

APPENDIX O

March 17 PAC Meeting Minutes



Project Advisory Committee (PAC)

Meeting Minutes from Thursday, March 17, 2005

INTRODUCTIONS

SWA Team Members in Attendance

- Pat Quinn, Sacramento GreenCycle Project Manager, Sacramento Regional Solid Waste Authority (SWA)
- Kelli Sequest, Associate Recycling Specialist, Department of Waste Management & Recycling
- Janet Goodrich, Project Manager, CH2M Hill
- Michele McCormick, Principal, MMC Communications
- Jennifer Tencati, Sr. Account Executive, 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
- Tom May, Southeast Area CPAC
- Bob Moynihan, M.D., Sutter Medical Center
- Cortez Quinn, Sacramento County Board of Supervisors Chief of Staff, Office of Roger Dickinson
- Keith Roberts, ECOS, City of Sacramento
- Jane Smith, Sacramento County Board of Supervisors Chief of Staff, Office of Don Nottoli
- Joe Tudesko, Cosumnes CPAC
- Don White, Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Member
- Mark White, Pacific Waste Consulting Group
- Lois Wright, Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD)

Non-PAC Members in Attendance

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

- B.G. Tackett, Total Compliance Management

Handouts

- Agenda
- Siting Shortlist Recommendation Map
- Background on Anticipated Site-Specific Criteria
- Staff Report to SWA Board (March 10, 2005)
- Letters of Support from:
 - Carl Hauge, Chairman, Sacramento Cities and County SWAC/LTF
 - Mark White, President, Pacific Waste Consulting Group
 - Paul Gumbinger, President, Rancho Murieta Association
 - Trent Smith, President, Rosemont Community Association
- Updated Site Screening Process Funnel Diagram
- Siting Criteria Worksheet

COMMENTS ON MEETING MINUTES

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

AGENDA REVIEW

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

REVIEW PROJECT STATUS

Pat Quinn reviewed the project status to bring all PAC members up-to-date and answer any questions the new PAC members had. Items Pat reviewed included:

- Started with over 150 sites.
- Started outreach last fall, met with stakeholders and developed PAC.
- Held a series of four PAC meetings.
- Pat reviewed the Mission Statement/Siting Criteria Worksheet (wall chart & handout) stating that these are the goals and criteria the PAC previously developed to use against the shortlist of sites.
- Pat briefly explained the Funnel Diagram handout and the steps the project has taken to get us where we are today.
- Pat explained that the Project Team presented a shortlist of sites to the SWA Board at its December 9, 2004 meeting. The shortlist was developed using the SACOG base case blueprint map. The SWA Board informed the Project Team that it has just adopted the preferred blueprint scenario and directed the Project Team to go back and re-evaluate the sites based on the preferred map. This process is how we arrived at the current shortlist of candidate sites.
- Pat explained that tonight's goal is for the PAC to develop the criteria that it will use to evaluate the shortlist of 14 sites. Once developed, the PAC will

then determine the weighting for the criteria in order to identify the preferred site or sites to carry into the environmental process.

Joe Tudesko asked why the Project Team didn't talk with the CPACS to see if they want the facility in their area, if they're doing anything with that land, etc. It would eliminate sites and see if there are any complaints about the candidate locations.

Paul Gumbinger said, "That's why you're here, to give us those comments." **Pat** said that Project Team members have been presenting at the CPACs and will be presenting at the Cosumnes CPAC on March 23, the earliest date we could get on the agenda. Pat also stated that sites have been identified based on a number of criteria from the first series of PAC meetings, such as site size and bufferlands that would accommodate the project, downwind areas and residential impact. **Mark White** stated that by looking at the list again with the preferred map, is how we got sites in less developed areas.

Lois Wright reminded the group that we are here tonight to develop and weigh criteria to put against the shortlist of 14 sites.

REVIEW & DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED SITE-SPECIFIC CRITERIA

Paul thought the PAC had already narrowed it down to three categories: environmental issues, transportation and cost. **Lois** responded that at a minimum, yes those should be included.

Janet Goodrich suggested she review the Siting Criteria Worksheet for the PAC. She explained how the criteria weighting process works, and that it would be comparable to the process the PAC used last time.

Tom May said that when looking at the results, the sites' scores are all within 10 percent of each other and wanted to know what that meant. **Pat** said our shortlist of 14 sites had the highest scores. The rest fell below the threshold of 650 points, which caused them to drop-off the final list.

