

WEST CONTRA COSTA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING MINUTES – MARCH 14, 2019

Meeting Date | Time 3/14/2019 7:00 PM | **Meeting Location** San Pablo City Council Chambers, 13831 San Pablo Avenue, San Pablo, CA

Meeting called by Board of Directors

Type of meeting Regular

Authority Staff Present Stan Hakes, Lorna Thomson, Christina Leard, Andy Schneider

Legal Counsel John Bakker

Board Members Present:

Directors: G. Lyman, El Cerrito; D. Romero, Hercules; P. Murray, Pinole; A. Pineda, San Pablo; N. Bates*, B. Choi, (Chair), and J. Myrick, Richmond

Absent: F. Glover (Ex-Officio) Contra Costa County

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Choi called the meeting to order at 7:10 P.M. The Roll Call established the existence of a quorum (Bates*, Lyman, Murray, Myrick, Pineda, Romero, and Choi). *Director Bates arrived after Roll Call.

CLOSED SESSION/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/EX-PARTE COMMUNICATIONS & DISCLOSURE/PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no Closed Session.

Chair Choi led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chair Choi called for ex-parte communications. There were none.

Chair Choi called for public comment. There was none.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Chair Choi called for approval of the Consent Calendar consisting of four items.

MOTION by Director Romero to approve Consent Calendar Items 6.0 through 6.3, acknowledging the receipt of an updated Table 12 to Item 6.3. **SECOND** by Director Lyman.

MOTION PASSED unanimously.

STAFF REPORT

Staff Report Item 7.0

Mr. Hakes reported that:

- 1) The contract with Triformis to sell the compost bins with a discount of \$40 had resulted in the sale of 65 compost bins, 35 Soil Savers, 16 Wriggly Wranches, and 14 Compost Tumblers.
- 2) A Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) event is scheduled for April 13 at the Hercules Public Works Corp Yard (next year it would be in Pinole potentially at the wastewater site); August 10 in El Sobrante site to be determined; and September 14 in South Richmond at the Galileo Club. The Civic Spark Fellow (Adam Murphy) would be the staff person at the Hercules event.
- 3) The HHW Grant would both pay a portion of an HHW Collection day, and focus on reusable one-pound propane cylinders through the California Product Stewardship Council (CPSC); he stated CPSC was working

to find locations where the collection receptacles could be stored and working to set up propane cylinder exchange events.

- 4) RecycleMore has applied for a 2019/2020 Civic Spark Fellowship, with the application focused on database management but still included outreach for AB 1826 and preliminary work for SB 1383, along with some AB 341 work. If awarded, Board approval would be required.
- 5) Republic Services had been complying with the Cooperative Agreement with respect to organics disposal. They started a monthly compost giveaway; the first day was February 6 and would be the first Wednesday of each month; Republic had made the \$50,000 payment in recognition of staff and legal services time; and had started a mattress recycling program on February 1 at 101 Pittsburg Avenue, four days per week at no charge to residents or RecycleMore.

Director Romero requested a report next month on the first couple of months of the mattress program in terms of number by city; and verified that the compost program was for two yards of free compost, bringing your own shovel, and loading your own compost.

Agenda Item 8.0 – Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement (JEPAs) Update | Presenter Stan Hakes – Executive Director

Mr. Hakes highlighted the status of the JEPAs discussions with the city managers, and noted the city managers had last met in August and had come to agreement on seven of the eight issues, with the remaining issue being the disbursement of funds upon withdrawal. Since that time, two new city managers from Richmond and El Cerrito were now involved. The new Richmond City Manager had expressed concern with the Board structure of each city having one Director and supported a weighted vote, and on February 26 the Richmond City Council considered the issue and voted 5-0 with two abstentions that Richmond would remain in RecycleMore only if three key provisions were included in the JEPAs. Those provisions included maintaining Richmond’s weighted voting; updating the JEPAs withdrawal language to allow member agencies to leave the agency and request ratepayer paid funds proportionally; and focus Authority programs on HHW programs, compliance with state laws, management of the Post-Collection Agreement (PCA), setting Post-Collection rates, and outreach and education.

Mr. Hakes stated that the Pinole City Council had discussed the issue last week and the San Pablo City Council would discuss the issue next week. He sought Board direction on the issue and identified four potential options to address the JEPAs issue; 1) Ask the city managers to continue to meet to determine if a city managers JEPAs solution could be achieved; 2) Discontinue the city managers JEPAs negotiation process and have the Board deliberate in April or at another future Board meeting to address remaining JEPAs issues; 3) Direct staff to no longer work on the JEPAs update, and continue to use the current JEPAs as the authority governing document; or 4) Consider other options determined by the Board.

