

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

Minutes of November 20, 2008

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Carl Clark, Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, Inc.  
Margaret Clark, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division  
Betsey Landis, Environmental Organization Representative  
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative  
Ron Saldana, Private Sector Representative

COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY OTHERS:

Dean Efstathiou, represented by Carlos Ruiz, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Dr. Jonathan Fielding, represented by Gerry Villalobos, County of Los Angeles Dept. of Public Health  
Stephen Maguin, represented by Charles Boehmke, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County  
Gerry Miller, represented by Charles Modica, City of Los Angeles  
Greig Smith, represented by Nicole Bernson, City of Los Angeles  
Enrique Zaldivar, represented by Karen Coca, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Christine Andersen, City of Long Beach  
David Kim, City of Los Angeles  
Mary Ann Lutz, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division  
Sam Perdomo, Business/Commerce Representative  
Dr. Barry Wallerstein, South Coast Air Quality Management District

OTHERS PRESENT:

Martin Aiyetiwa, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Paul Alva, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Gabriel Arenas, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Joe Bartolata, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Russell Bukoff, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Adam Campos, The Mark-Costello Co.  
Rafael Garcia, Allied Waste  
Armine Kesablyan, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Tobie Mitchell, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
David Nguyen, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Mark Patti, City of Santa Clarita  
Leonard Robinson, California Department of Toxic Substances Control  
Hossein Torabzadeh, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting was called to order at 1:04 p.m.

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 16, 2008**

A motion was made to approve the corrected minutes of October 16, 2008. The motion passed unanimously. Mr. Gerry Villalobos and Mr. Carlos Ruiz were absent at the time the vote was taken.

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

Ms. Tobie Mitchell reported that the Subcommittee did not meet in the month of November. However, the Conversion Technology Evaluation Team (evaluation team) did meet and reviewed the proposals from all short-listed conversion technology vendors. The evaluation team met with all companies on November 5<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> to discuss different aspects of the proposals.

Ms. Mitchell also reported that a Request For Proposals for a technical consultant for phases III and IV of the conversion technology project was released on November 17, 2008. A pre-proposal conference will be held on December 15, 2008. More information on the request for proposals is available at [www.socalconversion.org](http://www.socalconversion.org).

**IV. REPORT FROM THE PUBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE**

Mr. Mike Mohajer reported that the Subcommittee met earlier in the day and considered the following articles for the next edition of *Inside Solid Waste*:

1. An article from the City of Huntington Park on the City's partnership with Starbucks to recycle coffee beans
2. An article from the City of Santa Monica on the City's new commercial services
3. An article from the City of Calabasas on the winners of the 2008 grammar school drawing contest
4. Several articles from the County of Los Angeles on the following:
  - County's single use bag reduction and recycling program
  - County's green partnership that deals with programs such as battery recycling
  - County and Task Force new membership in the California Product Stewardship Council

- BlueFire waste-to-ethanol conversion technology facility that was recently approved by the County Board of Supervisors
- Adjustment to the countywide solid waste management fee to expand waste reduction and recycling programs
- Air Resources Board's scoping plan for greenhouse gas emission reduction
- Reduction in markets for California recyclables

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

Ms. Betsey Landis reported that the Subcommittee met earlier in the day and discussed incorporating the following facilities in the City of Santa Clarita's Non-Disposal Facility Element (NDFE):

1. Agromin Green Materials Composting
2. Sun Valley Paper Stock Materials Recovery Facility
3. Community Recycling/Resource Recovery Incorporated
4. Downtown Diversion
5. East Valley Diversion
6. Santa Clara Organics

Ms. Landis reported that the Subcommittee concurred with the staff report ([see attachment](#)) and moved to approve four of the six listed facilities for inclusion in the City of Santa Clarita's NDFE. She noted that Agromin Green Materials Composting and Santa Clara Organics do not have a solid waste facility permit and thus action on those facilities was postponed until further direction from the Waste Board is obtained. The Subcommittee also discussed the decline in markets for California recyclables.

A motion was made to approve the Subcommittee's motion to include four of the six facilities listed in the City of Santa Clarita's NDFE. The motion passed unanimously.

