



MINUTES OF JULY 21, 2010

The Sonoma County Waste Management Agency met on July 21, 2010, at the City of Santa Rosa Council Chambers, 100 Santa Rosa Avenue., Santa Rosa, California

PRESENT:

Town of Windsor	Christa Johnson, Chair
City of Cloverdale	Nina Regor
City of Cotati	Marsha Sue Lustig
City of Healdsburg	Mike Kirn
City of Petaluma	Vince Marengo
City of Rohnert Park	Linda Babonis
City of Santa Rosa	Elise Howard
City of Sebastopol	Jack Griffin
County of Sonoma	Phil Demery

ABSENT:

City of Sonoma

STAFF PRESENT:

Interim Executive Director	Susan Klassen
Counsel	Janet Coleson
Staff	Patrick Carter
	Karina Chilcott
	Charlotte Fisher
	Lisa Steinman
Recorder	Elizabeth Koetke

1. CALL TO ORDER MEETING/INTRODUCTIONS

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

2. AGENDA APPROVAL

Chair Johnson requested that item #8 be addressed prior to item #7.

Vince Marengo, Petaluma, moved to accept this change to the agenda. Mike Kirn, Healdsburg, seconded. City of Sonoma absent.

3. ATTACHMENTS/CORRESPONDENCE

Chair Christa Johnson, called attention to the Director's Agenda notes.

4. ON FILE WITH CLERK

Chair Johnson noted the resolutions approved in June, 2010, on file with the clerk.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS (items not on the agenda)

None.

CONSENT

6.1 Minutes of June 16, 2010

6.2 CoIWMP Five Year Review

6.3 SCC Monthly Reports for April and May 2010

6.4 Household Hazardous Waste Facility Expansion

Nina Regor, Cloverdale, requested that item #6.1 be pulled from consent for a correction to the minutes

Items 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4 moved for approval by Marsha Sue Lustig, Cotati. Vince Marengo, Petaluma, seconded with a comment acknowledging staff for the extraordinary work they did on item 6.4. Items 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4 approved. City of Sonoma absent.

6.1 Minutes of June 16, 2010

Ms. Regor asked for a correction to the June 16, 2010 SCWMA Minutes on page 5, Item # 11 doesn't have the results of the vote.

Ms. Regor moved to approve item #6.1 with corrections, Mike Kirn seconded. Motion approved. City of Sonoma absent.

REGULAR CALENDAR

8. COMPOST RELOCATION UPDATE

Patrick Carter presented milestones of the project and announced that the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) could possibly be released prior to the August 18, 2010 Agency meeting.

Paul Miller, ESA, gave a presentation explaining the project.

Matt Cotton, Integrated Waste Management Consulting, a subcontractor of ESA, explained the interaction of current composting technologies affect this project.

Mr. Carter explained that the Administrative Draft EIR had been received and identified some concerns. Site 5a is identified as needing road improvements would be necessary to access the site. The cost of doing the necessary road improvements would be equal to, or greater than the cost of purchasing the site. The site's position on the 100 year flood plain is producing issues with ground water and waste water feasibility. Site 13 is basically has the same concerns as Site 5a; more significant road improvements may be needed in order to do the project.

Site 40 looks to be the more attractive choice. It moves the project from its current site and provides enough capacity. While some off-site improvements may be necessary, they are projected to not be as expensive as the other sites. The parcel is for sale and, while the initial purchase price of the site may require some additional funding sources, staff still believes it's feasible from a cost perspective.

The EIR will detail all of the impacts continuing with analysis and focus on Site 40 and Central.

The site at Central would move the composting operation off its current site, but it would not have the capacity that is needed. There is rock that would need to be blasted and it would add some complexity to the project. There is also the general uncertainty concerning the future use by the County of the site.

Staff recommends continuing the analysis and focusing on Site 40 and Central.

Public Comments

Will Bakx, Sonoma Compost, inquired about the technology that reflects the 110,000 tons annual production mentioned in the presentation, windrow composting or aerated static? Paul Miller answered that the technology described was aerated static.

Boardmember Discussion

Phil Demery, Sonoma County, questioned whether Site 40 was off the market and now is available. Was that one of the reasons it was not studied at the same level as Site 5A?

Mr. Carter confirmed that Site 40 was ranked the most feasible site. The Open Space District was pursuing a purchase, but their negotiations were not successful, which makes it available now.

