

APPENDIX S

April 27 PAC Meeting Minutes



Project Advisory Committee (PAC)

DRAFT Meeting Minutes from Wednesday, April 27, 2005

INTRODUCTIONS

SWA Team Members in Attendance

- Janet Goodrich, Project Manager, CH2M Hill
- Claudia Goss, SWA Communications and Media Officer
- Doug Kobold, Solid Waste Planner, Dept. of Waste Management & Recycling
- Michele McCormick, Principal, MMC Communications
- Pat Quinn, Sacramento GreenCycle Project Manager, Sacramento Regional Solid Waste Authority (SWA)
- 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
- Wendell Kido, SRCSD
- Tom May, Southeast Area CPAC
- Bob Moynihan, M.D., Sutter Medical Center
- Albert Stricker, City of Rancho Cordova
- Joe Tudesko, Cosumnes CPAC
- 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 Municipal Utility District (SMUD)
- Karen Muldoon, Editor and Publisher, Murieta Publishing LLC
- Jack Mulligan, Taylor & Wiley

- Cortez Quinn, Sacramento County Board of Supervisors Chief of Staff, Office of Roger Dickinson
- B.G. Tackett, Total Compliance Management

Handouts

- Agenda
- *Sacramento Bee* Article from April 27, 2005
- Siting Shortlist Map of 14 Sites
- Site Evaluation Worksheet A
- Site Evaluation Worksheet B
- Site Evaluation Worksheet C
- Comparison of Site Rank Order for Each Analytical Method
- Siting Shortlist Evaluation Table

COMMENTS ON MEETING MINUTES


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

AGENDA REVIEW

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

REVIEW SITE SCORING AND WEIGHTING RESULTS

Site Evaluation Worksheet D
Pac No. 8
April 27, 2005



Comparison of Site Rank Order for Each Analytical Method

Rank Order	Site #'s		
	Method A	Method B	Method C
1	40	40	40
2	4	4	4
3	18	18	18
4	7	7	7
5	26	107	26
6	38	26	39-A
7	107	38	107
8	39-A	3	39-B
9	9	9	38
10	3	39-A	120/121
11	39-B	39-B	120/121
12	120/121	120/121	9
13	120/121	120/121	3
14	33	33	33
15	34	34	34

Jill Sideman reviewed the three Site Evaluation Worksheets with the PAC and said that we are working with a Multi-Attribute Modeling Methodology, where in Method A – Category Weights Only Method, the purest method, only the categories are measured. Here, the weighted scores equaled the category weight multiplied by the average score of the criteria. In Method B – Weighted Average Method, the weighted scores equaled the weighted average criteria score multiplied by the category weight. In Method C – Category Weight + Criteria Weight Method, the weighted scores equal the category weight and average score multiplied together and added to the criterion weight multiplied by the criterion score.

Jill noted that the same four sites scored the highest in all three methods, which

shows the strength of these results through a type of sensitivity testing. These results are “very robust” in mathematical modeling terms and show that the PAC engaged in a process that is extremely defensible. She also mentioned that among the sites there are some that were consistently low, some that were consistently high and some that were not consistent either way, but generally in the middle group.

Paul Gumbinger commented that Janet, Jill and Kelli did a wonderful job pulling this all together and should be commended for their good work. He also thanked the Project Team for getting the results to the PAC members early so they had time to review it before tonight’s meeting. Paul also stated that he was concerned about the criteria, and asked if site 4 has an adequate access road. **Pat Quinn** replied that access to this site would be off of Scott Road and that access road improvements were considered in the site evaluation.

Paul asked about site 7, specifically where it is located on the Kiefer site and if there is a buffer. **Pat Quinn** said there is some buffer, and that there is no development planned or approved that would not be compatible with the site.

Herb Garms commented that the urban service line runs very close to the landfill. **Paul** confirmed it has a buffer and **Pat** answered yes.

Mark White said, the last time the PAC was making a recommendation on the short list, the site scores were clustered and it was a bit clearer to the group which sites to recommend to take forward. Today, looking at the scores of the sites, it’s hard to see what’s clear below the top four ranked sites. **Jill** agreed and said that below the fourth site, scores depend on the mathematical methodology used.

Lois Wright stated that the only site she would see recommending, after the top four, is site 26, which scores 5th or 6th depending on the methodology.

Paul said he doesn’t have problems with sites 40 and 18, but the problem with site 4 is that Scott Rd would have to be widened. He also stated that he is not in favor of site 7.

Herb said there would be road improvements made around site 4 because of the quarries that are being developed in that area. Herb said he spoke with the quarry folks about two weeks ago. **Mark** asked if the quarries were approved. **Herb** said not yet, but they’re almost 100 percent to go and that the quarries will have to blast. **Mark** stated that from the perspective of presenting a recommended short list to the Board, this site looks very compatible with the planned development in the area. He would like to see a map with the top four sites on it.

Mark asked if Herb knew of any issues with sites 40 and 18. **Herb** stated that he doesn’t know those areas very well.