A second motion was made to send a letter to the Waste Board asking for directions on whether or not to include facilities without a solid waste facility permit in the NDFE. The motion passed unanimously.

A third motion was made to send letters to a) the Waste Board reiterating the Task Force's support for the development of markets for recyclables and the use of conversion technology (including its use in recycling markets) to create jobs in California, and b) the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and each city mayor in

Los Angeles County asking them to forward letters to the Waste Board in support of the above recommendations. The motion passed unanimously.

**VI. CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT TO CITY OF SANTA CLARITA'S NON-DISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT**

See Item V above.

**VII. UPDATE ON SUNSHINE CANYON LANDFILL FINDING OF CONFORMANCE**

Mr. Martins Aiyetiwa provided an update on the finding of conformance (FOC) for Sunshine Canyon Landfill. He reported that approximately three months ago, the Task Force had sent a letter to the City of Los Angeles inquiring about the City's position with regards to the approval of the development of Phase II of the city project, and no response from the city has yet been offered. However, he noted that there have been several developments since then.

Mr. Aiyetiwa reported that the City and the County reached agreement on two memorandums of understanding (MOU) regarding Sunshine Canyon Landfill. The first MOU establishes the framework for combining land use planning responsibilities of the City and County and the second MOU establishes the formula by which revenue derived from the landfill will be allocated between the City, County and BFI. These MOUs were approved by the County Board of Supervisors on November 12, 2008.

Mr. Aiyetiwa stated that these MOUs will be on the November 25, 2008 Los Angeles City Council meeting agenda for discussion. They will also discuss the \$3 per ton, alternative landfilling fee that is going to be assessed at the Sunshine Canyon Landfill.

Mr. Aiyetiwa indicated that City Council is expected to approve these MOUs and pass a resolution authorizing BFI to develop phase II of the Sunshine Canyon Landfill city project. The approved resolution will satisfy the Task Force requirement regarding the development of Phase II. The County Technical Advisory Committee will authorize the joint operation of Landfill upon the approval of the City Council resolution by the Task Force.

**VIII. AB 1109 LIGHTING TASK FORCE REPORT, COLLECTION & RECYCLING OF FLUORESCENT BULBS IN CALIFORNIA**

Mr. Leonard Robinson, Chief Deputy Director with the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), and Chair of the AB 1109 Lighting Task Force (Lighting Task Force), gave a presentation on the Lighting Task Force Report ([see attachment](#)).

Mr. Robinson reported that the Lighting Task Force convened in March 2008 to consider and make recommendations to the Legislature on methods of collection, recycling, education, outreach, labeling, and designations for end of life residential fluorescent lamps, which are considered hazardous waste upon disposal.

Mr. Robinson stated that the Lighting Task Force included representatives from utility companies, environmental organizations, retail stores, and local and state governments. He indicated that the Lighting Task Force meetings were well publicized and many members of the public and private sectors were active participants.

Mr. Robinson noted there were areas of consensus among the proposals and recommendations for collection and recycling systems put forth by the Lighting Task Force members. The ten key areas where Lighting Task Force members agreed on were:

1. Focus on residential fluorescent lights – both compact fluorescent lights and tubes;
2. Combine energy efficiency and environmental protection messages;
3. The program should be administered by an independent third party organization (TPO);
4. Collection must be free, local and convenient for the public;
5. Shared responsibility among all parties that benefit from fluorescent lighting;
6. Public funds should be explored as one funding source;
7. State enforcement authority should be clearly spelled out;
8. The collection and recycling programs should emphasize compliance and safety;
9. Education and outreach should include a wide range of methods and media outlets
10. Only fluorescent lights from TPO participants should be sold in California.

Mr. Robinson indicated that approximately 30 million fluorescent lamps will be available for recycling in California by 2012. The estimated recycling cost ranges from \$4 to \$44 million per year.

Mr. Robinson stated that the DTSC has launched the *Not In My Trash Can*-paign in an effort to provide California residents with information on how to recycle used fluorescent lamps in a free, local and convenient manner.

