

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

Minutes of July 20, 2006

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Margaret Clark, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division  
Betsey Landis, Environmental Organization Representative  
Mary Ann Lutz, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division  
Joe Massey, Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, Inc.  
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative  
Ron Saldana, Los Angeles County Disposal Association  
Mark Waronek, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division

COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY OTHERS:

Dr. Bruce Chernof, rep. by Ken Murray, County of Los Angeles Dept. of Health Services  
Gerry Miller, rep. by Rafael Prieto, City of Los Angeles  
Rita Robinson, rep. by Karen Coca, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation  
Greig Smith, rep. by Nicole Bernson, City of Los Angeles  
Don Wolfe, rep. by Carlos Ruiz, County of Los Angeles Dept. of Public Works

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Christine F. Andersen, City of Long Beach  
Albert Avoian, Business/Commerce Representative  
David Kim, City of Los Angeles Appointee  
Jim Stahl, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County  
Dr. Barry Wallerstein, South Coast Air Quality Management District

OTHERS PRESENT:

Chuk Agu, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Noelle Andrade, City of Pico Rivera  
Siya Araumi, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
James Armijo, City of Arcadia  
Ray Chavez, City of Pico Rivera  
Carl Clark, Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, Inc  
Tom Kino, City of Walnut  
Ben Lucha, City of Santa Clarita  
John McTaggart, General Public Representative Alternate  
Michael Miller, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division Alternate  
Louis Morales, City of Commerce  
Phil Morales, California Integrated Waste Management Board  
Marie Nguyen, City of Arcadia  
Greg Reitz, City of Santa Monica  
Subodh Sinha, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Ursula Schmidt, City of Pasadena  
Coby Skye, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Lacy Taylor, City of Pico Rivera  
Steve Uselton, California Integrated Waste Management Board  
Richard Varenchik, California Air Resources Board  
Ben Wong, League of California Cities

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 1:08 p.m.

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 15, 2006**

A motion to approve the minutes of June 15, 2006, was made with the following changes ([see attachment](#)):

- On page 1, item III, third paragraph, the last sentence should read: "A discussion on the impact of where the City of Los Angeles and County Sanitation Districts will manage their biosolids ensued, which included existing facilities/sites in Kings and San Bernardino counties as options in the discussion."
- On page 2, continuation of item IV, first complete paragraph, the last two sentences should read: "The permit also includes a \$0.50 per ton fee for natural habitat mitigation. A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the adequacy of the permit's closure, post-closure and corrective action requirements."

The motion passed unanimously. (Mr. Rafael Prieto being absent)

**III. SPECIAL RECOGNITION FOR BEN WONG AND JOE MASSEY**

Ms. Margaret Clark, on behalf of the Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/Integrated Waste Management Task Force, presented Mr. Ben Wong and Mr. Joe Massey with a certificate recognizing them for their outstanding contributions and years of service and dedication in addressing the solid waste management needs of residents and businesses in the County of Los Angeles.

Mr. Carlos Ruiz announced that Mr. Phil Morales, who was also present, will retire from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (Waste Board), after 34 years of public service.

**IV. REPORT FROM THE ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE**

Mr. Coby Skye announced the California Emerging Waste Technologies Forum will be held at the University of California, Los Angeles on July 27, 2006 ([see attachment](#)). The Forum will bring together academia, private and public sectors, and the environmental community, to discuss conversion technologies.

Mr. Skye stated that the Subcommittee had their first meeting with ARI, the contractor for the facilitation phase of the Conversion Technology

Demonstration Facility project. ARI will help the Subcommittee closely examine the technology vendors and the material recovery facilities that have been identified to select the best from the two categories and find a partnership and funding for the demonstration facility.

The Subcommittee discussed whether to consider additional technology vendors, since the economics for electricity, fuel, and disposal rates have changed since the Task Force approved the evaluation report in August 2005. The technology vendors who were not able to participate in phase one of the process have been in communication with the Subcommittee, and will be considered to participate in phase two. The Subcommittee will consider the issue further at future meetings.

Mr. Skye also noted that a separate contract for public education and outreach will work hand in hand with the facilitation project, and a request for proposals is scheduled to be released by the end of August 2006.

#### **V. REPORT FROM THE FACILITY AND PLAN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE**

Mr. Mike Mohajer stated that the Subcommittee reviewed the third draft revisions to Chapter 7 of the Countywide Siting Element, and approved submittal of the draft revisions to the Task Force at the August Meeting. Chapter 7 identifies new class III landfills, inert waste landfills, transformation facilities, conversion technology facilities, biomass processing facilities, and potential expansion of the existing facilities.

