

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD LOCAL
ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

IN THE MATTER OF THE:)
)
LOCAL ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING)
COMMITTEE MEETING)
_____)
 —

DATE AND TIME: WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1996
 9:30 A.M.

PLACE: BOARD HEARING ROOM
 8800 CAL CENTER DRIVE SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, RPR, CSR
 CERTIFICATE NO. 7152

BRS FILE NO.: 36010

APPEARANCES

MR. WESLEY CHESBRO, CHAIRMAN MR. ROBERT C. FRAZEE, MEMBER MS.
JANET GOTCH, MEMBER

STAFF PRESENT

MR. ELLIOT BLOCK, LEGAL COUNSEL
MS. KATHY MARSH, COMMITTEE SECRETARY MS. JUDITH FRIEDMAN

MS. CAREN TRGOVCICH

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

I N D E X

PAGE_NO. _____

CALL TO ORDER AND EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS	7 7
ITEM 1: REPORT FROM DIVERSION, PLANNING ASSISTANCE DIVISION	7 AND LOCAL
ITEM 2: REPORT ON WASTE PREVENTION ACTIVITIES OF THE WASTE PREVENTION AND MARKET DEVELOPMENT DIVISION	13
ITEM 3: CONSIDERATION OF CONSENT AGENDA:	22
ITEM 6: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF BALDWIN PARK, LOS ANGELES COUNTY	
ITEM 7: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT AND THE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF CARSON, LOS ANGELES COUNTY	
ITEM 8: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ADEQUACY OF THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF POMONA, LOS ANGELES COUNTY	
ITEM 9: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF SOUTH EL MONTE, LOS ANGELES COUNTY	
ITEM 10: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE MULTIJURISDICTIONAL HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT FOR THE UNINCORPORATED MODOC COUNTY AND THE CITY OF ALTURAS	
ITEM 11: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE, PLACER COUNTY	

ITEM 12: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF LOMA LINDA, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

ITEM 13: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT FOR THE UNINCORPORATED SAN DIEGO COUNTY

ITEM 15: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF SONORA, AND THE UNINCORPORATED AREA OF TUOLUMNE COUNTY AND THE COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT AND SUMMARY PLAN FOR TUOLUMNE COUNTY

ITEM 16: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT AND HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF DAVIS, YOLO COUNTY

ITEM 17: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT AND HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO, YOLO COUNTY

ITEM 18: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT AND HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF WINTERS, YOLO COUNTY

ITEM 19: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT AND HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF WOODLAND, YOLO COUNTY

ITEM 20: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT AND HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT FOR THE UNINCORPORATED AREA OF YOLO COUNTY

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

ITEM 4: CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE 1996 WRAP-OF-THE-YEAR WINNERS

STAFF PRESENTATION	23
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	27
ACTION	30

ITEM 5: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SITING ELEMENT AND SUMMARY PLAN FOR KERN COUNTY

STAFF PRESENTATION	30
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	
ACTION	33

ITEM 14: CONSIDERATION OF PETITION FOR DISPOSAL REDUCTION FOR SLUDGE DIVERSION CREDIT FOR THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE, SANTA CRUZ COUNTY

STAFF PRESENTATION	33
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	39
ACTION	46

ITEM 21: CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT REGULATIONS

STAFF PRESENTATION	46
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	52
ACTION	56, 57

ITEM 22: CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND THE PROPOSED NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT REGULATIONS

STAFF PRESENTATION	57
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	
ACTION	60, 61

ITEM 23: CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF THE NEGATIVE
DECLARATION AND THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE PROCEDURES
FOR PREPARING AND REVISING CITY, REGIONAL AGENCY, AND
COUNTY SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT, HOUSEHOLD
HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENTS, AND NONDISPOSAL FACILITY
ELEMENTS REGULATIONS

STAFF PRESENTATION 61 PUBLIC
TESTIMONY

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION 63 ACTION

65, 66

ADJOURNMENT 66

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1996
9:30 A.M.

CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: GOOD MORNING. THIS IS THE MEETING OF THE LOCAL ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE OF THE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD. WE WILL BEGIN BY CALLING THE ROLL.

THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBERS FRAZEE.

MEMBER FRAZEE: HERE.

