

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

Minutes of October 19, 2006

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
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative
Ron Saldana, Los Angeles County Disposal Association

COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY OTHERS:

County of Los Angeles Dept. of Public Health represented by Ken Murray
Gerry Miller, rep. by Rafael Prieto, City of Los Angeles
Rita Robinson, rep. by Karen Coca, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation
Jim Stahl, rep. by Charles Boehmke, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
Dr. Barry Wallerstein, rep. by Jay Chen, South Coast Air Quality Management District
Mark Waronek, rep. by Michael Miller, League of California Cities, Los Angeles Division
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
Carl Clark, Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, Inc.
David Kim, City of Los Angeles
Mary Ann Lutz, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division
Greig Smith, City of Los Angeles

OTHERS PRESENT:

Chuk Agu, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Paul Alva, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Susan Higgins, Alternative Resources Inc.
Tim Hughes, City of Palmdale
Grace Huizar, City of Redondo Beach
Cary Kalscheuer, City of Azusa
Armine Kesablyan, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Linda Lee, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Joe Levin, California Climate Action Registry
John McTaggart, General Public Representative Alternate
Lee Miller, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Charles Modica, City of Los Angeles
Mark Patti, City of Santa Clarita
Ursula Schmidt, City of Pasadena
Coby Skye, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Steve Uselton, California Integrated Waste Management Board

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 1:03 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 21, 2006

A motion to approve the minutes of September 21, 2006, was made with the following corrections:

- For each reference that a member was absent during a vote on a motion, indicate that the member was "absent at the time the vote was taken."
- On page four, item VIII, the last sentence should read: "This would result in a solid waste facility permit being issued even though it may be in conflict with the land use permit or in absence of an approved land use permit."
- On page five, item XI, bullet item AB 1980, the definition of AB 1980 needs to be consistent with the definition of AB 1688.

The motion was passed unanimously. (Mr. Jay Chen and Mr. Rafael Prieto were absent at the time the vote was taken)

III. REPORT FROM THE FACILITY AND PLAN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. Al Avoian stated the Subcommittee reviewed the Countywide Siting Element Chapter 9 revision documents submitted by Staff. Staff will incorporate the Subcommittee's recommendations and submit the draft Chapter 9 revisions at a future Subcommittee meeting.

IV. REPORT FROM THE ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. Coby Skye reported the Subcommittee's efforts in evaluating potential locations for the conversion technology demonstration facility co-located at a materials recovery facility. Two previously identified materials recovery facility locations, City of Los Angeles Recycling and Transfer Station (CLARTS) and the proposed MRF in the City of Santa Clarita, have been put on hold for the following reasons: the City of Los Angeles may consider CLARTS for its conversion technology facility and needs to go through its own transparent process before saying yes; and the Santa Clarita site has had a number of unexpected delays, and therefore is holding off for now on this process. There

are four remaining potential materials recovery facility locations: one in Sun Valley, two in Riverside County, and one in Ventura County.

A Request for Information will be sent to nine screened technology vendors by the end of October 2006. Responses will be due in early December 2006 and evaluated shortly thereafter. The Subcommittee will interview the vendors in January 2007, and tours will be arranged around February 2007 to thoroughly evaluate the facility's operations.

A Bidder's conference was held on October 19, 2006, for the public outreach contract. Proposals are due on November 2, 2006 and the contract is expected to be awarded by the end of the year or early next year.

V. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Mr. Skye provided an end of the year wrap-up ([see attachment](#)). He stated that the Task Force has taken an active leadership role and made an impact on legislation by taking a position on numerous Bills.

Mr. Skye also gave a brief overview of the following:

- AB 2449 - Introduced by Levine

This Bill would require grocery stores to establish a collection program for plastic bags. At the August 2006 Task Force meeting, the Task Force voted to support the Bill. However, the Bill was later amended to usurp local control over imposing fees or other recycling programs on grocery stores. At the September 2006 meeting, the Task Force voted to send a letter to the Governor recommending he veto the Bill. The Bill was later signed into Law.

