

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

**Minutes of March 17, 2005**

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:

Gerry Miller, represented by Rafael Prieto, City of Los Angeles Appointee  
Thomas Garthwaite, rep. by Stan Uyehara, County of L.A. Dept. of Health Services  
Jim Stahl, rep. by Charles Boehmke, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County  
Barry Wallerstein, rep. by Jay Chen, South Coast Air Quality Management District  
Don Wolfe, rep. by Shari Afshari, County of Los Angeles Dept. of Public Works  
Ben Wong, rep. by John McTaggart, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Christopher J. Garner, City of Long Beach  
David Kim, City of Los Angeles Appointee  
General Public Representative  
Rita Robinson, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation

OTHERS PRESENT:

Chuk Agu, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Martins Aiyetiwa, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Paul Alva, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Kelly Astor, Los Angeles County Waste Management Association  
George De La O, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Adriana Figueroa, City of Norwalk  
Judith Fries, County Counsel  
Travis Lange, City of Santa Clarita  
Mary Ann Lutz, Task Force Alternate  
Carolyn Meredith, City of Pasadena  
Lara Orchanian, City of La Habra Heights  
Carlos Ruiz, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
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 FEBRUARY 17, 2005**

A motion was made to approve the minutes of February 17, 2005, subject to the following changes. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote of those members present.

- Amending Section II to state, "A motion was made to approve the minutes of January 20, 2005, subject to the following correction to Section X. The motion was carried unanimously."
- Amending Section VIII to include, "At the end of Mr. McCarron's presentation, Mr. Mohajer requested that the Waste Board and DTSC inform cities and counties of the locations of authorized collection and recycling centers to insure consistency with the local jurisdictions' general plan and land use requirements."
- Deleting the following Section X paragraph: "A motion was made to send a letter to the Waste Board and its counsel requesting clarification on whether conversion technology facilities need to be identified in the Siting Element. The motion was adopted unanimously."
- Amending Section XI to include, "A motion was made to send a letter to the Waste Board requesting written clarification on whether the location of any potential/proposed conversion technology facility needs to be identified in the Siting Element. The motion was carried unanimously."

**III. REPORT FROM THE ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE**

Mr. Paul Alva reported that the Alternative Technology Advisory Subcommittee met on February 18, 2005, at Community Recycling/Resource Recovery, Inc., in Sun Valley, to discuss contract deliverables. He stated that based on preliminary responses received from interested material recovery facilities (MRFs) willing to partner with the Task Force to co-locate a conversion technology demonstration facility, staff had discussed that the Subcommittee's initial look at 100 tons per day (tpd) facility may be too small.

Mr. Alva stated the Subcommittee discussed scaling the magnitude of tonnage processed and added that this discussion had carried to the Subcommittee's March meeting, held earlier today. It will remain an ongoing item until all of the facilities and technologies have been evaluated and the final report completed. Mr. Alva stated the final report would be released in May or June 2005.

Mr. Alva stated the Subcommittee, upon review of AB 1090, recommends that the Task Force take a supportive position on this Bill as it promotes conversion technologies by modernizing the solid waste management hierarchy. Mr. Alva stated the Subcommittee also recommends that a letter be sent to Mr. Joe Desmond, Deputy Secretary of Energy for the California State Resources Agency, providing information on what the Task Force has done in relation to conversion technologies.

A motion was made to send a letter to Mr. Desmond. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote of those members present.

#### **IV. WASTE BOARD PROPOSED CONVERSION TECHNOLOGY REGULATIONS**

Mr. Alva stated that on March 15, 2005, the Waste Board adopted a report to the State Legislature which discussed conversion technologies. He added that Mr. Fernando Berton of the Waste Board had indicated the Waste Board would begin drafting regulations within the following months. Mr. Alva stated staff would monitor these regulations and provide status as information becomes available.

#### **V. CONVERSION TECHNOLOGIES LEGISLATION**

Mr. Mike Mohajer was not able to attend the meeting.

