

Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/
Integrated Waste Management Task Force

Minutes of May 20, 2004

County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
900 South Fremont Avenue
Alhambra, California

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Albert Avoian, Business/Commerce Representative
Margaret Clark, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division
Betsey Landis, Environmental Organization Representative
Joe Massey, Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries
Michael Miller, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division
Ron Saldana, Los Angeles County Disposal Association

COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY OTHERS:

Thomas L. Garthwaite, rep. by Virginia Maloles, County of L.A. Dept. of Health Services
James A. Noyes, rep. by Shari Afshari, County of Los Angeles Dept. of Public Works
David Roberti, represented by Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative
Jim Stahl, rep. by Charles Boehmke, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
Ben Wong, rep. by John McTaggart, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division
Christopher J. Garner, rep. by Charles Tripp, City of Long Beach

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Ron Deaton, City of Los Angeles Appointee
David Kim, City of Los Angeles Appointee
Rita Robinson, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation
Barry Wallerstein, South Coast Air Quality Management District

OTHERS PRESENT:

Tammy Evans, City of Monrovia
Marsha McLean, Task Force Alternate
Ben Lucha, City of Santa Clarita
Mary Ann Lutz, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division
Duane McDonald, Athens Disposal Services
Carolyn Meredith, City of Pasadena
Carlos Ruiz, County of Los Angeles Dept. of Public Works
Jason Rush, Waste Disposal
Isabel Schleif, City of Covina
Coby Skye, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Vanessa Tubaces, City of Palos Verdes Estates, City of Hidden Hills
Steve Uselton, California Integrated Waste Management Board
Angela Williams, City of Inglewood

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 1:04 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 15, 2004

The minutes were unanimously approved.

III. REPORT FROM THE PUBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. Mike Mohajer provided a summary of the Public Education and Information Subcommittee meeting. Articles received include one by the City of Monterey Park regarding recycling efforts, one by the City of Santa Clarita regarding their new franchise agreements for residential and commercial wastes, and an article on SB 20. Mr. Mohajer also mentioned articles on the Antelope Valley Pride Week and a future household hazardous waste site in Palmdale which were both approved by the Subcommittee.

IV. REPORT FROM THE ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. Coby Skye stated the Request For Proposals to study the feasibility of developing a pilot conversion technology facility had been released. The proposals were due today at 5 p.m. The review committee for the proposals will consist of the current Alternative Technology Subcommittee members, less two members who are consultants. It will also include Public Works' staff.

The Alternative Technology Subcommittee will meet again on May 27, 2004, at 2 p.m. to discuss and review the proposals. It is expected to make a decision within a month. The first deliverable is due November 1, 2004.

V. REPORT FROM THE FACILITY AND PLAN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. Al Avoian requested Mr. Mohajer to present the report to the Task Force for Items V and VI. Mr. Mohajer provided a summary on comments that were made during the morning Facility and Plan Review Subcommittee Meeting with regard to the Five-Year Plan Review Report.

VI. LOS ANGELES COUNTY COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN (CoIWMP) FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

Mr. Mohajer stated there were several issues discussed regarding the Los Angeles County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan Five-Year Review, including:

- inconsistencies with disposal numbers
- emphasizing programs not numbers
- current emphasis on mathematical compliance to measure a metropolitan area such as the County of Los Angeles
- inclusion of a table comparing projected and actual disposal tonnages for 2001
- missing emphasis on Task Force actions of May 1999 regarding conversion technologies
- recognition of the County of Los Angeles Countywide Siting Element
- documentation of 50 million tons of waste diverted from landfills

Mr. Mohajer provided Task Force members with a written report outlining these issues in greater detail (attached). Mr. Mohajer also stated that the addition of an Executive Summary, to emphasize the most important conclusions of the Report, was discussed.

Mr. Mohajer also inquired of Mr. Steve Uselton about extending the June 26, 2004 deadline. Mr. Uselton requested notification from the Department of Public Works outlining the issues and providing a timeline needed for completion of the Report. Mr. Uselton stated that the Waste Board is looking for a review that accurately addresses the local issues.

The Task Force also decided to discuss the revised Five-Year Review Report at the main Task Force meeting instead of the Facility and Plan Review Subcommittee meeting.

