

# WEST CONTRA COSTA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY (WCCIWMA) BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING MINUTES – JUNE 12, 2025

**Meeting Date | Time 6/12/2025 6:15 PM | Meeting Location City of Richmond, City Council Chambers, 440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond, CA 94804**

**Meeting called by** Board of Directors  
**Type of meeting** Regular  
**Authority Staff Present** Reka Abraham, Lisa Borreani, Rachel Dice and Viviane Vidal  
Absent: Steve Duran  
**Legal Counsel** John Bakker

**Board Members Present:**  
Directors: C. Zepeda (Chair) Richmond; W. Ktsanes, El Cerrito; D. Bhattarai, Hercules; D. Murphy, Alternate, Pinole; D. Robinson, Richmond; and R. Xavier (Vice Chair) San Pablo  
Absent: J. Brown, Richmond; A. Tave, Pinole, S. Scales-Preston and J. Gioia (Ex-Officio), Contra Costa County,

## CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Zepeda called the regular meeting of the West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority (WCCIWMA), also known as RecycleMore, to order at 6:18 P.M.

The Roll Call established the existence of a quorum (Bhattarai, Ktsanes, Murphy, Robinson, Xavier and Zepeda).

Chair Zepeda adjourned into Closed Session at 6:20 P.M.

## CLOSED SESSION

### PUBLIC EMPLOYEE APPOINTMENT

*Title: Executive Director*

Chair Zepeda returned to open session at 6:28 P.M.

Legal Counsel John Bakker stated there was no reportable action taken in Closed Session.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Zepeda led the Pledge of Allegiance.

## EX-PARTE COMMUNICATIONS & DISCLOSURES

There were no ex-parte communications or disclosures.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, invited the Board to the Richmond Rotary Club Weekly Meeting to be held on June 13 at 12:30 P.M. at the Country Club, \$35 for lunch; to the Hercules Business Roundtable on August 7 from 7:30 to 9:45 A.M. at Leila by the Bay; and to the Contra Costa Mayors Conference on September 4 hosted by the City of El Cerrito, more information to be provided.

## CONSENT CALENDAR

1. May 8, 2025 Authority Board Meeting Minutes: (Motion to Approve)
2. May 22, 2025 Special Board Meeting Minutes: (Motion to Approve)
3. Clerical Correction – Fiscal Year 2024/25 Edible Food Recovery Grant Allocations: (Motion to Approve corrected FY 2024/25 grant funding allocations from \$59,719 to \$77,107 for food recovery organizations)
4. Job Description for the Position of Executive Director: (Motion to Approve Resolution 25-08 establishing a position description for the Executive Director of the West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority)
5. Job Description for the Position of Marketing & Operations Manager: (Motion to Approve Resolution 25-07 creating the new position of Marketing & Operations Manager, establishing a job description and a salary range for this position)
6. Job Description for the Position of Deputy Executive Director and Regulatory Manager (Motion to Approve Resolution 25-06, creating the new position of Deputy Executive Director and Regulatory Manager, establishing a job description and a salary range for this position)

**MOTION** by Vice Chair Xavier to approve Consent Calendar Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, as submitted. **SECOND** by Director Bhattarai.

**MOTION PASSED** unanimously by a Roll Call vote.

## STAFF REPORT

Cliff Feldman introduced himself, and congratulated Reka Abraham and Lisa Borreani for their promotions to the newly established positions of Deputy Executive Director and Regulatory Manager, and Marketing & Operations Manager respectively, and stated those promotions were well deserved. He appreciated the Board's consideration as the next Executive Director and stated that if approved, he would zealously represent the ratepayers and the Member Agencies and provide value to those ratepayers.

---

### **Staff Report Item 7.1 – Executive Director**

Recycling & Household Hazardous Waste Program Manager, Reka Abraham, reported that in the absence of Interim Executive Director Steve Duran, who was ill, she would be serving as the Acting Interim Executive Director. She presented the Interim Executive Director's staff report and stated that there were three items on the agenda that interplayed and it was important to approve them to be able to move forward with the other items related to the Post Collection Agreement (PCA) extension, the budget and the rates approval. She added that negotiations continued with Republic Services.

