



# CONSENT CALENDAR



**DRAFT MINUTES**

SOUTH BAYSIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY  
 MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
 October, 22, 2015, 2015 – 2:00 p.m.  
 San Carlos Library Conference Room A/B

Call To Order: 2:03PM

1. Roll Call

Agency	Present	Absent	Agency	Present	Absent
Atherton	X		Menlo Park		X
Belmont	X		Redwood City		X
Burlingame	X		San Carlos		X
East Palo Alto		X	San Mateo	X	
Foster City	X		County of San Mateo		X
Hillsborough	X		West Bay Sanitary District	X	

2. **Adjourn to Closed Session** – Pursuant to Government Code Section Govt. Code Sec. 54956.9 Conference with Labor Negotiator: Unrepresented employees- (All employees).
3. **Regular Session CTO: 2:11PM**  
Roll Call

Agency	Present	Absent	Agency	Present	Absent
Atherton	X		Menlo Park		X
Belmont	X		Redwood City	X	
Burlingame	X		San Carlos		X
East Palo Alto	X		San Mateo	X	
Foster City	X		County of San Mateo		X
Hillsborough	X		West Bay Sanitary District	X	

4. **Report from Closed Session**

Chair Widmer noted that the Board met with the representative that was negotiating on behalf of the unrepresented employees, and that the Board took action and would be reporting on that action during the regular agenda.

**5. Public Comment**

Persons wishing to address the Board on matters NOT on the posted agenda may do so.

Each speaker is limited to two minutes. If there are more than five individuals wishing to speak during public comment, the Chairman will draw five speaker cards from those submitted to speak during this time. The balance of the Public Comment speakers will be called upon at the end of the Board Meeting.

If the item you are speaking on is not listed on the agenda, please be advised that the Board may briefly respond to statements made or questions posed as allowed under The Brown Act (Government Code Section 54954.2). The Board's general policy is to refer items to staff for attention, or have a matter placed on a future Board agenda for a more comprehensive action or report and formal public discussion and input at that time.

None

**6. Executive Director's Report**

Executive Director McCarthy highlighted a commodity price chart that was in the staff report. He noted that world commodity prices as they relate to plastics, and metals are extremely volatile, and added that with the price of oil being low, the price for plastics has depressed, which continues to affect movement of that commodity from the MRF.

Executive Director McCarthy also introduced Carolina Leonhardt as the new Recycling Outreach and Sustainability Manager.

Executive Director McCarthy commented that all of the Board members were copied on correspondence from the Town of Atherton related to interpretation of the Franchise Agreement, and things that are covered in the compensation and the JPA budget. He noted that those items and the specific questions will be addressed in the next few meetings.

**7. Approval of Consent Calendar:**

Consent Calendar item(s) are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless members of the Board, staff or public request specific items be removed for separate action. *Items removed from the Consent Calendar will be moved to the end of the agenda for separate discussion.*

- A. Adopt the September 24, 2015 BOD Meeting Minutes
- B. Resolution Approving Amendment Number 4 to Agreement with WM Curbside, LLC to Provide Household Hazardous Waste, Universal Waste, Electronic Scrap, Sharps and Medicine Door-to-Door Collection, Recycling and Disposal Services
- C. 2016 Annual Public Education Plan
- D. Consideration of Approval of 2016 Merit Increase Pool for Unrepresented Employees

Chair Widmer noted that item 7D is the approval of the Merit Increase pool for the unrepresented employees that was discussed in closed session.

Member Benton pulled item 7C from consent

Member Bonilla moved to accept items 7A, 7B, and 7D

Member Bronitsky seconded the motion

Voice Vote: All in favor

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Atherton	X				Menlo Park				X
Belmont	X				Redwood City				X
Burlingame	X				San Carlos				X
East Palo Alto	X				San Mateo	X			
Foster City	X				County of San Mateo				X
Hillsborough	X				West Bay Sanitary Dist.	X			

Discussion on item 7C:

Member Benton commented that he pulled the item because it's an extensive list of materials and programs towards public education. He noted that the report frequently mentions how these items will be measured for effectiveness, but that there isn't anything in the staff report about historical effectiveness.

