



City of Davis

Utility Rate Advisory Commission Minutes

Community Chambers Conference Room, 23 Russell Boulevard, Davis CA 95616

Thursday, February 9, 2017

7:00 P.M.

Commissioner Members Present: Gerry Braun (Chair), Jeffery Ballantine (Alternate), Jacques Franco, Lorenzo Kristov, Richard McCann, Elaine Roberts-Musser, Johannes Troost

Absent: None

Staff Present: Stan Gryczko, Assistant Public Works Director

Additional Attending: Jennifer Gilbert, Conservation Coordinator; Adrienne Heinig, Administrative Analyst; Natalie Popovich

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Meeting was called to order by Chairperson Braun at 7:00pm.

2. Approval of Agenda

E Roberts-Musser moved, seconded by J Franco to approve the agenda. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Brief Announcements from Staff, Commission Members, and City Council Members

- S Gryczko discussed a report on updated look at the water cost of services, specifically the actual costs incurred and anticipated spending, is anticipated to be presented to the Commission for review in April.
- J Franco updated the Commission on the activities of the Broadband Advisory Task Force.
- Chair Braun updated the Commission on the status of the Commission recruitment process.
- J Troost remarked that the next voting meeting of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) will be on March 2, 2017 at 9:30am at UC Davis, related to Community Choice Aggregation (CCA), as an opportunity to make public comment.

4. Public Comment

Natalie Popovich spoke to the Commission about her interest in the potential to charge for municipal waste, and an interest in looking at the “pay as you throw” model.

E Roberts-Musser apprised URAC members the Finance & Budget Commission was considering a 2/3 supermajority requirement for increasing utility rates and mentioned article

indicating policy changes in regard to drought should not end even though rain has been plentiful this year.

5. Consent Calendar

A. E Roberts-Musser moved to approve the minutes for January 12, 2017 with the following minor corrections. J Troost seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

- i. Add the word “shortages” after Water on in Item 4 on page 1.
- ii. Asked for inclusion of clarifying language for Item 5i – include the paragraph referenced in the comment.
- iii. For Item 5iii, add the item number (6iii) for context.

6. Solid Waste Discussion

S Gryczko opened the item on Solid Waste with an outline of the solid waste-related topics to be discussed – the Davis Waste Removal contract terms, and a review of two draft Requests for Proposals. He reiterated to the commission that the goal of the Request for Proposals discussion was to receive comments and discuss the proposals, however the item remains informational only.

A. S Gryczko introduced Jennifer Gilbert, City of Davis Conservation Coordinator, to present a historical look at the Davis Waste Removal (DWR) contract with the City of Davis, and present a “how to we got to where we are” review of the Organics program, beginning in 2011 with collection and how the material is being handled. The current agreement with DWR began in March of 2015 and ends December of 2017. She also detailed other terms of the contract, including the process needed to make changes, the billing procedures, and the rate adjustments.

- i. In response to questions from the Commission, J Gilbert supplied the following information:
 - a. The contract with DWR includes language regarding the City and State goal to divert 75% of waste from landfills by 2020, and there are penalties if the goal is not met.
 - b. There are three performance reviews of DWR during the term of the contract, which are led by the City.
 - c. DWR does not have to report the income received from selling recyclable material to the City.
 - d. The contract between DWR and the City can be amended with agreement from both parties. Prior agreement was amended fourteen times.
 - e. The cost determined in the contract is a moving target. A variable component of the cost is the “tipping fee,” which changes. The needs of the city also change based on program requirements.
 - f. If the city wished to negotiate the timing of the street yard waste pickups, it would require an amendment to the contract and a change of the Municipal Code.
 - g. Special pickups for individual customers can be arranged by DWR and the price is negotiated directly with the customer.

- B. S Gryczko spoke to increased costs due to landfill tipping fees and the organics program as the driver behind the discussion on the Solid Waste Rate Study. Due to the increases in the fees, and the increased service levels of the Organics program beyond what was originally proposed, the fund balance is slowly decreasing, potentially by the beginning of fall the fund balance would be exhausted.

During comment on the item, the Commissioners discussed the following topics:

- The Scope of Work in RFP needs historical context
 - Whether or not the RFP should include preference for local contractors
 - Clarification on how city will evaluate the project approach
 - Clarification on whether or not staff would consider an opt out provision for those who can provide sufficient proof of bin sharing
- C. The second RFP presented to the Commission requests proposals on the possibility of the City opening an organics processing facility, and to explore other options for the city's organics. Yolo County is aware that the City is looking at options outside of the landfill. In response to a Commissioner question, S Gryczko clarified that although the single-stream processing was not included as an option in the current RFP, the process will be reviewed through the update of the city's Integrated Waste Management Plan.

During comment on the item, the Commissioners provided the following feedback on the proposal:

- Suggested providing a more focused RFP
- J Franco suggested getting quotes from anaerobic digester companies, and find out what processes they apply to organics waste stream.
- E Roberts Musser suggested shifting seasonal pickup to later in the season, and increasing customer education, as the extra storm pickup was a cost to the city of \$26,000.

After discussion of the specific comments on the RFPs, J Franco made a motion to review the requests prior to their release to the public. E Roberts Musser added an amendment to the motion to specify a special meeting be scheduled in two weeks for the review. R McCann seconded the amended motion and the motion passed by the following votes:

Ayes: Braun, Ballantine, Franco, Kristov, McCann, Troost

Noes: Roberts Musser

Absent: None

7. Discussion on the Commission Process

Chairperson Braun introduced the item on the current commission processes and how best to proceed now that the committee has become a commission. Specifically, the discussion was aimed at how to achieve the following:

- A. Starting the meetings on time.
- B. Preparing prior to the meeting as much as possible.
- C. Ensuring that questions can be sent to staff ahead of the meeting to allow for questions to be answered at the meeting in the most efficient way.

- D. Clear expectations from city staff on what is expected of Commissioners in the wording of the staff report.

During discussion of the item, E Roberts Musser commented on the need for flexibility, if a topic is complicated or requires significant review, the commission may need to meet twice in a month, and reiterated the importance of adhering to the mission of the commission.

A draft work plan will be prepared and reviewed by the Commission, and the mission language will be included in the Long Range Calendar.

8. Commission and Staff Communication

- A. Long Range Calendar
 - i. Wastewater Study and URAC recommendations to City Council by March
- B. The Broadband Task Force consultant recommendation will go to City Council
- C. The Cannery fiber optic cables may not have been installed correctly
- D. The Commission is adjusting to the new role after the recent shift from Committee, and the City Council has indicated the work undertaken by the Commission justified the change.
- E. Jeffery Ballantine, current Alternate on the Commission, announced he will be leaving the commission as he is moving to the Bay Area. The Commission thanked him for his service.

9. Adjourn

J Troost moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by R McCann. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectively Submitted by,

Adrienne Heinig
Administrative Analyst I