
SACRAMENTO ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION

Marjorie Namba, Chair
Diana Parker, Vice Chair
Mark White
Andrea Leisy
Robert Bailey
Dana Curran
George "Buzz" Link
Dr. Anthony DeRiggi

A JOINT COMMISSION APPOINTED BY:
County of Sacramento
City of Sacramento
City of Isleton
City of Folsom
City of Galt

MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2013, 6:30P.M.
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' CHAMBERS
700 H STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

ITEM

1. Call to Order – Chair Namba

The meeting was called to order at 6:30p.m.

2. Roll Call – Staff Secretary

Commission Members Present: Marjorie Namba, Diana Parker, George "Buzz" Link, Dana Curran, and Andrea Leisy.

Commission Members Absent: Mark White, Robert Bailey, and Dr. Anthony DeRiggi.

Staff Members Present: Val F. Siebal, Vicki M. Kloock

3. Introduction of Commissioners – Chair Namba

The Commissioners each took a turn to introduce themselves.

4. Public Comments – Chair Namba

The "Live/Replay Statement" was read by Secretary Kloock.

5. **CONSENT ITEMS** – Approval of September 2013 Meeting Minutes

It was determined that there was not a quorum of members present at the September 2013 meeting so the minutes were continued to next month.

6. 2013 Flu Update – Dr. Olivia Kasiry, Public Health Officer, County of Sacramento

Chair Namba introduced Dr. Kasiry who spoke to the Commission about recent outbreaks and the communicable disease report as well as her ongoing goal of national accreditation for the Public Health Division of Sacramento County. To reach the goal of accreditation, they must develop a strategic plan, a community health assessment plan, and a community health improvement plan. They now have a draft strategic plan in place which was funded by the

Sierra Health Foundation. There has only been one reported case of flu this year, a child in intensive care with H1N1. Dr. Kasiyre then shared the draft strategic plan whose mission is to promote, protect, and assure conditions for optimal health and public safety for residents and communities of Sacramento County through leadership, partnership, prevention, and response. The plan consists of five priorities: 1) Collaboration, 2) Communications, 3) Funding, 4) Continuous quality improvement, and 5) Workforce development. At present, their objectives under these priorities are a little vague on purpose as this is a draft. They are looking to establish regular meetings with EMD to further their collaboration on this. In the future, they would like to do cross-training with EMD. They are estimating that it will take about 18 more months to finalize the plan.

7. Construction, Rate and Fee Aspects of the EchoWater Project – Ruben Robles, Director of the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD)

Chair Namba introduced Mr. Ruben Robles from the County Sanitation District who made a PowerPoint presentation on the EchoWater Project which involves upgrades to the wastewater plant. At present, the San. District has 1.4 million people in their service area with an operating budget of \$110,000,000. They are one of SMUD's biggest customers. The Elk Grove Wastewater Plant consists of 3400 acres first constructed in the early 80's. Most of this property is bufferlands (or a wildlife area). Only 900 acres are developed. The most recent NPDES Permit was issued in December 2010 which required expensive tertiary upgrades. This was appealed to the State Board in early 2011 but no action was taken, so in early 2012, the San District filed litigation which was stayed to give the State Board time to act. The State Board largely upheld the permit in late 2012 and a partial settlement agreement was made in early 2013. The new compliance dates are as follows: For nutrient reduction: May 2021; for filtration/disinfection requirements: May 2023. This will involve the building of a new facility. The new permit does not require them to meet prescriptive values, but they must achieve equivalency. The new permit requires 16 acres of large tanks as they are more effective at removing nitrates. The cost is so large that they must be sure it will work. Therefore, they have hired consultants to construct a complete pilot facility which cost \$18 million and could service a small city, like Courtland. They looked at 3 different processes for filtration and the following were chosen: for ammonia and nitrate removal – a Biological Nutrient Removal (BNR) process; for filtration – a Granular Media Filtration process; and for disinfection – Liquid chlorine (NaOCl) & liquid dechlorination (NaHSO₃). The BNR process does not require the use of plastic membranes and will save millions. At the height of the construction, there will be about 800 to 1,000 workers and 15-20 contractors onsite. The solid storage basins will use anaerobic digesters. The solids will stay for 15 days and then go into storage. The solids will then stay in these storage 'ponds' for 3-4 years. They will also be recycling about 28% of their solids into a fertilizer. The EchoWater Project is actually about 15 different projects. The project design is another matter and involves other consultants. They will also be issuing more RFPs through the end of the year. In regard to the CEQA process, the draft EIR will be coming out in early November and they hope to finalize this in 2014. They hope to have complete permit approval by October 2014. Due to the CEQA process, construction will not be able to begin until 2015. During the main period of construction, they will be spending about \$20 million/month. As the Sanitation District is not tax-based but receives revenue from their customers, there will be impact fees. Although they are now getting a much bigger portion of their income from monthly rates. The monthly rate projections for a single-family home will go from \$26/month in 2013 to \$44/month by 2022. To cover the complete cost of the project, the San District will be paying for about 30% of it as they go and about 70% will be paid off over time as debt. This facility will be built to accommodate for the possibility of future changes such as phosphorus removal. And, as recycling is a more costly alternative, they are working toward onsite disposal.

