

APPENDIX Q

## April 6 PAC Meeting Minutes

---



## **Project Advisory Committee (PAC)**

### **Meeting Minutes from Wednesday, April 06, 2005**

#### **INTRODUCTIONS**

##### **SWA Team Members in Attendance**

- Janet Goodrich, Project Manager, CH2M Hill
- Claudia Goss, SWA Communications and Media Officer
- Michele McCormick, Principal, MMC Communications
- Pat Quinn, Sacramento GreenCycle Project Manager, Sacramento Regional Solid Waste Authority (SWA)
- Kelli Sequest, Associate Recycling Specialist, Department of Waste Management & Recycling
- Jill Sideman, Vice President, CH2M Hill
- Jennifer Tencati, Sr. Account Executive, MMC Communications

##### **PAC Members in Attendance**

- Bryan DeBlonk, Natomas Community Planning Advisory Council
- Bill Gibson, Sacramento Environmental Commission and Sacramento Cities/County Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Member Representing Sacramento County
- Paul Gumbinger, Rancho Murieta Association
- Wenedll Kido, SRCSD
- Tom May, Southeast Area CPAC
- Keith Roberts, ECOS, City of Sacramento
- Albert Stricker, City of Rancho Cordova
- Joe Tudesko, Cosumnes CPAC
- Don White, Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Member
- Mark White, Pacific Waste Consulting Group

##### **Non-PAC Members in Attendance**

- Herb Garms, Cosumnes CPAC
- John Lundgren, County of Sacramento Planning Department
- Ruth MacDougall, Sacramento Metropolitan Utility District (SMUD)
- Karen Muldoon, Editor and Publisher, Murieta Publishing LLC
- Cortez Quinn, Sacramento County Board of Supervisors Chief of Staff, Office of Roger Dickinson
- Jane Smith, Sacramento County Board of Supervisors Chief of Staff, Office of

- Don Nottoli
- B.G. Tackett, Total Compliance Management
- Joel Weeden, CorPAC & Rosemont Community Association

### **Handouts**

- Agenda
- PowerPoint Presentation
- Weighting Activity Sheet

## **COMMENTS ON MEETING MINUTES**

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

## **AGENDA REVIEW**

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

## **WEIGHTING EXERCISE FOR SITE SHORTLIST EVALUATION**

**Jill Sideman** reviewed the PowerPoint presentation on weighting the categories and the criteria, why the weighting process is important, and how the weights will be used in ranking the potential candidate sites. She also explained that all of the categories and criteria on the weighting activity sheet would receive a minimum value of one point so that there will not be any category or criterion with zero points. Therefore, when the sites have been scored against the weighted criteria, none of the sites will "zero out." Also, to be consistent, each criterion and category will receive a base value of one point; so one point will be added to each score.

**Paul Gumbinger** was concerned about having so many categories. He gave the example that transportation was broken into two categories with several criteria under each category; and asked if this is double-counting transportation. Also Paul noted that it would be best to just weight the categories, not the criteria in each category. **Jill** said that at the last PAC meeting, it sounded like people felt it was important to be able to assign weightings to both the categories and the criteria under some of the categories. Jill also noted that typically just the categories are weighted.

**Mark White** said that he emailed his scores in and wanted to know if he should vote again, or if his submitted vote would be sufficient. **Pat Quinn** said that two people emailed their scores in and that we would add those scores to the chart.

**Keith Roberts** said that he saw three categories on cost and that to him \$1 is \$1. He asked what the relative costs of the different options were. **Pat** said that since the largest component of the cost is trucking, we are applying miles from the transfer points to judge one component of cost. **Herb Garms** asked what the cost per mile is. **Mark** said that the current cost is \$1.53 per mile.

**Paul** thought we were going to try and narrow the list down to two or three sites. **Pat** confirmed his thought.

**Janet Goodrich** said the project team is trying to look at factors that we know right now will impact cost and that can be evaluated at this time when comparing the sites. For example, we know that truck transportation is a significant cost.