---

### **Staff Report Item 7.2 – Recycling and HHW Programs Update | Presenter | Reka Abraham – Recycling & Household Hazardous Waste Program Manager**

The report from the Recycling and Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) Program Manager was presented in writing. There were no questions from the Board.

---

**Staff Report Item 7.3 – Outreach Programs Update | Presenter | Lisa Borreani – Outreach Program Manager**

Outreach Program Manager Lisa Borreani advised that her staff report had been presented in writing. She reported that RecycleMore would be at the Pinole Car Show on June 22, 2025, 7:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M., with a booth to educate residents, car enthusiasts, and DIYers with oil change information and supplies and how to properly recycle used oil.

Ms. Borreani added that Webster Nguyen had resigned from RecycleMore to accept an artist-in-residency program in Thailand. Staff will be actively looking for a coordinator to replace his position.

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

---

**Agenda Item 8.1 – DTSC Proposed Regulatory Changes for Hazardous Waste Landfills | Presenter | | Reka Abraham – Acting Interim Executive Director**

Reka Abraham, Acting Interim Executive Director introduced Larry Sweetser, RecycleMore’s Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) Consultant, to provide a verbal update on the California Department of Toxic Substances Control’s (DTSC’s) proposed changes.

Larry Sweetser, Sweetser & Associates, Inc., a Richmond resident and a customer, reported that DTSC had to revise its regulations a few years ago, revise its forms and raise its fees and also determined to evaluate its hazardous waste program. The DTSC issued a management report intended to look at the entire hazardous waste system in California. He stated there were a lot of good things affecting hazardous waste generation and the report would look at ways to reduce waste and look at all its programs. He noted that the California criteria for hazardous waste was different from the federal regulations and it was expensive to do both, when required. Aligning the testing methods from both was critical. He explained there was certain hazardous waste, like large volume hazardous waste, that may not need to go to a hazardous waste landfill, particularly since there were only two hazardous waste landfills in California, at Kettleman Hills and Button Willow. Certain hazardous waste had been allowed into solid waste landfills for many years if following a protocol and standards imposed on those landfills, such as with asbestos. The DTSC was looking with the management report to deal with what had been done with wood waste, contaminated soil and other waste that if following certain requirements that waste could be categorized under “alternative management standards,” managed not at a hazardous waste landfill but at certain landfills that could accept it and not have to be exported out of state.

Mr. Sweetser stated the management plan would come up with some recommendations. The process would have to go through statutory changes and there was a lot of concern. Another issue of concern was wildfires where the wildfire debris, once burned, many times would become hazardous and finding the best way to manage that waste was what the report would look at. He stated there were a lot more steps to go and if there was a concern at all this would be a good time to be engaged. He explained that July 15, 2025 would be the last public meeting (also virtual) in Sacramento and the Board of Environmental Safety was also looking at the issue. The report was coming up with guidelines and recommendations on what could be done. He emphasized that there were many steps to go and significant public scrutiny involved.

Mr. Sweetser responded to comments from the Board and as to what the Board could do, he suggested there were a number of avenues to pursue and there were a number of agencies involved. A lot of hazardous waste generated was not only from the large operators but also from small businesses, and if there was a way to educate the small businesses, such as source reduction, that could help reduce toxicity and reduce costs.

Mr. Sweetser added that the report was also looking at why products were being produced with hazardous materials in the first place, and input to help large and small businesses and even city departments was encouraged.

Acting Interim Executive Director Abraham explained that the HHW Program included outreach to community members when flyers were provided and where some programs had been focused to switch from toxic materials to reusables, such as with marine flares, and partnering with other organizations that focused on those types of things was important. She noted there were a lot of toxic products on the market and RecycleMore was targeting them one product at a time.

