

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

Minutes of July 17, 2008

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  
Carl Clark, Business/Commerce Representative  
Betsey Landis, Environmental Organization Representative  
Mary Ann Lutz, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division  
Ron Saldana, Los Angeles County Disposal Association

COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY OTHERS:

Dean Efstathiou, rep. by Carlos Ruiz, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Gerry Miller, represented by Charles Modica, City of Los Angeles  
Mike Mohajer, represented by John McTaggart, General Public Representative  
Enrique Zaldivar, represented by Karen Coca, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Christine Andersen, City of Long Beach  
Dr. Jonathan Fielding, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health  
David Kim, City of Los Angeles  
Stephen Maguin, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County  
Sam Perdomo, Business/Commerce Representative  
Greig Smith, City of Los Angeles  
Dr. Barry Wallerstein, South Coast Air Quality Management District  
Mark Waronek, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division

OTHERS PRESENT:

Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition  
Tobie Mitchell, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Mark Patti, City of Santa Clarita  
Fred Rubin, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Steven Samaniego, City of West Covina  
Coby Skye, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Bereket Tadele, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Emiko Thompson, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Hossein Torabzadeh, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting was called to order at 1:08 p.m.

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 15, 2008, AND JUNE 19, 2008**

A motion was made to approve the minutes of May 15, 2008, as read, and the revised minutes of June 19, 2008. The motion passed unanimously with Ms. Mary Ann Lutz abstaining for the June minutes only, and Mr. John McTaggart abstaining for both.

**III. SOLID WASTE CHAPTER OF THE DRAFT 2008 REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS CONTINUED FROM THE JUNE 19, 2008, MEETING**

Mr. Benjamin Cortez gave an update on the presentation he conducted during the June 19, 2008, meeting. He reiterated that the Solid Waste Chapter ([see attachment](#)), in essence, promotes a paradigm shift towards reducing waste generation and reliance on landfills.

He stated that the goal of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is to achieve a 40 percent disposal rate (which implies a 60 percent diversion rate) by 2035, and to make conversion technology available as a diversion strategy within the next five years. SCAG expects to achieve this through an action plan that lays out a comprehensive implementation strategy that includes near term constrained policies and long term strategic initiatives.

A standing motion from the June 19, 2008, meeting to support the Chapter and direct staff to submit any additional comments before the end of the public comment period was reintroduced. The motion passed unanimously.

**IV. REPORT FROM THE FACILITY AND PLAN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE**

Ms. Betsey Landis reported that the Subcommittee met on July 16, 2008, to discuss the Finding of Conformance (FOC) for Sunshine Canyon Landfill City/County Project (Sunshine Canyon Landfill).

Ms. Landis reported that the Subcommittee and BFI discussed the required conditions, described in Chapter 10 of the Countywide Siting Element, to approve a FOC for Sunshine Canyon Landfill. She stated that upon close examination of the items presented in BFI's report, staff and the Subcommittee determined that more information was needed in order to grant a FOC. The Subcommittee voted

not to grant a FOC for Sunshine Canyon Landfill until the necessary information is provided.

A motion was made to have staff send a letter to the City Council and Mayor of the City of Los Angeles requesting comments on current and post-closure management of the landfill, required City permits, and other issues related to the implementation of Phase II of the city side of the landfill. A copy of the minutes from the Facility and Plan Review Subcommittee meeting of July 16, 2008, was also requested for review by the Task Force. The motion passed unanimously.

**V. CONSIDERATION OF SUNSHINE CANYON LANDFILL (CITY/COUNTY PROJECT) FINDING OF CONFORMANCE**

See IV

**VI. PRESENTATION ON THE CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD'S AB 32 DRAFT SCOPING PLAN**

Ms. Tobie Mitchell conducted a presentation ([see attachment](#)) on the Air Resources Board's AB 32 Draft Scoping Plan. She explained that AB 32 was signed into law in September 2006. AB 32 requires California to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 1990 levels by 2020.