Lois said she didn't see "Maximize Site Feasibility" as a goal and wanted to know what was separate about permitting. **Janet** briefly reviewed the three co-location facilities on the shortlist: SMUD Rancho Seco, Kiefer, and the Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant. Janet stated that in permitting, when we talk about a co-location site, it could trigger a series of permitting issues that could make it not feasible. **Lois & Paul** stated that they felt they couldn't weigh this because they don't know enough about the permitting process and what you could run into. **Pat** stated that when talking about changing the permit for a co-location site, it's like opening Pandora's box again, in regard to trying to get another permit for a different use of the land.

Tom stated that he appreciated Paul's comments in the PAC #5 minutes that Jackson Highway is narrow; Twin Cities Road is narrower than Jackson in many areas.

Tom stated that he didn't see any private industry input in the process and asked if their input would help to narrow down the shortlist. He asked **Mark White** if he was from the private sector. **Mark** stated that he is a consultant and that most private companies would prefer to site a facility themselves and they could do so much quicker. **Pat** noted that the private sector does not go through the same lengthy process that we are going through because this is a public-sector project.

Tom said that we might want to add the road's need for maintenance/improvements to the list of criteria.

Paul informed the PAC that there is a County study going on for Jackson Road, which has developed a list of needed improvements – all of which are unfunded – making sites along 5 and 99 desirable.

Mark expanded on Lois' comment regarding "Maximize Site Feasibility." He stated that he thought the PAC should rank the criterion and not the goals. **Lois** stated that if it's going to be the goals, she recommended putting "Permitting" under "Land Use."

The **PAC** discussed the use of dots in the weighting process and several members stated they would like to use fewer dots to weigh the criteria.

Mark asked the group, "Why are we looking at some of these criteria again?" **Janet** stated that it's because we have more information now and that we'll be looking at community plans, draft plans, city plans, etc. **Lois** stated that sometimes we might run into conflict between the SACOG map and community plans.

Paul asked why we're taking a more conservative approach by looking at community plans and not just go with the SACOG preferred map as directed by the SWA Board. **Janet** said it was because she'd like to acknowledge additional information from community plans. **Paul** agreed, but doesn't want to be in the spot again where the Board directs us to go back and look at it again.

Herb Garms asked why we didn't eliminate agriculture land. **Pat** stated it was because the PAC came at it from a different perspective, staying away from residential. He also noted that Zoning Compatibility could be a criterion.

B.G. Tackett stated that he is from the private sector. He said that the private sector is not here because this process takes too long. The company he's with represents the private sector and could do this siting process in about two weeks. He suggested adding "Soil Suitability" as criterion under environmental impacts. He also stated that the State/Regional Water Board considers composting as a potential for water contamination.

Lois suggested placing "Soil Suitability" under "Minimize Environmental Impacts" and "Minimize Site-Related Program Costs." **Janet** said that we shouldn't put it under both because we don't want to score and weigh criteria two times, resulting in more associated total score.

Paul asked, “What if we go back to the three goals: environmental issues, transportation and cost. **Lois** said that she didn’t agree with that method.

Lois asked who pays for the cost of transportation/haul distance to the site...SWA? **Pat** confirmed that the SWA member agencies pay for it. **Lois** asked if we should pull that out on the matrix and call it “Fuel Cost/Transportation Cost.”

Paul thought that the PAC should perhaps weigh the eight categories of criteria (after moving “Permitting” under “Land Use”). **Pat** asked if there was a general PAC consensus to weigh the eight categories as **Paul** suggested. **Mark** said no, but he thought some of the criteria should be combined.

Michele stated that there has been a lot of good general talk and asked for thoughts.

Paul moved to use the eight criteria categories.

Lois asked if they use the eight, could they score on a scale of 1-10, rather than 1-5. **Pat** said that last time, the Project Team measured the haul distance and assigned a score of 1-5. **Janet** gave an example of how this was done:

0-5 miles = 1pt
5-10 miles = 2pts
10-15 miles = 3pts

Michele asked to do a “lightning round,” going around the table quickly to hear everyone’s thoughts.