#### **VI. REPORT FROM THE WASTE BOARD**

Mr. Steve Uselton reported that most of the 89 jurisdictions in the County of Los Angeles had submitted their 2003 Annual Report to the Waste Board. He stated that preliminary data indicates that jurisdictions which previously achieved the 50 percent diversion requirement were continuing to implement the same programs, thereby continuing to meet the State's diversion requirement. Mr. Uselton stated that 12 jurisdictions have requested a second time extension and staff is working to place this item on the Waste Board's June 2005 agenda to determine whether an extension to January 1, 2006, should be granted.

Mr. John McTaggart commented that the cooperation many jurisdictions receive from local Waste Board staff may have contributed to fewer jurisdictions requesting a second time extension during this reporting cycle. The Task Force commended Mr. Uselton and the Waste Board for their help and cooperation.

A suggestion was made to include a list of the 12 jurisdictions that had requested a second time extension in future Task Force minutes as the information is available.

## **VII. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Mr. Coby Skye provided a status on the following Legislative Bills (attached).

- AB 177—Introduced by Bogh

This Bill would remove conversion technologies from the definition of transformation, give diversion credit for conversion technologies, and treat them similarly to recycling and other diversion measures.

- AB 338—Introduced by Levine

This Bill would require CalTrans to increase the amount of asphalt containing crumb rubber in proportion to the total amount of asphalt paving materials used.

- AB 575—Introduced by Wolk

This Bill would allow retailers to pay their distributors the \$6-\$10 fee on covered electronic waste in lieu of the consumer paying the fee at point of purchase.

- AB 727—Introduced by Bermudez

This Bill would revise the hierarchy for solid waste management and rank conversion just below recycling and composting, but above environmentally safe transformation.

- AB 1049—Introduced by Koretz

This Bill would require all beverage and food containers to be color labeled to inform consumers how to manage these containers as either “trash,” “recyclable,” or “compost.”

- AB 1090—Introduced by Matthews

This Bill would modernize the solid waste management hierarchy, putting conversion technologies on equal footing with recycling and composting, and repeal the definition of gasification.

Mr. Skye stated that staff recommends support of AB 1090. A motion was made to send a letter supporting this Bill and requesting clarification of the statute related to renewable energy. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote of those members present.

- AB 1125—Introduced by Pavley

This Bill would require retailers of household batteries to establish a system to accept and collect household batteries by February 1, 2006.

- AB 1193—Introduced by Hancock

This Bill would prohibit the distribution or mass mailing of CDs or DVDs for commercial purposes to households unless prior consent is given or a postage paid return mail envelope is provided.

- SB 369 – Introduced by Simitian

This Bill would require CalEPA to establish a program whereby producers and distributors can affix a “Green Bear Eco-Label” to their product or service provided it meets specified criteria.

- SB 563—Introduced by Alarcon

This Bill would establish a State certified green business program.

- SB 928—Introduced by Lowenthal

This Spot Bill would change the State’s waste diversion mandate to an unspecified percentage beginning January 1, 2011.

- SB 942—Introduced by Chesbro

This Bill would impose an unspecified fee on each pack of cigarettes sold. Collected revenue would be used to, among other things, fund cigarette litter reduction activities.

- SB 1076—Introduced by Perata

This is a Spot Bill relating to solid waste management.

- SB 1106—Introduced by the Senate Environmental Quality Committee

This Bill would require local governments and State agencies to purchase recycled products. This Bill would also require State agencies to allocate half of their purchasing budget for the purchase of recycled products.

#### **VIII. CALIFORNIA PERFORMANCE REVIEW UPDATE**

Mr. Alva stated that on February 17, 2005, Governor Schwarzenegger withdrew from the Little Hoover Commission his reorganization plan to eliminate and consolidate more than 100 boards and commissions. This effectively terminated the reorganization plan for now, which would have gone into effect July 1, 2005, had all the statutory steps been taken. Mr. Alva stated that a letter from the Task Force was sent on February 10 expressing concerns with the proposed elimination of the Waste Board and the resulting loss of stakeholder access in the development of policy and regulations.

#### **IX. 2003 COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT ANNUAL REPORT**

Mr. Martins Aiyetiwa provided a PowerPoint presentation on the 2003 Countywide Siting Element Annual Report (attached). He stated the Annual Report had been divided into two sections, one that addresses the Countywide Summary Plan by describing its revisions and other regional issues, the other addressing the Siting Element by describing changes in permitted capacity, the strategy for maintaining adequate disposal capacity, and waste plan conformance.