Dot stickers were handed out to the PAC members to use in the weighting process.

**Jill** reviewed the large size weighting activity sheet on the wall (same as the one emailed to the PAC before the meeting). She said that because the PAC is putting weights on both the categories and the criteria under some of the categories, the project team would need to run the math a couple of different ways to check how the sites would rank based on scoring and weighting. After the math is done, the project team will bring the results back to share with the PAC. The PAC completed the weighting activity. (Please see the weighting activity summary on page 7.)

**Mark** said he would like to see how the project team is going to breakdown the 1-5 point scales for scoring each. **Pat** explained that many of these scales cannot be quantified until the sites are evaluated against the criteria. He described the transfer distance measurement, for example that for transportation cost impacts, the distances would be measured from the waste transfer points. The closest sites would receive 5 points, the farthest 1 point, and the rest will fall in between with a natural scale. This scale will need to be determined when site distances are measured. He also stated that the scales will be presented at the next PAC meeting. **Jill** said that some criteria will have natural scales like miles or dollars, and some will need constructed scales. Jill noted that in the initial round of site ranking that identified these 14 sites as the short list, the project team had shown the PAC the measurement scales for the criteria.

**Paul** asked if the project team has traveled the routes from each site, and how we are measuring the roads, including miles, if they have shoulders, etc. **Janet** said that, yes, they have traveled the routes.

**Paul** said that there are a couple of sites near roads that would need work in order to be a feasible option. **Jill** said that the team has taken note if the sites will need a bridge or road widening, for example.

**Paul** asked about Kiefer buffer lands. **Pat** confirmed that a portion of the Kiefer buffer is one of the siting alternatives and discussed the differing opinions as to the suitability of Kiefer buffer land use for waste management purposes like composting

**Bill Gibson** said we are missing what the site impacts would be on the surrounding area. **Jill** reminded the group that we specifically included the characteristics of the surrounding areas and the downwind areas in the process of developing the current shortlist, so it is built into the overall process. **Joel Weeden** stated that it is also built into the first category on the weighting activity sheet.

**Paul** said that if we're looking for a lightning rod site, Kiefer is a lightning rod.

**Pat** said that he has been meeting with site owners and operators, including Wendell Kido for the Wastewater Treatment Plant site and SMUD about their sites. Pat asked Wendell and Ruth to say a few words about their respective agency's sites.

**Wendell Kido** said that because this site (Wastewater Treatment Plant) is designed to double the size of the existing facility, when you extract that land, there is not enough room for a greencycle facility. He said there is room in the buffer, but then there are noise and odor issues. And, unless there is some benefit to water treatment, the greencycle facility does not mesh with the mission of the treatment plant. Additionally, open-air composting is a concern, as well as the trucking and the handling of green waste. Wendell said that although the site is large and fairly flat, they are concerned about noise and that it would exceed the County noise ordinance.

**Ruth McDougall** told the group that the Rancho Seco site is constrained by the topography, proximity of outdoor recreational activities at Rancho Seco Lake, a preponderance of vernal pools, a concern about groundwater and surface water quality, and the impact of truck traffic on access roads. She said that due to these constraints, and the fact that no energy would be produced by this process, SMUD does not consider Rancho Seco a viable site for this project.

**Pat** told the group that he wanted to have this information "on the table" as we continued our siting process.

**Paul** said that it doesn't sound like those sites are going to be feasible. **Pat** confirmed Paul's thought.

**Bill** asked if Kiefer is still in the mix. **Pat** said yes, and informed the PAC that there is a feasible location at Kiefer. However, it would only have a life of 20-30 years because the site would eventually become part of the landfill disposal area. **Paul** said that brings up the point of the lifetime of the facility. **Mark** said that reasonably, the County could move the facility over on top of the "old" landfill area at the end of the 20-30 years.

**Joel Weeden** asked if the project team had reported back on their meetings with the CPACs yet. **Pat** said that all of the CPACs had concerns about the project and don't want it in their areas.

