



County of Yolo

WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

c/o DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY SERVICES
DIVISION OF INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT

Taro Echiburú, AICP
DIRECTOR

MINUTES OF THE YOLO COUNTY WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING OF January 26, 2017

John Geisler called the January 26, 2017 meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. Those present were:

Members: John Geisler, Michael McDonald, Paulina Benner, Roberta Childers, Jacques Franco, Richard Tsai and Carol Scianna

Staff: Linda Sinderson – Yolo County DCS, DIWM
Pam Hedrick – Yolo County Central Landfill
Jeff Kieffer – Yolo County Central Landfill
Ramin Yazdani – Yolo County Central Landfill

Guests: Sophavy Sung – Sustainability Intern for City of Davis
Jennifer Gilbert – Conservation Coordinator for City of Davis
Reyna Pinon – City of Woodland
Kayla Rodriguez – Waste Management
Scott Chamberlain – Waste Management
Julian Ruzzier – Gaul- Consero Solutions
Kimberly Villa – Yolo County

Introduction

Introductions were made around the room.

Public Comment

None

Consent Agenda

1. Approve Meeting Minute

Any changes to our last minutes – Yes – Edit requested by Richard Tasi to update the title for Jennifer Gilbert and Roberts Childers noted that the City of Woodland was not included in the minutes – Changed noted – John Geisler seconded the motion Paulina Benner.

Regular Agenda

2. Member Updates

Yolo County – Linda Sinderson

- Working on getting the green waste facility up and running and working with Northern on the new contract. Purchase of the methane plant should be completed by Friday, January 27th.

City of Davis – Richard Tasi

- Davis printed and distributed the Environmental Resources Guide to all residents. It was a guide created in-house by the Environmental Resources Division of Public Works Department. The Environmental Program Specialist for environmental enforcement is undergoing recruitment.

City of West Sacramento – Paulina Benner

- Nothing to report

City of Winters – Carol Scianna

- Nothing to report

City of Woodland – Roberta Childers

- Nothing to report

UC Davis – Not present

3. MAC (Meeting of Area Coordinators) Update – Pam Hedrick

- The Dept. of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) issued an advisory about improperly drained used oil filters. If oil filters after being drained still contain oil then they need to be managed as hazardous waste under California Hazardous Waste Control Law. The County has purchased an oil filter crusher and is crushing all filters that come to our site and that come to Esparto Transfer Facility in order to comply with DTSC and not to have to send them out as haz. Waste. The County received this info because we manage our hazardous waste facility and we pass on this info to the other jurisdictions to keep them aware of new regs and advisories.

4. C&D Facilities Update – Jeff Kieffer

- We're working on trying to get loads that are recyclable C&D material. We've been doing outreach over the last month with our various customers. We've meet with DWR and Waste Management. Marissa took this information to the MAC meeting. We have established a 65% diversion requirement for the facility. When we started working with our new contractor we started getting some loads that were not C&D recyclable. We rejected a few loads at the very initial start of our operation before they were even dumped on the ground. However, this did not go over very well. Since then we have not rejected a load. Now we're making sure we meet our 65% diversion and trying to come up with a system that works for everybody.

We've updated the C&D brochure. No major changes to our previous brochure other than the guidance to the load containing 65% by weight of C&D products.

The first look at the roll off bins is when it comes into the facility. That's when they make the judgment call. If it's a high quality C&D load it goes to one side if it's a low quality C&D load it's goes to the other side. We're trying to get a handle on getting less of the lower quality C&D loads.

When we evaluate a load it's a visual evaluation. This is not a perfect system; you still have some judgment call in it. One way or the other we have to evaluate the loads that come into the landfill. We did a test sort on a low quality C&D load today (showed pictures) with this sort we were only able to recycle 37.5%, including fines. I don't think we got all the fines so is we doubled it; it would still only be 47%.

If we keep getting these types of loads it will be difficult to meet our diversion numbers.

Question: What did you do with this load you were showing us?

Answer: We took the load and the contractor will get his diversion. In this case only 37% will be recycled the other part of the load will be trash. It will negatively affect the overall facility diversion.

We have a verily good idea of what is a good load and what isn't. I wanted to make sure that you guys understood that we're not trying to be haphazard and reject loads. We're looking at this on a basis of weight and visual.

Question: I would like to know about the consistency of the loads and has Sierra every rejected a load?

Answer: We did take in less diversion last month. Sierra has not rejected but they charged us a higher rate.

Question: How much is the higher rate?

Answer: It's an extra \$10 a ton.

Question: When this rate was created was it every considered that this might be a possibility and what percentage of the loads actually incur that extra \$10?

Answer: No one wants to reject a load but we need to have some type of criteria. We can't just let someone bring in a load of trash and tell us they need C&D credit. We're getting about 5 to 10 loads a week that are questionable. When we first started out we were hit with the higher rates on the loads. We started taking those loads and doing a ground search on them. Pulling out what we can to recycle and talking the rest to trash because we didn't want to get hit with a higher rate from Sierra. Since the second month of operation we've been paying the lower rate. That's what we planned on when we set that fee.

At some point a load can be so contaminated with trash it doesn't make since to waste our time on it. If we can get some concession on what that might be, that would give us something to use moving forward. Then we could give our contractors a better idea of what to expect.

Loads visually determined to contain at least 65 percent by weight of recyclable C&D commodities as outlined in our current C&D brochure would be charged our standard C&D processing rate of \$69.50 per ton. These loads would receive the full recycling credit as calculated monthly at our C&D facility.

