Draft

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

Minutes of February 17, 2011

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
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative
Sam Perdomo, Business/Commerce Representative
Ron Saldana, Los Angeles County Disposal Association (Formerly GLASWMA)
Eugene Sun, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division

COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY OTHERS:

Carl Clark, rep. by David Thornburg, Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, Inc.
Gail Farber, rep. by Carlos Ruiz, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Stephen Maguin, rep. by Chris Salomon, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
Enrique Zaldivar, rep. by Karen Coca, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Michael Conway, City of Long Beach
Dr. Jonathan Fielding, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health
David Kim, City of Los Angeles
Gerry Miller, City of Los Angeles
Greig Smith, City of Los Angeles
Dr. Barry Wallerstein, South Coast Air Quality Management District

OTHERS PRESENT:

Paul Alva, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Kelly Astur, Los Angeles County Waste Management Association
Becky Bendikson, Sunshine Canyon Landfill CAC
Russell Bukoff, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Wayde Hunter, NVC/GHNNC
Martin Mangione, CalRecycle
Tobie Mitchell, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Coby Skye, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Matt Suska, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Mark Patti, City of Santa Clarita
Primitivo Nunez, CalRecycle

CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 1:10 p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 18, 2010, AND JANUARY 20, 2011

A motion was made to approve the revised November 18, 2010, minutes, and the January 20, 2011, minutes with corrections. The motion passed with one abstention from Chris Salomon.

II. REPORT FROM THE PUBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. Mike Mohajer reported the committee considered the following 13 articles for publication.

City of Calabasas – Recycling Drawing Contest
City of Malibu – Leed Certified City Hall
City of Huntington Park – Waste Management Donates New Recycling Bins to Huntington Park Schools
City of Los Angeles – Construction & Demolition Waste Recycling Ordinance
County of Los Angeles (PRG) – Just One Drop Is One Too Many
County of Los Angeles (EPD) – Award of Urban Greening Grants for Walnut Park Elementary and Vanguard Middle School, Award of Los Angeles County Recycling Market Development Zone loan to Princess Paper Company, Update on Mandatory Commercial Recycling Regulations, Household Battery Program, Legislation Update, Earth Day 2011, Calrecycle's Efforts regarding Implementation of The Carpet And Paint EPR, California Energy Commission Awards $4.5M Grant to Southern California Conversion Technology Project, Battle of the Schools Board presentation, Steve Uselton Memorial Service & Board Recognition, Task Force Letter to Jerry Brown, and Captive Insurance.

Mr. Mohajer stated the electronic version of the Inside Solid Waste Newsletter is coming soon and consideration was given to update the logo.

III. REPORT FROM THE ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE (ATAS)

Ms. Tobie Mitchell updated the Task Force on the recent announcement that the California Energy Commission awarded $4.5 Million to the County-endorsed anaerobic digestion project being developed by CR&R Incorporated and ArrowBio. The project is not fully funded yet, but this grant will bring the project

much closer to achieving the total amount needed. Ms. Mitchell reported that the County's consultant ARI is working with staff on an accelerated 6-month plan that will analyze a number of options for several sites identified in the County's October 2010 report. The 6-month timeline will include development and issuance of two Requests for Expression of Interest – one for technology vendors and one for potential funders.

Ms. Mitchell reported that in lieu of a meeting during the month of February, the subcommittee toured the landfill gas to energy facility at the Calabasas Landfill. The facility, owned and operated by the County Sanitation Districts, is equipped with a state-of-art emissions control system and has achieved a lower emissions breakthrough. The facility is producing 9 MW of electricity and exporting 7MW to the grid.

IV. REPORT FROM THE FACILITY AND PLAN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

Ms. Betsey Landis reported the subcommittee discussed Sunshine Canyon Landfill (SCL). They reviewed the vegetation report and discussed the landslide. Ms. Landis stated the landslide area has been cleared out and the soil was moved to the buffer area on the City side of the landfill. And there were problems with permitting that seemed to be ignored. There are also some vegetation problems in the area that has received its final closure.