Director Myrick advised that he was one of the two members of the Richmond City Council to abstain from the vote. He did not support the Richmond staff recommendation, and having been a member of the RecycleMore Board noted the progress that had been made to see what could be done to move forward with all cities on board. While the RecycleMore Board had understood that the JEPAs was close to approval, he suggested the question to the other cities would be to determine whether to move forward with a JEPAs that did not include Richmond since Richmond had made clear that it would not support anything without the stated provisions. He agreed with the underlying reasons for the 5-0 Richmond vote since Richmond paid the most and wanted an authoritative say in the Authority.

Director Bates referred to the original formation of the Joint Powers Authority (JPA), the opportunity to unify the five cities in West County to work together, and questioned what had changed to suggest breaking up that unity and reconstructing it. He was unclear of the motivation and the benefit to designating only one vote for Richmond and suggested the Board should take the leadership and identify what it wanted in the JEPAs, and take control of the decision making process. He supported Richmond’s original weighted position and if the other cities did not

want to participate suggested that RecycleMore be disbanded, although he recognized the devoted RecycleMore staff committed to serving West County.

Director Romero stated he had watched the Richmond meeting, thanked Mr. Hakes for attending that meeting to explain what was occurring, and suggested that the Richmond City Council did not have all the necessary information to make an informed decision, including the R3 Consulting report or the eight items that the city managers had discussed in that what had been voted on was two items that had already been agreed upon. He still believed in RecycleMore and expressed concern that Richmond was raising items of concern that had already been resolved. He wanted to focus on CalRecycle requirements and commented that there were things that could be done if having to reduce staff or RecycleMore's activities, such as having quarterly Board meetings. He could accept an arrangement where Richmond would continue to have three votes as long as Richmond did not come up with something else. He could also accept a continued evaluation of the JPA by the city managers. He emphasized again that one nay vote would cancel out new programs and avoid program creep.

Director Lyman stated that El Cerrito benefitted from the regional approach for four main things; the interaction with regional legislation using the plastic bag ban and the straw ban as examples; HHW; AB 939 reporting; and interaction with the West Contra Costa Unified School District (WCCUSD) and other education and outreach programs. El Cerrito did its own AB 1826 and AB 341 compliance and outreach, provided its own recycling center, and negotiated an independent PCA, which benefitted from the collective solicitation of PCAs. As a result, from El Cerrito's perspective, it did not get the same benefits from the JPA as other cities did. He added that while El Cerrito was willing to be participants in the JPA, it was "clunky" and El Cerrito was overpaying for some of its services. He emphasized his statements were not a declaration that El Cerrito wanted to withdraw, but that the benefits were not currently outweighing the headaches of negotiating the document over the last three years.

Director Pineda reported that San Pablo opposed a weighted vote. He recognized the years of work, the numerous meetings, and the agreements that had been made, and he was disappointed that Richmond had decided to negate all the progress that had been made. He expressed concern that there might be more backpedaling and stated that San Pablo would not support anything that had not already been agreed upon. He suggested the regional relationship was not being recognized, stated that San Pablo wanted to work together to support each other, and did not want to turn back on all the progress that had been made.

Director Murray suggested that issues of this type had to do with turnover, and instead of looking to the organization's history and experiences and what it represented as an entity, the Richmond staff report had not taken that history and focus into account. A loss of the regional body would miss opportunities and be a disservice to ratepayers. He asked the reason for the backpedaling and noted that the same issues had come up before, which was why the city managers had been approached, had worked out the scenarios, and had been on the verge of the last issue when the Richmond staff report had jeopardized the agreement. He agreed with Director Romero that the R3 Consulting report should have been provided and noted that industrial waste was not cheap to handle, tonnage was difficult to handle and labor intensive, waste streams from Richmond were highly contaminated and labor intensive, and there was a benefit that balanced out for everybody. He emphasized that the organization worked well together for the benefit of all, including Richmond. He added that RecycleMore was worth saving but the points that generated the current situation had been brought on by Richmond staff to encourage the Richmond City Council to look at it from a regional perspective and not from an organization that was benefitting the region. He did not know how many times they had gone over the disbursement of reserves and once solved was continually thrown back for discussion. He questioned what was driving the objections.