Mr. Sweetser stated the whole criteria of how California managed hazardous waste would be evaluated and would likely be similar to current criteria with respect to a lined landfill, environmental controls to control dust and the quantity of material, and in the case of wood waste and asbestos, the material would be put in a cell and buried immediately; efforts to reduce environmental impacts and environmental emissions from the waste. Landfills required a monthly inspection by the local solid waste agency to ensure that regulations were being followed. There would be controls on how the material would be managed, reported and collected. He noted there was little difference between solid waste landfills and hazardous waste landfills in terms of controls but the problem was the few and far between hazardous waste landfills. Communities were concerned given the limited hazardous waste landfills that might mean the local landfills might become involved. He noted that the report was also looking at impacts to disadvantaged communities.

As to whether the change in classification impacted transportation, Mr. Sweetser stated the materials were being imported to communities now and if the existing facilities were significantly changed by the change in classification there would be environmental reviews to address impacts, which would be part of the discussion. He expected good information to come out of the report. He also clarified that there were no facilities that would take nuclear waste, although there might be processing facilities that would handle that material and opportunities to have that kind of industry available to process that material, which would be under strict guidance. As to whether workers in the industry were concerned with the proposed changes, he stated for those facilities now taking the waste, such as wood waste, there had to be a training program for workers exposed to the material and a monitoring of those workers, which was part of the operational controls (standard OSHA) that would impose safety requirements to protect workers. When there was a special waste, there was an obligation under OSHA that employees be protected and trained.

As to whether older landfills could be re-opened to accept the re-categorized waste, Mr. Sweetser suggested that there was no process now and no discussions of that possibility, which would be extremely unlikely given that significant law changes, including federal law, would be needed to allow that to occur., which was why old landfills had been turned into transfer stations to transport material. As to what impacts there could be to the local communities he stated would depend on the quantity involved.

---

**Agenda Item 8.2 – Employment Agreement for Executive Director | Presenter | Reka Abraham – Acting Interim Executive Director**

For public comment, CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, stated he had read the agreement. He commended the Board and Bob Murray & Associates for the recruitment and supported the approval of Cliff Feldman as the new Executive Director of WCCIWMA.

Acting Interim Executive Director Abraham recommended approval of the Employment Agreement with Cliff Feldman to serve as Executive Director of WCCIWMA, and highlighted the background of the item after the Employment Agreement with the prior Executive Director had ended in 2024, the recruitment process, the interview of five candidates, and the ultimate selection of Cliff Feldman as the new Executive Director.

Ms. Abraham highlighted the basic terms of the Agreement with Mr. Feldman to fill the Executive Director position at \$204,250 for a three-year term commencing on July 28, 2025. She added that the fiscal impact of the Employment Agreement had been included in the RecycleMore Budget.

**MOTION** by Vice Chair Xavier to approve an Employment Agreement by and between West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority and Cliff Feldman for services as Executive Director in a form substantially conforming to Attachment 1 to the staff report dated June 12, 2025. **SECOND** by Director Bhattarai.

**MOTION PASSED** unanimously by a Roll Call vote.

Mr. Feldman was congratulated by the Board and welcomed to the team.

---

**Agenda Item 8.3 – Amendment Extending Current Post Collection Agreement | Presenter | Reka Abraham – Acting Interim Executive Director**

Reka Abraham, Acting Interim Executive Director, identified the action to authorize the Interim Executive Director to execute a First Amendment to the current Post Collection Agreement between WCCIWMA and West County Resource Recovery, Inc.; West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill, Inc.; Golden Bear Transfer Services, Inc.; Richmond Sanitary Services, Inc.; and Keller Canyon Landfill Company for Post-Collection Recycling, and Disposal Services, extending the term through December 31, 2025. The current agreement would expire on June 30, 2025. The Board had directed the Interim Executive Director to negotiate an extension to the contract. The amendments to the current agreement had been successful to extend the services for six months to be able to continue regular services under the existing agreement pending negotiations for a new PCA. She stated the First Amendment would clarify that during the extension period, negotiations for a new PCA would be exclusive solely between the parties in the First Amendment. She recommended approval of the First Amendment to the current agreement.