Ms. Landis made a motion to send a letter the SCL City LEA asking them to enforce the vegetation cover on the bare land on the City portion of the final closure area of the landfill with copies to CalRecycle and the City/County LEA. She stated there was a potential enforcement action against the operator of the site due to the lack of vegetation the closed portion of the landfill. She further stated that because there is confusion over who's in charge, all governing agencies of the landfill will be informed of the problems at the landfill. Mr. Mike Mohajer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

V. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Mr. Coby Skye reported on following legislative bills (see attachment):

1. AB 255 (Wieckowski)

   This bill would allow a permanent HHW collection facility that is authorized to accept hazardous waste from a conditionally exempt small quantity generator (CESQG) to accept recyclable latex paint from any generator, if the facility complies with certain requirements.

Staff suggested supporting this bill. Ms. Karen Coca noted there would not necessarily be a benefit to cities if the cost isn't offset. Mr. Mike Mohajer suggested watching the bill.

2. AB 298 (Brownley)

   This bill would, until January 1, 2013, prohibit a manufacturer, as defined, from selling or distributing a reusable bag unless it meets the following conditions: (1) The reusable bag is made from a material that can be cleaned and disinfected, (2) Guidelines are printed for cleaning and disinfecting the bag, and (3) The bag does not contain any heavy metal in toxic amounts.

   Staff recommended watching this bill. No action was taken.

3. AB 341 (Chesbro)

   This bill would (1) require CalRecycle, on January 1, 2020, and annually thereafter, to ensure that 75% of all solid waste is diverted; (2) provide that Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE) updates are not subject to CalRecycle approval or comment/review by a local task force (LTF); (3) statutorily establish mandatory commercial recycling including requiring a jurisdiction to implement a commercial recycling program and include that program in a jurisdiction's AB 939 compliance review; and (4) allow a local enforcement agency to allow certain changes to a solid waste facility permit without a formal revision to the permit.

   Staff recommended opposing this bill. Mr. Mohajer made a motion to send a letter to Senator Chesbro expressing the Task Force's concern regarding the bill and requesting a meeting to explain the Task Forces' position. Ms. Betsey Landis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. AB 512 (Gordon)

   This bill would expand the definition of an eligible renewable generating facility, as defined, to include a facility that has a generating capacity of no more than 5 megawatts.

   Staff recommended watching this bill. No action was taken.

Draft

5. AB 525 Gordon

   This bill would require CalRecycle to set aside an unspecified percentage of grant funding for local government public works projects that use waste tires. These provisions would sunset on June 30, 2015.

   Staff recommended supporting this bill. Mr. Mohajer moved to send a letter to Senator Gordon stating the Task Force will support the bill if amended to ensure the Southern California and specifically Los Angeles County receives a fair share of grant money. Ms. Landis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

6. SB 23 (Simitian)

   This bill would revise the 20% renewable portfolio standard (RPS) implementation date to December 31, 2013, and increase the amount of renewable energy procured to 33% by December 31, 2020. This bill would also perpetuate restrictive requirements that would continue to prohibit municipal solid waste conversion technologies from being classified as "renewable electric generation facilities."

   A letter of concern was previously sent, but there has been no response. The bill was redesignated as SBX1-2 and made part of the budget process. Staff anticipates Governor Brown would sign the bill if it reaches his desk. Ms. Landis made a motion to send a letter to Senator Simitian opposing SBX1-2. Ms. Mary Ann Lutz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

7. SB 178 (Simitian)

   This bill would authorize the Green Ribbon Science panel to review proposed regulations of chemicals of concern and make recommendations to the Department of Toxic Substances Control.

   Staff recommended watching this bill. No action was taken.