VII. STATUS OF TASK FORCE REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON STATUS ON BRADLEY LANDFILL

Mr. Carlos Ruiz stated the Task Force had sent letters to Waste Management, Inc. (Waste Management), the City of Los Angeles Building and Safety, and the Department of City Planning with regard to the project and had requested responses no later than May 13, 2004. Only the response from the City Department of Building and Safety and a letter from Waste Management dated May 12, 2004, had been received. The Waste Management letter indicated that the summary of odor and noise complaints would be forthcoming by May 20, 2004. Such a letter had not yet been

received nor the response from the Department of City Planning. Staff is reviewing the letters. Mr. Ruiz also indicated that the Los Angeles City Council recently adopted an ordinance which requires that new structures near landfills be protected against methane intrusion.

A discussion ensued regarding a Finding of Compliance (FOC) for Bradley Landfill. Concern was expressed by Task Force members regarding length of time since the Task Force first considered the project and the Department of City Planning's lack of response. Mr. Ruiz stated staff will continue to work with the City to get their response to the request.

VIII. REPORT FROM THE WASTE BOARD

Mr. Uselton provided the Task Force with an update and background on the addition of two new Waste Board members: Ms. Rosario Marin and Ms. Rosalie Mulé. He also updated the Task Force on two issues discussed at the last Waste Board meeting: the SB 1066 Time Extension Review Process and the use of extrapolation in base-year studies. Jurisdictions who were under the Time Extension Review process were encouraged to incorporate C&D Debris Recycling programs into their Time Extension petitions.

Mr. Uselton stated staff is recommending a streamlined agenda item process for jurisdictions who have consistently shown an above 50 percent diversion rate. Those jurisdictions who have shown a severe drop in diversion rates or in program implementation will go before the Waste Board as single agenda items. The Waste Board would then look at what the effect of program implementation has had on their diversion rates. Program targets would be identified and recommendations made.

Mr. Uselton stated that after staff review of several statistical studies looking at diversion rates of private industry, it was shown that most of the diversion was coming from the largest 10 to 25 businesses. In some cases, up to 80 percent of the diversion was coming from the top 30 businesses. Mr. Uselton summarized that jurisdictions targeting these large employers could yield beneficial results.

IX. CONVERSION TECHNOLOGIES, PRELIMINARY LIFE CYCLE, AND MARKET ANALYSIS REPORT

Mr. Mohajer gave an overview to the Task Force regarding the Preliminary Findings of Conversion Technologies Life Cycle and Market Impact Assessments Report.

Mr. Mohajer discussed AB 2770 which requires the Waste Board to conduct research that looks at emerging/new technologies for reusability of residual waste that would otherwise be sent to landfills, as a potential source for alternative fuel, electricity, or alternatives for industrial chemicals.

Mr. Mohajer stated the Waste Board is using the UC Davis and UC Riverside studies and has hired several consultants to prepare the final report. The completion of this report has been postponed to July 2004. Discussion ensued on Dr. Kay Martin's written comments dated April 27, 2004 (attached) to the Waste Board. These comments stated that the model the consultants used does not allow for a fair evaluation of alternate waste management practices. A motion was made to send a letter to the Waste Board in support of Dr. Martin's comments. The motion was passed with a vote of 9 to 1 in support.

After further discussion, Ms. Mary Anne Lutz asked for a brief summary on alternative/conversion technologies. A summary of conversion technologies will be drafted and provided to the Task Force members.

X. STATUS ON CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD'S PROPOSED SOLID WASTE COLLECTION VEHICLE RULE

Mr. Mohajer provided an update and overview of the California Air Resources Board's Solid Waste Collection Vehicle Rule. He mentioned that it was recently released for a 15-day comment period and is expected to be filed with the Office of Administrative Law by June 4, 2004. He also distributed a fact sheet, "Facts About the California Air Resources Board's Waste Collection Vehicle Regulation" (attached).

This regulation applies to:

- diesel-fuel trucks with a gross vehicle weight of over 14,000 pounds
- 1960-2006 model year engines used to collect waste
- private haulers, or cities, counties, State, and Federal agencies which directly operate refuse collection services

Costs will vary from \$3,000 to \$50,000 per truck. It is estimated to cost \$1 per household. Discussion also included the United States Supreme Court ruling on the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 1193. Rule 1193 also applied to solid waste collection vehicles.

XI. STATUS ON SB 20 IMPLEMENTATION

Mr. Mohajer provided an update on SB 20. On May 10, 2004, the Office of Administrative Law approved the emergency regulations to implement sections of the Electronic Waste Recycling Act of 2003. He also stated that the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is reviewing the emergency regulations to see what changes would need to be implemented to their own regulations.