Chair Choi spoke to the issue of equity and stated that Richmond had tried to follow the Board's reserves policy and disburse reserves, but the Board would not do that.

Director Murray stated the reserves belonged to the ratepayers and not the cities, and disbursing the reserves to go back to the cities would be stealing the money from the ratepayers. He requested that the city managers discuss

the issue one more time, and if there were no votes they would go back to the original JEPA under the guidelines utilized during the prior 30 years.

Director Romero referred to the three issues from Richmond and would accept Richmond's request for three votes subject to the one-vote veto on new programs to avoid project creep. Director Romero stated with respect to staff misinformation that after the R3 report had been presented and it had dispelled reallocating the industrial waste to the benefit of \$315,000 to the City of Richmond, there had been a 7-0 vote by the RecycleMore Board that the blended rates would be, as part of the PCA, how the rate setting had been done. They had all agreed to use a blended rate. He explained that Richmond staff had not presented that information that Richmond had previously unanimously agreed to, and Richmond staff had suggested that leaving RecycleMore would save \$1 million although HHW would still be the same at \$500,000. He emphasized the misinformation that had been provided by Richmond staff.

Director Bates took this opportunity to publicly apologize to Mr. Hakes and Director Murray and to acknowledge that their treatment at the Richmond City Council meeting had been inappropriate in that they should have had the opportunity to express themselves further. He commented that each Director had the opportunity to deal directly with their City Manager, although the three Directors from Richmond did not have the same opportunity, which was an internal problem.

On the suggestion from Director Romero that other Directors be allowed to discuss the issue with the Richmond City Council, Director Bates recommended a study session instead which would be educational to the other councilmembers and staff, to openly discuss the issues and to determine how to proceed.

Director Lyman noted the importance of the withdrawal issue which was a long-standing division point, and recommended guidance to staff on the goal of the withdrawal language and working the issues out from there.

Mr. Hakes explained with respect to withdrawals, that the concept had been approved and the city managers had been working to refine the language, although that had not been finalized because the Richmond City Manager had left. He clarified that the discussion had been predicated on the negotiations for the one-vote system. He also noted the other topic of the discussion was the future role of RecycleMore and whether that should be in the JEPA. His understanding of the city managers' opinion was that there were no strong feelings one way or another, although Richmond did not support it given the core services which indicated what was allowed to be done. He emphasized that anything new would require a unanimous vote of the Board.

Director Romero recommended that the city managers discuss a provision that Richmond be allowed to keep its three votes and any new programs would require a unanimous vote in that one nay vote would be a veto.

Directors Bates, Myrick and Lyman supported that recommendation, and Chair Choi verified the consensus that the Board had no problem with three votes for Richmond or with a weighted vote of some kind.

Director Romero wanted to get on with the discussion to verify whether there would be an Authority before proceeding with the discussion of a new Executive Director. He wanted to find out if the city managers could accept the recommendation after which the issue of the withdrawal language could be considered. He suggested that the document be presented to everyone to verify the status of the discussions with the city managers.

On the discussion, the Board sought assurance that if there was agreement on the points that had been discussed, Richmond would not be allowed to bring up any other issues at the last minute.

The Board received the JEPA update report and while there was no motion or formal vote and while it was not unanimous, the consensus of the Board was to ask the city managers to meet again, with staff to recommend to the city managers that Richmond retain three Directors for a weighted vote, that core services would remain, and any new non-core programs or projects would require a unanimous vote of the Board, with withdrawal and disbursement of reserves upon withdrawal language to be negotiated into language that all could support.

There was then Board discussion on the share of liabilities, Mr. Hakes stated that he would make recommendations on CalPERS Unfunded Accrued Liability (UAL) and Other Post-Employment Benefit (OPEB) liabilities, RecycleMore's only two liabilities, and would recommend setting aside additional funds in a trust fund for both, to be discussed at a future Board meeting.

Director Romero recommended that Mr. Hakes commission a report on liability recommendations if the cost to do so was under his limit, to be done as soon as possible.

Agenda Item 8.1 – Self-Haul Disposal Sources Report for Calendar Years 2016 and 2017 | Presenter Stan Hakes- Executive Director

Mr. Hakes explained that R3 Consulting had been hired to assist in completing RecycleMore's 2016 electronic annual report (EAR). When the 2016 EAR was completed, staff and R3 identified a concern with the increase in self-haul disposal tonnage. There was a similar spike in self haul disposal when R3 Consulting helped prepare the 2017 EAR CalRecycle. As a result, the Board approved an amendment to an existing agreement with R3 Consulting to complete a more involved report on the increase in disposal tonnage during 2017.