VI. UPDATE ON LANDFILL CLOSURE, POSTCLOSURE, CORRECTIVE ACTIONS, AND FINANCIAL ASSUARNCE REGULATIONS

Ms. Linda Lee reported that Title 27 regulation (Section 22211) requires the operator of each solid waste landfill that accepted waste on or after January 1, 1988 to demonstrate financial responsibility or financial assurance for postclosure maintenance until released from postclosure maintenance. Phase I

of the regulations detail how the estimate must be based on the cost to the state rather than the operator or responsible party. Recently developed, Phase II of the regulations requires the operators to demonstrate sufficient funds for closure and postclosure maintenance through two methods – maintaining sufficient funds to provide for site-specific corrective action at landfill caused by 'causal events' or a pool of funds that comes from an annualized maintenance cost estimate multiplied by a factor of 30. This financial assurance is meant for postclosure maintenance until landfill operators are released from postclosure maintenance. Phase II regulations were approved on April 9, 2010, and became effective on July 1, 2010.

Ms. Lee stated an effective proactive monitoring plan (PMP) is believed to reduce future maintenance at a site and is required for step-down or reduction in financial assurance multiplier. The purpose of allowing an operator/owner a 'step-down' is to provide an incentive for the owner/operator to perform high-quality postclosure maintenance. High-quality monitoring during the years leading to a step-down request is anticipated to result in lower future maintenance and repair costs and fewer and less costly corrective actions. Reduced cost and frequency of corrections will reduce the risk to the State upon default by an owner/operator. Step down criteria are stringent but achievable. The costs associated with a PMP are to be included within the costs for postclosure maintenance plans and the related financial assurance. If proactive monitoring is no longer being performed, the operator would be required to increase the multiplier. Step-up potential included in the regulations would ensure that the operator will continue monitoring at a landfill.

An approved PMP must include an evaluation process that identifies how the landfill system in functioning over time. A properly designed, closed, and maintained landfill should stabilize over several years after closure. A proactive monitoring program is one that monitors and confirms this stabilization. Since PMP is part of a postclosure maintenance plan (PCM), it is subject to re-evaluation and re-approval by the Enforcement Agency, CalRecycle, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board at 5 year intervals.

There are two methods of evaluating performance of a landfill during a seismic event. The older method called the deterministic approach considers magnitude and distance to a single fault line. This method is slowly being replaced by the second method, a probabilistic method, which considers the probability of rupturing along any part of any pertinent fault. The landfill risk methodology is contained in Chapter 5 of the *Study to Identify Potential Long-Term Threats and Financial Assurance Mechanisms for Long-Term Postclosure Maintenance and Corrective Action at Solid Waste Landfills* dated November 26, 2007.

Ms. Lee concluded CalRecycle has created a technical advisory group to develop best management practices (BMP) guidelines. The guidelines evaluate existing landfill design standards and are compared to adopted Corrective Action Cost Estimate methods.

VII. UPDATE TO THE SAFER CONSUMER PRODUCT ALTERNATIVIE REGULATIONS

Mr. Matt Suska gave an update on the latest developments of the Green Chemistry Regulations for Safer Consumer Products that were scheduled to be implemented with the start of the new year, but were delayed.

Mr. Suska reported that the Task Force has been actively involved with commenting on the various drafts of these regulations and most recently sent a letter requesting an extension of the final 15-day formal comment period. While DTSC had the option to allow a longer, 45-day comment period, they were pressed to meet the statutory deadline for implementation. However, the Task Force argued that the extent of the changes made along with the Thanksgiving holiday falling right in the middle of the comment period was sufficient to warrant the longer comment period.

While most of the Task Force's concerns were addressed in the preceding draft, the final draft's language differed significantly. For example, the End-of-Life management Regulatory Response was gutted, removing the triggers that were previously incorporated to identify chemicals of concern. The initial scope of the regulations was also reduced to encompass only personal care, cleaning, and children's products for the first five years.

The proposed final draft of the regulations drew a lot of criticism from both the environmental and industrial communities, and many organizations sent letters to Governor Schwarzenegger urging him to stop their implementation. As a result and at the request of Linda S. Adams, California's Secretary for Environmental Protection, DTSC postponed implementation of the controversial regulations. Currently this is the only official action to have taken place. DTSC has agreed to take additional time to continue developing the regulations and the scientific advisory panel, which was only involved in initial development of these regulations, will be reconvened. At this time, there is not an opportunity to submit comments but Staff will continue to monitor the development of these regulations.

