

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

Meeting Minutes

Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Five-Year Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) Update

Date: Wednesday, September 4, 2019

Attendees: Committee Members: Lillian Clark, Tammy Del Bene, Monica Devincenzi, Charles Ice, Christine Kohl-Zaugg (Vice Chair), Joe La Mariana, Barbra Mathewson, Roxanne Murray, Adam Rak, Ann Schneider (Chair), Vicki Sherman, Gordon Tong

Others in attendance: Joanna Chen (Menlo Park), Kirk Gharda (Redwood City), Eun-Soo Lim (staff)

Not in attendance: Committee Members: Rebecca Lucky, Stephen Stolte

Location: 400 County Center, 1st Floor, Sheriff's Criminal Justice Training Room, Redwood City, CA

Call to Order: 10:10 AM

1. Introductions

2. Public comment for items not on the agenda

No public comment was provided to the committee.

3. Approval of minutes of August 23, 2019 meeting

Mr. Ice pointed out three corrections:

- Page 4 of Agenda Package:
 - i. Section 5. Review of CIWMP Household Hazardous Waste Element – second paragraph.
 - 1. “The County’s Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) program is a very mature program that includes HHW collection events, a permanent collection facility at Tower Road (by appointment only), a Very Small Quantity Generator (VSQG) Program, an HHQ giveaway program,

retail take back program, and door-to-door collection for those with limited mobility.”

- a. Correction 1: “HHQ” should be replaced “HHW”
2. “The HHW characterization team identifies unknown materials discovered by first responders.”
 - a. Correction 2: “HHW” should be replaced with HMER (Hazardous Material Emergency Response)
- ii. Section 5. Review of CIWMP Household Hazardous Waste Element – 6th paragraph.
 1. “Ms. Mathewson commented that sharps are a problem because there is no place to dispose of them on the coast. Mr. Ice replied that sharps are a physical hazard and medical waste, not a hazardous waste. He stated that there is pending new legislation (SB 212) that would address sharps.”
 - a. Correction 3: “Pending” should be removed. SB 212 has already been adopted and signed into law.

Vice Chair Kohl-Zaugg pointed out one correction:

- Page 5 of Agenda Package:
 - i. Section 5. Review of CIWMP Household Hazardous Waste Element – first sentence at top of page.
 1. “Chair Schneider commented that elected officials is usually unaware of the details of existing programs and asked how the County ensures that non-South Bayside Waste Management Agency (SBWMA) cities receive information about HHW.”
 - a. Correction 4: The “is” in “Chair Schneider commented that elected officials is...” should be replaced with “are.”

With these corrections, Ms. Mathewson moved and Ms. Del Bene seconded approval of the August 23, 2019 meeting minutes. Motion passed unanimously (absent: Mr. La Mariana, Mr. Rak, Ms. Devincenzi, Ms. Murray).

4. Continued discussion of the review of the CIWMP Household Hazardous Waste Element

Mr. Tong provided clarification and additional information on medical waste (including sharps) and in which element of the CIWMP it falls under. Medical waste falls under the Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) and not the Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE). However, the current information in the SRRE focuses mainly on medical waste generated by hospitals and research centers and not those generated by households (medical waste generated by households are actually exempt from the CIWMP). A recommendation by the committee to include programs for proper sharps disposal, including those generated from households in the future revised CIWMP was included in the draft letters of findings for the C/CAG Board.

Chair Schneider stated she is interested in the possibility of collaborating and including the

five cities that were not part of the original joint countywide process (Millbrae, South San Francisco, San Bruno, Brisbane, Pacifica) in the next revision of the CIWMP. One main concern that was raised by City of Millbrae staff during Chair Schneider's discussion with them regarding this possibility was the potential cost for the cities to join this effort. Chair Schneider also asked how the HHWE would be impacted if the five cities decide to join the joint countywide effort. Chair Schneider has concerns that the existing HHWE may not be adequate in distributing and getting the word out about existing programs for HHW.

Mr. Ice responded stating that the County promotes and offers the same services to all cities across the county regardless of whether they were part of the original joint CIWMP or not, as detailed out in the HHWE. Therefore, the integration of the five cities in the revision of the CIWMP would not warrant any changes to the existing HHWE.

Mr. La Mariana concurred with Chair Schneider that offering the five cities to join the joint countywide plan would be a good idea, so that the CIWMP can truly be representative of the entire county.

