

ALTAMONT LANDFILL OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
March 18, 2011
APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

- I. Call to order** – The meeting was called to order by Chris Gray at 12:45 p.m.
- II. Approval of Minutes – November 19, 2010** – Mr. Schneider moved to approve the minutes of November 19, 2010, as submitted. Steve Stewart seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.
- III. Public Comment – Any member of the public may address the committee on a matter not on the regular agenda. No discussion or action may be taken on these items.**
Dick Schneider announced Tom Harper’s passing. He said Sierra Club will find a replacement for Tom on this committee. It is important to have someone from the East County.

Liz McElligott gave a brief description of the Dhaoui’s property at Frick Lake. She said that the owner, Colleen Dhaoui, contacted staff about coming to this committee to talk about the biological importance of her property. She would like to have easements on her property and also make her property available for development credits. Laura Mercier from the Tri-Valley Conservancy said that they recently met with her and that the area is approximately 4 ½ acres of land. The Conservancy found that at this time they could not afford the asking price, which was quoted at approximately one million. Liz said she will notify the committee if Ms. Dhaoui decides to schedule for a future meeting.

- IV. Discussion on guidelines, procedures for the committee and consideration of process for determining priorities for property acquisition** – William Fleishhacker from County Counsel, said that at the last meeting there was discussion on compliance by the committee with procedures and guidelines as described in the settlement agreement. There was also discussion on amending the agreement. William said that according to 7.4.2 “The Committee shall prepare two (2) priority lists of properties for acquisition in fee or permanent easement, one for each of the geographic areas of concern as defined in subsection 7.3.1 The Committee shall also prepare proposed allocations of funds in the Open Space Account for expenditure during the upcoming year from each of the proposed priority lists...” He said he discussed it internally with staff and his suggestion is that the committee could adopt a resolution that identifies the current process. He said he could draft something for the next meeting for adoption.

Mr. Schneider said that is it a good idea to formalize the procedure, but amending the agreement seems too involved and will require signature from all parties. Steve Stewart said the other concept that had been discussed was to create an all inclusive list of all properties in the East County and allocate funds. The list could be updated annually. The Park District has the same procedure and the discussion on what property they are interested in is done under closed session. Chris Gray suggested having a list under various categories for habitat importance, wildlife corridors, etc... County Counsel said there are two obligations, a list and allocation of funds. He also pointed out that 7.4.4 as it reads does not make sense if the committee does not have a grant application for a property. Laura Mercier said having properties divided into categories is not a good idea as it gives more value to certain properties. Susan Canale from EBRPD said that in order for them to comply with the Brown Act, they have to have a list which they bring to their board for discussion. Mr. Schneider said that the Park District also has a master plan, so having a list makes sense. Steve Stewart said that the committee could have a list based on geographical regions based on the Conservation Strategy plan which can help the committee assess properties with significant biological importance. County Counsel suggested that a side letter signed by the parties to the agreement describing the current process could be added to the end of the agreement. Everyone agreed with this process. Chris asked that County Counsel work with Planning staff and bring this back at the next meeting for approval by the committee.

- V. Update on San Francisco Contract** – David Tam updated the committee on the San Francisco solid waste contract negotiations. He said since the committee met last time there have been a number of meetings between City and County officials, Board of Supervisors, and Budget Finance committee. On November 19th two of the members of the Board of Supervisors went on a tour of the Yuba County landfill and they

came back with a negative opinion. A February 3rd Budget and Legislative Analyst report revealed that a 1932 ordinance gave Recology a monopoly on all post-collection recycling, consolidation, composting, long-distance transport to landfills, and waste disposal contracts. The report recommended that the board replace existing trash collection and disposal laws with legislation that require competitive bidding on all waste contracts and that rates for trash collection become subject to board approval. On February 9th, the Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Committee asked for a two month delay on awarding Recology a 10 year contract to dispose San Francisco waste at the Yuba County landfill. During this meeting approximately 50 people testified. There was some interest in barging the garbage instead of truck and rail transportation. The next meeting will take place on April 20, 2011. Waste Management is also having meetings with the Board of Supervisors. There is only one competitor to Altamont which is Recology. Republic had also made a proposal and Vasco would have been very competitive. Mr. Tam said that at a scoping session on March 17, they reviewed the train route from Oakland to see the issues with moving all this garbage by train. Chris Gray pointed out that this is a good point since the train route carrying all this garbage will cross counties and cities and there needs to be some evaluation on the potential impact along this route. Discussion ensued on route to be taken by the train.

Joan Sepalla thanked David Tam for all his work and for keeping the committee well informed on this issue. David Tam suggested that representatives from Livermore and Pleasanton attend the April meeting. He will update everyone by e-mail on the upcoming meeting.

- VI. Update on available funding** – Report was distributed and presented.
- VII. Future Agenda Items/Speakers** – Continue discussion of process issues and easements.
- VIII. Next meeting** - May 20, 2011
- IX. Questions/Comments**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.