



LOS ANGELES COUNTY  
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE/  
INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT TASK FORCE  
900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE, ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331  
P.O. BOX 1460, ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460  
[www.lacountyiswmf.org](http://www.lacountyiswmf.org)

GAIL FARBER, CHAIR  
MARGARET CLARK, VICE-CHAIR

December 13, 2012

Ms. Caroll Mortensen, Director  
Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle)  
1001 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95812-4025

Dear Ms. Mortensen:

**COMMENTS REGARDING CALRECYCLE'S PROPOSED MATERIAL RECOVERY FACILITY STANDARDS: TECHNICAL APPROCHES – NOVEMBER 26, 2012, ASSEMBLY BILL 341 WORKSHOP**

The Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/Integrated Waste Management Task Force (Task Force) appreciates the continued commitment of you and your staff to engage stakeholders regarding material recovery facility (MRF) performance standards. The Task Force in concert with its previously submitted input of November 14, 2012, would like to provide comments on the following key issues as discussed at the November 26, 2012, workshop hosted by Los Angeles County Department of Public Works:

1. The intent of Assembly Bill 341 was to accommodate the use of mixed waste processing facilities (MWPF) to manage materials collected from businesses where source separation was not feasible. CalRecycle has interpreted this clause as requiring a performance standard that would ensure MWPFs achieve diversion results that are "comparable" to MRF handling source separated recyclables/divertible materials, but this is not evident in the law. It is also unclear how the performance of MWPFs can be compared to "source separation" when no standard for "source separation" has been established by statutes, emphasis added. Therefore we feel this issue needs to be evaluated further and better defined with emphasis on GHG reduction and availability of markets for the divertible materials in California, and/or those located in other states or foreign

countries providing their use causes a reduction in GHG emissions verified by an appropriate lifecycle analysis, emphasis added.

2. We have an ongoing concern regarding CalRecycle's proposal to establish standards that would require additional materials to be separated, without any consideration for the availability of sufficient local markets for those recyclable or compostable materials. As previously stated, this is a critical factor that must be considered by CalRecycle before pursuing a mandatory performance standard.
3. The process undertaken by CalRecycle seems to have lost sight of the original intent of the Mandatory Commercial Recycling requirement, which was focused on the reduction of GHG emissions; this is highlighted by the lack of actual performance data for the recycling facilities located in foreign countries where much of California's recyclables are shipped for processing.
4. There appears to be very little support for the proposed Option A of the "Topic 1" ("Specify Amount of Certain Materials Allowed in Residuals") from jurisdictions and other key stakeholders in Southern California. The Task Force is greatly concerned this option would establish additional prescriptive measurement and quantification schemes (a.k.a. "bean-counting") that would reverse the progress we've collectively made over the last decade to move away from expending resources on quantification of minutia, and focusing more on the quality of program implementation. We encourage CalRecycle to pursue options that are more reasonable and broader support.
5. CalRecycle's push for establishing a performance standard for residuals that may be used for energy recovery or other beneficial uses (the so called "Topic 2") seems counterproductive to CalRecycle's mission, in that placing additional requirements for the processing of materials prior to beneficial use only serves to make such options more difficult and costly, thereby creating an incentive to send residual wastes to landfills for disposal. We encourage CalRecycle to establish policies that would strongly encourage residual wastes to be sent to beneficial uses rather than disposal, such as conversion technologies which can convert residual solid waste into marketable products, green fuels and renewable energy while complementing the State's recycling infrastructure.

Ms. Caroll Mortensen  
December 13, 2012  
Page 3

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this important issue and we look forward to continuing to work with you and your staff during the coming months. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Mike Mohajer of the Task Force at [MikeMohajer@yahoo.com](mailto:MikeMohajer@yahoo.com) or at (909) 592-1147.

Sincerely,

*Margaret Clark*

Margaret Clark, Vice-Chair  
Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/  
Integrated Waste Management Task Force and  
Council Member, City of Rosemead

CS:my

P:\sec\TF\CalReMRFS\std

cc: CalRecycle (Scott Smithline, Howard Levenson, John Sitts, Nancy Carr)  
League of California Cities  
California State Association of Counties  
Each Member of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors  
Rita Robinson, Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office  
Each City Mayor/Manager in the County of Los Angeles  
South Bay Cities Council of Governments  
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments  
Gateway Cities Counsel of Governments  
Southern California Association of Governments  
Each City Recycling Coordinator in Los Angeles County  
Each Member of the Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Task Force  
Each Member of the Alternative Technology Advisory Subcommittee  
Each Member of the Facility Plan Review Subcommittee