September 19, 2013

To: SCWMA Board Members

SONOMA COUNTY Waste Management Agency

From: Henry J. Mikus, SCWMA Executive Director

Executive Summary Report for the SCWMA Board Meeting of September 18, 2013

<u>**Closed Session:**</u> The Board met in closed session at the start of the meeting, and discussed one item: employee performance evaluation, and no formal action was taken.

<u>Consent:</u> The Consent Agenda approval contained three items: the Minutes of the August 21, 2013 Regular Board Meeting, HHW contract modifications (unanimous vote required), and Local AB939 Task Force changes to their bylaws. The HHW contract change was to reflect price reductions from our start to receiving services from PaintCare, a state-mandated paint producer funded program to pay for waste paint disposal.

Item 9: Carryout Bag Ordinance Update: Since the last meeting, staff visited Cotati, who expressed support for the ordinance, and Santa Rosa. Santa Rosa has concerns about enforcement, the Agency's ability to enact an ordinance, and losing sovereignty if and outside entity enacts and ordinance within their borders. Some Council members in Santa Rosa would like to do a "carve out" of the regional program so they can independently do their own ordinance yet allow the regional ordinance apply everywhere else. The Santa Rosa Council asked that their City Attorney and Assistant City Manager meet with the Agency Director and Counsel to address their concerns; this meeting is set for October 9. During discussion Petaluma's Board member indicated his City shared Santa Rosa's issues. The Board asked Agency Counsel to consider solutions to these issues, including preparing a draft amendment to the Agency's Joint Powers Agreement to clearly state the ability to enact an ordinance and to create a framework to allow a "carve out".

Item 10: Compost Site Analysis: At the last meeting the Board asked staff to develop additional information for the September Board meeting regarding greenhouse gas emissions, costs at nearby competing facilities, food waste capacity, fire code restrictions, a project time line for each site, storm water requirements for site 40 (particular to the San Francisco Bay RWOCB). leasing or purchasing just the minimal portion of Site 40 rather than the entire property, and an appraisal of Site 40's value. Staff presented information on all these items. Of particular note was the Site 40 appraisal, which reported sale and lease prices much lower than previous estimates. The Board recognized that there are still significant items of important information pertinent to a site selection decision that are not clear or complete. Staff was asked to address those items that they could: calculate greenhouse gas benefits from potential mitigating actions at Site 40 such as use of solar power and electric rather than diesel powered equipment, costs for use of the County/Rohnert Park/Laguna Plant pipeline & treatment system for compost storm and contact water, compare trucking firm costs to estimated costs for material hauling, land use and zoning questions, discussions with the Site 40 owners, examination of the full appraisal, update on landfill negotiations, and questions about the right to use the land at Central including fees.

Item 11: Executive Director Contract: This item was continued until October.