

# Amador Air District Board of Directors Meeting

## Summary Minutes

---

---

Meeting was partially recorded in the Amador County Board of Supervisors Chambers  
810 Court Street, Jackson, California  
1:30 p. m. October 16, 2016

---

---

### Determination of a Quorum

#### Present on Roll Call:

John Plasse	Amador County District 1, Supervisor
Richard Forster	Amador County District 2, Supervisor
Lynn Morgan	Amador County District 3, Supervisor (Vice Chair)
Brian Oneto	Amador County District 5, Supervisor
Pat Crew	City of Jackson, Councilman
Robin Peters	City of Sutter Creek, Councilman (Chairman)

#### Absent on Roll Call:

Louis D. Boitano	District 4
Michael Vasquez	City of Amador City
Patrick Weart	City of Ione
Jon Colburn	City of Plymouth

#### Staff:

Jim McHargue, APCO  
Matt Peterson, Air Quality Specialist  
Herminia Perry, Clerk of the Board

NOTE: These minutes remain in *Draft* form until approved by Minute Order at the next regular meeting of the Board of Directors. Any packets prepared by Staff are hereby incorporated into these minutes by reference as though set forth in full. Any staff report, recommended findings, mitigation measures, conditions, or recommendations which are referred to by Board members in their decisions which are contained in the staff reports are part of these minutes by reference only. Any written material, petitions, packets, or comments received at the hearing also become a part of these minutes by reference.

At 1:31 p.m. Chairman Peters called the meeting to order. It was determined that there was a quorum for business.

**Pledge of Allegiance:** Chairman Peters led the Board and staff in the Pledge of Allegiance.

<b>Approval of Agenda:</b> Approval of the agenda for this date; any and all off agenda items must be approved by the Board (pursuant to §54954.2 of the Government Code).	
Motion	It was moved by <u>Director Forster</u> , seconded by <u>Director Oneto</u> , and unanimously carried to approve the agenda for this date. Vote 6-0  <b>Absent:</b> Directors Colburn, Boitano, Vasquez, Knox and Weart

<b>Public Matters Not on the Agenda:</b> Discussion items only; no action to be taken. Any person may address the Board at this time upon any subject within the jurisdiction of the Amador Air District Board of Directors; however, any matter that requires action may be referred to staff and/or a committee for a report and recommendation for possible action at a subsequent Board meeting. <b>Please note - there is a five (5) minute limit per topic</b>	
→No one of the public wished to address the Board (Merv)	

Administrative Matters	
1.	<b>Minutes: Review and approval of the August 16, 2016 Board Minutes:</b> Approved with minor changes. Correction – Item 5, second to last sentence to read: Chairman Peters <del>asked</del> <i>if confirmed that</i> there...
Motion:	It was moved by Director Forster, seconded by all, and unanimously carried to approve the amended minutes for this date. Vote 6-0  <b>Absent:</b> Directors Colburn, Boitano, Vasquez, Knox and Weart
2.	<b>Approval by Resolution of the Final 2016-2017 Budget:</b> Action APCO McHargue opened the discussion for the final 2016-2017 budget. There were no changes from the last public meeting on August 16, 2016 draft budget. Included in this package are the revenue and expense sheets, slightly updated for style and format for ease to the reader.  Comments/Questions: <i>-Based on how we deal with the special district issue, will that impact the need to adjust or add any line item for outside services for this budget?</i> APCO McHargue does not believe there will be the need. He will get clarification from Tacy (County Auditor). APCO McHargue’s understanding is that the changes that are outlined in the memo don’t necessarily have a whole lot of impact on the Air District because we are somewhat unique in the special districts category in Amador County. Our employees are already employees of the County. APCO McHargue anticipates that the Air District might have to address is getting our own federal tax ID number. There wouldn’t be a requirement for \$8,000.00 additional expenditure because we are already part of the County’s payroll. APCO McHargue to confirm with Tacy that these changes would not pose a big impact to the Air District.

