



MEMORANDUM TO: Community Advisory Committee
FROM: Staff
SUBJECT: Dec. 14, 2005 Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting Minutes
DATE: December 20, 2005

Present: General Manager Roland Williams, Administrative Technician Naomi Yee of Castro Valley Sanitary District; CAC members: Gary Wolff, Anthony Graves, Lucille Lorge, Aileen Chong-Jeung, Wanda Davis, Gail Waiters, Robert Craig

Absent: Peter Fong

1. ***[Call to Order]***

The meeting was called to order at 6:15 p.m. No members of the public were in attendance.

2. ***[Items from the Public]***

There were no items from the public.

3. ***[October 12, 2005 CAC Meeting Minutes]***

Minutes of the October 12, 2005 CAC meeting were reviewed by the Committee. The Committee stated that the slogan, "Shrink Your Waste" to accompany the "Shrinky" garbage can mascot was not reflected in the minutes. Additionally, the Committee stated that the current theme would not suffice, contrary to the last line in item 6. A., because the concept would not resonate with the public. Members noted that other brainstorming ideas were not recorded, but that they could not remember what else was suggested. Manager Williams stated that a future recommendation memo would summarize ideas from the meetings for the Board Committees. The minutes were approved by the Committee.

4. ***[Public Relations Review]***

A. Solid Waste Department possible name change

Manager Williams stated that the Solid Waste Department had brainstormed department name change options because the Board had requested a name that would more accurately represent what the department does. He stated that two (2) main premises helped to guide the most recent thought process: AB 939 (diversion) and the Health and Safety Code (collection of refuse). The Department's major emphases are:

A. Diversion

1. Increase and sustain CVSD community participation
2. Community leader of green principles by example
3. Knowledgeable in industry standards and topics
4. Meets and exceeds regulations
5. Stewardship of grant funds
6. Compliant with laws

B. Refuse Collection

1. Everything is collected on time and sites left clean

2. Convenient/efficient/user-friendly quality service to the community (residents, drivers, CVSD staff)
3. Responsive to residents (customer service)
4. At a reasonable cost
5. Meets and exceeds regulations/current industry standards

Manager Williams stated that staff and the Board like “Waste Diversion Department” (WDD) because it speaks to the mission and main focus of the department. He stated that the desire of the department was that the term “diversion” would become more commonly understood and used. He noted that the Collection System Maintenance Department and Engineering Department may be better named as the Wastewater Department with two (2) focuses.

Member Wolff requested that all twenty-three (23) options be read. After the options were read, Member Wolff stated that an everyday customer would not know that the WDD handles the hauler franchise agreement. Manager Williams noted that the department wanted to focus on what it is essentially producing, which would be non-garbage. Member Chong-Jeung stated that WDD may not be client-friendly, with residents looking for “garbage” in telephone books. Member Waiters noted that journalists write at a 6th grade level, and that “diversion” may be at a level that is too high. Member Craig asked why “recycling” was not included in the department name. Manager Williams stated that recycling is one (1) component of diversion, but does not encapsulate all the other functions that diversion describe. Member Graves suggested “Integrated Waste Services Department”.

After much discussion, the Committee determined that “diversion” is a word that the public does not yet know, and therefore it is considered jargon and not client-friendly. The Committee felt that “recycling” invokes emotion and triggers an understanding between the District and the public it serves. The Committee also felt that this may not be the best time to change the department name, because the term “solid waste” is not necessarily outdated or misunderstood.

5. *[Solid Waste Service Review and Program Recommendations]*

A. New contract suggestions

Ms. Yee gave a summary of the current franchise agreement between the District and Waste Management of Alameda County, Inc. (May 1, 2001 - April 30, 2009 midnight) and the proposed timeline for the new contract. The District anticipates conducting surveys, town hall meetings, and researching what haulers are available in 2006. In 2007, staff plans to refine its search, travel and visit other disposal sites or composting facilities, and research types of hauling vehicles. To allow for transition into the 2009 contract, staff intends to put out a Request For Proposals (RFP) in April or May of 2008, enter into negotiations through October, and have ready the proposed new contract by November.