Both Chair Schneider and Ms. Sherman questioned whether joining the joint countywide effort will free up staff time, since the County will be leading the effort on the revision of the CIWMP. Ms. Clark stated that city staff involvement will still be necessary to some level for developing the joint countywide plan even if the effort is headed by the County.

Chair Schneider also stated that she could not locate the CIWMP on the OOS website. Mr. Tong stated that all of the elements of the CIWMP are up and now available on the OOS website (<https://www.smcsustainability.org/waste-reduction/reduce-reuse-recycle/#countywide-integrated-waste-management-plan>). Having these documents available on the OOS website was one of the recommendations provided by the recent Grand Jury report, which investigated the need for the County to revise and update its CIWMP. Mr. La Mariana stated that it's the 2018-2019 Grand Jury that released this report. Ms. Clark stated that the Grand Jury report recommends that all elements in the CIWMP be revised.

5. Approval of Ad Hoc Committee Letters of Findings for C/CAG Board Approval

Mr. Tong stated that based on discussions held during the previous committee meetings, staff have drafted four Letters of Findings from C/CAG to CalRecycle and the County of San Mateo for the committee's approval. Upon approval, two letters will be submitted to the C/CAG Board of Directors as the committee's recommendation for submittal to CalRecycle and the County, respectively.

In previous committee meetings, direction was given to staff to draft letters recommending changes to the Source Reduction and Recycling Elements (SRREs), the countywide Siting Element (HHWEs), and the Non-Disposal Facility Element (NDFEs). However, it was unclear what the direction was for the Household Hazardous Waste Elements (HHWEs). As a result, staff have prepared two versions of the letters to CalRecycle and the County for the committee's consideration.

Version 1 of the letters recommend revisions to all elements with the exception of the HHWEs, whereas Version 2 of the letters recommends a revision to the HHWEs.

Mr. La Mariana stated that he defers to Mr. Ice and his recommendation on how to proceed with the HHWE, since HHW is Mr. Ice's area of expertise. Mr. Ice again stated that the HHWE is still adequate, and improvements to programs are a part of the process and can be done without updating the HHWE. He stated that the CIWMP is designed to illustrate the process rather than being descriptive of all the programs. He recommends that the committee find that there is no need to update the HHWE. In reference to the draft Version 2 letter, Mr. Ice also stated that universal and electronic waste, although not specifically called out as bulleted items in the HHWE, still fall under the umbrella of HHW, so is being managed by the County.

Mr. Rak stated that he now feels comfortable with the existing HHWE and does not feel that it needs to be updated since staff clarified that sharps will be covered under the SRRE.

Ms. Del Bene asked if one of the bullets specifically around post-usage fate of e-waste and its tracking is a feasible recommendation for the committee to include in the letters of findings. Ms. Clark stated that tracking of e-waste and recyclables in general, especially if shipped to other countries was one of the recommendations made by the Grand Jury in their report.

Chair Schneider asked if the draft letters captured all the recommendations provided by the Grand Jury. Mr. Ice stated that one recommendation that's not included in the draft letters is the public posting of all relevant CIWMP documents on the OOS website. However, given that OOS has already taken up this recommendation and now has available on its website all CIWMP documents, there does not seem to be a need to include that in the draft letters.

Vice Chair Kohl-Zaugg asked whether the education and outreach programs in the CIWMP need to be updated. Mr. Tong responded by saying that since the education and outreach section of the SRRE will be part of the revision of the plan in the future, he feels that it is not necessary to include additional educational and outreach program update recommendations in the draft letters.

Mr. Tong read the summary of the grand jury response's recommendations to the committee. The recommendations are provided below:

1. Updated descriptions of solid waste management facilities and programs implemented by the County, local jurisdictions, and their private franchise holders.
2. Goals, objectives, policies and implementation measures that reflect the overall 75 percent waste diversion target contained in AB 341 (2011), the 75 percent organics waste diversion target contained in SB 1383 (2016), the 20 percent edible food diversion target contained in SB 1383 (2016), and consider the more aggressive waste diversion targets contained in the CAPs adopted by several San Mateo County jurisdictions, including the goal of "zero-waste."