Executive Director McCarthy replied that there was a section in the Long Range Plan that detailed all of the existing programs, so the last time the Board would have seen historical effectiveness data would have been the Long Range Plan. He added that whenever specific projects are run there are numbers tied to them, and gave an example of a truck signs program. He also commented that everything in the public education plan is required in the Franchise Agreement.

Member Benton asked for confirmation that as a part of the process staff is reviewing items for effectiveness, and programs are continually evaluated.

Executive Director McCarthy answered that to the extent possible, yes, data is collected and analyzed.

Chair Widmer added that he would like to see metrics included for some of the pieces mentioned in the plan, and noted that he would like to see metrics specifically for the mobile app, and multifamily outreach. He also noted that he thought the anti-littering campaign sounded like make work. He noted that he would like to see key performance indicators (KPI) included, or at least have a discussion on what those indicators should be.

Member Brownrigg commented that outreach is not always easy to measure, if it was reduced then less education would happen in our service area, and it's not always easy to point to one campaign or another.

Executive Director McCarthy commented that some of the data and KPIs are collected but not reported. Adding that, based on feedback from the Board that the Board Packets were too long and those staff updates were taken out of the Board packet about a year ago, but are still being written and are available. He also added that the website, MyWaste app, and social media are being tracked, but the feedback he received was to not give that level of detail, but he would be happy to share it. Lastly, he added the anti-littering campaign is a state requirement, and the idea of a bill insert came out of a collaboration with a number of agencies, as a way to get the word out about those requirements.

Chair Widmer commented that KPIs are not as important now, but it would be important to see them as part of the budget process when future programs are being discussed, and he would like to see the information.

Member Dehn noted that she is a fan of shrinking the package, but when changes to a particular program come forward to the Board statistics and specifics need to be included.

Member Benton moved to approve agenda item 7C.  
Member Brownrigg seconded the motion.

Voice Vote: All in favor

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Atherton	X				Menlo Park				X
Belmont	X				Redwood City				X
Burlingame	X				San Carlos				X
East Palo Alto	X				San Mateo	X			
Foster City	X				County of San Mateo				X
Hillsborough	X				West Bay Sanitary Dist.	X			

**8. Administration and Finance:**

**A. Presentation on Extended Producer Responsibility Framework by the Executive Director of California Product Stewardship Council (Presentation and Discussion item)**

Staff Feldman introduced Heidi Sanborn, Executive Director, for the California Product Stewardship Council (CPSC).

Heidi Sanborn gave a presentation on Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR).

Chair Widmer asked if laptops and flat screens TVs would be included in EPR legislation.

Heidi Sanborn answered that the current California bill is a government run program with an advance disposal fee and only covers monitors, and is the opposite of producer responsibility.

Chair Widmer asked about end of life management, noting that the consumer is paying for it at the time of purchase but then it is very difficult to get it where it needs to go at the end of life even though its already been paid for.

Heidi Sanborn commented that if the right details aren't in the law, then the outcomes desired won't be achieved, and is also why it would be great to have an agency like the SBWMA to give input to these laws to get the right details into the bill.

Member Brownrigg asked who is paying when the producer is out of state, if it is the reseller or wholesaler or manufacturer.

Heidi Sanborn answered that producers are responsible if the item is sold into a jurisdiction regardless of where the item is made, and the definition that Cal Recycle has adopted is producer first, then the brand owner, and then first importer, and that definition catches all the decision makers.

Member Brownrigg asked if EPR legislation makes it hard for California companies to compete in 3<sup>rd</sup> markets.

Heidi Sanborn answered no, because it doesn't matter where it is made.

Member Benton requested further information on the process to add an item to the product list.

Heidi Sanborn answered that each product has to go through the legislature, and she noted that in 2008 Assembly Member Chesbro tried to pass legislation for a framework approach, that would

delegate the authority to CalRecycle to pick products based on their volume, toxicity, and cost. However, there was a lot of opposition, and now the legislature is going product by product.

Member Benton commented that a lot of packaging has no indication that it is recyclable, and asked what it takes to get a product that is packaged in plastic to be required to be recyclable plastic.