Mr. Mike Mohajer reiterated his concerns with AB 1688, AB 1980, and how both Bills impact AB 1992. The power of arrest for AB 1688 and AB 1980 refers to Penal Code Section 830.7i. Since AB 1980 was signed into Law last, the power of arrest requirement would fall under Penal Code Section 830.7j. Mr. Mohajer explained that the order in which these Bills were signed could create legal confusion.

Mr. Mohajer briefly mentioned the following:

- AB 2206 - Introduced by Montanez

This Bill requires local governments to report on their efforts to develop multi-family recycling programs. In 2005, Assembly Member Montanez introduced AB 399, which the Task Force opposed and the Governor eventually vetoed. In 2006, Assembly Member Montanez introduced AB 2206 with similar language to AB 399, which the Task Force did not take a position on. The Bill was also vetoed by the Governor.

VI. PRESENTATION ON CLIMATE CHANGE AND THE CALIFORNIA CLIMATE ACTION REGISTRY

Mr. Joel Levin, Vice-President of the California Climate Action Registry (Registry), presented on California's climate policy and the role of the Registry in accordance to AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act ([see attachment](#)).

Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger issued an Executive Order on June 1, 2005, to return greenhouse gases to 1990 levels by 2020, a 25 percent reduction. The Governor signed AB 32 in September 2006, which mandates the 2020 reduction target as State law and gives the California Air Resources Board (CARB) broad authority to regulate all "significant" sources of greenhouse gases (GHGs). By January 1, 2008, CARB would have to issue a rule for mandatory reporting and by January 1, 2012, the reduction regulations would be in effect.

On October 17, 2006, the Governor signed a new Executive Order that guides CARB on the implementation of AB 32, sets up the framework for a program of emissions trading with northeastern States and Europe, and instructs CARB to use the standards and protocols developed by the Registry. The Executive Order also instructs the Registry to develop new standards for local governments and agriculture, and develop a multi-state GHG registry.

AB 32 allows entities to voluntarily join the Registry by December 31, 2006. These entities would have one year to report their GHG emissions and have the data certified. Entities who voluntarily reduce their GHG emissions prior to January 1, 2012, would receive appropriate credit for their early action.

The Governor appoints the Registry's Board, and that the Secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency is the Chair of the Registry Board.

The Registry currently has 95 members from solid waste companies, local government agencies, and businesses.

VII. UPDATE ON THE WASTE BOARD'S PROPOSED PERMIT IMPLEMENTATION REGULATIONS

Mr. Mohajer stated that the Waste Board released their proposed permit implementation regulations in September 2006. He submitted comments to the Waste Board regarding the issue of the land use permit ([see attachment](#)). He stated the Waste Board regulations would allow the Local Enforcement Agency and the Waste Board to issue a solid waste facility permit without the local host jurisdiction's land use approval. Mr. Mohajer provided alternatives to the Waste Board staff's proposal, but his comments were not incorporated in the final regulations. The Waste Board approved the permit implementation regulations on October 17, 2006, and they will be submitted to the Office of Administrative Law for final approval.

VIII. 2006 ASCE CALIFORNIA INFRASTRUCTURE REPORT CARD, SOLID WASTE

Mr. Mohajer stated the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) released their first statewide infrastructure report card ([see attachment](#)). The report card analyzed ten categories: aviation, levees/flood control, parks/open space, ports, public relations, solid waste, transportation, urban runoff, wastewater, and water.

Mr. Mohajer discussed the solid waste category of the report card, which consists of three components: collection, processing to remove recyclable and compostable materials, and disposal of waste that cannot be recycled. The existing system received a grade of "B."

Mr. Mohajer commented on the deficiencies of the report, which include a lack of information on transformation, conversion technology and waste-to-energy facilities. He also mentioned the report did not disclose the cost of local government to maintain closed landfills, and that most landfills are privately owned.