3. Possible policies related to the impact of waste management practices in San Mateo County on the global environment, including emissions of methane from landfills, and the environmental and social impacts that may occur when the county's recyclables are exported to other nations with the less stringent environmental and worker protection practices than in the United States.
4. Environmental justice concerns as they relate to solid waste management decision-making by local jurisdictions in this county.
5. A strategy and schedule for providing additional landfill capacity after year 2034, when the county's Ox Mountain landfill is projected to reach its current permitted capacity.
6. A County ordinance banning the disposal of green waste and possibly other organics at the Ox Mountain landfill, in order to support organic waste diversion programs and conserve landfill capacity.
7. Whether the Office of Sustainability should implement additional countywide programs including public education and technical assistance related to waste diversion. The CIWMP should also consider whether the Office of Sustainability should coordinate the rescue of edible food waste at the countywide level.
8. The Grand Jury recommends that C/CAG, in its role as the Local Task Force, participate with the County Office of Sustainability in revising the CIWMP.
9. The Grand Jury recommends that the San Mateo County Office of Sustainability make the existing 1999 CIWMP and all Five-Year Reviews available to the public on its website by September 30, 2019 and place the revised CIWMP on its website after it is drafted and adopted by the County Board of Supervisors.

The committee vetted the additional draft recommendations for any future revision of the CIWMP that were bulleted in the draft letters. The agreed upon recommendations for edits to the bulleted recommendations are summarized below:

1. Original text: "Strategies to help understand the post-usage fate of electronic waste, specifically around how they are disposed of and how they are handled at their final destination"
 - a. Edit to: Strategies to help understand the post-usage fate of waste, specifically around how they are processed/disposed of and how they are handled at their final destination
2. Original text: "Strategies for reviving the recycling markets"
 - a. Edit to: "Strategies for supporting domestic and international markets for reusables and recycling as well as job creation."
3. Original text: "Management of proper sharps disposal, including those generated from households"
 - a. Broaden to all medical waste, not just sharps
4. Original text: "Strategies and programs for addressing food and beverage packaging"
 - a. Broaden to product and shipping packaging, not just food and beverage packaging
5. Original text: "Re-emphasis of the importance of source reduction and organics composting in diverting waste"
 - a. Edit to: "Re-emphasis of the importance of source reduction". Then combine it with the organics composting content into subsequent bullet

recommendation.

6. Integrate “reuse” every time “recycle” solutions are mentioned in the recommendations.
7. Include a bullet on environmental justice concerns related to solid waste management decision-making
8. Include a bullet for collaborating and including the five cities (if they are interested) that were not part of the original joint countywide process in the next revision of the CIWMP
9. Ensure the recommendations made by the committee are in line with the Grand Jury Report
 - a. Mr. Tong stated that the only item that has not yet been addressed in the recommendations by the committee listed in the draft letters is meeting relevant post-1999 state legislations around waste reduction (e.g., AB 341, AB 1826, SB 1383, etc.) that have not been included in the CIWMP.

Mr. La Mariana motioned to approve Version 1 of the draft letters (HHWE is still adequate and revision is not recommended). Ms. Devincenzi seconded.

Mr. La Mariana stated that he believes the County is conscientious in rotating the various services it offers, including HHW programs, to all cities in the county, including the smaller cities.

Chair Schneider stated that she cannot recollect an HHW event being held in Millbrae, which implies that there must be gaps in the current HHWE, especially in terms of education and outreach. She stated that the smaller jurisdictions in the county do not have sufficient resources to get the word out to their communities about existing HHW programs.

Ms. Murray stated that she distinctly remembers that Millbrae was selected for an HHW pilot program some years ago.

Ms. Del Bene stated that many community members are not fully aware of HHW programs that exist in the county. Instead of revising the HHWE, she recommends having available on the County website all existing HHW programs. This may help get the word out about available HHW programs in the county.

Ms. Clark recommended not revising the entire HHWE but reviewing the education and outreach efforts for HHW programs.

Mr. La Mariana withdrew his motion for Version 1 of the draft letters (HHWE is still adequate and revision is not recommended). Ms. Devincenzi also withdrew her second motion.

Chair Schneider motioned to approve Version 2 of the draft letters (revision to the HHWE is recommended). Ms. Devincenzi seconded. Below are the results of the vote:

- 3 “Yes” votes
 - i. Chair Schneider, Vice Chair Kohl-Zaugg, Ms. Mathewson

- 8 “No” votes
 - i. Ms. Del Bene, Ms. Devincenzi, Mr. La Mariana, Mr. Ice, Ms. Murray, Mr. Rak, Ms. Sherman, Mr. Tong
- 1 “Abstain” vote
 - i. Ms. Clark

Mr. La Mariana motioned to approve Version 1 of the draft letters (HHWE is still adequate and revision is not recommended). Ms. Murray seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Adjourn: 12:00 PM