

FACILITY AND PLAN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

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

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Albert Avoian, Business/Commerce Representative
Charles Boehmke, County Sanitation Districts of L.A. County
Betsey Landis, Environmental Organization Representative
Virginia Maloles, County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services
Michael Miller, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT

John Gulledge, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
Rafael Prieto, City of Los Angeles
Ledra Sanchez, City of Gardena

OTHERS PRESENT

Ben Lucha, City of Santa Clarita
Joe Massey, Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, Inc.
Marsha McLean, Task Force Alternate
John McTaggart, Task Force Alternate, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division
Carlos Ruiz, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Coby Skye, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 11:08 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 15, 2004

The minutes of April 15, 2004, were unanimously approved as presented.

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

Mr. Coby Skye gave a presentation summarizing the contents of the CoIWMP Draft Five-Year Review Report. Mr. Skye explained the CoIWMP is comprised of 89 SRREs, 89 HHWEs, 89 NDFEs, the Countywide Siting Element, and the Countywide Summary Plan.

Mr. Skye discussed State law and regulations relating to the review of CoIWMP. Section 41822 of the Public Resources Code requires the CoIWMP be reviewed, and revised if necessary, every five years. Section 18788, Title 14 of the CCR requires the local Task Force to review the CoIWMP to ensure that the waste management practices remain consistent with AB 939's hierarchy, which entails source reduction, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe transformation and landfill disposal.

Mr. Skye informed the subcommittee that Waste Board staff recommended the report utilize Waste Board supplied data in order to meet the June 23, 2004, deadline for submission of the Five-Year Review Report, as some cities had failed to submit their survey responses. The final Five-Year Review Report is due to the Waste Board by June 23, 2004.

Mr. Skye also mentioned that the County recommends revising the Los Angeles County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Summary Plan and the Los Angeles County Countywide Siting Element to accommodate the following changes: the formation of the Los Angeles Area Integrated Waste Management Authority Regional Agency on January 13, 2004, and the removal of Elsmere Canyon and Blind Canyon Landfills from the Countywide Siting Element's list of potential new landfills. The County finds that as the Countywide Siting Element is being revised, the goals and policies of the Countywide Siting Element would need to be re-evaluated to ensure adequate solid waste management services are provided over the 15-year planning period as well as to account for recently adopted/considered regulations that may impact the management of residual solid

waste, including but not limited to, conversion technologies and environmental justice statutes/regulations.

Ms. Betsey Landis requested clarification to a number of apparent discrepancies in the Jurisdiction Compliance Status table on page 11 of the Five-Year Draft Report in the fifth column where the Board approved the jurisdiction's diversion rate in instances where the 50 percent mandated diversion amount was not met. Mr. Skye explained that compliance measurement for a number of the County of Los Angeles cities was postponed because the Waste Board had approved a time extension, and that other cities were determined by the Waste Board to have made a good-faith effort to comply even though their officially measured diversion rate was slightly below 50 percent. It was recommended that cities given "good-faith effort" or time extensions be noted by an asterisk stating such. It was also recommended that cities changing their base year should also be noted.

The following recommendations/comments were also made regarding the Five-Year Draft Report:

- an analysis be added stating that due to 1990 data being inaccurate, cities have since developed a better understanding of the waste stream, thus they should not focus on the cities showing 1990 as the base year for the data collected (Page 23 on Five-Year Draft Report)
- state more clearly that there is a discrepancy in the numbers due to the Disposal Reporting System's inefficiency
- add a more comprehensive discussion of Conversion Technologies into the report
- expand on the discussion of the unclassified landfills/inert waste and construction and demolition regulations

Mr. Mike Mohajer distributed general comments to the members of the subcommittee regarding the Five-Year Draft Report (see attachment). Within this document several general and specific comments were made regarding the Report along with recommended changes.

In summary, the subcommittee felt that a strong statement should be made about how the disposal tonnages and numbers are conflicting due to a flawed Disposal Reporting System that cannot be relied upon for its intended purpose. An additional recommendation was made to add a table visually illustrating the mathematical discrepancies among disposal and diversion data for the County of Los Angeles' jurisdictions. The subcommittee further recommended that an

executive summary be added to the Report in place of the existing "Preface" in order to better communicate the intent of the Five-Year Review Report.

IV. OPEN DISCUSSION/PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments received.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:18 p.m.