Ms. Abraham stated that with the extension there would be a change in the material specific rate (only) from \$93.81 per ton to \$144.01 per ton for the extended term only. This would not affect the RecycleMore budget but it would affect ratepayers, resulting in a rate amendment to allow the current provisions of the PCA to continue in addition to the HHW operations, mattress recycling program and the monthly compost program. When the agreement was approved, all other agreements would no longer be in effect and all of the issues currently being negotiated would continue to be negotiated in the new PCA. Not extending the agreement would mean there would be nothing to limit the contractor (Republic Services) from raising rates. In addition, programs that Republic helped RecycleMore deliver would cease until other ways could be found to implement or fund them. She recommended that the extension be approved.

In response to questions, Ms. Abraham stated the exclusivity portion explained that RecycleMore would be negotiating exclusively with Republic Services for the new agreement, and at the time of negotiations during the term RecycleMore would be locked into negotiations with the service contractor.

Director Robinson expressed concern for the significantly greater material specific rate that would impact ratepayers, and Ms. Abraham explained that the Board had directed the Interim Executive Director to negotiate terms for a six-month extension to be able to extend the current services. The negotiations had been unable to eliminate that increase and approval of the agreement would implement that increased rate for the term of the extension only.

Director Robinson understood the need for the extension but sought some dialogue with the public to explain the increased rate during the extension period. She verified with staff that the new rate would become effective July 1, 2025 and residents' next bill thereafter would reflect that increased portion of the new rate.

Legal Counsel John Bakker agreed that some public outreach could be pursued at the discretion of the Board.

Director Bhattarai agreed with the need to inform the public of the Board’s need to extend the agreement for six months and to accept an unavoidable increase in the rate with an impact to ratepayers.

Ms. Abraham clarified that the outreach to ratepayers should reflect that the increased rate would be specifically for the second half of the calendar year and that RecycleMore was still in negotiations for the new agreement with no information at this point what that would look like. She stated if directed by the Board, RecycleMore staff could create an outreach plan and when moving forward with the negotiations for the Board to realize and the residents to learn that the services needed to continue to be provided and the Board was doing everything it could to get the best deal possible for West County residents.

On the continued discussion, whether or not the public outreach should occur prior to the approval of the extension agreement, Ms. Abraham stated that a rate setting hearing was normally held in November each year, and RecycleMore meetings in general were always open to the public. She clarified that this rate setting did not fall under Proposition 218 and that a Proposition 218 process was not required to increase the rate.

On the further discussion after the motion and second to approve, a provision was added to design and conduct a public information process to help inform ratepayers of the short-term increase in cost and allow an opportunity for public questions and feedback prior to the release of the next quarterly bill, within 90 days.

**MOTION** by Director Robinson to Authorize the Interim Executive Director to execute the First Amendment to the Agreement Between the West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority and West County Resource Recovery, Inc.; West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill, Inc.; Golden Bear Transfer Services, Inc.; Richmond Sanitary Services, Inc.; and Keller Canyon Landfill Company for Post-Collection Recycling, and Disposal Services, extending the term through December 31, 2025, and to design and conduct a public information process to help inform ratepayers of the short-term increase in cost and allow an opportunity for public questions and feedback prior to the release of the next quarterly bill, within 90 days. **SECOND** by Director Murphy.

**MOTION PASSED** by the following Roll Call vote.

AYES:	Bhattarai, Murphy, Robinson, Xavier, Zepeda
NOES:	Ktsanes
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Brown

---

**Agenda Item 8.4 – Approve Fiscal Year (FY) 2025/26 Authority Budget and Approve a Change to the Reserves Policy | Presenter | Reka Abraham – Acting Interim Executive Director**

Reka Abraham, Acting Interim Executive Director reported that the item represented a follow-up from the workshop held in May 2025, and involved two actions: to consider and approve Resolution 25-09 (R-1) adopting the Fiscal Year 2025-26 Budget and Compliance Fund as proposed by staff; and to consider and approve Resolution 25-10 (R-2) establishing the Operating Fund Reserve minimum balance, to be fixed at 67 percent of the Operating Budget, and lowering the Recycling Fund Reserve to a minimum balance of \$100,000.