Mr. Mohajer also noted that due to the County Board of Supervisors' preliminary approval of the replacement Conditional Use Permit for Sunshine Canyon Landfill in June 2006, Browning Ferris Industries, Inc., the landfill owner/operator, has submitted an application for a solid waste facility permit to expand the County portion of the landfill into the "bridge" area. Pursuant to the existing Countywide Siting Element, staff will forward a letter to Browning Ferris Industries informing them that a Finding of Conformance will need to be obtained from the Task Force prior to the expansion.

#### **VI. PRESENTATION ON THE CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD'S 2004 SOLID WASTE COLLECTION VEHICLE RULE REPORT**

Mr. Richard Varenchik, from the California Air Resources Board (ARB), explained that in 1998, after extensive study, ARB ruled that particulate matter in diesel exhaust was a toxic air contaminant. ARB was obligated to take steps to reduce the amount of diesel particulate matter in the air.

ARB focused on waste collection vehicles due to trash/recycling/greenwaste trucks visiting every business and residential community at least once a

week. It is estimated that there are 12,000 to 13,000 diesel waste collection vehicles operating in California.

In September 2003, ARB adopted the Solid Waste Collection Vehicle Rule. The rule works by groups based on the model year of the engine truck between 1960 through 2006. The owners of these vehicles are obligated to comply with the Rule in stages from 2004 to 2010, gradually reducing emissions by installing filters or catalysts, replacing trucks with newer ones, switching to natural gas, etc. With a few compliance extensions, all vehicles must be in compliance by December 2011.

The results for the first full year of implementation of the regulation can be found in the ARB's 2004 Solid Waste Collection Vehicle Rule Report. Mr. Varenchik highlighted the report as follows ([see attachment](#)):

- When ARB wrote the regulation, recovering costs for compliance was a major concern. To address those concerns, ARB wrote letters to cities and counties encouraging them to be fair when waste haulers would ask for a rate increase due to regulation compliance and implementation. Although ARB wrote those letters, ARB found that private haulers were reluctant to release information regarding rate increase requests.
- The fleet compliance regulation required that 10 percent of vehicles manufactured between 1988 and 2002 be in compliance by the end of 2004. Companies who opted to comply with the regulation on 50 percent of their Group I vehicles by July 1, 2005, would be able to delay final enforcement for an extra two years for the last half of their fleet. About 20 fleets took advantage of the incentives offered through earlier compliance.
- In early 2000, ARB began outreach by distributing regulation information at the landfills.

Mr. Varenchik emphasized that all other diesel vehicles, including delivery trucks, out-of-State trucks, and international trucks will eventually come under a similar rule within the next couple of years.

## **VII. UPDATE ON THE FINANCIAL ASSURANCE REQUIREMENTS FOR LANDFILLS**

Mr. Siya Araumi provided a summary of the Waste Board's financial assurance requirement PowerPoint presentation as discussed by the Waste Board on July 18, 2006 (Agenda Item 13). A copy of the PowerPoint presentation was provided to the Task Force ([see attachment](#)).

The PowerPoint presentation discussed California's current situation with financial assurance for closure, post-closure maintenance activities, and

some of its shortcomings. Mr. Araumi indicated post-closure activities at landfills are required to be performed for a minimum of 30 years after the closure of the landfill or until it no longer poses a threat to the environment or public health and safety. Financial assurance demonstration for these activities is only required for the first 30 years, and does not include all post-closure maintenance costs for all potential events that may occur at a landfill for a longer period than 30 years (e.g. replacement/repair of equipment, corrective actions, or costs associated with natural disasters such as earthquakes or floods).

Mr. Araumi added that out of 282 solid waste landfills that are subjected to financial assurance requirements, 116 are already in the post-closure maintenance phase. These landfills will exhaust its required post-closure maintenance fund by 2021, and all funds will be exhausted by 2040.

Waste Board staff recommended a comprehensive study be conducted to gather data and information for rulemaking to include:

- Obtaining clarification on financial assurance for a minimum of 30 years
- Improving existing financial assurance mechanisms and cost estimate regulations
- Proposing a State-wide study of other potential funding assurance mechanisms for corrective actions

The Waste Board, at its July 18, 2006, meeting, approved staff's request to initiate the rulemaking policy and to prepare the parameters of the study.

A motion was made to send a letter to the Waste Board requesting the Landfill Decomposition graph (first slide of PowerPoint presentation) be modified to show actual units and to include a timeline for the proposed rulemaking. The motion passed unanimously.