Phil Demery asked, with the space limitation of the Central Site, has consideration been given to going Gray property?

Mr. Carter replied part of the study done on the Gray property. The study identified two issues, one was the topography and another issue was the property was habitat for the California Tiger Salamander and Red-legged Frog. Any mitigation would be very expensive.

Marsha Sue Lustig, Cotati, expressed concerns about the impact of removing large amounts of rock from the Central site. She also expressed concern about limiting the study.

Ms. Klassen clarified that none of the sites are being removed from the EIR at this point. Some sites are more feasible than others. The study is focused on the more feasible ones, but all four sites will be in the EIR as alternatives.

Mr. Demery stated the decision makers will be able to select those alternatives to be studied at the project level. Currently site 5A Site 40 and Central are being studied at the project level. Staff's recommendation is to only look at Site 40 and Central for additional analysis. When the document is certified, will only those two sites, Site 40 and Central, be selected due to the detailed environmental analysis?

Janet Coleson, Agency Counsel, explained that those two sites would have a complete study done on them; staff brought this item to the Board as a potential cost-saving measure. All four sites can be studied at the same level. There are two issues with what's been done to this point, one on site 5a and one on Site 13 that could cause those two sites to drop out of the mix because they will be cost prohibitive. The question is whether the Board would like to continue to study those two sites given the fact that it appears likely they could drop out. All four sites would still be in the study, but those two sites would not have the complete analysis that the other two have.

Ms. Klassen added that site 5A is in a flood plain.

Christa Johnson, Windsor, expressed Windsor's interest in contracting out for this service and sending the materials to a private facility. She requested that staff do additional research about this option.

Mr. Demery expressed support in researching other options as long as it would not undermine the efforts of this project as staff has been acting on the Board's direction for this project.

After much discussion, Mike Kirn, Healdsburg, moved to approve staff expand the study of Site 40 and the Central Site to take them to the project level for the draft EIR. Included in the motion would be the exploration and cost analysis of two specific issues on site 13 related to the traffic impacts on Highway 37, flood impacts and mitigation. As part of the 'no option alternative', identify what the fallback would be as far as privatizing the compost program. Jack Griffin, Sebastopol, seconded. City of Sonoma absent. Vince Marengo, Petaluma, asked that an engineer's estimate of time and costs be included.

Recess from 10:38 to 10:45

July 21, 2010 SCWMA Meeting Minutes

City of Cotati left the meeting at 10:45 a.m.

7. SONOMA COUNTY/CITY SOLID WASTE ADVISORY GROUP

Chair Johnson gave the SWAG update as Steve Barbose was not available.

In September a facilitator will be brought in to start looking at various alternatives for a solid waste solution in Sonoma County. At some point in the process the SWAG will establish a resource committee which will be comprised of members of the public and related industries and town, city and county staff.

There was an informative presentation about Material Recovery Facilities (MRF), and the SWAG has planned a fieldtrip for Friday, July 30th to visit a few MRF's in San Jose.

9. UNVEILING OF NEW WEBSITE

Karina Chilcott gave a presentation of the new www.recyclenow.org website. The domain name has remained the same and the programming was done by ISD staff. Staff can add features such as upcoming meetings where automatic email can be requested.

The reason for the upgrade is that the old site was created in 1998 using "HTML" language, while the new site uses "CSS". Some of the old HTML tags and attributes are being deprecated by newer browsers, so this new CSS framework is more functional and flexible for the future. It follows the ADA protocol which is useful for screen readers. Meeting archives are now available and this website links to the eco-desk Access database

Ms. Johnson asked about the cost of the upgrade.

Ms. Chilcott said the original contract was \$30,000 but in order to meet some of the ADA requirements there were some unexpected costs. The financial details are still being sorted out.

Chair Johnson said she felt this project was very well done and was a large expenditure for education.

10. BOARDMEMBER COMMENTS

None.

11. STAFF COMMENTS

Ms. Klassen said the recruitment for Executive Director position closed, the applicants were screened and narrowed down to a one day interview panel. Hopefully, there will be a recommendation for the Board at the August meeting.

12. NEXT SCWMA MEETING AUGUST 18, 2010

13. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Elizabeth Koetke

Copies of the following were distributed and/or submitted at this meeting:
SCWMA Proposed Sonoma County Compost Facility PowerPoint Presentation
Feasibility of Goals Comparison chart