

**SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES
May 9, 2016**

Locations: 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA
1052 Tata Lane, South Lake Tahoe, CA

Members Present: Dickson Schwarzbach, Chair, County Representative, District 3
Don Nizolek, Vice Chair, County Representative, District 1
Jeanne Lear, South Tahoe Refuse
Nancy Spinella, County Representative, District 4
Frank Papandrea, County Representative, District 5 (SLT)
Jeff England, El Dorado Disposal
Mary Cahill, Cameron Park CSD
Pierre Rivas, City of Placerville

County Staff: Greg Stanton, Director
Donna Cademartori, Department Analyst
Paul Harden, Environmental Health Specialist
Barbara Houghton, Environmental Health Manager

Members Absent: Ray Jarvis, City of South Lake Tahoe
Dr. Katrina Jackson, El Dorado Hills CSD
George Turnboo, County Representative, District 2

1. Call to Order

- ❖ Meeting was called to order at 2:33 p.m. by Schwarzbach. Dickson reminded all attendees to state their name before speaking.

2. Roll Call (Members)

- ❖ Roll call was taken.

3. Approval of Agenda

- ❖ Dickson re-emphasized the new agenda format in which reports will be on consent unless pulled for questions or comments. Stanton clarified the process for consent items would be to recommend approval of the Agenda, and pulling report(s) for discussion and possible action, if applicable. Dickson made a motion to approve the agenda and pull reports 6a, 6b and 6d, to items for discussion. Rivas seconded the motion. All members present unanimously approved the motion. Stanton stated that to eliminate one of the motions for the Committee, staff will combine Item #3, Approval of Agenda, with Item #5, Approval of EDSWAC Meeting Minutes, for the next meeting.

4. Public Comment (non-Agenda Items)

- ❖ No public attendees

Consent Agenda:

5. Approval of EDSWAC Meeting Minutes – March 14, 2016

- ❖ Lear motioned to approve the Agenda. Motion was seconded by Papandrea. All members present unanimously approved the motion.

6. Agency/Jurisdiction reports – Receive and File

- ❖ Cahill motioned to receive and file the reports. Motioned was second by Spinella. All members present unanimously approved the motion.

Discussion and Possible Action Items:

ITEMS PULLED FROM CONSENT: Reports 6a, 6b and 6d from consent to items for discussion.

Report 6a

- ❖ Dickson discussed C&D Option #4 was at 81.6%, and by not having those options in front of her, clearly it's the most popular, and wants to know what it is.
- ❖ Harden explained Option #4 are the exempted projects that do not require a building permit: commercial additions less than or equal to 1,000 SF; commercial alterations with permit valuation less than or equal to \$200,000; renovations or remodel/alterations of existing residential buildings where remodel/alterations do not increase the building's conditioned area, volume or size, except roof replacement projects; construction of new decks; pool construction; electrical only; mechanical only; plumbing only; solar only; and sign only permits.
- ❖ Dickson asked if this goes with CalGreen in their categories so we are being consistent with them – Harden responded - yes. Dickson stated most of our projects are small and do not fall under this, but we are capturing more.
- ❖ Nizolek asked if it's just small or is it renovations. If renovations that's probably throwing us in there; if you're not increasing the size, then do any renovations fall outside?
- ❖ Harden responded – yes. Renovations or model/remodel alterations of existing residential buildings, where the remodel/alterations do not increase the buildings conditioned area, volume or size, except for roof replacement projects.
- ❖ Nizolek stated the last C&D ordinance, the County had covered 5,000 SF or greater and sub-divisions. The green building code was to include renovations and smaller projects, so this is showing 81.6% of projects fall outside of the ordinance; which strikes him as unproductive.
- ❖ Stanton explained that unfortunately he does not have a breakdown of numbers at this meeting. He cannot tell if 402 are hot water heaters that wouldn't fall under CalGreen or under the C&D Ordinance. What you are asking is of the 81.6%, how many are full-blown construction projects.

- ❖ Nizolek asked which option was going to be used for the Franchises - Harden responded – Option #1.
- ❖ Nizolek shared that when there were discussions about putting a new ordinance together, all indications were that we have exclusive franchise operations, and we have facilities that can meet the 50% diversion. It was going to be very simple that everybody was going to choose, more than likely, C&D Option #1 because everyone is going to be using except self-hauling. Only 7.8% of all the building permits are saying they're going to use the Franchise, and there are no reporting requirements before or after. Why are they choosing C&D Option #4 and not C&D Option #1 if everything is going other than there's not a reporting mechanism, and they don't want to deal with it.
- ❖ Diskson sensed that projects like water heaters are where most of them are, there's no reporting, and she wants to know why they are choosing C&D Option #4 instead of C&D Option #1, except that there is not a reporting mechanism.
- ❖ Stanton explained that they have six weeks of data in front of them, and it's premature to get good information. Permits are required for so many small items and he will provide a breakdown of the 81.6% at next meeting.
- ❖ Nizolek tried using the Building Department's web-site to request a building permit, but the C&D link did not work.
- ❖ Stanton stated that he doesn't think that currently you're able to initiate a building permit on line.
- ❖ Harden explained that C&D forms are on Environmental Management's web site.
- ❖ Stanton added that if EDSWAC wants a full discussion about how the C&D Ordinance works, then agendize it. Dickson agreed.
- ❖ Nizolek mentioned that he looked at the web site for past meetings, it caught his attention about the green building code being revised, and the minimum to be recycled goes from 50% to 65%. Are we going to be hitting 65% in January?
- ❖ Stanton stated that we will not know if hitting 65% until we get there.
- ❖ Lear explained that this percentage is a moving target, and they are floating around 63%, and she feels they will be able to accomplish it.
- ❖ Stanton stated that the new EDDS MRF will not be ready until 2018, so it will be a challenge for them to get to 65% by January.