Mr. Aiyetiwa described the Summary Plan's revisions which address changes in the goals and policies, provide an update on countywide programs, and discuss changes in the countywide solid waste management system. He added that the regional issues described in Section 1 assess solid waste management, processing capacity, the market for recovered materials, waste reduction, the State Disposal Reporting System, and AB 939 compliance.

Mr. Aiyetiwa stated that as part of staff's assessment of the Siting Element, changes in permitted landfill capacity had been reviewed. He stated that expansions to the Puente Hills Landfill increased its capacity to 13,200 tpd and life to ten years. Mr. Aiyetiwa also described the proposed expansions of the Sunshine Canyon City Landfill, Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center, Antelope Valley Landfill, Bradley Landfill, and Peck Road Gravel Pit.

Mr. Aiyetiwa stated that part of the County's strategy for maintaining adequate disposal capacity included expanding in-County capacity, facilitating the utilization of out-of-County/remote disposal facilities, and fostering the

development of transformation facilities and innovative solid waste disposal technologies. He reported that there were several transfer stations, MRFs, and landfills currently permitted to process the Countywide disposal capacity and need. These include 25 permitted transfer stations/MRFs, five permitted large-volume City maintenance yards, and numerous small-volume transfer stations, the total available transfer/processing capacity of which can add up to 60,000 tpd, with the current total daily average being 26,000 tpd. They also include eight major solid waste landfills, four small solid waste landfills, and two waste-to-energy facilities.

Mr. Aiyetiwa provided waste generation projections which utilize a State-developed methodology, consider demographic and economic changes, and project waste generation for a 15-year period. Mr. Aiyetiwa presented six scenarios which analyzed disposal need and led staff to conclude there is a need to utilize out-of-County disposal capacity and develop an in-County infrastructure to facilitate exportation of waste to out-of-County facilities. Jurisdictions must also continue efforts to encourage the development of conversion technologies. Mr. Aiyetiwa stated that the Mesquite and Eagle Mountain landfills are viable out-of-County landfill options since both are fully permitted. He added that the County would need to develop the infrastructure to make this happen and suggested a combination of rail and truck.

#### **X. COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT CHAPTER 3 REVISIONS**

Mr. Chuk Agu provided the Task Force with an overview of the potential revisions to Chapter 3 of the Siting Element (attached). Chapter 3 provides information on existing solid waste disposal facilities. Mr. Agu indicated that staff is in the process of conducting the landfill survey for the 2004 Annual Report. He also stated that the maps showing the location of each existing Class III landfill, their property boundaries, and disposal footprints would be submitted at a later date after the survey is completed. Task Force members discussed the revisions to Chapter 3 and provided staff with feedback and comments.

#### **XI. TASK FORCE COMMUNICATIONS AND OPERATING PROCEDURES**

Mr. George De La O provided an overview of the current Task Force communications and operating procedures. Mr. De La O then inquired, in a situation that requires an immediate response, prior to the next regularly scheduled Task Force meeting, whether staff should schedule a special meeting or send informal comments. Task Force members discussed the issue and came to a consensus for staff to send informal comments.

The informal comments would need to state the comments are from staff, are informal, and are based upon previous Task Force actions. If the issue concerns nuances not addressed by the Task Force in the past or if concurrence could not be reached on the wording of the comments, the correspondence would simply state the issue is of concern, but no position can be taken yet. In either case, the Task Force would consider the item at its next meeting and issue formal comments afterward.

Also brought up for discussion was whether and how Task Force members should identify themselves as members of this Task Force when communicating with other agencies. Some instances have caused confusion in the past, especially if the Task Force and member organization's positions differ on an issue. The Task Force consensus was that members should not identify themselves as Task Force members unless asked. However, they should indicate they are not representing the Task Force.

The Task Force directed staff to draft communication guidelines/policies for the Task Force to review and take action on at the next meeting. A request was also made for County Counsel to provide a presentation on the requirements of the Brown Act.

**XII. NEXT MEETING DATE**

The next meeting date is tentatively scheduled for April 21, 2005, at 1 p.m.

**XIII. OPEN DISCUSSION/PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no public comments.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:21 p.m.

Attach.