided their estimated numbers, staff reviewed them and disagreed. It was a mutual process.

Ms. Zane asked whether it was through a financial audit.

Mr. Mikus replied that it was discovered through the normal process of reviewing information from businesses which have agreements with the Agency.

Mr. Carter interjected that this was the first time in this agreement that Sonoma Compost had submitted and staff had reviewed the revenue sharing provision. Sonoma Compost submitted amounts under the terms of the previous agreement, Agency staff disagreed, and the dialogue began between both parties.

Don Schwartz, City of Rohnert Park, asked what assurance the Agency had that Sonoma Compost would pay the full amount under the agreement.

Mr. Carter replied that Sonoma Compost would be in default of the agreement if they failed to pay the Agency, and that the Agency had additional remedies to be made whole in that event.

Mr. Schwartz wished to make approval of the amendment contingent upon receipt of the full revenue sharing amount.

Public Comments

Roger Larsen questioned whether the fire safety was impacted by the increased pile size.

Mr. Mikus replied that there was no added fire danger.

Pam Davis, Sonoma Compost Company, mentioned that this equipment purchase had been discussed some months previously, and was something Sonoma Compost was willing to stop pursuing as the previous discussions did not seem palatable to the Board. The reason it has been brought back up at this meeting is to reduce the amount of water generated by the compost site. Initially the windrow turner purpose was to take pressure off the site, now the discussion is to reduce the compost site footprint to improve water issues on the site. Regarding the revenue sharing provision, Sonoma Compost recognizes that there was a mistake, that Sonoma Compost signed the agreement, and that it is bound by that agreement, regardless of the mistake. Regarding the fire danger, the active windrows do not experience fires, as they are turned on a regular basis, and the Rancho Adobe Fire Department has reviewed information about the larger windrows and did not have an issue with them. Sonoma Compost, at its own expense, hired Fire Cause Analysis to do a thorough, third party review of the fire danger at the site for pile sizes even larger than proposed and the review did not raise major issues.

Chair Wood asked how long it would take to secure this piece of equipment.

Ms. Davis replied that windrow turners have already been tested on the site, and the specific piece of equipment has been selected. The exact lead time was unknown, but Sonoma Compost was willing to enter into a contingent agreement if the amendment was approved.

Board Discussion

Chair Wood asked whether there was a cap to the foregone revenue if there was a future spike in revenue.

Mr. Mikus replied that it was not in the existing amendment, but could be added if the Board wished it. Mr. Mikus pointed out that regardless of the revenue sharing, the Agency is still experience reduced expenses as a result of this new amendment, and that does not change with this amendment.

Mr. Barbose agreed that the revenue sharing cap was a good idea.

Ms. Phillips asked how there was a difference in the budgeted amount for revenue sharing vs. the actual amount.

Mr. Carter replied that the purpose of the new agreement with Sonoma Compost was to minimize the net amount paid to Sonoma Compost at the expense of revenue sharing, so the budget amounts were estimates under those assumptions, and once the data was received from Sonoma Compost, the amounts were much greater than those assumptions.

Mr. St. John motioned to table this amendment until August, with direction to staff to provide more information on what the revenue the Agency would be giving up, with a cap on revenue given up not to exceed the cost of the equipment and with the amendment containing a provision of who owned the equipment at the end of the term.

Mr. St. John mentioned that there are other discussions taking place that could have an impact on this issue. Mr. St. John did not want his motion to be interpreted as casting a negative light on the Agency's Zero Discharge Plan.

Debora Fudge disagreed with tabling the issue, as that would send a bad message of inaction of the Agency's part to the NCRWQCB from the very first step.

Ms. Zane asked whether there anything that would prevent Sonoma Compost from doing this action unilaterally.

Chair Wood commented that this was an Agency proposal to Sonoma Compost to help solve a problem together.

Chair Wood asked for second to the motion. There was no second.

Mr. Barbose moved to adopt the proposed amendment with the following change: continue to audit the revenue stream after the Agency has foregone the right to receive it, and when the amount of revenue foregone reaches the cost of the equipment, the revenue sharing would resume that we would have received under the existing agreement, with the understanding that Sonoma Compost keeps the equipment.

Bob Cox, City of Cloverdale, seconded the motion.

Chair Wood added that how this action is perceived by the NCRWQCB is very important. Inaction on this item could have a negative impact on the entire plan.

Susan Harvey, City of Cotati, strongly agreed with Chair Wood and Member Fudge regarding the amount of effort to produce this plan and the message it sends if this item is not approved.

Ms. Phillips concurred with fellow members supporting the plan, and pointed out that Sonoma Compost was only liable for the first \$50,000 of cost related to environmental law or regulation changes, so the Agency would be liable for this purchase regardless.

Chair Wood requested staff bring back the financial information at the next meeting.

Ms. Zane suggested that at some point the revenue stream should be independently audited.

Mr. St. John stated that he could not support the amendment as it stands.

Mr. Barbose asked what the problem with the language was in the amendment.

Mr. St. John responded that there may be a way to reduce the incoming material by 20% without this amendment.

Janet Coleson, Agency Counsel, interjected that this item was listed as a unanimous vote, but she does not agree with the assertion. She stated that this was not a capital expenditure greater than \$50,000, and so a majority vote is all that is required.

After discussion, Chair Wood called for a vote on the motion.

The motion passed on a 9-1-0-0 vote.

Cloverdale- Aye

Cotati- Aye

County- Aye

Healdsburg- Aye

Petaluma- No
Sonoma – Aye

Rohnert Park- Aye
Windsor- Aye

Santa Rosa- Aye

Sebastopol- Aye

AYES -9-

NOES -1-

ABSENT -0-

ABSTAIN -0-

Ms. Zane reiterated her request that an independent audit of the revenue sharing be discussed at a future meeting.

11. **Recycling Market Development Zone Renewal**

Mr. Carter reported that the members of the Agency are part of a recycling market development zone which includes all of Sonoma, Napa, and Lake Counties. The program provides low interest loans to businesses engaged in creating products from recycled materials or by adding value to recycled material to make them more easily made into recycled products. This item requests the Board approve of the renewal on behalf of all Agency members in that zone.

Board Questions

None

Public Comments

None

Board Discussion

Mr. Barbose motioned to approve of resolution to include the County of Sonoma and incorporated cities within Sonoma County in the renewal of the Sonoma/Mendocino/Lake Recycling Market Development Zone. Ms. Zane seconded the motion.

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

AYES -10-

NOES -0-

ABSENT -0-

ABSTAIN -0-

12. **Attachments/Correspondence:**

12.1 Reports by Staff and Others:

12.1.a July 2014 and August 2014 Outreach Events

12.1.b Reusable Bags Event

12.1.c Draft Amended JPA Agreement

13. **Board member Comments**

Ms. Phillips asked whether the draft amended JPA was intended to be brought before individual Councils for feedback or approval.

Mr. Mikus replied that the Board is seeking approval.

Chair Wood acknowledged the significant effort that was put forth to create a Zero Discharge Plan by staff and consultants.

Chair Wood also suggested that if the Board held workshops or strategic planning sessions in the future, the form of the minutes should be decided in advance as a matter of policy.

14. Staff Comments

None

15. Next SCWMA meeting: August 20, 2014

16. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:24 AM.

Submitted by
Patrick Carter