Ms. Abraham explained that in July 2024, the Board had approved the FY 2024-25 Budget with Total Revenues of \$1,197,910, and Total Expenditures of \$1,706, 173, which included a \$508,336 Deficit. In order to balance that budget, the Board had approved a transfer of \$878,667 from the Recycling Fund Reserve to the Operating Budget. For the

Budget Ending June 30, 2025, the FY 2024-25 Projected Revenues were now estimated at \$1,463,869 with \$1,974,457 in Expenditures, and a Deficit of \$510,588. For this year, proposed post-collection revenues were \$2,099,051 with interest revenues of \$50,800 for Total Operating Revenues of \$2,149,851. The post-collection revenues would add \$100,000 to the Operating Fund Reserves to help meet the 67 percent Operating Fund Reserve Policy requirement. With that, she noted that there would be a much smaller deficit this year of \$100,000 that would need to be funded for the Operating Reserves.

Ms. Abraham also highlighted the Compliance Fund, noted that expected expenses were less than anticipated and there was more than enough in the budget to cover expenses. She clarified that the Compliance Fund was a restricted fund specific to regulatory expenditures, at this time for SB 1383 expenses, that was currently sitting with Republic Services but which would be transferred back to RecycleMore. At the end of the fiscal year with the transfer and expected expenses, the Compliance Fund projected closing balance would be slightly more than \$61,000 and no additional revenues were needed for the Compliance Fund this year.

Ms. Abraham highlighted the other elements of the FY 2025-26 Budget under Personnel with a total budget of \$1,223,228 for six positions, including the new position classifications; under Operational Expenses at \$533,328; Professional Services at \$311,030; and Program Expenses at \$242,495.

Vice Chair Xavier reported that San Pablo staff did not support the proposed \$30,000 increase to the HHW Program for marine flares one-day collection, which funding had been required because the usual grant funding had not been forthcoming this year to cover the expense of the event.

In response, Ms. Abraham stated the \$30,000 for ratepayer impact was quite small, although the impact of the collection program was large given the communities situated along the Bay and given that all boaters were required to have marine flares if going into open ocean. She emphasized that marine flares were toxic and hazardous, expired whether they were used or not, and there was no outlet for disposal, and there was no collection space for the material and the flares were either in the garbage trucks, in communities, or being hoarded in homes that created a public safety issue. She stated the program, which had been funded by grants the last three years saved the community the environmental and public safety impacts. Over the years, the collection program had collected hundreds of marine flares and she recommended the Board take that into consideration when considering this one-time impact on the budget. She expressed a hope to get the grant funding from CalRecycle next year.

Director Robinson asked if the \$30,000 had already been included in the budget and Ms. Abraham affirmed that the program section included all planned events, including the \$30,000 for marine flare collection.

As to how the programs impacted rates, Ms. Abraham stated the program budget would require a \$0.26/month increase for a 35-gallon service level for a resident that would represent about \$1.00 on a quarterly bill. She added that last year RecycleMore had underbudgeted so the rate increases in November amounts being expended were not reconciling with the amounts received. To have no impact on the rates whatsoever, some programs would have to be cut. The \$0.26 monthly increase would be on top of the current 35-gallon rate \$13.27.

Director Ktsanes was concerned that with the number of small increases there was an overall impact of a 15 percent increase on rates from the year before. He shared the concern with the \$30,000 cost for marine flares collection, particularly since there was a deficit and he did not support a budget with a deficit.