A motion was made to have staff review the Lighting Task Force Report and provide recommendations of support to the Task Force. Based on the staff's

recommendations, the Task Force will then submit a letter to the County Board of Supervisors, Cities in Los Angeles County, and Assembly-member Jared Huffman expressing its support for the report. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **IX. UPDATE ON AB 2296, LANDFILL FINANCIAL ASSURANCE**

Mr. Mohajer reported that the AB 2296 Working Group met on October 30, 2008, in Sacramento to further discuss the issue of landfill financial assurance. At this meeting the concept of two separate “pooled funds” was introduced. One of the pool funds would cover privately owned landfills and the other would cover publicly owned landfills. This would safeguard public entities from bailing out privately owned landfills in the event such landfills can not meet their closure and post-closure financial obligations.

Mr. Mohajer reported that the issue was scheduled for discussion at the November 30, 2008, Waste Board meeting but was unexpectedly removed from the agenda. It is still unknown when the Waste Board will discuss the pooled fund issue again.

#### **X. UPDATE ON MANAGING PHARMACEUTICAL WASTE**

Ms. Armine Kesablyan provided an update on the model programs the Waste Board is proposing to manage pharmaceutical waste. This program resulted from SB 966, which was enacted in 2007. It requires the Waste Board to establish criteria and procedure for the implementation of pharmaceutical waste management programs.

SB 966 requires that the programs be convenient; operate at no cost to the State; protect the environment and the health and safety of consumers; provide full reporting to the Waste Board; protect against diversion of drug waste; and provide educational materials for consumers.

Ms. Kesablyan reported that the Waste Board had conducted workshops, surveys and meetings to obtain feedback from stakeholders. Based on this feedback, the Waste Board is proposing three types of model programs that health organizations, pharmacies, local governments, and other agencies may implement to properly dispose of pharmaceutical waste.

The first model program is the *Permanent Collection and Disposal Facilities program*. According to the Waste Board’s criteria, facilities that might operate such programs are pharmacies with active and unrestricted licenses, police and sheriff stations, public environmental health agencies, doctors’ offices, and household hazardous waste collection facilities.

This model emphasized the types of pharmaceutical waste that can be collected at these facilities, necessary security of the collected waste, appropriate collection methodology, and the informational signage required at the facilities on the type of acceptable pharmaceutical waste. Over the counter drugs, prescription drugs, and vitamins can be accepted by the facilities' staff, however the handling of controlled substances requires the presence of law enforcement. The recommended staff for this model includes pharmacists, law enforcement, and HHW handlers. In addition, this model requires a sustainable budget to accommodate the anticipated increase in the disposal of pharmaceutical waste, and effective public outreach to educate the residents.

Ms. Kesablian stated that, in her opinion, the ideal point of collection would be at the pharmacies, where these drugs were purchased. Unfortunately, the Pharmacy Board contends that the business code is unclear on whether or not these stores can collect pharmaceuticals or sharps waste. To disseminate the information on the proper disposal of pharmaceuticals, she stated that a universal message approach would work best to educate the public.

The second model program type is the *Government Sponsored Periodic Collection Program*. The requirement for this program is similar to the first model, with the exception that this model requires the presence of the law enforcement and pharmacists at all the collection events in order to identify the pharmaceutical waste. This would potentially increase operational costs adding more to the need for sufficient funding.

The third model program, *The Mail Back Collection Program*, requires providing prepaid envelopes for consumers to mail-in their pharmaceutical waste. Proper tracking and disposal of pharmaceutical waste received are also the requirements of this costly model type.

Ms. Kesablian stated that the main challenge to implement these programs is the lack of funding. Mass advertising and specialized personnel requirements will increase costs to these local government run-programs. Unfortunately, the Waste Board does not consider pharmaceutical waste as a hazardous waste, thus making pharmaceutical waste ineligible for HHW grant funding.

Ms. Kesablian indicated that a stakeholder meeting will be held on December 19, 2008 in Sacramento to consider comments. Recommendations on the final criteria and procedures will be considered at the February 2009 Waste Board meeting.

