

APPENDIX M

February 2 PAC Meeting Minutes



Project Advisory Committee (PAC)

Meeting Minutes from Wednesday, February 2, 2005

INTRODUCTIONS

SWA Team Members in Attendance

- Pat Quinn, GreenCycle Project Manager, Sacramento Regional Solid Waste Authority (SWA)
- Claudia Goss, SWA Communications and Media Officer
- Janet Goodrich, Project Manager, CH2M Hill
- Michele McCormick, Principal, MMC Communications

PAC Members in Attendance

- Bill Gibson, Sacramento Environmental Commission and Sacramento Cities/County Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Member Representing Sacramento County
- Paul Gumbinger, Rancho Murieta Association
- Wendell Kido, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD)
- Cortez Quinn, Sacramento County Board of Supervisors Chief of Staff, Office of Roger Dickinson
- Don White, Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Member
- Lois Wright, Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD)

Non-PAC Members in Attendance

- John Lundgren, County of Sacramento Planning Department
- Ruth MacDougall, Sacramento Metropolitan Utility District (SMUD)

Handouts

- Agenda
- Updated Site Screening Process Funnel Diagram
- Updated Siting Criteria Scoring Figure
- Comparative Results Figure

COMMENTS ON MEETING MINUTES

The PAC agreed that the minutes from the fourth meeting were sufficient.

AGENDA REVIEW

Michele McCormick reviewed the evening's agenda with the PAC.

WEB SITE REVIEW

Claudia Goss gave an update on the Sacramento GreenCycle web site (www.sacgreencycle.com). A number of improvements and additions have been made to the site. These include additional hotlinks, reorganization of the site structure and more comprehensive information. At meeting time, the improvements are visible only on the test site. However the updated version is expected to go live early the week of February 7.

REVIEW DEC. 9, 2004 SWA BOARD MEETING COMMENTS

Pat Quinn reviewed the direction given by the SWA Board at the December meeting. At that meeting, SWA asked that the Blueprint map be used to revise the shortlist results. Pat explained that the purpose of the current PAC meeting is to approve the resulting revised shortlist.

The GreenCycle Project technical team has re-evaluated the sites and re-visited the prospective site shortlist based on the Blueprint map.

Janet Goodrich explained the revision process. All non-fatal flawed sites were re-evaluated against the new Blueprint mapping for future land use. As was done for the initial site scoring process, if a site scored higher than a value of 1 on compatibility with future land use given the new Blueprint, that site was retained for evaluation against the remaining criteria. That is because this score indicated a greater distance from projected future residential development.

This process created a significantly different result, and left 29 sites for further evaluation. This is because the areas of projected residential development are quite different if the SACOG Preferred Option Blueprint model is implemented versus the base case Blueprint. The Preferred Option mapping projects more extensive residential development in the area around Galt, and less along the White Rock corridor.

Pat explained that when the 29 sites were scored using all criteria, a shortlist of 14 potential sites resulted. The Siting Team reviewed the site scores and agreed that 650 points presented a clear breakpoint for inclusion of sites on the shortlist.

The three co-location sites remain. These are SMUD Rancho Seco, Kiefer Landfill and the Wastewater Treatment Plant. The SMUD Rancho Seco site also scored well on its own.

Under this process, two previously selected sites are removed and five new ones are added. The two previous sites were removed for different reasons. Site 116 scored lower because of the projected residential development around Galt, placing its score below the 650-point threshold. Site 37 became fatally flawed in that it was purchased by the International Airport using FAA funds, and this use would not be permissible given FAA guidelines.

Janet pointed out the five new shortlist sites on a map, by designating them in yellow. They are near the offroad vehicle park, adjacent to Kiefer Landfill and in North Natomas.

John pointed out that sites 120 and 121 are in the Natomas Visioning Area.

Lois asked for more detail about the exact location of each site – a physical description of the five new sites. **Pat** said a table presenting this information will be developed and distributed to the PAC.

Wendell asked about the location of Easton development relative to White Rock Road sites. He pointed out that there are now more sites closer in. The group generally discussed our understanding of where the Easton development would be located.

Having sites closer to the population and waste centroid could be cost effective, according to **Pat**. Several of the new sites are freeway close.

Paul and Mark have discussed distance to centroid at past PAC meetings and want to make sure it is considered further as the siting process continues.

Pat said some future road plans could make some of the sites even more accessible.

Lois pointed out that three new sites ended up with higher scores than any previous sites. This is largely based on access.

Janet said the big difference is the change in residential areas, and a lack of conflicting uses along the access road.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH RECOMMENDATION

Michele discussed the next steps in the community outreach process. These steps include:

1. Meet with CPACs in each area
2. Identify adjacent landowners and affect stakeholders near each site.
3. Briefing meetings with those stakeholders

4. Coordinate additional stakeholders for targeted outreach through coordination with Board member staffs, homeowner associations, and others.
5. Expand the PAC membership to include representatives from potentially neighboring areas.

Paul pointed out that there is no Chamber of Commerce in some areas, and it's important to identify additional key groups.

Lois asked if the new sites are publicly or privately owned, and what is the expected result of the outreach process. **Pat** and **Janet** reviewed general information on site ownership.

Pat said new members would help us narrow down the shortlist. He reviewed the schedule and plan for future PAC meetings. He said his goal is to make a site recommendation by May, as June is budget month.

Paul requested a large version of the map to present to Rancho Murieta HOA. This was provided. **Cortez** also requested the large map. **Lois** was provided with a copy of the large map.

Lois asked when we would stop using the current number designations for each site.

Paul pointed out that first it's important to show the Board we've sifted through many sites. He proposed that the current shortlist be adopted, and suggested that CPAC chairs be asked to join the SWA PAC.

Janet asked the PAC to let us know of any particular concerns with any site or for the process in general as we move forward in the siting process.

Paul is concerned that the Blueprint plan, while adopted, may not actually be implemented. He is also concerned about travel distance to some of the sites.

Lois suggests we look at lists with the site description and add a line or two about buffer requirements, as relevant to Blueprint.

Paul pointed out that at some point the PAC will have to seriously narrow down the list to two or three sites. He said one key characteristic might be a willing seller, as well as funding to purchase a site.

Pat estimated that more than \$2.5 million is currently spent on green waste processing (given fuel costs and trucking distance), and that savings may help fund the purchase of a site.

Paul asked if there are any particular environmental issues on any of these sites, and suggested this be looked at very early.

Janet said that the shortlisted sites generally scored high, meaning little to no expected significant environmental issues. A few of the sites have known

environmental issues that would need to be resolved or further evaluated. This review is part of what we would anticipate for the site-specific evaluation process.

John said he has looked at the sites and seen no “stopper” issues.

Pat said it would now be easier to take a more detailed look at the shorter list.

Lois said that if the site is leased, that could be an advantage, as at the end of a long lease there may well be a new process for green waste recycling/management. One additional advantage of leasing a site would be the possibility to have less up front capital needed.

CONSENSUS

Michele asked the group if there is consensus.

The group agreed to consensus, assuming all conditions discussed are adhered to.

Paul pointed out that the analysis conducted to date has been quantitative, and the group should accept it because its views are subjective. Later, there will be more detailed analysis.

Pat said the ultimate project must come in cost effectively, and not be a nuisance.

It was discussed that some people may have sites they wish to offer, and that these will be evaluated and subject to the same criteria as any site.

NEXT STEPS

1. Meet with CPACs
2. Expand PAC membership by inviting CPAC Chairs and other key stakeholders to join
3. Go live with revised web site