Garth Schultz, Principal, R3 Consulting Group, Inc., highlighted an investigation into an observed spike in reported tons of landfill disposal. He noted that any tonnage going to a landfill in the state were monitored and tracked by the jurisdiction of origin to account for the tons of total disposal attributed to each reporting entity in the state to ensure compliance with state mandates. In early 2018, the spike in tonnage was discovered, the importance of which related to RecycleMore's measure of compliance with AB 939, and the numerator was the total number of tons reported to the state by the jurisdiction of origin. He explained that compliance was expressed in per capita disposal expressed in pounds per person per day (PPD), with a target ceiling of 5.4 pounds in the RecycleMore service area in terms of meeting the 50 percent diversion requirement. In 2017, RecycleMore had achieved 3.9 PPD, the same as 2016, an equivalent diversion rate of 64 percent. He described the different types of disposal and a wide variety of sources, and noted that for this investigation they had focused on the special waste category where the spike had occurred, which had been the impetus for the investigation that had been attributed to bio solids delivered directly to Keller Canyon Landfill. Having sought out the sources of the bio solids and having worked with the sanitary districts in the region, the spike in bio solids had been attributed to the West County Wastewater District as a result of a clean-out of sewage drying beds. Ultimately, that tonnage had been deemed to be eligible for exclusion now but not necessarily in the future. If it had not been excluded, RecycleMore's PPD would have increased to 4.7, the difference between 64 and 56 percent diversion rate. As a result, R3 Consulting suggested RecycleMore work with the sewage treatment plant and other waste districts to see if there were other diversion end sources for that tonnage.

Mr. Schultz referred to AB 901, a bill that had passed although the rule making was still under implementation by CalRecycle, which would change how disposal was reported around the state. Currently, disposal tons reported would go from the facilities to the county in a variety of methodologies, while AB 901 would circumvent the counties and expand the reporting to other types of tonnage, primarily related to recycling and organics. Monitoring prior to the implementation of AB 901 would ensure that as much as possible was being excluded.

Director Murray clarified that the spike had applied to a one-time scenario and should not be a concern for some time. While sewage disposal based on the current average from each agency had not been a concern in the past he asked if West County Sanitary District could phase the cleaning of their beds to avoid a spike in the future.

Rose Radford, Project Manager, R3 Consulting, stated that based on an initial conversation with West County Sanitary District that was the first of potentially many other clean-outs likely to occur. A similar clean-out was expected in the next reporting year and the disposal would remain at this level for a few more years.

Director Murray asked if there were options that RecycleMore should be considering in the future, and Mr. Schultz stated that RecycleMore should engage the state in a conversation as to whether the previous exclusions would be

allowed or whether there were other end sources such as the land application that the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) had pursued.

Andy Schneider, RecycleMore Program Manager, commented that SB 1383 would consider bio solids as disposal by 2022 unless there was an alternative diversion process for that such as land application or anaerobic digestion.

Director Pineda requested details on AB 901, and Mr. Schultz advised that he would provide that information to Mr. Hakes.

Director Romero asked if a portion of the industrial area in Richmond was part of the West County Wastewater District. He commented that the majority of the R3 Consulting report related to bio solids and not self-hauling. He sought more information on self-hauling and the businesses associated with self-hauling, which the report should have provided. He referred to Richmond Municipal Sewer District that pumped bio solids to West County Wastewater District, and asked for a clarification of that information.

Mr. Schultz commented that there was potential for additional investigation.

Chair Choi noted that the spike had been identified as specifically being from the bio solids, and Mr. Schultz stated the purpose of focusing on that activity was to find out what was in the tonnage and what could be monitored and regulated, a challenging source of tonnage given the large and broad range of those haulers.

Director Pineda explained that Oakland was regulating and conducting oversight on self-hauling in that city and evaluating different measures to create a database and require self-reporting, charging a fee, and with potentially more surveillance to monitor the dumping sites more closely.

Director Murray asked staff to contact Supervisor Gioia's office with respect to the self-haul issue that he was going to regulate and Mr. Hakes stated that what had been discussed with Supervisor Gioia's office was illegal haulers and illegal disposal sites, increased enforcement, and having the District Attorney's office prosecute one or two big haulers. He would get a report on the illegal hauling and disposal issues and determine what had been done to remedy the growth of those illegal activities in the future.