Reports 6c & 6e

- ❖ Dickson noted that on the disposal trend reports, EDDS has tons of newspaper and SLT has tons of mixed paper. She is not sure if they meant the same, but would be nice if they were the same measures. Lear stated that for STR newspaper is added to mixed paper. Dickson asked England if EDDS could also include newspaper in with the mixed paper category - England agreed to make this change.
- ❖ In regards to organics recycling, Dickson requested EDDS and STR to provide how many food waste and recycling programs they have at the schools, if any colleges are participating, and what has been implemented. England and Lear agreed to provide this information on the next report.

Reports 6b & 6d

- ❖ Dickson also commented that for categories 4050, mixed wood, and 4060, asphalt concrete mix, the report shows an increase - is this a trend? Lear and England responded that construction has increased.

7. Report out from Ad Hoc Committee (SWMP Review)

- ❖ Stanton provided a summary of the Ad Hoc Committee's findings. Ad Hoc findings are listed on page one of the report, and Ad Hoc finds that there is no reason to amend the SWMP at this time; however, even though they found to not amend, there were some new target implementation dates revised that are noted in the year due column. Target date revisions do not require a change, but will be communicated to the Board on June 7th. There are a total of eleven near term strategies: seven completed; two in progress; and two not completed; WS JPA and WS C&D facility. Also three of the five intermediate term strategies have been initiated, but are not due until 2017-2025.
- ❖ Cahill requested that specific names not be used in the Ad Hoc report, but instead all comments be submitted as a committee.
- ❖ Nizolek asked how the Ad Hoc review is closed out. Stanton recommended formalizing the Ad Hoc review and comments in a letter to include recommendations, and have the Ad Hoc committee approve the content of the letter. Staff can assist with drafting the letter, and the Committee can edit to their preference. Dickson requested Cahill's recommendation regarding not using names in the report, but rather all comments shall be presented as a Committee, as a whole. Stanton suggested making a motion to accept the Ad Hoc Committee's review and findings, and remove personal names from the report. Lear motioned to approve. Cahill seconded the motion. All present unanimously approved the motion.
- ❖ A second motion was made by Dickson authorizing the Ad Hoc committee to send a letter with EDSWAC's inputs and findings to the BOS. Spinella seconded the motion. All present unanimously approved the motion.

8. List from EDDS & STR identifying facilities that are required to comply with MORE, and facilities that are complying.

- ❖ Lear went through the State's guidelines, and there are three different ways to determine if organics recycling is required: (1) take 36% of weekly generation and see if it hits eight cubic yards per week; (2) preferred is to take the number of employees they have by facility type, and the numbers will be plugged in to determine if producing the number of cubic yards per week; and (3) by facility type which is a lot more accurate than option one (1). STR will be meeting with Heavenly Village and Heavenly Valley, and will meet on-going with schools. The report is due annually to the State.
- ❖ England has approached Marshall Hospital, and they have opted out because of concern over sanitation and disease, as well as liability. It's possible they might get a pass from participating. There was some discussion regarding pre and post-consumer waste. Stanton clarified for the Committee that post-consumer waste is what they are going after.
- ❖ Dickson requested a list from England that is comparable to STR's provided at the meeting - England agreed to provide the list.
- ❖ Spinella shared her concern regarding bins that are not meeting the threshold for organics recycling. Stanton added that if he recalled correctly, CalRecycle is aware of the issue regarding shared bins in which individually they do not meet the threshold, but combined they do meet the threshold, and CalRecycle may be treating the shared bins as one.
- ❖ Cahill would like to have snippets regarding organics recycling to link with Master Gardeners and Master Canners classes. Lear shared that she has been trying to get them linked for a while and also finds this valuable.

9. Try to change EDSWAC meetings to a meeting room downstairs.

- ❖ There are no available meeting rooms on the first floor. Meetings will continue to be held on the second floor until further notice.

10. Action items for next meeting

1. Change next agenda from "Approval of Agenda" to "Approval of Agenda and Consent Calendar" - Cademartori
2. C&D data breakout – Stanton and Velasco
3. EDD bring organics recycling list comparable to STR's to next meeting - England
4. EDD and STR to make changes to reports as noted in the minutes – England and Lear
5. Status update on the progress of EDDS's new state-of-the-art MRF and C&D Recycling Facilities - England

Meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Dickson made a motion to adjourn. Cahill seconded the motion. All members present unanimously approved the motion.

Next meeting – September 12, 2016 @ 11:00 a.m., located at El Dorado Disposal

“Approved

Katherine Dickson Schwarzbach

Chairperson

9/12/16

Date”