Tom May said that in Stanislaus County, west of I-5, you can see their landfill and waste to energy facility 30 miles away because the area is flat and there is nothing blocking the view of the site. He asked if any of the top four ranked sites would be able to be seen from the freeways or main roads. **Pat** said that you would probably be able to see the facility if it were on sites 40 and 18. However, a facility could be less visible at site 40 due to some natural vegetation and topographical breaks. Both sites could be planted and laid out with visual screening. Known issues with these sites include the presence of a flood plain, which is mitigable; Franklin Field, and potential fog from the site; and nearby Swanson Hawk habitat. **Mark** said that Tom's point is well taken, and thinks that the EIR should have something for visual impacts. Also the Stanislaus County site has very tall stacks for the waste to energy plant.

Joe Tudesko asked how far off the road site 40 is located. **Pat** said it is about 100-150 yards. **Joe** noted potential for odor at the freeway. **Janet** said yes, it is near the freeway, but it's also in an area with dairies and chickens, which also produce odor. That said, odor will be reviewed during CEQA.

Michele asked Pat to review the CEQA process and timing.

Pat said that the next steps are to present the recommended short list to the SWAC in late May and then to the SWA Board in early June. Then, it would go into CEQA where the Board would take action. This may result in a process that would have involvement by the PAC.

Lois asked if it is possible to go into CEQA with more than one site. **Pat** said yes. We want to have siting alternatives and technology alternatives. **Lois** thought the PAC could add site 26 as well, but that it would mean having five site alternatives in CEQA review. **Pat** said we are looking for that fine line between too few/too many alternatives. One reason for having multiple sites is that the individual landowners may not be willing sellers and we want to avoid eminent domain process if possible.

Lois said it seems very defensible to stick with the top four ranked sites, but does like that the quarry would be a neighbor to site 4.

Herb said that in regard to sites 26 and 7, the Project Team should have a discussion with Supervisor Nottoli in regard to a buffer and what they want to put on that land. Right now, there is no plan of what will go on that land.

Pat said that we must also add in Rancho Cordova's plans. And that the access to sites 26 and 7 is Jackson Road. Pat also stated that the Project Team tried to minimize road impacts for each site, but that Jackson Road would have the most impact of all surface streets considered.

Paul said that the County has done a study on Jackson Road (SR 16), but the proposed roadway improvements are neither funded nor included in the State's seven- year matrix.

Mark said that perhaps Kiefer should be added only as an alternative to the top three sites. **Paul** agreed with Mark. **Lois** pointed out that if we're looking at technology alternatives, it might be good to leave it on the list. **Michele** asked the PAC to think about what Lois said and reminded the team that all of the sites would be looked at very closely for all of these criteria. **Pat** stated that all sites would be considered "alternatives."

Bob asked if six sites are too many. **Pat** said yes, it could become too much to review during environmental scoping.

Bob asked about site 107. **Pat** said it does not have good access and that there are natural resource concerns.

Paul asked about site 39 and if it's an unwilling seller. **Herb** said that site 39 sits inside the urban service line. **Paul** said that if people were wondering about why it's listed as 39-A and 39-B, it is because they are two siting options with different owners.

CONSENSUS ON RECOMMENDED SITING ALTERNATIVES

Mark made a motion to move the top three ranked sites forward, but to list site 7 as an alternative.

Michele asked if we move the top four ranked sites, with site 7 as the fourth alternative.

Paul motioned to move the top three ranked sites forward, showing they need road improvements.

Michele asked if the group would be comfortable wording it to say the PAC recommends moving the top four ranked sites forward, but also note that the PAC has some concerns in regard to site 7.

Bob said he thinks everyone has a reservation about one or more sites. He asked Pat how many sites he wants to present. **Pat** said four or five would be appropriate to carry forward.

Michele informed the PAC that it is very helpful if they write a letter and/or talk to the Boards rather than just having them hear from the staff. She said we would put all of the recommended sites through the same process, regardless if they were presented with reservations. She also reminded the PAC that last time, the Board had a different perspective on the project and asked us to revisit some sites, and we ended up with five more sites, of which some are in our top four ranked list today.

Lois said there's enough with the methodologies to just move all four top ranked sites forward.

Pat said that if a minority group wants to add something about economic reservations, we could do so.

Mark said he would agree to move the top three ranked sites forward with having a minority opinion in regard to site 7.

Tom said the team's effort should remove politics from their recommendation. The SWA board members will consider political, economic, and other issues.

Lois said she feels that a lot of the PAC members feel site 4 should be at the top of the process. **Pat** said we would present them all as alternatives without ranking them and would put them all through the same process.

Paul asked if the Project Team would present maps/aerials with the Staff Report and asked if they would show the proposed quarries near site 4 and any sensitive areas near sites. **Mark** agreed this would be useful. **Pat** said he would work with the Project Team on this.

Wendell stated that when the Sanitation District was selecting their biosolids recycling facility vendor, they did theirs based on best value, not lowest bid. **Pat** said that is what we would do as well.

Final PAC Consensus:

PAC consensus is to recommend to the SWA Board the top four ranked sites move into CEQA.

PAC would also like to use site aerials in the staff report and have them show the location of the proposed quarries near site 4 and any sensitive areas near all of the sites.

NEXT STEPS

- Project Team to develop Staff Report.

SWAC Meeting

May 31, 2005
11:30 a.m.
County of Sacramento
Department of Water Quality
10545 Armstrong Avenue
1st Floor, Conference Room #170
Mather, CA 95655

SWA Board Meeting

June 9, 2005
3:00 p.m.
County Administration Center
700 H Street
Room #1450
Sacramento, CA 95814