Director Romero requested that Republic Services be asked to identify the illegal self-haulers, bring that information to the Board, and consider a letter to the county to address those illegal activities.

The Board received the oral presentation by R3 Consulting Group, Inc. on 2017 Self-Haul Disposal Sources.

Agenda Item 8.2 – AB 341/AB 1826 Update | Presenter Stan Hakes - Executive Director

Mr. Hakes stated that AB 341 required each California city to have a commercial recycling program and notify businesses of the law, and AB 1826 required each California city to have a commercial composting program and notify businesses about the law. RecycleMore had been responsible for complying with both on behalf of the member agencies, and compliance information on both had been reported in the annual report to CalRecycle. He highlighted the background of RecycleMore's CalRecycle reporting when RecycleMore had been put on notice to address some reporting concerns, and how RecycleMore had addressed those concerns and its reports had ultimately been accepted by CalRecycle. He explained that as of January 1, 2019, AB 1826 required a new and stricter threshold for businesses to meet. RecycleMore staff had prepared and sent letters to numerous businesses to identify the new threshold and compliance was being tracked and recorded under the 2019 new threshold. He identified the site visits that had been held by CalRecycle Local Assistance and Market Development (LAMD) staff members in the member jurisdictions. At the final site visit, CalRecycle staff member JoAnn Jaschke had advised that she would inform RecycleMore and the member agencies of CalRecycle's recommendations in March.

Mr. Hakes commented that staff had come across a company with a specialized software program that specifically dealt with AB 341, AB 1826, and SB 1383 legislation. He noted that RecycleMore's compliance percentage numbers were great, but there was room for improvement on reporting and documentation. He expressed that CalRecycle staff's appear frustrated with the reports and back up documentation provided, by RecycleMore. Cal Recycle staff

expressed the desire a table (or tables) with more detail than the summary sheets submitted, but less detail than the full compliance data sheet RecycleMore provided. He emphasized that the CalRecycle representative only recently communicated her desire for this kind of table. The data platform mentioned was something positive that would be brought to the Board in the future.

Director Myrick asked about the potential that member agencies would be deemed non-compliant or penalized. Mr. Hakes stated the CalRecycle representative explained that RecycleMore and a single member city or a group of member cities could be placed on a formal compliance plan. If there was a recommendation from CalRecycle staff to do that, there would be a public hearing. RecycleMore staff would testify that RecycleMore had made great efforts and dedicated additional resources into doing the work, identify the successes, and work on developing better tables. He also noted that the Cal Recycle representative indicated that more information was not desired at this point. Richmond staff was helping RecycleMore with pivot tables to provide CalRecycle with its preferred format.

Mr. Hakes emphasized that AB 1826 compliance was the highest priority of staff and the software program mentioned was being used by others in the area and those using it were CalRecycle compliant. When asked, he stated the software program would initially cost in the \$25,000 to \$30,000 range, and then about \$15,000 annually ongoing after the first year.

Director Myrick emphasized the importance of RecycleMore meeting compliance requirements and requested quarterly updates.

Director Romero wanted to know what specifically occurred on a site visit, what instructions had been given by CalRecycle, and if the data offered related to the electronic review.

Mr. Hakes stated that the information provided to CalRecycle in August was a 2017 report and because RecycleMore was on an informal probation, CalRecycle had asked for progress reports and RecycleMore had provided information to Cal Recycle throughout 2018. A progress report had been provided to CalRecycle in November 2018 and a final report in and December 2018.

Director Romero asked why the December compliance percentages provided to CalRecycle had not been included in a staff report to the Board. He asked for the numbers per city of businesses that were compliant, and those that were not. He recognized that the relationship with CalRecycle had worsened. He suggested approaching CalRecycle to find out how to improve the relationship and request a response in writing.

Mr. Hakes noted that he had called Ms. Jaschke after the last meeting in Richmond, had expressed a desire to build a better relationship with CalRecycle, and suggested that RecycleMore staff and member agency staff meet with Ms. Jaschke and her boss, with a meeting to potentially be scheduled in April.

In response to the Board question as to whether the improved numbers from 56 to 91 percent were from 2017 or 2018 data, Andy Schneider stated the percentage improvements were from 2017 to current and not in a single year. He clarified that the improvement in compliance was actually a reflection of the improvement in the follow-up activities. He too wanted to build a better relationship with CalRecycle and stated the process could be perfected to make it a non-issue to be ready for the new SB 1383 legislation.