VIII. CALRECYCLE CARPET PRODUCT STEWARDSHIP

Mr. Matt Suska gave an update on the carpet stewardship and an overview of the recently released draft regulations concerning carpet EPR.

Mr. Suska reported that California's situation is favorable to implementing extending the responsibility for carpet products at the end of their useful life, since carpet waste is a significant portion of the total waste stream, and several established carpet recyclers already operate in the state. As such, last year the Legislature passed Assembly Bill 2398 (AB 2398) making California the first state to establish a private-sector designed and managed, statewide carpet stewardship program. AB 2398 designated the Carpet America Recovery Effort (CARE) as the designated carpet stewardship organization, which will develop the stewardship plan and be responsible for its implementation and progress. Individual manufacturer plans, while allowed, are not expected. Beginning July 1, 2011, the initial funding mechanism will be a $.05 product stewardship assessment that will be added to every square yard of carpet sold in this state. By September 30, 2011, the stewardship plan must be submitted to CalRecycle for approval. Enforcement of compliance upon manufacturers and retailers will begin April 1, 2012.

As part of its responsibilities in implementing the carpet stewardship law, CalRecycle recently released draft regulations to clarify the statutes. These regulations detail the approval requirements for submitted stewardship plans and included performance goals. The plan must include education and outreach to consumers, commercial building owners, carpet installers, and retailers. Local Governments are listed as stakeholders, and the submitted plan must include a process of consultation with affected stakeholders. The draft regulations make it clear that the State's solid waste management hierarchy must be followed, however transformation is not considered diversion for purposes of these regulations, and carpet as alternative fuel is not considered recycling; it is unclear how other conversion technologies, such as gasification, would be treated.

Overall, the regulations were found to be satisfactory, although staff recommends the Task Force request some clarifications, especially regarding the role of transformation facilities and conversion technologies in meeting the performance goals. Staff will be participating in the February 22 workshop regarding these regulations and can submit comments by the February 25 deadline, if so directed by the Task Force.

Ms. Betsey Landis asked if CARE was a private or government agency, and if artificial turf was included. Mr. Suska responded it is a group that encompasses both private and government agencies. In regards to artificial turf, carpet wasn't

clearly defined and more clarification was needed. Ms. Landis stated that because it is a growing industry and it is considered as carpeting, staff should ask at the February workshop if it's included.

Mr. Mike Mohajer noted that throughout the regulations there are consistent references to implementation of the AB 939 waste management hierarchy. It is important because the Task Force wants AB 939 revised to explicitly include conversion technologies (CT), which are not properly defined in Statute, and these regulations should not perpetuate the current barriers in State statute the development of CTs.

Mr. Mohajer made a motion to send a letter to CalRecycle regarding Carpet Product Stewardship stating that post-recycled residual carpet material should be given diversion credit when processed at a CT or transformation facility. Ms. Karen Coca asked for clarification of whether the MOU's 40 percent diversion goal was for carpet sold in the state or disposed. She asked staff to clarify that at the workshop. Ms. Coca also clarified that the Task Force is not insisting CTs should be considered on the same level as recycling, but should be utilized in the case of carpet waste that cannot be recycled or composted. A brief discussion ensued. Ms. Mary Ann Lutz stated a colleague of hers helped author the bill and she would invite her to come and speak to the Task Force about the bill and carpet product stewardship, specifically including how CTs should be considered. After further discussion, Ms. Coca seconded Mr. Mohajer's motion. The motion passed unanimously.

IX. SIMI VALLEY LANDFILL EXPANSION DRAFT FINAL EIR

Ms. Tobie Mitchell updated the Task Force on the newly released Final Draft EIR for the Simi Valley Landfill Expansion. The Task Force has sent two letters to the County of Ventura expressing concern over the incomplete analysis of conversion technologies in the alternatives analysis section of the EIR. While some of the Task Force's concerns have been addressed, the Final Draft EIR still offers a limited and flawed analysis on conversion technologies. The Ventura County Planning Commission will be reviewing this issue on March 24, 2011 and the Ventura County Board of Supervisors will consider the adoption of the Final Draft EIR on May 17, 2011.