Member Davis asked whether the District is able to purchase their own vehicles, or if the District plans on hiring drivers. Ms. Yee stated that it would be possible for the District to buy vehicles, i.e. Oro Loma Sanitary District, but would need to determine if it was the best for the District. Secondly, she stated that whether or not the District purchases the vehicles, if the District entered into a franchise agreement for services, the hauling company would likely provide drivers.

Member Wolff stated that it may actually be cheaper for the District to borrow money to buy the trucks, versus a private company.

The Committee had a lively discussion regarding the bidding process. Manager Williams stated that the District would be reviewing other agencies' contracts with haulers and taking note of improvements or benefits that it would want included in the District's future contract. Member Craig suggested that companies present to the District two (2) scenarios - for example, with or without vehicles purchased. Member Wolff stated that with various proposal processes, the District may not have to select the lowest bidder, because it is for a franchised contract, versus a general professional contract. He asked whether the Board had formally requested a competitive bid process. Manager Williams stated that the Board had indeed, although the District could extend WMAC's contract if it chose to do so. Member Wolff suggested that the RFP process start in January or February of 2008, instead of April or May. Manager Williams stated that he would need to weigh the benefits of having a potentially new hauler selected earlier when an existing hauler is still providing services in the community.

Finally, the Committee discussed the best ways to acquire information from the community. The Committee did not feel a phone survey would achieve the level of information the District was looking for, because the Committee felt that residents would either not answer the phone, or would not be interested in providing information over the phone. Member Chong-Jeung stated that a Town Hall would be good, especially with an agenda to keep the meeting on target and to avoid a meeting dominated by complaints. Manager Williams stated that a large number of complaints would demonstrate a problem with services. Member Chong-Jeung asked Manager Williams how much time and energy the District is willing to expend, giving the example of two (2) Alameda County meetings in which eight (8) - twelve (12) representatives were present. Manager Williams stated that for a seven million (\$7,000,000.00) dollar contract multiplied by ten (10) years, a fair amount should be spent in order to allow customers an opportunity to shape the contract. The Committee agreed that a Town Hall would be a good way for the District community to be involved in the new contract process. Other suggestions such as surveying on election days, those waiting in line for the Household Hazardous Waste facility, and on the BART platform were given by the Committee.

Staff stated that due to time, they would come back to the Committee to discuss existing services and education, and future services and education. Member Wolff suggested the following to address future services: more recyclables allowed curbside, free compost to customers, biodegradable bags inserted with bills, and an adjustment to customer service phone queues.

6. *[General Manager Report of December 6, 2005 Board Meeting and December 13, 2005 Board Workshop]*

Manager Williams thanked the Committee for attending the recognition dinner and first portion of the Board meeting on December 6th. He awarded those members who were not in attendance at the Board meeting with certificates and District key chains.

A report was given from the Board meeting, including an easement resolution rejection, commercial rate increase feedback from customers, and town hall meeting on January 10, 2006 with the consultant who compiled data for the increase.

A report from the Workshop was given, including a presentation from Waste Management of Alameda County for an extraordinary rate review due to escalating fuel costs, and plans to conduct strategic planning for February 2006. The Committee will discuss strategic planning in March or April of 2006.

7. *[Miscellaneous Comments from Committee and Staff]*

Member Wolff presented an article highlighting Singapore students who have developed a clothing “washer” that uses no water. The invention utilizes negative ionization of air and deodorants. Member Wolff also acknowledged Member Waiters for her wonderful service and ideas this past year, as she is concluding her term and stepping down from the Committee. Member Waiters noted that she enjoyed the Committee’s ability to brainstorm and build on one another’s ideas.

8. *[Adjournment]*

Meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

cc: Public Relations Committee
WMAC New Contract file