



DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
Solid Waste Management Division

MINUTES
Special Meeting of the
ZERO WASTE COMMISSION
Monday, February 20, 2007 3:00-5:00 PM
Solid Waste Management Center
1201 Second Street Berkeley CA 94710

Chairman Steen Jensen called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m.

1. Roll Call:

Commissioners present: Jensen, Kalil, Blachman, Dodsworth, Miyazaki, , Tam

Commissioners absent: Sadigh, Schultze-Allen

Staff: Peter Holtzclaw; Tania Levy

Members of the Public: Martin Bourque, Daniel Maher, and Mark Gorrell of Ecology Center; MaryLou Van Deventer and Dan Knapp of Urban Ore; Greg Von Mecklin (Architect) and Zelda Bronstein.

2. Comments from the Public: Martin Bourque of the Ecology Center reported State legislation on Solid Waste is not adequately addressing zero waste objectives and there is a great deal of lobbying underway to change that.

3. Announcements and Commissioner Comments: Tania Levy announced upcoming CCRA recycling workshop. Blachman announced upcoming regional smart growth workshops at ABAG (Association of Bay Area Governments)

Holtzclaw gave an update on timing issues related to required City rate study and timing for bringing on *Bighorn* consultant; weekly organics report to Council in May 07, folded in with 5% rate increase resolution session. This may delay curbside implementations because funding can't move forward for labor. Also included will be \$200,000 for transfer station rebuild preliminary engineering and estimates study RFQ for FY08.

Kalil reported on subcommittee meeting for Transfer Station rebuild included discussions with Energy Commission about alternative energy source creation, Transportation Commission work on West Berkeley Circulation Plan (Public Scoping session is February 22, 7PM at Senior Center) entailing new roundabout ideas and potential grade separation of railroad, and integration of Transfer Station frontage with West Berkeley Plan for Gilman Street.

4. Approval of Agenda: M/S Tam/Kalil to approve the agenda. Approved, 7/0/0.

5. Overview of Site Improvement Issues; tour of transfer station and recycling facilities:

- a. Site is approximately 10 acres, not big enough to accommodate all we need to achieve zero waste on-site. Big question is how to deal with

construction and demolition (C&D) waste sorting/transfer. Davis Street Transfer Station has 5 acres for C&D; South SF Scavenger who have SFO contract, with 10 acres for C&D, grinding to ½” minus for hauling.

- b. Site has been dealt with piecemeal over the years; difficult to maneuver around. Traffic is problematic, with heavy use from private sector and resident customers. Street access points need examination.
- c. Division offices and Ecology Center offices cramped, outdated. City trucks and Ecology Center trucks are parked on site.
- d. Pits are of issue environmentally. New facilities are best kept aboveground in order to deal with water. Other environmental issues include blown trash/debris, adjacent creek restoration/clean-up in conjunction with City of Albany who were supposed to have done work during Target’s construction, but not accomplished.
- e. 2006 statistics: 101,000 refuse vehicles (96,000 self-haul) and 32,000 organic waste vehicles (30,000+ self-haul). Top 5 customers: Caltrans, NORCAL organics, Streets department, Parks department, and local contractors.
- f. Rest of tour by staff and Ecology Center identified how waste and recycling is dealt with throughout current facility, aged equipment and problems, new paper building (1998) and recycling sort machinery. Fiber prices at all-time high. CCC operations discussed, including constrained space for public drop-off. Urban Ore discussed pulling of reusables in area where operating, including preliminary study of C&D box sorting. Problems with signage, coordination in small constrained spaces throughout site noted by all.

6. Urban Ore Presentation of Conceptual Site Design & Discussion

Dan Knapp and MaryLou VanDeVenter of Urban Ore described yearlong commitment of funds for redesign idea generation leading to a conceptual plan for a zero waste facility. Overarching is facility green architectural design. 12 “master categories” of waste flow as resource; pulling reusables, recycling, composting of organics. Customer service interface and division of public from commercial users was paramount.

Building upon ESA model defined in 2006 report, included the following:

- Retain ESA facility design strengths by doing a complete site makeover; use passive lighting (saw tooth building type), solar and photovoltaics; use swales to hold/filter rainwater; locate office/education center on Gilman; include elevated observation walkway.
- Single large building of approx. 85,000 sq ft to improve operations while reducing traffic area; cheaper to build with 4 exterior walls ranging 25’0” – 45’0”, none below-grade and no ramps; preliminary cost (06\$) \$18-\$20 million without equipment; interior spaces flexible for future adaptations.
- Better customer service and higher traffic capacity for increasing income by having “Airport-style” curbside unloading with customer interface 8 times longer (800 linear feet compared to 100 linear feet); improved

separation of vehicle types for safety with large trucks unloading/loading at rear of building, smaller vehicles at front.

- More electrical generation to save money; one large building has larger roof to carry more solar cells.
- Phased construction to allow continued operations with most services staying onsite, moving only equipment offsite: Phase I relocation, Phase 2 build 60,000 sq ft of main building, Phase 3 clear north side of lot, Phase 4 build rest of buildings and new pad in front, Phase 5 build offices and rest of site.
- Sustainable plan will also be pleasing aesthetically by minimizing visibility of debris piles, separating processing functions from public and office workers.
- Education about natural environment would include public center.

Discussion: Martin Bourque defined ideas related to Ecology Center operation needs, including offices, truck access/storage, and need to avoid below-grade problems such as exist with current pit. He also stated we should look at multi-story building opportunities given limited site acreage.

Kalil cautioned using limited budget figures due to public capital cost escalation over time; clarify what year based on and include appropriate soft costs (which will be high for this project, especially Environmental Impact Report) and contingency percent.

Next steps described by Holtzclaw included preparing a Request for Proposal (RFP) that would look at site, ESA report, Commission policy guidelines, and Urban Ore's work

7. Adjourn: M/S Kalil/Miyazaki to adjourn at 5:25.