## **VIII. PRESENTATION ON THE CITY OF SANTA MONICA'S GREEN BUILDING PROGRAM**

Mr. Greig Reitz, the green building advisor for the City of Santa Monica (City), encourages green building in order to reduce the environmental impacts of buildings. Green building deals with the health of indoor environment, comfort of buildings and related transportation to and from buildings ([see attachment](#)).

Mr. Reitz stated that green building saves money over time, rather than on a short-term basis. Regulation, motivation, facilitation, education, and leading by example are ways to motivate green building practices. By supporting

green building practices, developers would be able to obtain grants, rebates, expedited plan checks, tax incentives, and density bonuses.

The City provides seminars, expos, tours, and resources for their green building program. The success of their green building program has saved 1,100 tons of carbon dioxide from being emitted into the atmosphere per year. Also, Santa Monica has more Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) buildings per capita than any other city in the nation. Under the green building ordinance, 686 new residential units and several commercial buildings have been built. There are 100 new visitors at the resource center every month, and 15,000 visits to the Green Building website a month.

## **IX. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Mr. Skye provided a brief summary of green building and how it is related to solid waste management ([see attachment](#)). Green Building refers to construction design guidelines that emphasize responsible use of resources, including land, energy, water, and materials. Building green lowers operating and maintenance costs, reduces liability, and improves occupant health, morale, and productivity. Green building maximizes the use of recycled products, and minimizes the use of virgin materials.

Mr. Skye also discussed the following legislative bills related to green building:

- AB 1337 – Introduced by Ruskin

This Bill would define “green building” and require the Waste Board to adopt green building standards for newly constructed and renovated State buildings.

- AB 2160 – Introduced by Lieu

This Bill would require the Sustainable Building Task Force to define a life cycle cost assessment methodology to be used when considering “green building” design criteria.

- AB 2878 – Introduced by Ruskin

This Bill would define “green building” and require the Waste Board to adopt green building standards for State buildings. This Bill died in Committee.

- AB 2880 – Introduced by Lieu

This Bill would require the Waste Board to gather, analyze, and make publicly available green building information via the Internet.

- AB 2928 – Introduced by Laird

This Bill would require the Waste Board to develop voluntary green building guidelines for residential home construction.

As requested at last month's meeting, Mr. Skye also provided a summary of AB 2144:

- AB 2144 – Introduced by Montanez

This Bill revises public participation procedures related to site cleanup proposals. Requirements include providing notice of the proposed cleanup, timely access to written material, a minimum 30-day public comment period, and conducting a public meeting in the vicinity of the site during the public comment period.

The green building Bills led to a discussion on LEED requirements, incorporating a landscape plan, and complying with building codes. With AB 2144, a discussion ensued and issues such as the Water Quality Board's understaffed situation, the costs for brownfield site clean up, and who would be the lead agency, were raised. A motion to watch all the Bills was made. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Mike Mohajer noted a change in the following Bill:

- SB 928 – Introduced by Perata and Lowenthal

This Bill was considered by the Assembly Committee on Natural Resources on June 27, 2006. It repeals the provision that allows the time extension for newly incorporated cities to be in addition to the general time extensions.

## **X. REPORT FROM THE CIWMB**

Mr. Steve Uselton stated that the First Quarter 2006 Disposal Reporting System (DRS) report was due on July 15, 2006. DRS staff is preparing a training program to highlight the new data elements that are required under the new regulations.

Los Angeles County (County) is completing revisions to its reporting system database to comply with the new regulations, and anticipates having the

revisions completed by the end of July or August 2006. The County will conduct training sessions for disposal facility operators and haulers in August, and will submit its first quarter DRS report with its second quarter DRS report. The second quarter report is due on October 15, 2006. Approximately 30 percent of all DRS data in California is collected from Los Angeles County.

Waste Board staff finished a survey to determine if landfill operators are complying with requesting origin information. Out of 49 sites visited, only three did not comply with asking the correct questions.

Recently, a staff member from the Diversion Planning and Local Assistance Division was sent to the Department of General Services in Sacramento to help change their culture. This project is looking at post-occupancy improvements to promote programs that encourage an environmentally conscious culture.

With regard to State agency reporting, only nine out of 400 State agencies are not on track in meeting the 50 percent requirement. Twenty State agencies have not turned in their reports.

Annual reports from all local jurisdictions have been submitted. In the County, over 50 jurisdictions will follow a streamlined agenda in September to achieve at least 50 percent diversion.

**XI. NEXT MEETING DATE**

The next meeting date is scheduled for Thursday, August 17, 2006, at 1 p.m.

**XII. OPEN DISCUSSION/PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Mohajer mentioned that the Waste Board approved a permit for a bioreactor at the Kettleman landfill in Kings County. A bioreactor landfill will be placed on top of this hazardous waste landfill.

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.