- **Bob Moynihan** said it would be difficult to weigh the criteria because people will look at them against each site very differently. **Michele** asked isn’t part of that addressed by developing criteria first, without looking at the sites? **Bob** responded yes, but that you’re getting too microscopic. He thinks we’ll have to just open the discussion and wrestle with the merits of each site. He also said that there is a lot of detail on each site that will weigh heavily in people’s minds.
- **Don White** said that he thought something was missing.
- **Keith Roberts** said he likes the idea of the eight categories, and that he worries about the sites that are close to the edge of the County line.
- **Jane Smith** said that if we were looking at different sites, she’d want to know more about the sites before weighting them.
- **Cortez Quinn** likes the eight categories and likes **Paul** and **Mark**’s comments.
- **Bill Gibson** said he was trying to sort it all out by looking at environmental impacts. For him, the environment is the keystone for everything. **Bill** questioned the statement about a 30-year life of the project, stating that it would influence buying or leasing a site.
- **Joe Tudesko** asked if most of the waste would come from the City of Sacramento and Citrus Heights. **Pat** responded that about 40% would come from the City of Sacramento, 50% from the County and about 10% from Citrus Heights. **Mark** said that only one waste centroid had been identified, so it looks like most of the waste is coming from one area. **Joe** asked why

we don't hire B.G.'s company and that he likes B.G.'s comments. **Mark** said that Pat's predecessor thought that public outreach was listening to public comment at the Board meeting, and that this is a good process.

- **Tom May** agreed on the process we're going through. He said that he liked the eight categories, however, he felt that transportation is of enough importance to warrant a ninth category. Tom felt that the distance traveled on surface streets is as important as the distance traveled on highways. Tom asked if the private sector could help us narrow down our shortlist of sites.
- **Lois Wright** said she likes the eight categories and asked for clarification on Tom's suggestion of a ninth category, transportation. She said that if it is that important, we should give it a higher weight.
- **Paul Gumbinger** said he was anxious to get going and decide. We've already had so many meetings, we're losing momentum and need to keep going. He likes the eight categories and suggested that if we're decided on the eight, the PAC should weight them and bring in a filled-out weight sheet to the next meeting.

Michele reviewed that tonight the goal was to identify the criteria we want to consider and at the next PAC meeting we would review that criteria with the weighting exercise, then staff would evaluate the sites against the criteria, based on the PAC's weights.

Mark commented that by lumping all of these criteria into eight categories, we lose true feelings about individual criteria, which is why he thinks the PAC should have more criteria to weigh.

Michele suggested walking through the eight categories to see if there are any other criteria that the PAC feels should be pulled out into its own category. Staff and PAC discussed the individual items on the Siting Criteria Worksheet.

- Upon discussing several items, **Pat** said he was hearing two elements of transportation as important to the PAC: 1) cost and 2) safety (road conditions/social impacts). In addition he confirmed the PAC was suggesting removing the "Distance to closest disposal site (for disposal of residual)" criterion from the "Transportation Impacts" category.
- **Paul and Mark** suggested taking off the "Time frame for this development" criterion under the "Future Land Use Compatibility" category.
- **Staff** confirmed moving the "Known potential permit obstacles" criterion from the "Permitting" category (eliminating that category completely), and moving it under the "Future Land Use Compatibility" category.
- **Bob** asked if staff could identify any "red flag" issues before the PAC weighs the criteria. He said the PAC doesn't have enough knowledge about some of these topics to make the best decision on how to rank them. **Pat** commented that Bob's request was much like the fatal flaw conversation we had at the beginning of the whole process.

Herb Garms asked if the project staff has spoke with the landowners yet about the project. **Pat** said that staff is in the process of contacting the landowners. **B.G.**

confirmed that we have to go through this process and must talk with the landowners.

Paul and Lois suggested that the project staff email the criteria chart to the PAC members (before the next PAC meeting). The PAC members would then weigh all of the criteria (not just the eight categories); the project staff would compile the weights and tally the outcome at the next PAC meeting.

Janet suggested giving the PAC as many dots as there are criteria for the weighting exercise.

Pat said that if we followed this suggested weighting process; at the next meeting staff would present a table with all of the weights for review and discussion.

NEXT STEPS

- Project team to email criteria weighting chart to the PAC members.
- PAC members can review and weigh criteria in advance with criteria weighing exercise to be performed at next PAC meeting.
- Project team to bring a chart of the criteria categories to the next PAC meeting for compiling the weighting.

NEXT PAC MEETINGS

Dates:

PAC #7 – Wednesday, April 6, 2005

PAC #8 – Wednesday, April 27, 2005

Location:

County of Sacramento Department of Water Quality
10545 Armstrong Avenue
1st Floor, Conference Room #170
Mather, CA 95655

Note: Dinner will be served.