A motion was made to send a letter to the Waste Board addressing concerns regarding the proposed model programs presented to the Task Force by Ms. Kesablyan. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **XI. PRESENTATION ON THE CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD'S AB 32 PROPOSED SCOPING PLAN**

Ms. Tobie Mitchell provided a presentation ([see attachment](#)) on the AB 32 Proposed Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan) that was released by the California Air Resources Board (Air Board) on October 15, 2008. The scoping plan is a roadmap for the State to meet the goals of AB 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act, which requires California to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 1990's emission levels by the year 2020. Since the release of the first Draft Scoping Plan in June 2008, the Air Board has received over 42,000 comments submitted by stakeholders.

Ms. Mitchell stated that the program was developed using a mix of strategies that combined market mechanisms, imposed regulations, voluntary measures and fees. Some of the key elements of the scoping plan include energy efficiency programs; renewable energy; a cap-and-trade program linked to the Western Climate Initiative; targets for transportation-related emissions; existing laws and policies; and targeted fees.

Ms. Mitchell stated that the scoping plan put forward eighteen recommended measures, which included Recycling and Waste Management Strategies recommendations. She noted that the Draft Scoping Plan (first draft released on June 26, 2008) had included only one measure dealing with landfill methane control. Since then, however, the Air Board has made several additions to the Scoping Plan that could result in a potential reduction of nine million metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Some of these measures are:

- Increasing the efficiency of landfill methane capture: this would be a support measure to the Discrete Early Action that was implemented last year. The Air Board and Waste Board will be working together on this measure.
- Anaerobic Digestion: the inclusion of this component is a step in the right direction as no mention of this measure was made in the Draft Scoping Plan. This leaves an open door for the potential use of conversion technologies.
- Extended producer's responsibility and environmentally preferable purchasing: there is no estimated potential reduction of emission from this measure yet.

However, this will be a major component of the recycling waste management section.

- Commercial recycling: the Air Board estimates a reduction of five million metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from this measure. Economic studies are planned for this recommendation. The Waste Board will be the lead agency for this measure.
- Composting: the Air Board estimates a reduction of two million metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> from this measure. There is no clear indication of what the timeline for adoption or the cost for this measure will be. The Waste Board will be working with the Air Board on this measure. The Waste Board plans to conduct an economic and life cycle assessment of organic diversion for this measure.

Ms. Mitchell noted that only the *increasing of the efficiency of landfill methane capture* measure will be counting towards the State goal. This is because the State regulations are not currently in place for other introduced measures and there are overlaps between sectors, which makes it difficult to estimate reductions for recycling and waste management.

Ms. Mitchell stated that the Waste Board also expressed concerns regarding the measures not included in the 2020 reduction goal. The concerns varied from the authority to implement measures, the type of implementation approach, the issues related to cost and effectiveness; and the available resources to implement the measures.

Ms. Mitchell mentioned that she monitored the ARB meeting on November 20, 2008, where Chairperson Brown from the Waste Board discussed the Waste Board's opinion that commercial recycling should be a required element of the Scoping Plan's recommendations. In the current Scoping Plan, the commercial recycling element combines both regulatory and voluntary recommendations. Discussion ensued as to whether this was the best recommendation given the fact that the global recycling market has slowed dramatically in recent months, causing many California recyclers to stockpile material without the ability to sell it.

Ms. Mitchell stated that written comments on the scoping plan will be accepted until December 10, 2008. Alternatively, comments can also be made at the Air Board meeting on December 11, 2008. The scoping plan is expected to be adopted by January 1, 2009.

A motion was made to send a letter to the Air Resources Board reiterating previous comments made by the Task Force regarding the AB 32 Proposed Scoping Plan (e.g.

conducting lifecycle analyses) before the Air Board's Economic and Technology Advancement Advisory Committee on December 5, 2008. The motion passed unanimously.

**XII. PRESENTATION ON THE COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT ANNUAL REPORT**

No action. Item postponed until the next meeting.

**XIII. REPORT FROM THE CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD**

No action. Item postponed until the next meeting.

**XIV. NEXT MEETING DATE**

A polling of Task Force members was requested to determine availability for the December 18, 2008, meeting.

**XV. OPEN DISCUSSION/PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment. The meeting adjourned at 3:09 p.m.