Mr. Mohajer stated there are problems regarding implementation of SB 20's emergency regulations. Fees ranging from \$6 to \$10 are to be collected effective July 1, 2004, but the Board of Equalization will have insufficient staff and funds for the collection of fees. A few lines of text can be expected to be introduced into SB 50, or another Bill, to address the staff and funds shortage, but this will delay the fee collection until October or November 2004.

To clarify, Mr. Mohajer stated that authorized recycler/collector payments will not be available until October 1, 2004. He stated that the payment structure will be 30 cents per pound to authorized collectors and 48 cents per pound to authorized recyclers. Mr. Mohajer stated he knows of only four authorized recyclers in the State who can handle the toxicity in the cathode ray tubes. Collectors need to be aware that materials taken to a facility are in fact authorized recyclers. He also stated that collectors must verify the State where electronic waste was first sold.

Mr. Joe Massey stated the collector would only need to verify the State of residence of the person bringing him the waste. He also commented that, while the authorized recycler needs to be inspected by DTSC to receive Waste Board approval, DTSC does not currently have the staff to conduct the necessary inspections. Thus, there are political and operational problems with SB 20's implementation.

XII. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Mr. Coby Skye provided the Legislative Update for the Task Force (attached). He informed the Task Force that Mr. Theroux organized a UC Riverside field trip for May 28, 2004, on conversion technologies. Task Force members should contact staff if interested.

- AB 1808 – Introduced by Yee

The Task Force had provided a letter of support for the Bill, which raised fines for illegal dumping into a body of water. However the Bill was amended and the portion of the Bill which talked about distribution of the collected fines to

jurisdictions was taken out. There is no response from the Task Force at this time.

- AB 1873 – Introduced by Hancock

This Bill would remove the sunset clause from the RMDZ program which is expected on July 1, 2006. A letter of support from the Task Force was sent on April 22, 2004.

- AB 1942 – Introduced by Lowenthal

This Bill allows a hazardous waste facility to change equipment or structures without modifying the existing hazardous waste permit when:

- the structure in question is not within a permitted unit
- risk to human health and the environment is minimal or not significant
- equipment or structure is actively related to hazardous waste management

Ms. Lutz asked what the opposition to this Bill was. Staff will review background information for this Bill. Staff will continue to watch this Bill.

- AB 2166 – Introduced by Hancock

The Bill would prohibit the mass mailing of CD/DVD media without providing a postage paid mail return envelop. There was a status hearing on April 13, 2004. Mr. Mohajer stated this Bill had been opposed by the entertainment industry. Task Force members inquired if this Bill would conflict with Federal postal regulations. Staff will continue to watch this Bill.

- AB 2176 – Introduced by Montanez

The Bill would require the Waste Board to make a model ordinance for large venues available to local jurisdictions. A letter of opposition was sent out on April 22, 2004. The Bill was amended on April 28, but Task Force concerns were not addressed. The Task Force will continue its opposition.

- AB 2877 – Introduced by Ghanaian

The Bill would extend DTSC authority to give certain hazardous waste activities exemptions until January 1, 2008, and impose a State-mandated local program. No action from the Task Force at this time.

- AB 2901 – Introduced by Pavley

This Bill was amended April 20 and would require cell phone retailers to have a Waste Board-approved plan for their collection, recycling, and disposal by July 1, 2005. Staff will continue to watch this Bill.

- AB 2290 – Introduced by Chavez

This Bill was discussed by Mr. Mohajer. It is sponsored by Waste Management, Inc., and is aimed at recovering waste hauler fees paid to local jurisdictions for collection services they provide to State agencies. The Task Force voted to oppose the Bill with one member abstaining.

- AB 1159 – Introduced by Vaconcellos

This Bill would require the Waste Board to identify a program for the safe disposal of sharps, or used needles, beginning in January 1, 2005. Currently this Bill is on watch status; no action from the Task Force at this time.

- AB 1180 – Introduced by Figueroa

This Bill would authorize DTSC to impose a fee to offset the cost for recycling florescent lights. Staff will continue to watch this Bill.

XIII. DISCUSSION OF NEXT MEETING DATE

The meeting date for June was set for Monday June 21, 2004, at 10:00 a.m.

XIV. OPEN DISCUSSION/PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:56 p.m.