<p><b>Motion:</b></p>	<p>-What about the issue with direct deposit? If our employees are using it, can they continue to use it? Yes, because the Air District employees are on the County's payroll.</p> <p>-So, just because we are a separate entity that won't affect that area? It won't. It will affect other districts that are not as closely connected to the County. For example, Fire Districts would be impacted.</p> <p>Director Morgan is curious to see if we will need a new EIN because they are so intertwined with the County.</p> <p>-Director Forster brought up question he had to APCO McHargue via email regarding the Buena Vista Biomass Plant and the Center of Biological Diversity settlement. APCO McHargue's understanding is that the Air District does not have any standing to require anything from BVBP. However, the Center of Biological Diversity could. It would be up to the Center of Biological Diversity to request that BVBP pay the Air District the \$25,000.00 but beyond that there isn't anything the Air District could do. The Center of Biological Diversity has been notified that the plant has been shut down and that the Air District is not collecting the \$25,000.00.</p> <p>Director Morgan inquired about line item number 54712 under the special projects, she assumed that the \$103,400.00 includes the pine needle bin program. APCO McHargue explained that the 54120 is the pine needle bin program budget for a total of \$70,000.00 and the special projects (\$103,400.00) is the City, County, and Agency Diesel program.</p> <p>Director Peters asked the public if they had anything to add.</p> <p>It was moved by <u>Director Morgan</u>, seconded by <u>Director Oneto</u>, and approved to accept the Resolution as amended on item 5 and unanimously carried to approve. Vote 6-0</p> <p>Correction – Fifth "Where As", first line delete the first <i>into account</i> – it's a repeat.</p>
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Programs:</b> Discussion and possible action.</p> <p><u>Wood Stove Change Out:</u> APCO McHargue gave an overview of the first steps into implementing this program in Amador County.</p> <p>Questions/Comments: -Old stoves must be given to the installer in Alpine's program, do our two vendors mentioned not want to take the old stoves? APCO McHargue has not worked out the details with our two mentioned vendors on what to do with the old stoves. However, District staff will be working on coming up with the best solution on getting rid of the old stove and making sure they are destroyed.</p> <p>Director Forster pointed out that it would be a nice feature if the retailer would take the old stove similar to how appliance and/or mattress replacements work.</p>

*-Who destroys the old stoves and who pays for the cost of destruction and disposal, assuming there is a cost?*

Our objective of the program was to come up with something simplified and streamlined as possible so we don't get too deep into the weeds of the program. One thought was to require the installer or the owner to drill a hole in the unit, we would consider it destroyed.

If stoves are going in at locations within City limits, permits must be obtained within that City not the County.

*-Only two stove retailers are specifically mentioned, which potentially could exclude other retailers such as Lowes. Is there a reason for that or could we generalize the language to indicate that only approved or prequalified stove dealers can be used?*

APCO McHargue: Initially, we thought the person should be allowed to go anywhere...Lowes, Tractor Supply, wherever they wanted to get their stove. Our thought was to make it as easy and convenient as possible for them. But the more we started looking into it and some of the requirements Alpine County was dealing with, it became very important to work extremely closely with retailers so that's how we settled on the two mentioned. We figured we wouldn't get into too many problems if we just kept the number of retailers down.

Director Morgan states that the idea of using local businesses really appeals to her.

Per the Board, we should include language in our program that specifies that you must use a prequalified local dealer and these are the two that are currently qualified. This allows other retailers the opportunity to participate as long as they can go through the pre-qualification process.

Discussion moves on to mention the other four programs mentioned in the agenda. APCO McHargue states that he is looking for recommendations on each of the programs mentioned.

Director Peters brings back the discussion to the wood stove program.

*Didn't see a mention in the staff report of a cap on how much money the District is considering devoting to this program. Specifically, did you have a number in your mind?*

APCO McHargue states that in one of his iterations of this memo he had a dollar amount of \$50,000.00 to start (25 stoves at \$2000.00) but he decided to leave it out because there is going to be more work on the details of this program so he would come back at a future meeting with more specifics.

Director Peters agrees that knowing what APCO McHargue is thinking of magnitude for the program will help the Board consider the other programs mentioned.