8. CalEnviroScreen 1.1: Understanding This Guidance and Screening Tool – Allan Hirsch, Chief Deputy Director, State of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA).

Chair Namba introduced Mr. Allan Hirsch from the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment who made a PowerPoint presentation to the Commission on the new CalEnviroScreen 1.1 screening tool. OEHHA is an office within CalEPA consisting of 120 employees, mostly PhDs. They specialize in air safety and managing Proposition 65 which was approved by the voters in 1986 as an initiative to address their growing concerns about exposure to toxic chemicals. This became the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986. CalEnviroScreen 1.1 presents a broad picture of the relative burdens California communities face from environmental pollution. It identifies 17 indicators of environmental and socioeconomic conditions. This grew out of the Environmental Justice program. In 2007, CalEPA asked them to look at the impact of pollution on a local level. In 2010, they completed the framework for this. The basic outlook is that low-income people live in more affected areas, but OEHHA wanted to test this. The evidence showed it to be true. First, they had to decide how to define the geographic area. There are 1800 zip codes in California and they decided to use these as their parameters. The 17 indicators are divided into 4 categories: 1) Exposures, 2) Environmental Effects, 3) Sensitive Populations, and 4) Socioeconomic Factors. The 17 indicators were chosen based on the ability to do something about them. The criteria for the indicators include being able to provide a good measure of the contribution to the component, how they relate to issues that may be actionable by CalEPA, how they relate to demographic factors that may influence vulnerability to disease, the information is publicly available, it is statewide and location-based information, and it is good quality data. A percentile was calculated for each indicator. The zip code scores are relative and are used for comparison. The highest 10% of CalEnviroScreen Scores represent 176 of California's 1800 zip codes and covers 7.7 million people (which is 21% of California's population). Sacramento County has 6 zip codes in the top 10%.

Some potential uses of the tool include aiding ongoing planning and decision-making within CalEPA for the Environmental Justice Small Grant program, to promote greater compliance with environmental laws, and prioritize site-cleanup activities. It will also help meet the requirements of the newly passed SB535 which requires the identification of disadvantaged communities for investment opportunities based on geographic, socioeconomic, public health and environmental hazard criteria. CalEPA does not want the tool used to hurt a community by discouraging business. It is not meant to be a health risk assessment or a substitute for a CEQA-required cumulative impacts assessment and does not determine whether a specific project's impacts are significant under CEQA. CalEnviroScreen is a work in progress. It was introduced in April of 2013 and started with 18 parameters including one on race which has since been dropped. Refinements such as these will continue to be made. They also want to develop an indicator for drinking water. They continue to solicit suggestions for overall refinement and updating of the tool. The results are published in several places online including www.oehha.ca.gov, Google Earth results, and the ArcGIS geodatabase. Funding for CalEnviroScreen came from CalEPA programs, but will be getting some cap-and-trade money as well. SB535 requires that the new investment plan be updated every 3 years, but they hope to do it more often than that.

9. Sacramento County Environmental Management Department (EMD) Director's Report – Val Siebal, Director, EMD
Chair Namba introduced Director Val Siebal who directed the Commissioners to EMD's enclosed newsletters.
10. Environmental News Review – Vice Chair Parker
Vice Chair Parker reviewed news items of interest to the Commission.
11. Commissioner Comments
None made.
12. The meeting was adjourned at 8:35p.m.