Heidi Sanborn gave an example of the Belgium system, and how the producers are working with the manufacturers, and noted that we have to work together and in the United States there is a lot of influence from the industry group's causing push back on this type of legislation.

Executive Director McCarthy commented that the staff report lists 3 types of items that the SBWMA receives revenue for, but it's an insignificant amount of money in terms of what local government and the rate payers are paying. He also noted that not every class of materials is the same in terms of difficulty in getting laws passed, there are all kinds of complex issues, and the more stakeholders that get involved the more opposition there is. He also added that he helped write California's eWaste law, and it is a different model from EPR which mandates that manufactures stop using certain chemicals in their product.

Heidi Sanborn commented that EPR is a policy tool in the toolbox that wasn't being used in the United States and now for the right products it can be.

Member Bronitsky asked if the resistance to EPR was all political.

Heidi Sanborn said yes, from the manufacturers, but not all of them, paint, mattresses and thermostat industry stakeholders worked with lawmakers.

Member Bronitsky commented that he thought the law should be like product liability law and changed so that any product in the stream of commerce has to be recyclable.

Heidi Sanborn commented there is a lot of legislative strategy around EPR, and she noted that CPSC is trying to encourage the SBWMA to have a voice at the table when the time comes.

Executive Director McCarthy added that the intent would be to bring back a resolution for approval, and asked for comments on the draft resolution in the staff report.

Chair Widmer commented that as opposed to just embracing one manner of policy, he wanted to make sure it was the right and smart thing to do.

Vice Chair Dehn asked when the item would be back for approval.

Executive Director McCarthy responded probably November, since there are not a lot of questions at this point.

**9. Collection and Recycling Program Support and Compliance:**

- A. Results of Recology Evaluation of Using Larger Data Pool for Conducting Annual Route Assessment (Discussion item)

Chair Widmer commented that he thought the staff report was too narrowly focused, and that the original question was broader, and the report should have included how Recology does data collection and why it is so hard to get a larger data pool, when the cost of equipment for data collection was included and paid for through the RFP process.

Staff Feldman gave an overview of the staff report, and summarized that Recology has come to the conclusion that it will cost roughly \$8,300 for a one time set up fee, and an additional \$93,000 annual for an additional staff person, to manipulate the date in the way that the Board is requesting.

Chair Widmer commented that as part of the future franchise agreement discussion the onboard computer system should be looked at from the point of view of being cost effective in the first place. He added that if it isn't being used for reporting the information the JPA has requested then the Company should be paying for it and not the rate payers.

Staff Feldman responded that the onboard computer system does have a value add in customer service real time responses that Recology is providing, but it was never envisioned to be the critical component related to cost allocation.

Chair Widmer reiterated that data was supposed to be collected, and collected data should be available and it is not.

Member Benton asked for clarification on what exactly were the findings from the data collection.

Staff Feldman answered that the results are that Recology will analyze additional data, if that is what the Board decides, but it will cost additional money.

Member Benton asked for clarification if a second period of data collection to validate what the results were from the first data collection period was or was not part of the Franchise Agreement.

Staff Feldman answered Recology compared data from the contractually required period in the April/May time frame with an additional not contractually obligated period in July of 2015. He added that in September Recology provided a report that compared the two. The extra money to compile a wider range of data to be used in the future is not in the Franchise Agreement.

Member Benton asked for clarification if Recology was willing to do the second validation period going forward.

Executive Director McCarthy added that from Recology's perspective the data results were not significantly different enough to justify continuing with two data collection periods, or moving forward with the larger data pool.

Mike Kelly of Recology added that the second data collection is time consuming and he would need to verify what the additional costs would be, but Recology could do it. He noted that he wasn't sure there would be any value add other than what is in the report today. He also noted that there is a timing issue, because it's already happening in April/May and if the data collection is happening any later than July it is too late to get included in the rate report.

Member Benton reiterated that he wanted to have some kind of a validation process to make sure that the data that is used in the compensation application is accurate.