Ms. Mitchell noted that the Scoping Plan is essential to meet the goals of AB 32. The plan lays out a comprehensive approach for California to address climate change while protecting and improving public health and the economy. The Draft Scoping Plan was developed by the Air Resources Board in coordination with numerous stakeholders such as the Climate Action Team, The Economic and Technology Advancement Advisory Committee (ETAAC), and multiple State agencies.

Ms. Mitchell reported that the Draft Scoping Plan was released on June 26, 2008, and the public comment period will end August 1, 2008. The Proposed Scoping Plan will be released on October 3, 2008, and will be considered by the Air Resources Board on November 20, 2008. She stated that the Draft Scoping Plan outlines various strategies that combine market mechanisms, regulations, voluntary measures, fees, and other programs in order to meet AB 32 goals.

Ms. Mitchell noted that two measures in the Draft Scoping Plan are likely of interest to the Task Force: 1) Local Government Actions and Regional Targets measure, which has the potential to reduce carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions by two million metric tons; and the 2) Recycling and Waste measure, whose

objective is to reduce the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by one million metric tons through landfill methane control.

Ms. Mitchell concluded that the section on Waste and Recycling in the Draft Scoping Plan should broaden its recommendations to include all aspects of solid waste management, not just methane control at landfills. A discussion ensued and a motion was made to send letters to the Air Resources Board, the Governor, and ETAAC requesting that solid waste issues be addressed in depth in the AB 32 Scoping Plan. The motion passed unanimously.

## **VII. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Mr. Coby Skye provided updates on the following Legislative Bills ([see attachment](#)):

1. AB 501—introduced by Swanson and Hancock

This Bill requires manufacturers to provide a sharps container to customers upon request. New language added on June 11, 2008, would allow the following as an alternative to manufacturers 1) supply a coupon for a mail-back sharps container or a container for safe storage, or 2) provide a toll-free number or website to be displayed on the package directing the patient to a supplier of sharps containers or mail-back containers.

A motion was made to send a letter to Assembly members Swanson and Hancock stating the Task Force's concern to ensure that new options added to the Bill will direct customers to obtain sharps containers free of charge from the manufacturer. The motion passed unanimously.

2. AB 2058—introduced by Levine

This Bill has been heard in the Senate Appropriations Committee. Assembly member Levine, the Bill's author, agreed with the Committee's recommendation to pull out the paper bag fee from the Bill's language in order to have additional discussions with stakeholder on whether paper bags should be included in the Bill and what the appropriate fee would be, if included. Staff will continue to monitor any developments on this Bill.

3. AB 2640—introduced by Huffman

This Bill would make greenwaste used as alternative daily cover (ADC) subject to the State's solid waste fee. The latest amendments to the Bill

retain the provisions that compelled the Task Force to initially oppose the Bill. Staff recommendation was to continue opposing the Bill.

4. AB 2697—introduced by Ruskin

This Bill would authorize a local enforcement agency (LEA) to fund illegal dumping abatement, prevention, and public awareness activities as part of their enforcement programs. It also refines the way in which LEAs and the Waste Board interact and how they address illegal dumping and other related activities. Staff was directed to evaluate the Bill and report back at the following Task Force meeting.

5. AB 2866—introduced by De Leon

This Bill would increase the solid waste disposal fee from \$1.40 per ton to \$2 per ton in order to fund the promotion of composting operations. The Bill includes a provision stating that no less than 40 percent of the funds would be available for composting facilities in Southern California. Siting of composting facilities in Southern California, however, is not feasible due to geographical and regulatory constraints. Staff recommended that the Task Force continues to oppose the Bill.

6. SB 1016—introduced by Wiggins

This Bill would revise the current diversion rate measurement system to a per-capita disposal based system using 2003-2006 as a base year.

At the June 19, 2008, meeting, Mr. Mike Mohajer made a motion to “support and amend” SB 1016 as amended on June 10, 2008 ([see attachment](#)). However, due to a lack of quorum, the Task Force delayed taking a formal position on the Bill until its next meeting.