Discussion ensued regarding the scope of the facility and the volume of waste processed at the facility from L.A. County. Ms. Mitchell noted that this EIR is among the first that includes CTs as a possible alternative to the project, and if it is finalized and approved with an incomplete or flawed analysis, it could set a precedent for future EIRs. After further discussion, Mr. Mike Mohajer made a motion to send a letter to Ventura County Planning Commission indicating the

Task Force's specific, unresolved concerns regarding the findings of the EIR. Mr. Eugene Sun seconded the motion. The motion passed with one abstention from Mr. Chris Salomon.

X. UPDATE ON STATE SOLID WASTE POSTCLOSURE AND CORRECTIVE ACTION TRUST FUND

Mr. Martins Aiyetiwa reported CalRecycle estimates the total financial exposure posed by environmental threats from landfills to be as much as $6.2 billion over the next 100 years. Recent regulatory changes in financial assurance requirements reduce the exposure by $3 billion (regulations became effective on July 1, 2010) and of the remaining $3.2 billion, there is a reasonable expectation that landfill operators will cover $2.8 billion on their own, leaving the State liable for about $370 million in residual financial exposure.

The State enacted AB 274 and AB 1004 last year to establish a State Solid Waste Postclosure and Corrective Action Trust Fund to cover the residual exposure. CalRecycle will be able to access the Trust Fund when a landfill fails to perform closure, postclosure activities, or corrective actions; a landfill is unable to pay for required activities; or when all financial assurances are exhausted.

Mr. Aiyetiwa also stated that By January 1, 2012, CalRecycle needs to receive letters of participation in the Trust Fund from landfill owner/operators representing at least 50% of the total volume of waste disposed in 2010. The election to participate is voluntary but once committed, a landfill will pay $0.12 per ton of waste disposed. If elected to participate, the decision is binding and irrevocable.

To date, all local governments have indicated no interest in participating and no landfill owner/operator has elected to participate. However, CalRecycle has identified Waste Management, Inc., and Republic Services, Inc., as the most likely participants. Participation of large entities such as Waste Management, Inc., and Republic Services, Inc.; Orange and Riverside counties; and the Los Angeles County Sanitation District (accounting for 65% of the Trust Fund combined) is imperative for the Trust Fund to become effective on July 1, 2012.

The main concerns of Stakeholder's pertain to how CalRecycle can ensure fairness in fund contributions and disbursements. Currently, there are no incentives for participation. The waste industry made proposals on incentives

such as reducing the minimum financial assurance requirement from 15 times the annual PCM cost to 5 times, lessening the standards for transfer of ownership, and re-examining the concept of "custodial care" to define the end of postclosure maintenance (PCM). CalRecycle staff indicated that the proposals are not viable because they are likely to put the State at a greater financial risk if a landfill defaults. However, CalRecycle staff believes providing an incentive is important and could consider changing the step down mechanism from a reduction of 5 times PCM every 5 years to year-to-year reduction. The minimum requirement would remain at 15 times PCM.

Mr. Aiyetiwa concluded his report stating there would be a Public Discussion/Workshop on March 29, 2011, and Financially Viable Incentive Regulations (at CalRecycle's discretion) sometime between April 2011 and April 2012.

XI. REPORT FROM CALRECYCLE

Mr. Primitivo Nunez thanked everyone for their support in attending Steve Uselton's memorial service. He then reported that CalRecyle will be holding a local public meeting in Lakewood on March 30 for good faith efforts received by local jurisdictions for diversions. He also stated that at the meeting, Bradbury would be added to the LA Regional Agency. Request for documents will be available 10 days prior to the meeting by request and online. RSVPs will be needed from those planning to attend the meeting due limited space. The Task Force will receive a formal invite to the meeting.