Mr. Paul Alva provided background on how the ASCE (solid waste section) report card was developed. He stated that the report card was a collaborative process put together by a team headed by Orange County and joined by representatives from the Waste Board, Northern California, San Diego, Riverside, and the County of Los Angeles. The team developed the solid waste report card to be consistent with the other categories. Mr. Alva stated the report was intended to give the public a brief simple overview of the solid waste infrastructure condition Statewide. Because the report card is statewide, some of the information may

not represent local conditions such as sufficient disposal capacity. To accurately reflect local conditions, ASCE released a bi-annual County report card. For example, in November 2005 ASCE released the Los Angeles County infrastructure report card. The County Sanitation Districts, City of Burbank, the County of Los Angeles, the City of Los Angeles, and SCS Engineers collaborated on the Los Angeles County report card (solid waste section). The solid waste category received the grade of "B." The report card was forwarded to the Task Force and all elected officials and decision makers in Los Angeles County, and Statewide officials.

Discussion ensued. Task Force members emphasized how critical the Statewide report is and raised concerns regarding potential harm to the Los Angeles County solid waste system. Task Force members stated the Statewide report could be accessed by elected officials and decision makers, the Legislature might look at the report and determine that conversion technology was not necessary because it was not extensively discussed.

A motion to send a letter to ASCE expressing the Task Force's concerns with their 2006 California Infrastructure Report Card was made. The letter should include the following comments:

- The majority of landfills are owned by the private sector, not by city or county entities;
- Transformation, waste to energy, conversion technology, and closed landfill costs were not included in their infrastructure funding;
- The report lacks extensive policy discussions, especially with the issue of conversion technologies or looking to landfill alternatives;
- The report does not discuss the economics of recycling, alternatives to landfilling, funds for maintaining/cleanup of closed landfills;
- The report does not accurately depict landfill capacity in Los Angeles County.

The motion was passed with Mr. Charles Boehmke and Ms. Karen Coca opposing.

IX. UPDATE ON THE COUNTYWIDE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS/ ELECTRONIC WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Ms. Armine Kesablyan provided a brief update on the Countywide Household Hazardous Waste/Electronic Waste (HHW/E-waste) Management Program ([see attachment](#)). She reported that on average 53 events are conducted annually throughout Los Angeles County. In fiscal year 2005/2006, over

64,000 participants attended the collection events and a total of 3,500 tons of household hazardous waste were collected, 53 percent of which was recycled. A total of 995 tons of E-waste were collected, and 100 percent of it was recycled. Over 2.1 million pounds of universal waste (U-waste) were collected, and 95 percent of it was recycled. The largest events were in the Cities of Santa Clarita, Pasadena, West Covina, Long Beach, and Arcadia, ranging from 2,500 to 3,000 participants each.

Mr. Lee Miller presented on the Antelope Valley Environmental Collection Center (AVECC). The AVECC is a permanent HHW/E-waste collection center established in partnership with the Cities of Palmdale and Lancaster, Waste Management, Inc., the County of Los Angeles, and grant funds from the Waste Board. Since its opening in August 2005, there has been a 55 percent increase in participation compared to the mobile collection events previously conducted in the area. Over 600,000 pounds of household hazardous waste and over 650,000 pounds of e-waste were collected.

There are six permanent centers operated by the City of Los Angeles. The Countywide HHW/E-Waste Program partially funds these centers, and they are open to all residents countywide. In fiscal year 2005/2006, residents disposed of over 2.5 million pounds of e-waste, 2.8 million pounds of u-waste, and 6.9 million pounds of HHW at the six permanent centers.

Mr. Miller continued to report on the County's efforts to expand the Countywide HHW/E-waste program to include the construction of a permanent HHW/E-waste collection center in the San Gabriel Valley, expansion of the number of events conducted annually, and enhancements to public outreach efforts.

Mr. Mohajer suggested that the Countywide HHW/E-waste website should include information on the cities that have u-waste programs for residents.

A motion was made to contact Pacific Gas & Electric Company in Northern California to inquire about their u-waste recycling program. A report will be provided to the Task Force so they can decide if a letter should be sent to Southern California Edison requesting them to sponsor/coordinate a similar program. The motion passed unanimously.