The Board agreed with the importance of working well with CalRecycle, with making sure that required reports were easy to understand and with the content needed for compliance. There was also a request to break down the contribution to compliance by city, and Mr. Hakes stated he would provide a breakdown by city at the April meeting to identify the compliance at the end of 2018 for both AB 341 and AB 1826.

In response to comments, Mr. Hakes clarified that each member agency had received a site visit by CalRecycle and all cities were in the same program although El Cerrito did not include Republic staff because El Cerrito was not serviced by that system. The site visits involved a lot more than AB 341 and AB 1826 in that there were other components such as going over records and documents, regional plans and programs, as well as visiting some of the businesses, non-profits, and schools.

Director Pineda urged RecycleMore to work with its state legislative partners, if needed, for clarification of requirements.

The Board received and filed AB 341/AB 1826 update report and directed staff to provide details on what occurred at site visits.

Agenda Item 8.3 – Authority Priority Projects for Spring-Summer 2019 | Presenter Stan Hakes - Executive Director

Director Romero requested that the item be deferred pending a verification of whether there would be a JPA and an Executive Director. The Board agreed.

Mr. Hakes explained that some items were time sensitive and recommended some forward movement on Executive Director Recruitment. He recommended some decision next month to either move forward with Executive Director Recruitment or hire an Interim Executive Director to fill in, and expressed a willingness to work an extra month, if needed, to accommodate an Interim Executive Director.

Directors discussed pursuing Items 1 and 4 on the list (AB 1826 and AB 341 Compliance and Executive Director Recruitment or Hiring an Interim Executive Director) along with Items 12 and 16 (One Day HHW Events and Study – Alternatives for New RecycleMore Offices).

Given the short timeframe, the Board offered direction to move forward to hire an Interim Executive Director and schedule a closed session to discuss the Executive Director vacancy at the April Board meeting. The Board also asked staff to bring back the priority list to the April Board meeting for consideration.

Agenda Item 8.4 – Evaluation Process for Legal Counsel/Legal Services Proposals | Presenter Stan Hakes - Executive Director

John Bakker, Legal Counsel, recused himself from the discussion given that he was one of the proposers. He clarified, when asked, that he was prepared to stay on indefinitely under the existing contract.

Chair Choi suggested that the evaluation process for Legal Counsel/Legal Services Proposals be continued to the next meeting.

Director Romero suggested that the Board continue with the current Legal Services contract to ensure continuity pending the selection of a new Executive Director.

The Board directed staff not to move forward with Legal Counsel RFPs at this time, continue with the current Legal Counsel Meyer’s Nave, and wait until the end of the year to solicit new proposals and notify proposers in writing to thank them for their interest and to ask them to look forward to future solicitations.

Agenda Item 8.5 – Election of Board Chair and Vice-Chair | Presenter Stan Hakes - Executive Director

Mr. Hakes recommended the nomination of candidates for Chair and Vice-Chair beginning March 15, 2019 and ending January 31, 2020. He clarified that according to the JEPA, the Chair and Vice-Chair shall not be representatives of the same Member Agency, no person may serve consecutive terms as Chair or Vice-Chair, and successive Chairs shall not be representatives of the same City.

MOTION by Director Bates to nominate Greg Lyman as the Board Chair for 2019. **SECOND** by Director Myrick.

MOTION PASSED unanimously.

MOTION by Director Myrick to nominate Abel Pineda as the Board Vice-Chair for 2019. **SECOND** by Director Choi.

MOTION PASSED unanimously.

MOTION by Director Myrick to close nominations. **SECOND** by Director Choi. *Greg Lyman* was elected as Chair and *Abel Pineda* was elected as Vice-Chair of RecycleMore for 2019.

MOTION PASSED unanimously.

BOARD MEMBER AND STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Lyman reported that Earth Day in El Cerrito would be April 13, the same day as the HHW event.

Director Romero reported that April 13 would also be Hercules' HHW date.

Andy Schneider reported that April 20 would be North Richmond's Earth Day celebration at Shields-Reed Park where RecycleMore and Republic Services would have a table.

ADJOURNMENT

With consensus of the Board, Chair Lyman adjourned the meeting at 10:24 P.M. until the next regular Board meeting scheduled for April 11, 2019.

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true and correct statement of the Official Minutes of the West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority Board meeting held March 14, 2019.

Board Secretary

Date