



**MINUTES**  
**SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMISSION**  
**Monday, December 17, 2001**  
**Solid Waste Management Center, 1201 Second Street**

Solid Waste Management Division

Chairperson Rod Becker called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

1. Roll call: Commissioners Present: Rachel Balsley, Rod Becker, Howard Chong, Carrie Sprague  
Commissioners Arriving After Roll Call: Kristine Johnson, Judith Maguire  
Commissioners Absent: Garth Schultz  
Staff: Becky Dowdakin  
Members of the Public: Dave Williamson
2. Comments from the Public: None.
3. Approval of the November 26, 2001 minutes: Chong noted an erroneous percentage on page 2 under the CCC presentation, "80-08" should probably be "80-85" percent. Balsley noted that in the following sentence "by" should be changed to "be." The Commission approved the minutes as amended 4/0/2, Sprague and Johnson abstaining.
4. New Business

**a. Revised Job Titles for Solid Waste Management Division**

Dowdakin said that some crewmembers and their supervisors have agreed that current job titles be changed to reflect the change of the Division name from Refuse to Solid Waste Management. Refuse Worker, Refuse Truck Driver, Refuse Supervisor, and Senior Refuse Supervisor would be changed to Solid Waste Worker and so on. Because simply changing a job title requires the same process as changing a job description, staff decided that it was a good opportunity to update these job descriptions that have not changed since 1990. Dowdakin said she would bring revised job descriptions to the January 2002 meeting for Commission approval.

**b. Staff Report and Discussion of 2001 Annual Cleanup Results**

Dowdakin passed out a revised version of three tables, to replace the originals in the 2001 Annual Cleanup Report that was sent with the Commission packets. She said that new data was found at the last minute, which significantly changed the cost and tonnage figures, though the report sections on innovations and improvements for next year remained valid. Dowdakin summarized the innovations for the year, and mentioned that overall the program ran more smoothly and with far fewer problems than in previous years. The main contributors to those outcomes were strict enforcement of the rules and a much improved brochure.

The overall tonnage decline by 6%, or 62 tons, compared to 2000. Trash collection was down 15% (181 tons), and plant debris was down about 8%. Collection tonnages for mattresses, reusable goods, and appliances increased.

Area 1 was the least efficient area, but a plant debris truck was sent out that day contrary to the original draft of the report. The Streets Division sited thirteen debris boxes in the University area and provided flyers and maps to fraternities for their use. The City is concerned that if these boxes are not available, then students moving out will throw debris into the streets. The Commission discussed this issue heatedly, with Becker objecting to the subsidy and Balsley suggesting that the City was rewarding bad behavior. There was consensus that the debris boxes should not be provided free, but at cost. Johnson suggested that the City and University make stronger efforts at promoting reuse, and that Lisa Bauer (of UCB) be invited to address the commission on the issue. Balsley suggested that the Streets Division be invited as well. Chong noted that

UCB has no direct control over the fraternities and sororities, but that the Inter-Fraternity Council can act collectively and self-police. Becker noted that the student co-ops also have a governing body that we could work with.

Dowdakin went on to discuss the reusable goods collection, and noted that this year the City contracted with East Bay Depot (EBD) for the service for \$10,000. In past years, EBD provided this service through a Grant from the Alameda County Waste Management Authority. Dowdakin said that the contract amount was probably too high for the service provided, though it was still far lower than what EBD was paid to provide a similar service in Central Contra Costa County. Johnson and Becker expressed dismay over the apparent high cost of this service. Balsley agreed that the service was expensive, but stated that it was important. She suggested that staff contact the Central Contra Costa Solid Waste Authority to learn about their program. Becker said that we needed to be careful not to create redundant programs, and that the EBD services are readily available from several private companies without City subsidy. Staff should consider publicizing other reuse opportunities. Chong said he thought the service at twice the per ton cost of refuse collection was not outrageous. He suggested that staff consider setting up a drop off point during the clean up, or explore a per ton contract for reusable goods collection. Maguire suggested that EBD might be able to do a better job when they move to the EcoPark and have more storage capacity. She added that the per ton cost is high in part because the items are so light, but the service is incredibly valuable. Balsley suggested that EBD might be able to improve their partnering for this service.

Johnson asked if staff could present the tonnage information on a per household basis, which might be a better reflection of what is happening in each area.

Chong asked about poaching. Dowdakin responded that part way through the Cleanup, EBD began doing some collections on Thursday nights, in order to beat the poachers.

Dowdakin proceeded to summarize the plant debris collection, and noted that there was a correlation between the number of trucks sent out to collect plant debris and the amount collected. She believes that some organic materials are being picked up as trash when the assignment of plant debris trucks to the Cleanup is inadequate. Becker again suggested that this might be a redundant service considering that plant debris is collected biweekly. Balsley noted that the waste stream still contains considerable amounts of plant debris, and Maguire pointed out that convenient options are critical to public participation. Chong asked what the per ton collection costs are for regular trash and plant debris collection.

Becker suggested that the Commission consider forming an ad hoc committee to explore options for improvement in Area 1 and in the reusable goods collection contract.

6. Staff updates: Dowdakin distributed copies of the Berkeley/Albany Reuse Directory, which became available November 1, 2001. She noted that the Public Works newsletter had been sent out with the Commission packet, and highlighted the article by Wanda Redic on the use of biodiesel in City's solid waste collection trucks and the Ecology Center recycling trucks. Dowdakin announced that at the direction of her supervisor and in accordance with City policy, future meeting minutes would be much shorter. Becker suggested that she strike a balance between what she had been providing them, and the very brief minutes they had been provided by past Commission Secretaries.

Chong moved that the Commission recognize as excellent the minutes prepared by Dowdakin. The motion was seconded by Johnson and passed 6/0/0.

7. Future agenda items and meeting days: The next meeting is scheduled for January 28, 2002. The agenda will include a discussion of **poaching**, a presentation from Tom Farrell on the **SWMD reserve fund**, and review of **revised SWMD job descriptions**.
8. Adjourn: the meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.