X. PROPOSED REGULATIONS FOR ACTIVE DISPOSAL SITE GAS MONITORING AND CONTROL

Ms. Linda Lee stated that at the September 17, 2004, meeting, the Waste Board directed staff to implement a recommendation made by a landfill facility compliance study. The recommendation was to modify the current regulations to apply to active landfills the more comprehensive gas monitoring and control regulations currently applicable to closed landfills. Accordingly, on December 13-14, 2006, the Waste Board released proposed regulations entitled,

“Active Disposal Site Gas Monitoring and Control” ([see attachment](#)). Comments on the proposed regulations are due on October 30, 2006. Ms. Lee provided a summary of the proposed regulations and recommended the Task Force forward a letter of support, including commenting that the regulations identify the local building authority as proper oversight agency.

A motion to send a support letter was made. The motion passed with Mr. Boehmke abstaining.

XI. REPORT FROM THE WASTE BOARD

Mr. Steve Uselton mentioned that Waste Board staff is reviewing local jurisdictions’ efforts to meet State diversion requirements. The Waste Board is tasked with reviewing each jurisdiction’s progress in complying with the California Integrated Waste Management Act at least once every two years. On the September and October 2006 Waste Board agendas, staff presented 250 jurisdictions that met the 50 percent requirement or obtained a good faith effort in implementing their diversion programs from the Waste Board. This is the fifth biennial review cycle and it has the largest number of jurisdictions that have met or exceeded the 50 percent goal.

Waste Board staff concluded their September survey visits to solid waste facilities. Facilities are required to request and record the origin of jurisdiction. This requirement is crucial for the calculation of the jurisdiction’s diversion rate. Staff visited 53 facilities during the survey week and all, except for one facility, complied. If the facility does not comply by staff’s third visit, the facility will be identified by the Waste Board as failing to comply with disposal reporting system requirements.

The 2005 electronic annual report has been released and the Waste Board has notified and mailed out packages to all jurisdictions. Each jurisdiction can submit on-line their diversion program and planning documents and update their programs’ information. The 2005 disposal reporting data have been posted on the Waste Board’s website and jurisdictions can calculate their annual diversion rate using the generation-based method which can be used to establish a new base year. Jurisdictions that want to use the adjustment method must wait until the 2005 Board of Equalization releases their taxable sales table.

Jurisdictions will have to comment on large events/venues within their jurisdictions on their year-end report, as required by AB 2176. In addition to basic information, each jurisdiction has to report on the venue’s written recycling plan, the extent to which the plan is being implemented, the type of solid waste diversion program, the type of materials being generated, and the total tonnages

generated. This requirement is an effort to involve large venues and improve public education on solid waste.

Waste Board staff prepared a diversion program for the Governor and the First Lady's Conference on Women at the Long Beach Convention Center on September 26, 2006, in support of AB 2176. Waste Board members and staff, City of Long Beach representatives, event organizers, and venue administration coordinated their efforts to promote a zero waste event. Two and a half tons of lunch waste was collected for composting. All waste that was not source separated for composting was taken to a nearby waste-to-energy facility. This event will be posted on the Waste Board's website for local jurisdictions to use as an example on how to comply with AB 2176.

Two multi-family recycling workshops were held in September 2006 in Sacramento, and at the South Coast Air Quality Management District's headquarters in Diamond Bar. Both workshops were attended by recycling coordinators and industry service providers. Presenters included those who have a successful multi-family recycling program in their jurisdiction.

Staff has received approximately 95 percent of the State agencies' annual reports.

An advisory board was created to discuss and develop a recycling municipal solid waste management certificate program at the University of California, Los Angeles Extension. A meeting was held on September 7, 2006, to discuss previous certificate programs, including recycling, on-line sessions, the economic benefits to local governments, the importance of purchasing recycled products, sources for local utilization of recycling materials, and contract writing.

XII. NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting date is scheduled for Thursday, November 16, 2006, at 1 p.m.

XIII. OPEN DISCUSSION/PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Rafael Prieto introduced Mr. Charles Modica, another alternate for Mr. Gerry Miller, who represents the City of Los Angeles.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.