Director Ktsanes was also concerned about the reduction in the Recycling Fund Reserves from the target of \$662,000 to \$100,000. Given his concerns, he had spoken to El Cerrito City staff and he asked if Christina Leard could speak to the Board to summarize the City's concerns.

In response, Ms. Abraham explained that the decision to reduce the Recycling Fund Reserve from \$662,000 to \$100,000 had been made strategically to reduce the rate impact that residents would receive with this change. Without that reduction, there would be a \$500,000 deficit, which would need to be funded and which would be a significant impact on the rates. She added that the revenue requirement for the post collection rates for the budget included the expenditures for this year plus the \$100,000 to go towards reserves. Even decreasing the Recycling Fund Reserve limit there would still be a \$100,000 deficit in the Recycling Fund Reserve. She stated that \$100,000 in programs could be cut and not fund the Operating Fund Reserve anymore and there would still be a \$500,000 deficit for the Recycling Fund Reserve. She added that staff had spent a lot of time going back and forth on how to reduce the rate impact on residents this year.

Ms. Abraham clarified that the Operating Fund Reserve was the bucket of money intended to balance the budget and the Recycling Fund Reserve had been created for special projects and was a separate account created for regulatory purposes. She referred to the Operating Fund Reserve bucket, the Recycling Fund Reserve bucket, and the restricted account for Compliance Fund activities. Overall, the amount of money in reserve funding with the change would still leave over \$1.4 million in reserves. Without the change, the reserve would be closer to \$1.8 or \$1.9 million.

To clarify, Ms. Abraham explained that nothing from reserves would be pulled for expenses. The Operating Budget was not touching reserves. The Operating Reserve Fund that was nowhere near the 67 percent minimum at this point was being bumped up by using the Recycling Fund Reserve and lowering the minimum requirement on the Recycling Fund Reserve to \$100,000, but overall, there would be still be \$1.4 million in reserve. Since the reserve funds had been quite high over the last few years, the Board had approved the authority to pull from reserves rather than raising rates but that was no longer feasible.

CHRISTINA LEARD, Operations & Environmental Services Division, City of El Cerrito, and a former member of RecycleMore staff, shared some historic knowledge on the item that had been thoroughly considered and approved with Board Resolution 18-02 enacted in June 2018, requiring the balance of Operating Fund Reserves to remain fixed at 67 percent of annual Operating Revenue and the balance of the Recycling Fund Reserve to remain fixed at \$662,000. She emphasized that a lot of time, energy and negotiations, with the help of a consultant, had been involved in the development of that policy. She suggested more thought should be put into any revisions or updates to the policy.

When asked, Ms. Leard noted that the \$662,000 limit had been set with specific parameters pursuant to industry standards, management best practices and a variety of professional sources and to ensure that RecycleMore, member agencies and the public would have adequate funds set aside to address contingent liabilities and opportunities, program and compliance changes, as well as fluctuations in the market. The reserve had been used to reduce impacts for the last several years and the reserves now needed to be replenished.

Director Robinson clarified that there were two reserve accounts and one restricted fund, and there was one policy, which was repeated. Director Robinson asked what the requirements were for how much needed to be in a reserve fund and if there were any expected issues with the recycling fund in the future.

Ms. Abraham clarified the reserve funds involved, the balances, and the proposal to avoid the need for a rate increase. She understood the Recycling Fund Reserve had been created separate from the Operating Fund Reserve to be a special projects fund to move with the market in response to solid waste regulations and changes in programs regarding solid waste, and Ms. Leard affirmed it was also intended to balance potential rate increases.

Ms. Abraham stated the Compliance Fund was specific to regulatory programs in response to changes in the recycling world from the state. That fund did not exist at the time the policy had originally been written. The purpose of the Recycling Fund Reserve in addition to programs was also to protect ratepayers from rate impacts, and without lowering the limit, there would be a \$500,000 deficit, which was a rate impact. She stated the proposal

to lower the minimum did not mean the balance could not be increased in the future. As to whether there could be an issue in the future, she reiterated that there was a balance of \$1.4 million in the whole reserve.