In addition, what would help Director Plasse as they consider the other programs would be to see a total number that we are considering allocating to programs.

*Director Oneto inquires if it's "Special Projects"?*

Special projects is specifically for CCAD and the pine needle. APCO McHargue agrees and states he has not allocated any money regarding the wood stove and the chip and grind programs into the budget.

After further development of each of these programs he would come back to the board with a recommendation on budget if we were to go in that direction.

Board was looking at reducing reserves only to a certain level that would give us some sustainability.

Director Plasse asks if APCO McHargue has a sense of what the number would be for here and moving forward for maybe the next three to five years?

APCO McHargue knows we are spending \$70,000/year on the pine needle. He anticipates we will spend this year approximately \$100,000.00 on the CCAD program, and if we were to come up with a wood stove program at \$50,000.00 – that's \$220,000.00 for the next year on those programs.

Director Plasse: Two of the three mentioned are already budgeted and we are not making any provisions for reserves this year. No contributions to reserves are getting made to this years budget.

APCO McHargue states that is correct.

*Director Oneto: Jim, aren't your drawing \$85,000.00 out of reserves?*

APCO McHargue explains that the \$85,000.00 that he drew came out of the budget that just got approved and is going to the CCAD program.

Director Morgan points out that the reserves are steadily growing with the years.

APCO McHargue agrees and explains that the reasoning behind these programs is to reduce our reserves.

APCO McHargue requested direction on the wood stove program from the Board and confirms that the Board would like to see continued development for this type of program and for the next meeting in January bring back a proposed dollar amount?

Board came to the consensus that the program should move forward. APCO McHargue shall bring a more developed program with cost allocation to the Board at next meeting. In addition, he shall also look into developing a low-income program.

Discussion moved on to the chip and grind program.

APCO McHargue opens up the discussion regarding the possibility of implementing a chip and grind program and what role does the Air District have in this issue.

APCO McHargue gave a few options of what the Board could consider as viable possibilities to this program. He also gave some approximate numbers of how many tons of materials Amador County is facing with the tree mortality issue and what the District's contribution could be to find a solution to this problem.

The District has started to see logs and big rounds coming into our pine needle bins. Also commercial landscapers have been an issue. Commercial companies using our bins to drop off their green waste rather than paying for disposal.

Discussion brought back to chip and grind program.

Director Peters: The quantity of the material is vast and it is going to take an equally vast amount of resources to deal with it adequately. He continues to be concerned that the Air District doesn't have the kind of resources that will be required. We should try to come up with a way to leverage our money to help organizations that are better equipped to deal with it on a larger scale.

One option that Director Peters doesn't particularly care for is the large burn pile. We are going through great lengths to encourage people to bring their vegetation and put it in the bins so it can be composted instead of burned. One program discourages burning while the other is encouraging it – seems counter-intuitive. If the right solution is large burn piles, he does not believe the Air District should be involved in encouraging this type of burning. Even if that's the right solution overall, air quality is our thing, we shouldn't be putting money into something that runs counter to our goals of improving air quality.

APCO McHargue: Our mission is to maintain air quality. I looked into the large burn piles as a potential option in that they would be far away from people to reduce impacts and these piles burn very hot making smoke minimal. If the tree mortality issue is as big as we think it is, then this option can potentially be part of the solution.

Director Peters: Still related to large burn piles....*In your mind, how would Air District funding be used to further that particular approach? You said that by funding transportation, how do you envision that?*

APCO McHargue: Collection event(s) to gather the materials and transport it Up Country away from people where it can be burned. The cost associated with that would be part of our contribution. Secondly, employing the experts, CalFire or Forest Service.

Merv: It would be better for CalFire to burn it in a controlled location. He doesn't have enough room to take in all the material.

APCO McHargue went through his three options for the Chip and Grind program.

If the County is going to bring somebody on board to study the tree mortality problem and bring a solution on how to tackle it then, we should work with and follow closely what they are doing.

Keep APCO McHargue's recommendation on this program and bring back more information as we know more.