Loads visually determined to contain less than 50 percent recyclable commodities will not be directed to the C&D facility for recycling. If however, the load does reach the facility (such as the case with the large commercial haulers who use our automated ticketing system) and the load is dumped on the ground, the load will be rejected. A \$175 handling fee will be imposed on each load to cover the removal and transfer of the load to the disposal area as well as the documentation. The per ton rate on the load would be changed to our current disposal fee and the load would receive zero recycling credit.

- *Letter mentioned during our meeting, was sent out to the WAC Members and Haulers on January 27, 2017*

5. Composting – Ramin Yazdani

- Last December I gave an overview of anaerobic compost digester and the liquid digester.
- The Water Board has implementing the new [Waste Discharge Requirements \(WDR\)](#) for composting sites. They mentioned that all composting sites would have to be protected from a 100 year flood; which means we would have to build a levee around the entire composting facility. In addition to that we would have to collect all the water. As we discussed they added more issues to our project.

We're looking at placing the whole operation on top of the landfill. Northern Recycling is hiring a consulting firm to do a preliminary cost estimate, comparing the cost of placing the composting facility on top of the landfill to the cost of a levee. We're meeting with the Water Board in early February to discuss this matter. I will have more information once I have the cost estimate.

The \$63 per ton cost for organic waste that I mentioned last time was based on previous costs. We will find out if moving the composting facility to the top of the landfill cost and compare it with the option of levee around the facility at the current location. The other option were looking at is if we continue the anaerobic composter digester option and run the entire tonnage through the anaerobic compost digester. This could potentially reduce the cost of

the composting portion of the project.

- If we expand our anaerobic compost digester project we would be able to take all of Yolo County's waste and waste from outside the county. The financial model that I ran for this project was for a 10 year project life with all Yolo county waste plus waste from out of the county and the tipping fee was \$63 per ton. I also looked at 20 years and 15 years. The 10 year project life yielded \$63 per ton rate. In this option Northern Recycling would construct a composting facility to process all of the waste and Yolo County's waste would go through the anaerobic compost digester cells and then finished off and removed for marketing. All other organic waste would go through the newly constructed Northern Recycling composting facility. The \$63 per ton cost would be based on a ten year agreement with Northern Recycling facility and a composting facility constructed at Yolo. I will have more information about the potential changes to the facility once we have had a chance to review the new requirement with the Water Board and meet with Northern Recycling engineers. I'm working hard on getting the anaerobic compost digester project design finished for construction this summer and start project operation for the anaerobic digester portion by October 2017.

Question: When is the due date for the CalRecycle grant?

Answer: March 9th

6. Organics Grant

- We have been looking at that to see what the requirements are. Every hauler has to fill out a form and say exactly how many tons they will be diverting. One of the issues, the liquid food digester I talked about that equipment that can actually remove contamination from the food waste source, looks like the City of Davis and the City Woodland are planning on not having a separate collection for food waste from commercial sector. They're going to mix IT with the green waste, which will go to the anaerobic compost. We're still going to do that liquid digester project because we have some additional canned tomato waste and other types of canned waste that we have to divert from the landfill with our machine can handle. But if there are other types of organic waste out there we can still send it to that our facility.

Question: The liquid digester just takes food waste?

Answer: Currently we get a lot of tomato cans, it will remove the cans. It won't take green waste but it will take bags of trash and packaged food waste. Liquid food coming out of the machine would be pumped into the liquid digester.

- We were hoping to have tonnage information from cities to add to that tonnage we already get and predict the total tons of food waste. But it doesn't look like we can get those numbers and add them to the equation. So I took those out to see if the numbers still work, so we could do the project. It will allow us to have the potential to take other types of separated food waste. If a commercial load comes to our site and it has no green waste, only food waste we can divert to the liquid digester project.
-
- We still get calls from customers that have odd things, like a load of ice cream, or some type of rejected food waste. Those get landfill currently but we could take it at this facility. It's hard to put a number on that for future potential tonnage. This grant requires that you have to estimate the tonnage. If the food waste is already mixed with green waste then it will be even more difficult to estimate food waste tonnage. Because green waste was already diverted you can count it as new tonnage diverted. The CalRecycle grant available for the entire state for all rural regions is \$3,000,000. I estimated that we could ask for about \$500,000. They don't require matching funds but matching funds of \$500,000 could help you get a higher score. Based on economics even if we received a \$500,000 grant it would not reduce

the tipping funds much. Waste tonnage and tipping fees is what impacts the overall tipping fee rate.

- Linda and I are looking at this grant and will determine if we think this would be worth the time to apply for the grant.

7. YCCL Business Plan

- Last summer the Board of Supervisors was looking into potentially selling the landfill or leasing it or doing something to get additional money for the general fund. Because they need more money to operate the general fund projects and departments. They've moved along now and they've decided that they wanted to see who our partners are and how we can make money for the landfill. There might not be anything there but we're looking at it.
- Kimberly is helping me put together a new business plan so we can show the Board of Supervisors how we operate and how our partners interact with us and where we're going for the future. We will be meeting with our stakeholders to let them know and help us put together this plan. This will take several months. We're hoping to meet with and bring back some ideas for the Waste Advisory Committee as well as to the cities, stakeholders, haulers and customers. We'll be looking at: what are our services, our products, where are we going in the future from where we were, in terms of how we think we're going to be working with Cal-Recycle and others.

Member Questions

Where are our host fees?

Linda: I'm waiting on the information. As soon as I get it I will let everyone know. If you haven't had a check even though you were supposed to we will definitely get this to you.

Meeting Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned by Chairman John Geisler.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Yolo County Waste Advisory Committee is scheduled for February 23, 2017 at 3:30 p.m. in the Conference Room of the Yolo County Central Landfill.

John Geisler, Chair
Yolo County Waste Advisory Committee

Prepared By: Rose Cook