Executive Director McCarthy commented that Recology has an obligation when the annual route assessment is completed if there is something noticeably off in the data that they have to do something so that the results are not skewed. He added that it would be very complex timing wise to figure out what to do with the validated numbers.

Member Benton commented that little variances in the route assessment data can make big swings in allocation especially for the smaller agencies who are not a big percentage of the total.

Mike Kelly commented that there is no period of time that could be identified to guarantee no anomalies.

Chair Widmer noted that one of the options discussed previously was the possibility of taking one to two weeks per quarter, to level out the anomalies.

Mike Kelly noted that the data collection process is a manual process to merge three different data collection systems, and because it's not the same drivers on every route every day it takes and individual to try and marry up all of the collected data, which is why it would take an additional head count to have additional data available for allocation purposes.

Member Brownrigg suggested coming up with an acceptable percent swing and if the number for a particular agency is above that percent swing, anomalies are then looked for, and an Agency has to defend those anomalies. If there are anomalies the number is thrown out and last year's percentage is used, and if not the new percentage stands.

Mike Kelly noted that Recology does explain any variances greater than plus or minus three percent, and those are identified by jurisdiction in the rate application.

Executive Director McCarthy added that so far in the rate application that type of anomaly hasn't happened where there had to be a fix negotiated.

Member Bonilla wondered why an average of the data over the year couldn't be used.

Chair Widmer commented that that more or less that is what the Board had asked Recology to do, and this staff report is their response to that request.

Member Aguirre asked why the data collected would be collected that often, and what would be done with the data, and will additional data make a difference, noting that they wouldn't be able to stop road work just because it was time for the route assessment.

Chair Widmer noted that the data collected goes into the allocations in the annual compensation application, and the Board has suggested that if a larger data sample is used the anomalies will trend themselves out. He asked for clarification if Recology is saying these small percentage differences are not having a major impact.

Mike Kelly responded that it's not necessarily true for the smaller agencies, but overall not one jurisdiction's allocations changed by one half of one percent for 2016.

Executive Director McCarthy added that maybe there needs to be a change written in the contract so that if there is an anomaly that has a material effect in any jurisdiction there is a process to deal with that. He also asked Recology to set the goal of coming up with a better way to collect the data that isn't going to cost \$93,000 a year.

Staff Feldman added that the data collection period in the April/May time frame predates the Recology contract, it was chosen to deal with the complexity of the service area and the sharing of routes to maximize efficiency. He also noted the Recology's contract is structured in such a way that they have no incentive or disincentive to be more efficient in one Agency over another, they have incentive to maximize efficiency evenly in every Agency.

Member Benton commented that Recology's lack of incentive or disincentive is the genesis of his concern, noting that they get the compensation they're going to get it only affects the allocation among the jurisdictions, and therefore data collection needs to be done carefully because it does have impact.

Mike Kelly commented that all of the data is reviewed carefully, it is three systems that are manually reviewed, which is why an additional person would be needed for that manual review if the Board wanted to review it for all 12 months.

**10. Shoreway Operations and Contract Management:**

**A. Discussion on Glass Commodity Market Issues Impacting Shoreway Environmental Center Operations (Discussion item)**

Staff Gans noted that the goal of the staff report was to inform the Board of changes in the glass market. He noted that staff is trying to anticipate the costs associated with the glass market changes, and determine all the possible options for managing those changes. He added that once a preferred recommendation is determined, staff will be bringing an approval item back to the Board.

Chair Widmer commented that from the report it looks like there needs to be another truck or maybe more, and he asked if the new truck would be able to have CNG fuel.

Staff Gans responded that a CNG package has not been developed for these bigger tractor trailer trucks yet, CNG is currently only available on smaller collection vehicles. He added that if the recommendation is the SBR buy a truck we would have them search the market to see if CNG is available.

Member Benton asked for further explanation of the freight on board (F.O.B.) transportation option.

Staff Gans noted that this option will require a facilities modification because only specific truck configurations can fit through the tunnel in the transfer station. Contract trucks will likely not fit through that tunnel, so the tunnels would need to be modified to allow for outside trucks to collect the glass directly.