Director Robinson questioned whether both reserve funds were needed. She suggested the Operating Fund Reserve and the Recycling Fund Reserve were serving the same purpose, although Ms. Abraham stated that both funds were in one account and one was specified by the Joint Exercise of Powers Authority (JEPA). To combine the funds would require a modification to the JEPA.

Chair Zepeda recommended a presentation in the future to discuss the reserve accounts and the potential changes to the JEPA.

**MOTION** by Director Robinson to Approve Resolution 25-09 (R-1) adopting the Fiscal Year 2025-26 Budget and Compliance Fund as proposed by staff in the staff report dated June 12, 2025; and Approve Resolution 25-10 (R-2) establishing the Operating Fund Reserve minimum balance to be fixed at 67 percent of the Operating Budget, and lowering the Recycling Fund Reserve to a minimum balance of \$100,000. **SECOND** by Vice Chair Xavier.

On the question, Director Ktsanes asked whether a motion to defer the item to the next meeting for a further discussion pending the onboarding of the new Executive Director made sense, although he was cautioned that to defer the change in the resolution the option would be to approve a budget with a \$500,000 deficit. The Budget would need to be approved prior to the end of the fiscal year on June 30, 2025. It was clarified that approving the Budget now did not mean that the policy could not be changed in the future.

**MOTION PASSED** by the following Roll Call vote.

AYES:	Bhattarai, Murphy, Robinson, Xavier, Zepeda
NOES:	Ktsanes
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Brown

---

**Agenda Item 8.5 – Public Hearing to Consider Adoption of Resolution to Approve a Mid-Year Rate Adjustment for the 2025 Post Collection Rates for July 1, 2025 to December 31, 2025 | Presenter | Reka Abraham – Acting Interim Executive Director**

Reka Abraham, Acting Interim Executive Director requested that the Board hold a public hearing to consider the adoption of Resolution 25-11 to approve a Mid-Year Rate Adjustment for the 2025 Post Collection Rates for July 1, 2025 to December 31, 2025, to the 2025 Post-Collection Rates for the Republic Services Collection Service Area as set forth in the resolution.

Chair Zepeda opened the Public Hearing.

Acting Interim Executive Director Abraham reported that pursuant to Article 5 of the current PCA, Republic’s sole compensation for services provided to RecycleMore were charged by the Post Collection Rate determined by the Blended Per Ton Rate, which included a number of components that she highlighted.

The PC rates were charged by Republic to Richmond Sanitary Service, which provided solid waste collection services to RecycleMore’s member agencies except El Cerrito, which had its own Post-Collection Agreement that would expire December 31, 2025, and El Cerrito set its own post-collection rates. While the rates had been set in November 2024, the Board was advised that the rates would have to reset mid-year given that the agreement would expire on June 30, 2025, although that agreement had since been extended to December 31, 2025. As earlier reported, the material specific mid-year rates were increasing from \$93.81 per ton to \$144.01 per ton, a \$50.20 per ton increase.

With the RecycleMore budget just approved, there would be a rate increase in the RecycleMore per ton rate from \$10.22 per ton to \$12.57 per ton, an increase of \$2.35 per ton. She clarified that only two components of the Blended Rate would be changed; the material specific rate component and the RecycleMore component. Overall, there would be a 43 percent increase on the Blended Rate from \$121.81 per ton to \$174.35 per ton, an increase of \$52.54 per ton.

With the information about the new Blended Per Ton Rate, Ms. Abraham identified the methodology used to identify the proposed rates for residential customers (per cart size), commercial customers (per cubic yard), and industrial customers (per ton). With the increased rate, residential customers would see per month increases by cart size of \$3.26 (20-gallon); \$5.73 (35-gallon); \$10.65 (65-gallon) and \$15.99 (95-gallon) carts; commercial customers would see increases of \$5.12 per cubic yard and industrial customers would see a \$94.21 increase per ton.