THE SECRETARY: GOTCH.

MEMBER GOTCH: HERE.

THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN CHESBRO.

CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: HERE. I WAS GOING TO SAY MOTION CARRIES.

SECONDLY, ARE THERE ANY MEMBERS WHO HAVE ANY EX PARTES TO REPORT?

MEMBER FRAZEE: NONE FOR ME.

CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: OKAY. THEN, WE WILL BEGIN BY -- WITH AGENDA ITEM 1, WHICH IS THE ORAL REPORT BY JUDY FRIEDMAN, DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE DIVERSION PLANNING AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE DIVISION AND HER MONTHLY UPDATE TO THE COMMITTEE.

MS. FRIEDMAN: GOOD MORNING, CHAIRMAN CHESBRO AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS. THIS ITEM IS AN

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 UPDATE ON SOME OF THE MAJOR ACTIVITIES OF THE
2 DIVERSION PLANNING AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE DIVISION.

3 FIRST, AS ALWAYS, LOCAL PLAN UPDATE.
4 ELEMENTS OF 18 JURISDICTIONS ARE ON TODAY'S
5 AGENDA, AND THAT IS A COMBINATION OF SRRE'S,
6 HHWE'S, AND NDFE'S, SITING ELEMENTS, AND SUMMARY
7 PLANS. THIS REPRESENTS EIGHT SRRE'S, TEN HHWE'S,
8 FIVE NDFE'S, TWO SITING ELEMENTS, AND TWO SUMMARY
9 PLANS.

10 AS OF NOVEMBER 13TH, 325 ANNUAL
11 REPORTS HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD FOR
12 COMMENT. AT THIS TIME A HUNDRED FIFTY-EIGHT
13 LETTERS OF COMPLETENESS HAVE GONE OUT TO THOSE
14 JURISDICTIONS.

15 AN UPDATE ON REGULATIONS: FOUR
16 DIFFERENT REGULATION PACKAGES CONCERNING
17 DEFINITIONS FOR PLANNING REQUIREMENTS, MATERIAL
18 TYPE DEFINITIONS, SOLID WASTE GENERATION STUDIES,
19 AND DISPOSAL CHARACTERIZATION STUDIES ARE BEING
20 FINALIZED. IT IS ANTICIPATED THAT THEY WILL BE
21 SENT OUT FOR INFORMAL PUBLIC REVIEW THIS MONTH.

22 OTHER PLANNING ISSUES: THE TREND
23 TOWARDS DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL AGENCIES
24 CONTINUES. STAFF IS WORKING WITH JURISDICTIONS
IN
25 SANTA CLARA, MONO, INYO, DEL NORTE, AND IMPERIAL

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 COUNTIES ON REGIONAL AGENCY ISSUES. AND YOU KNOW
2 YOU ALSO PROCESSED SEVERAL REGIONAL AGENCY
3 AGREEMENTS. SO WE'RE SEEING A GOOD, POSITIVE
4 TREND TOWARDS INCREASING THAT, WHICH YOU KNOW
5 INCREASES EFFICIENCIES OF SCALE AND, ETC., ON
6 PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION, SO IT'S VERY EXCITING.

7 AN UPDATE ON THE DISASTER PLAN:
8 STAFF RECEIVED COMMENTS ON THE UPDATED VERSION OF
9 THE DRAFT PLAN WHICH HAD BEEN DISTRIBUTED TO
10 INTERESTED PARTIES. STAFF IS NOW MODIFYING THE
11 PLAN BASED ON THOSE COMMENTS AND HOPES TO PRESENT
12 THE PLAN TO POLICY, RESEARCH, AND TECHNICAL
13 ASSISTANCE IN JANUARY OF NEXT YEAR.

14 THE MEASUREMENT ACCURACY ISSUES
15 WORKING GROUP MET ON OCTOBER 3D IN SOUTHERN
16 CALIFORNIA AND ON OCTOBER 15TH IN NORTHERN
17 CALIFORNIA. THE FOCUS OF THESE MEETINGS WAS TO
18 EXAMINE BASE YEAR SOLUTION OPTIONS FOR
19 JURISDICTIONS THAT MAY NOT BE ABLE TO CORRECT
20 THEIR EXISTING BASE YEAR DATA. SO WE'RE
21 CONTINUING TO MAKE PROGRESS ON THAT, WHICH, OF
22 COURSE, IS OF GREAT INTEREST TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT
23 AND OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES.