On July 2, 2008, the Bill was amended ([see attachment](#)) to allow the Board to consider factors other than the per capita disposal rate when assessing whether a jurisdiction has adequately implemented its diversion programs.

A new motion to “support if amended” to delete the July 2, 2008, proposal to SB 1016 as well as to request other changes discussed at the Task Force meeting of June 19, 2008, was made. The motion passed unanimously.

7. SB 1020—introduced by Padilla

Senate Bill 1020, if enacted, would increase the State diversion rate mandate from current 50 percent to 60 percent by 2015 and 75 percent by 2020. It also requires local governments to mandate all businesses within their jurisdiction to implement recycling/diversion programs or face a penalty. Failure of a local government to achieve the mandated recycling rate will subject the jurisdiction to \$10,000 penalty per day. The Bill passed the Senate and the Assembly Natural Resources Committee and has been sitting at the Assembly Appropriation Committee since July of 2007.

A proposed amendment dated September 6, 2007, was circulated to all stakeholders, including the Task Force. The Task Force considered the proposal and voted in opposition and notified Senator Padilla in a letter dated October 25, 2007 ([see attachment](#)). Last Friday, Senator Padilla released another version of his proposal, dated July 8, 2008 ([see attachment](#)).

With the exception of one item, i.e. changing the date to meet the 60 percent diversion requirement from 2013 to 2015, the July 2008 version of the Bill is the same as the September 2007 version. A motion was made to send a letter to Senator Padilla based on previous letters reiterating the Task Force's opposition to the July 8, 2008, proposed amendment of the Bill. The Motion passed unanimously.

#### **VIII. REPORT FROM THE CIWMB**

Mr. Steve Uselton reported that the Waste Board met in June to discuss the reduction of greenwaste as ADC. He stated the Waste Board directed staff to develop a comprehensive toolbox that offers examples of jurisdictions' marketing plans, local contract provisions, and local uses for greenwaste materials. Staff will also continue to provide technical guidance on proposed legislation regarding fees and phasing out of greenwaste as ADC.

Mr. Uselton stated that new developments on diversion processing capacity concepts would require Counties to conduct annual studies to ensure that there remains 15 years of diversion capacity. However, this would require new legislation. He also said further analysis was conducted on the phasing out of diversion credit for ADC.

Mr. Uselton also reported that there was discussion of directing local Waste Board offices to assist jurisdictions in identifying impacts on diversion rates if other markets for greenwaste materials are not available. In Los Angeles

County, diversion rates could decrease by 1 percent and 5 percent for 55 percent and 25 percent of jurisdictions, respectively. He stated that the local Waste Board office's goal is to visit local jurisdictions once a quarter to provide assistance on issues and receive input on prospective solutions.

Mr. Uselton reported that the Waste Board's pharmaceutical waste management plan is now available at the Board's website. The plan's webpage contains information on how to properly dispose of pharmaceuticals, including sharps. He stated the Waste Board is working with the Department of Public Health, the Department of Toxic Substance Control, the State Water Resource Board, the Product Stewardship Institute National Dialogue, and the California Stewardship Council to learn more about options on pharmaceutical waste management.

He stated that a survey has gone out to pharmacies across the State to obtain feedback on program efficiency, sustainability, and cost effectiveness. A follow-up meeting with stakeholders to discuss the results of the survey is scheduled for August 25, 2008. A full report on program effectiveness and performance is due to the Legislation in late 2010.

Finally, Mr. Uselton reported that applications for reuse grants are now available from the Waste Board. He said local reuse plans help jurisdictions keep materials from the waste stream and provide an alternative source of cost-effective material.

**IX. NEXT MEETING DATE**

The next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, August 21, 2008, at 1:00 p.m.

**X. OPEN DISCUSSION/PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment. The meeting adjourned at 2:46 p.m.