Executive Director McCarthy commented that what would come back to the Board for approval would be one of two capital requests, either the purchase of an additional tractor trailer or facilities modification to allow for F.O.B. trucks that would include adding a conveyance and load out system at the transfer station.

11. **Informational Items Only (no action required)**
  - A. 2015 Finance and Rate Setting Calendar
  - B. Check Register for September 2015
  - C. Potential Future Board Agenda Items
12. **Board Member Comments**
13. **Adjourn 3:23**



## STAFF REPORT

---

**To:** SBWMA Board Members  
**From:** Cliff Feldman, Recycling Programs Manager  
**Date:** November 19, 2015 Board of Directors Meeting  
**Subject:** Consideration of Approval of Extended Producer Responsibility Framework

---

### Recommendation

It is recommended that the SBWMA Board of Directors approve Resolution No. 2015-32 attached hereto supporting Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) Programs and Policy.

### Analysis

At the October 22, 2015 Board of Directors meeting staff was directed to include comments from Board members into the draft resolution supporting extended producer responsibility programs and policy, and to present the resolution for the Board's consideration at the November Board meeting. Subsequent to the October 22 Board meeting, staff received feedback from Board Member Michael Brownrigg, City of Burlingame. Staff and Board Member Brownrigg discussed his proposed revisions to the resolution and two additional 'whereas' statements were included. Mr. Brownrigg's primary concern was to ensure that the EPR policies the JPA supports do not result in a competitive disadvantage to California industries.

Also at the October 22, 2015 Board meeting Ms. Heidi Sanborn, Executive Director of the California Product Stewardship Council, gave a presentation on extended producer responsibility and answered several questions from the Board. As Ms. Sanborn explained, the mission of CPSC is to shift California's product waste management system from one focused on government-funded and rate payer-financed waste diversion to one that relies on producer responsibility in order to reduce public costs and drive improvements in product design that promote environmental sustainability.

### Background

Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) is a mandatory type of product stewardship that includes, at a minimum, the requirement that the producer's responsibility for their product extends to post-consumer management of that product and its packaging. There are two related features of EPR policy: 1) shifting financial and management responsibility, with government oversight, upstream to the producer and away from the public sector; and, 2) providing incentives to producers to incorporate environmental considerations into the design of their products and packaging.

The SBWMA Long Range Plan (LRP) approved by the Board of Directors on June 25, 2015 directed staff to prepare for the Board's consideration an Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) policy resolution to facilitate the JPA's participation in policy discussions and preparation of letters supporting EPR related State legislation and local initiatives. A draft resolution was presented to the Board at their October 22, 2015 Board meeting.

As discussed in the Long Range Plan, adopting an EPR policy resolution will enable the SBWMA to support State and federal efforts to build the environmental costs into the price of products and packaging and then require manufacturers to manage directly and/or participate in a management system for products at the end of their useful life. In addition, approval of the an EPR policy resolution supporting product stewardship provides a more formal way for the SBWMA to participate in discussions related to legislation, issue letters of support or concern, and attend meetings and hearings, as appropriate. In addition, adopting a formal EPR policy in turn supports several LRP guiding principles including:

- Support product stewardship policies and initiatives
- Support local, State and national mandates, including meeting the State's 75% recycling goal by 2020
- Promote behavior change through public education

**Fiscal Impact**

There is no fiscal impact associated with the Board adopting an EPR policy resolution as the JPA's future contributions to further EPR related policy are not anticipated to result in additional expense.

**Attachments:**

Resolution No. 2015-32



## RESOLUTION NO. 2015-32

### RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTH BAYSIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS SUPPORTING EXTENDED PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY PROGRAMS AND POLICY

**WHEREAS**, the Authority is a joint powers agency organized under the Joint Exercise of Powers Act by cities and other local government agencies in San Mateo County (the "Member Agencies"), each of which oversees the collection of solid waste, organic materials and recyclable materials within its jurisdiction; and

**WHEREAS**, the SBWMA's adopted mission is to cost effectively design, implement and manage innovative waste reduction and recycling programs and facility infrastructure that fulfills our fiduciary responsibilities to our Member Agencies while achieving community environmental and economic goals.