In regards to AB 32, the Air Resources Board (ARB) hearing to consider the adoption of the mandatory commercial recycling regulations has been postponed pending completion of the staff report. The consideration of the proposal has been rescheduled until May 26 or 27 at the ARB hearing. The ARB and CalRecycle will submit the regulation package to the Office of Administrative Law in early April. They will inform all the stakeholders know when the staff report is available. He thanked the Task Force for their recommendations to changes and stated some of the recommendations were incorporated. Ms. Cara Morgan can go over them in detail. Some issues are still in the air such as multi-family units, and they are currently working on revisions for the transformation language. The Institute for Local Government will hold a webinar on April 7 on the commercial regulations focusing on implementing a multi-family program.

Mr. Nunez briefly mentioned the following:

- The Recycling Market Zone Program approved a $150,000 loan for a local business in the LA County zone for equipment and to make products with post consumer materials.
- There will be a Carpet EPR workshop February 22. They are soliciting comments and encourage participation.
- There will be a Paint EPR workshop on March 10.
- The California Beverage Container Recycling Fund will be releasing the City/County Payment Program information at the end of February regarding $10.5 million allocated in the Fiscal Year 20101/11 for beverage container recycling and litter clean up. The cities qualify for $5,000 and the Counties $10,000 per year or on a per capita basis.
- Legislative analysis of SB 6030 brings concern that not enough savings is being realized. Another concern from the analysis is the splitting of the California Beverage Container Recycling Fund and the former Waste Compliance and Mitigation Program.
- An Executive Director has still not been appointed. Mark Leary is still the acting Director.

Ms. Karen Coca asked if the MCR package still has a start date of January 2012 as the original scoping plan indicated, and Mr. Ron Saldana asked if there would be public comment opportunity after the final draft is submitted. In answer to these questions, Mr. Nunez stated he was unsure of the January start date, but there would be a 45-day period once the package is submitted. He reiterated the package would be sent out to stakeholders once available. Mr. Chris Salomon commented that the MCR is a proposed regulation that is trying to amend legislation with regards to the transformation credit. The Sanitations Districts along with Stanislaus County and the City of Long Beach have traveled to Sacramento to urge CalRecycle to stick with the legislative mandate for transformation. They believed there was language in the new legislation that would do that, but now it appears they are retracting due to pressure from activist groups.

Mr. Carlos Ruiz asked if the amount of funds available through the City/County Payment Program is consistent with previous funding levels or less. Mr. Nunez stated he wasn't aware of the previous numbers, but Ms. Coca stated the amount is similar to the previous allotment.

Mr. Mike Mohajer commented that the support for Steve Uselton and his family shown by the CalRecycle Long Beach Office staff really demonstrated how close knit the staff was, and he appreciated everything that was done for Steve.

XII. FOLLOW-UP TO CALRECYCLE'S COMMENTS/RESPONSES FROM NOVEMBER TASK FORCE MEETING

Mr. Carlos Ruiz commented that at the November 17, 2010, Task Force meeting there was a very good discussion and dialogue during the visit from CalRecycle managers Howard Levenson and Cara Morgan to discuss items of concern presented by the Task Force; however, there is still a need for some clarification such as:

- Jurisdictional Review Tool – It was stated that this isn't a new tool and there wouldn't be a new requirement. The question is whether jurisdictions will be required to collect and report to CalRecycle the type of information mentioned in the newsletter which triggered the Task Force's concerns.
- CTs – It was stated at the November meeting that some CT facilities have been permitted and that CalRecycle will be handling such projects on a case-by-case basis. This needs further discussion since project proponents have difficulty obtaining financing when there is uncertainty regarding a project's ability to obtain all applicable permits.
- Life Cycle Analysis – The scope of CalRecycle's Life Cycle Analysis for recycling and organic waste management is much more limited than what is needed to address the Task Force's concerns.
- Greenwaste ADC – Under State law it is considered recycling and CalRecycle will enforce that. The question is whether CalRecycle will remain neutral on the issue when it comes to proposed legislation.

Mr. Ruiz stated Cara Morgan and Howard Levenson will attend the April Task Force meeting to continue the dialogue on these issues. Mr. Saldana suggested getting their answers in writing next time.

XIII. NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 17, 2011, in Conference Room B.

XIV. OPEN DISCUSSION

The meeting adjourned at 3:18 p.m.

TS