Chair Zepeda clarified that the temporary increase in rates is not the same as the rate increase for the new PCA and requested a historical review of why the authority is in this position.

Ms. Abraham clarified the increased rates were specifically for the services provided during the extension, while negotiations continued for the Blended Rate in the new Post Collection Agreement. She also clarified, when asked, why the extension was necessary that the current agreement was set to expire June 30, 2025. As a result, RecycleMore had started a couple of years earlier to pursue the steps necessary to enter into a new Post Collection Agreement and had created an ad hoc committee to review the markets and services in the area to determine whether a Request for Proposal (RFP) or sole source should be pursued. A market evaluation had been done and through the ad hoc committee a sole source negotiation had been pursued with the incumbent, Republic Services. The Board had decided to go with an RFP. She commented that there were a couple of “hang ups” creating the RFP and bringing it forward for approval. RecycleMore started working through a term sheet involving the TAC members from the member agencies to review the term sheet, and it was then requested that rather than a term sheet an entire RFP and an entire draft Post Collection Agreement to go with the RFP should be developed.

The RFP had been brought forward for approval in September 2024, at which time the Board had asked RecycleMore to review a couple of components specific to El Cerrito, and the Board approved the RFP in October 2024 and went out with a date for proposals due December 20, 2024, when one proposal from Republic Services had been received, at which time the Board required RecycleMore to move forward with negotiations with Republic Services. The motion from the Board was that if no other proposals were to come in, the Executive Director and RecycleMore were to work with Republic Services and consider an extension to the agreement to be able to continue negotiations. She clarified the differences between an RFP and a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and stated the Board had chosen to go with an RFP, which was a more formal process that required the respondent to provide specific information and specific amounts to charge for services. The respondent was required to provide a locked in proposal. Through that process, there had been a number of delays that had resulted in the time crunch approaching the expiration of the existing agreement on June 30, 2025, which had necessitated an extension.

Director Robinson referred to a number of cancelled meetings and other things that had been part of the delays and she clarified that there was more to the story.

Director Ktsanes expressed a desire to reconsider the just-approved budget.

No written comments were submitted, or oral comments made, by any member of the public.

Chair Zepeda closed the public hearing

**MOTION** by Vice Chair Xavier to Adopt Resolution 25-11 (Attachment 1 to the staff report dated June 12, 2025) approving the July 1, 2025 to December 31, 2025 mid-year adjustment to

the 2025 Post Collection Rates for the Republic Services Collection Service Area as set forth in the exhibits attached to the Resolution. **SECOND** by Director Robinson.

**MOTION PASSED** unanimously by a Roll Call vote.

## **BOARD MEMBER AND STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no staff announcements.

Director Ktsanes referred again to the earlier approved budget and the statement in Resolution 18-02 that the approval would have to be unanimous. Since he had voted no to approve Resolution 25-09 (R-1) adopting the Fiscal Year 2025-26 Budget and Compliance Fund as proposed by staff; and to approve Resolution 25-10 (R-2) establishing the Operating Fund Reserve minimum balance to be fixed at 67 percent of the Operating Budget, and lowering the Recycling Fund Reserve to a minimum balance of \$100,000, he expressed a willingness to change his vote to make that approval unanimous.

Legal Counsel Bakker explained that a Board resolution could not prevent a future majority of the Board from amending the resolution and he was comfortable that the action earlier taken was lawful.

Director Robinson referred to her role as a Boardmember for the California Department of Food & Agriculture and reported that a recent presentation to that Board on SB 54 related to producer responsibility had been very interesting. She suggested the RecycleMore Board might want to monitor that legislation to see if it might impact RecycleMore operations.

Acting Interim Executive Director Abraham stated she would love to give a presentation on SB 54.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

With consensus of the Board, Chair Zepeda adjourned the meeting at 8:24 P.M. to the next regular Board meeting scheduled for July 10, 2025 at 6:15 P.M.

---

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 June 12, 2025.

*Viviane Vidal*

07/28/25

Board Secretary

Date