24 THE NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING OF THE
25 LOCAL GOVERNMENT TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE IS

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 DECEMBER 5TH AND 6TH IN SAN DIEGO. LGTAC IS ALSO
2 PLANNING TO HOLD A SHORT MEETING WITH SWANA'S
3 LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE AT THE SAME TIME. STAY
4 TUNED FOR DETAILS ON THE AGENDA OF THOSE MEETINGS.

5 UPDATE ON USED OIL AND HOUSEHOLD
6 HAZARDOUS WASTE: DURING THE MONTH OF OCTOBER, 39
7 NEW USED OIL COLLECTION CENTERS WERE CERTIFIED,
8 102 CERTIFIED CENTERS WERE RECERTIFIED, AND FIVE
9 INDUSTRIAL GENERATORS WERE REGISTERED. CURRENTLY
10 THE PROGRAM HAS A TOTAL OF 2,046 CERTIFIED
11 CENTERS, 521 REGISTERED INDUSTRIAL GENERATORS, 68
12 REGISTERED CURBSIDE PROGRAMS, AND ONE REGISTERED
13 ELECTRIC UTILITY. SO WE'RE CONTINUING TO INCREASE
14 THAT PROGRAM AS WELL.

15 TODAY THE BOARD IS HONORING VENTURA
16 COUNTY AND ALL TEN OF ITS CITIES FOR THEIR
17 PIONEERING USE OF REREFINED OIL. CHAIRMAN
18 PENNINGTON IS PRESENTING COMMENDATIONS TO SEVERAL
19 LOCAL OFFICIALS FOR USING REREFINED OIL IN THEIR
20 FLEETS AS WELL AS TO REPRESENTATIVES OF LOCAL
21 BUSINESSES FOR OFFERING REREFINED OIL TO THE
22 PUBLIC. NEARLY ALL OF THE COUNTY'S 1,400 VEHICLES
23 NOW USE REREFINED OIL AND HAVE LOGGED 13 MILLION
24 PROBLEM FREE MILES. AS FAR AS WE KNOW, THIS IS
25 THE LARGEST COUNTY IN THE NATION TO GO
REREFINED.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 SEVERAL FAST LUBE BUSINESSES IN VENTURA COUNTY
ARE

2 ALSO JUMPING ON THE BANDWAGON IN OFFERING
3 REREFINED OIL TO THEIR CUSTOMERS AS AN
ALTERNATIVE

4 TO CRUDE BASED OIL. SO THIS IS A GOOD ASPECT OF
5 THE PROGRAM THAT WE'RE TRYING TO INCREASE IS THE
6 USE OF REREFINED OIL.

7 THE BOARD RECEIVED 96 HHW GRANT
8 APPLICATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR '96-'97, REQUESTING
A

9 TOTAL OF APPROXIMATELY \$9 MILLION. AS YOU KNOW,
10 ONLY \$3 MILLION IS AVAILABLE TO BE AWARDED. WE
11 HAVE FOUR GRANT TEAMS REVIEWING AND SCORING
THESE

12 APPLICATIONS. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ARE
SCHEDULED

13 TO BE BROUGHT BEFORE THE ADMINISTRATION
COMMITTEE

14 AND BOARD IN DECEMBER. SO STAY TUNED FOR THAT
AS

15 WELL.

16 THE AUTOMATED GRANT TRACKING
SYSTEM

17 OR GRATI\$ AS IT'S FONDLY CALLED, DEVELOPED BY
THE

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

18 GRANTS ADMINISTRATION UNIT AND THE IMB OFFICE,
IS
19 NOW ON-LINE. THE HHW GRANTS HAVE BEEN
DOWNLOADED
20 ONTO THE SYSTEM AND OIL GRANTS WILL BE ADDED
NEXT
21 MONTH. SO THIS IS AN IMPORTANT DATA TOOL FOR US
22 TO BE ABLE TO USE IN TRACKING GRANTS.
23 STAFF PRESENTED A CONTRACT CONCEPT
24 FOR AN INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT WITH THE COASTAL
25 COMMISSION TO THE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE AT
ITS