*Director Plasse: Should we need to allocate a portion of what has been determined as available funding for that purpose?*

That's a premature move. We don't know enough.

Director Peters moved the discussion to the CCAD program.

*Director Peters: First year we've done it; do we see this as an ongoing program or was this a one-time opportunity that won't necessarily be recurring every year?*

APCO McHargue: I see the CCAD program as a two-year program, totaling \$165,000.00 over two years. This is the way this program is set-up right now. Beyond that, I would come back to the Board and ask if this is something we want to continue and apply more money to it. This is a two-year program. This fiscal year 16-17 and 17-18 for a total of \$165,000.

Discussion moves back to the smoke bin program:

Budgeted \$70,000 per year. We run during the dry season and stop the program right about the end of October.

APCO McHargue did get the message from Director Morgan with interest in increasing the number of bins and/or length of time bins are out.

The funding is right on track with what we are spending on these bins.

*-If we're providing bins during the non-burning season, how are we accomplishing the nexus of smoke reduction?*

APCO McHargue explains that the purpose of the bins is for landowners to dispose of all their needles during the non-burning season, so that when the burning season comes they have no more to burn.

Merv: I was talking to ACES and they were telling him that in places like South Lake Tahoe they don't accept pine needles because they don't rot. They can't get rid of them.

*-Director Peters: Now that the program seems to be mature, it seems like it has developed problems with "irresponsible dumping". Are we at the point, do we need to do a gut check on the magnitude of the problem?*

APCO McHargue: I do think it is a good time to reevaluate the program. The biggest problem I see is the capacity. If we don't have a place to dump the needles, at some point we will need to stop collecting because we won't have anywhere to take them.

*-Director Peters: How acute is the space problem at your facility Merv?*

Merv: We are up to our limits. Paul was saying that the option was to maybe give everybody a small bin like they do to people in the Cities.

Paul Sr. has been talking to the people Up Country regarding green waste bins and there seems to be lots of interest in that. Downside to this is now your adding more trucks on the road which is causing wear and tear and pollutants on the road. Director Oneto does not see how that is avoiding pollutants overall.

We are trying to throw money at a problem where there is not enough money in the world to fix it.

*-Director Morgan: Are you aware that it's been a big problem, where people have been violating the rules?*

APCO McHargue: Yes, Pine Acres and Silver Drive have been more problematic.

*-Director Peters: We have touched on all four of the programs, do you have direction that you need on each of those? Were you looking for specific direction on the CCAD program?*

	<p>APCO McHargue: No, I'm looking at continuing that program as currently managed. The plan with the smoke reduction bin program is to discontinue it at the end of this month and that would give us the whole winter and spring to evaluate it.</p> <p>Consensus was to use this winter to really drill down on this program and make sure it is worth continuing in its present form and if not what to do next.</p> <p><b>**Note: Director Forster left at 2:50pm. Board no longer has a quorum. **</b></p> <p>APCO McHargue: Mentioned the news release of the CCAD attached.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p><b>APCO Update:</b> Informational only, no action to be taken.</p> <p><b>2015 8 Hour Ozone Design Standard - Nonattainment:</b> APCO McHargue reported that there is a new 8 Hour Ozone went from .075 parts/million down to .070 which kicks us to nonattainment status. What's the practical effect on that? Not a whole lot. We are considered marginal, so there's not a whole lot that is expected from us.</p> <p><b>Districts Rules Update:</b> Ray Kapahi is working on these and will have them to us in the future.</p> <p><b>Changes to County/Special Districts:</b> Should not affect the Air District. Per Director Peters, APCO McHargue to follow up with Tacy and make sure there is nothing on our end that needs to be done.</p> <p><b>Financials as of September 2016:</b> Board would like to continue getting spreadsheets from Quickbooks.</p>
<p><b>Correspondence</b></p>	<p>Letter to Planning Department (LAWDA). Per Board, APCO McHargue to respond to Susan with very simple and direct language on only those items that pertain to the Air District.</p>
<p><b>Adjournment:</b></p>	<p>At 3:12 pm the meeting was adjourned until January 17, 2017 at 1:30 pm</p>