**WHEREAS**, on June 25, 2015, the South Bayside Waste Management Authority Board of Directors approved Resolution No. 2015-17 approving the final 2015 Long Range Plan, which includes establishing a policy to support Extended Producer Responsibility programs and policy; and

**WHEREAS**, Extended Producer Responsibility is a policy approach whereby product manufacturers are required to share the responsibility for managing their products in a cost effective and environmentally sound and sustainable manner, including continuously improving products through redesign for durability and repairability, reducing resource depletion and waste, and minimizing toxicity; and,

**WHEREAS**, Extended Producer Responsibility is an effective policy tool to ensure the creation of shared responsibility for manufacturers to mitigate or even eliminate the negative impacts of their products and the end of the products usefulness; and,

**WHEREAS**, In circumstances where the California or Federal judicial system determines by ruling that draft Extended Producer Responsibility legislation unreasonably burdens California manufacturers over others or makes California exports to the rest of the USA more expensive and therefore uncompetitive, the SBWMA Board shall make an explicit determination on whether or not to support such legislation; and,

**WHEREAS**, Many Canadian provinces, all countries of the European Union, Korea, Japan, Israel and some countries in South America including Columbia and Brazil are well ahead of California in requiring manufacturers or brand owners to be responsible for the full life cycle costs of their products and packaging; and,

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the South Bayside Waste Management Authority hereby supports developing and fostering Statewide and national Extended Producer Responsibility related efforts which will benefit ratepayers by ensuring a shared responsibility (between consumers, ratepayers, local governments and manufacturers) for managing discarded products.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** by the Board of Directors of the South Bayside Waste Management Authority, County of San Mateo, State of California on the this **19th** day of **November, 2015**, by the following vote:

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Atherton					Menlo Park				
Belmont					Redwood City				
Burlingame					San Carlos				
East Palo Alto					San Mateo				
Foster City					County of San Mateo				
Hillsborough					West Bay Sanitary Dist.				

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution No. 2015-32 was duly and regularly adopted at a regular meeting of the South Bayside Waste Management Authority on November 19, 2015.

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cyndi Urman, Board Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bill Widmer, Chairperson of SBWMA



## STAFF REPORT

---

**To:** SBWMA Board Members  
**From:** Cyndi Urman, Board Secretary  
**Date:** November 19, 2015 Board of Directors Meeting  
**Subject:** Approval of 2016 Board Meeting Calendar

---

### Recommendation

It is recommended that the SBWMA Board of Directors approve a 2016 Board of Directors meeting calendar.

### Summary

Staff recommends continuing with a 4<sup>th</sup> Thursday meeting as there are not any Member Agency governing body meetings on this day of the week. It should also be noted that CCAG meetings are currently held the 2<sup>nd</sup> Thursday of the month starting at 6:30 pm and ABAG typically meets the third Thursday of every other month. Thus, it would be advisable to continue to schedule SBWMA Board Meetings on the 4<sup>th</sup> Thursday of the month.

### Analysis

The 2 pm time frame on the 4<sup>th</sup> Thursday of the month was chosen to avoid as many regional conflicts as possible.

### Background

The SBWMA Board monthly meetings have historically been held the on the fourth Thursday of the month starting at 2 pm. This day of the week and time was selected so as to minimize any overlap with Member Agency governing body meetings on Monday-Wednesday and other regional government meetings. As requested by the Board of Directors, staff has also checked the national holiday calendar and found no conflicting dates with any major national or religious holidays. In June 2016 there is a League of California Cities Executive forum for Mayors and Council Members from June 22-24 that does conflict with the June Board meeting. Staff sends out the Board packet one-week prior to the Board meeting.

### Fiscal Impact

There is no fiscal impact associated with continuing a monthly meeting calendar.