**Mark** thought it was unfair to hear from the two sites (Wastewater Treatment Plant and Rancho Seco) before the weighting process. **Pat** said he thought it was important to hear, and that these sites have been "special" as co-location alternatives all along. The project team agreed that the Wastewater Treatment Plant site and the Rancho Seco site would be carried through the scoring and ranking process along with the rest of the 14 potential sites.

**Paul** said, that as a past elected official, he thinks the PAC needs to look at the political fallout. The project team would be presenting to a Board of five Supervisors, who will make the final decision. He thought we shouldn't spend a lot of time and money on EIRs when there's potential to get cut short. **Mark** said that this is really the last step. In his experience even with the political realities, the viable sites still rose to the top.

**Tom May** asked **Joe Tudesko** if he heard correctly that the Cosumnes CPAC doesn't mind having the facility in its area. **Joe** said no, the Cosumnes CPAC does not want it and that it would cause trucks and traffic to cut across the area. **Joe** referred to sites 4 and 39 (White Rock), and 18 and 40 (Delta). **Joe** also said that the CPAC wouldn't mind if the facility used I-5 for its truck traffic.

**Bryan DeBlonk** confirmed that the project team did come and talk to the Natomas CPAC, but that the CPAC was not asked to comment on the location of the sites, but he imagines that the locations would be of some concern to the CPAC members.

**Mark** informed the PAC that the SWAC conducts some very dynamic meetings and it would be a good place to talk if anyone from the PAC wanted to comment about the process. **Mark** stated that the next SWAC meeting would be held on May 3 in the same room as the PAC meetings (Department of Water Quality, room 170).

**Michele** asked **Pat** to review the planned community outreach.

**Pat** informed the PAC that the project team would be conducting community meetings around the preferred sites (once determined).

**Paul** asked **Pat** if he and the project team are listening to the CPACs and giving weight to their comments, or if we're wasting their time? **Paul** said the project team needs to listen to the CPACs because they are the pulse of the community.

**Michele** asked if everyone understood the next steps.

**Paul** asked if the PAC could see the outcome of the site scoring and ranking using the established category and criteria weights before the next PAC meeting, so that the PAC members could review it and prepare for the next meeting. **CH2M Hill** said that they would try to get it done and out to the PAC before the next meeting.

**Tom** said that in doing quick math, transportation is almost two to one to anything else. **Jill** explained that is why they want to run it a few different ways, to see how consistent the results would be. She also said that she would share with the PAC how the calculations were done. **Jill** stated there is a theory behind this approach called Multi-Attribute Modeling.

## **NEXT STEP**

- Project team will report back with results of the site scoring and ranking process.

## **NEXT PAC MEETING**

**Date:** PAC #8 – Wednesday, April 27, 2005

**Time:** 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

**Location:**

County of Sacramento Department of Water Quality

10545 Armstrong Avenue

1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Conference Room #170

Mather, CA 95655

**Note:** Dinner will be served.

## Weighting Activity Summary

Category - Criterion	Weight
<b>Land Use Compatibility</b>	<b>28</b>
Distance to closest incompatible land use	14
Known permitting obstacles	1
<b>Site Ownership</b> <i>(willing seller/lessor)</i>	<b>20</b>
<b>Site-Specific Natural Resources Impacts</b> <i>(known natural resources, water resources, species resources, "disturbed" site)</i>	<b>21</b>
<b>Transportation Cost Impacts</b>	<b>18</b>
Distance to closest freeway	13
Distance from north & south transfer points	8
Road improvements needed <i>(turn lanes, road widening, bridges, traffic signals)</i>	4
<b>Transportation Social Impacts</b>	<b>15</b>
Distance of surface street haul routes with residential land uses	12
Number of existing immobile populations along access routes	10
<b>Site Acquisition Cost</b> <i>(cost/acre)</i>	<b>8</b>
<b>Site Development Costs</b> <i>(on-site road improvements, soil permeability, electric supply availability)</i>	<b>10</b>
<b>TOTAL WEIGHT ASSIGNED</b>	<b>182</b>