### Attachments

Attachment A – Proposed 2016 Board Meeting Dates

**SOUTH BAYSIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY**  
**2016 BOARD MEETING SCHEDULE**

Meetings of the South Bayside Waste Management Authority Board of Directors are held on the fourth Thursday of the month from 2:00 pm to 4:00 pm

Location: City of San Carlos Library, 2nd Floor, Conference Room A/B, 610 Elm St., San Carlos, CA 94070

January	28	2016
February	25	2016
March	24	2016
April	28	2016
May	26	2016
June	23	2016
July	28	2016
August	NO MEETING IN AUGUST	
September	22	2016
October	27	2016
November	17* (Third Thursday)	2016
December	NO MEETING IN DECEMBER	

\* The 4<sup>th</sup> Thursday of November falls on the Thanksgiving Holiday; the Board Meeting has been scheduled for the week prior.



## STAFF REPORT

---

**To:** SBWMA Board Members  
**From:** Hilary Gans, Facility Operations Contracts Manager  
**Date:** November 19, 2015 Board of Directors Meeting  
**Subject:** Consideration of Approval for a Contract with JR Miller & Associate for Preliminary Architectural Design of a Transfer Station Building Expansion

---

### Recommendation

It is recommended that the SBWMA Board of Directors approve Resolution No. 2015-31 attached hereto authorizing the following action:

Approval of a contract with JR Miller & Associates for preliminary architectural designs of a transfer station building expansion.

### Summary

The adopted FY1516 budget included funds for completion of a series of activities related to the Long Range Plan mixed waste processing project. JR Miller & Associate (JRMA) has provided a budget and scope of work for 30% design of a transfer station building expansion to accommodate the new mixed waste processing system.

### Analysis

SBWMA staff has been working with JRMA in the preliminary design of the expansion to the transfer station building to accommodate the new mixed waste processing equipment. JRMA has provided a proposal for professional design services that includes the 30% design of the transfer station expansion and the preparation of an engineer's estimate of construction costs. The cost proposal from JRMA for the design and estimation work of a 4,800 square foot building totals \$68,180.

### Background

JRMA was hired by the SBWMA for completion of the 2007 Master Plan project to design the MRF and the self-haul transfer station buildings. The company provided the agency architectural services during the Master Plan design and construction process which continued through early 2011.

At the June 2015 Board meeting, staff presented a Long Range Plan that proposed enhancements to the Shoreway Environmental Center to achieve higher diversion. A plan for a mixed waste processing system coupled with organic materials digestion by Silicon Valley Clean Water was discussed by the Board. At this same meeting the Board adopted a budget that included funds to study the technical and financial feasibility of the project and to development preliminary designs and construction cost estimates. The project envisioned the expansion of the transfer station building to accommodate additional mixed waste processing equipment.

### Fiscal Impact

The cost proposal from JRMA for the design and estimation work totals \$68,180. The adopted FY1516 budget includes the cost of architectural design of the transfer station building in the Long Range Planning budget line item.

### Attachments:

Resolution 2015-31



## RESOLUTION NO. 2015-31

### RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTH BAYSIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH JRMA FOR ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES TO PREPARE PRELIMINARY DESIGN OF THE TRANSFER STATION EXPANSION

**WHEREAS**, the SBWMA's plans to process waste at the transfer station to recover recyclable materials and organics to achieve additional landfill diversion; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board has directed staff to prepare preliminary designs and cost estimates for the building and system design so that a decision can be made whether to proceed with 100% designs; and,

**WHEREAS**, the SBWMA desires to engage JRMA on the 30% design and estimate of the transfer station building expansion.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the South Bayside Waste Management Authority hereby authorizes the Executive Director to enter into a contract with JRMA for architectural services to prepare preliminary design of the transfer station expansion in an amount not to exceed \$68,180.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** by the Board of Directors of the South Bayside Waste Management Authority, County of San Mateo, State of California on the 19<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2015, by the following vote:

Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Agency	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Atherton					Menlo Park				
Belmont					Redwood City				
Burlingame					San Carlos				
East Palo Alto					San Mateo				
Foster City					County of San Mateo				
Hillsborough					West Bay Sanitary Dist.				

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution No. 2015-31 was duly and regularly adopted at a regular meeting of the South Bayside Waste Management Authority on November 19, 2015.

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bill Widmer, Chairperson of SBWMA

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cyndi Urman, Board Secretary