1 NOVEMBER 5TH MEETING. THE INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT
2 BETWEEN THE BOARD AND THE CALIFORNIA COASTAL
3 COMMISSION FOR A STATEWIDE USED OIL EDUCATION
4 PROGRAM DESIGNED TO EDUCATE BOATERS, MARINE
5 OWNERS, AND OPERATORS ABOUT USED OIL RECYCLING.
6 THE PROGRAM WILL ALSO DEVELOP TOOLS FOR LOCAL
7 GOVERNMENTS TO USE TO CONDUCT AND MAINTAIN BOATER
8 AND MARINA USED OIL RECYCLING EDUCATION PROGRAMS.
9 THE COST OF THE INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT IS \$400,000,
10 AND THE COMMITTEE PLACED THIS ITEM ON CONSENT.

11 THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA USED OIL
12 RECYCLING FORUM WILL BE HELD NOVEMBER 19TH IN
13 ANAHEIM. SEVERAL STAFF WILL BE MODERATING
14 SESSIONS AND ATTENDING THE WORKSHOP. THIS IS THE
15 SECOND FORUM -- ACTUALLY THE THIRD FORUM -- THE
16 SECOND WAS THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA FORUM -- THAT
17 WE'VE DONE. AND THE FORUM IS A GREAT OPPORTUNITY
18 FOR OUR GRANTEES TO GET TOGETHER AND TO SHARE
19 IDEAS AND RESOURCES.

20 UPDATE ON PUBLIC EDUCATION AND
21 PROGRAMS IMPLEMENTATION: STAFF CONDUCTED TWO
22 PROGRAM OR PROJECT RECYCLE TRAINING SESSIONS FOR
23 THE DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION
24 IN
STATE
SANTA ROSA AND CONDUCTED SITE VISITS TO FIVE

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

25 OFFICES IN THAT AREA.

1 DURING THE MONTH OF OCTOBER, EIGHT
2 NEW RECYCLING PROGRAM SITES WERE ADDED TO THE
3 STATE'S PROJECT RECYCLE PROGRAM. THESE SITES
4 INCLUDE ONE MAINTENANCE YARD, ONE STATE OFFICE,
5 FOUR PARKS, AND TWO ROADSIDE RESTS.

6 ON OCTOBER 22D AND 24TH A TOUR OF
7 THE WEYERHAEUSER PAPER FACILITY IN SACRAMENTO WAS
8 CONDUCTED FOR MEMBERS OF THE LOCAL CCC, STATE
9 OFFICE RECYCLING COORDINATORS, AND FOR BOARD WASTE
10 PROS. THE PURPOSE OF THE TOUR WAS TO HELP THEM
11 UNDERSTAND THE CONTRACTOR'S NEEDS REGARDING OFFICE
12 PAPER COLLECTION AND TO ASSIST THEM IN
13 IMPLEMENTING A SUCCESSFUL OFFICE PAPER COLLECTION
14 PROGRAM. THERE WERE A TOTAL OF 25 PEOPLE WHO
15 ATTENDED THOSE FORUMS.

16 AND THIS CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION.
17 ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS?

18 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: ANY QUESTIONS AT THIS
19 POINT? NO. THANK YOU VERY MUCH, JUDY

20 NEXT I'M GOING TO CALL ON CAREN
21 TRGOVCICH, REPRESENTING THE WASTE PREVENTION AND
22 MARKET DEVELOPMENT DIVISION, FOR HER MONTHLY
23 UPDATE ON ISSUES IN HER DIVISION WHICH ARE BEFORE
24 THIS COMMITTEE.

25 MS. TRGOVCICH: GOOD MORNING, MR.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS. I HAVE SIX ITEMS THAT I'D
2 LIKE TO HIGHLIGHT FOR YOU THIS MORNING, AND I
3 THINK THERE ARE GOING TO BE A NUMBER OF THEM THAT
4 ARE GOING TO BE OF PARTICULAR INTEREST TO THE
5 COMMITTEE MEMBERS.

6 THE FIRST I'M GOING TO BEGIN WITH IS
7 A HUMAN STORY AROUND THE CALMAX CATALOG. I WANT
8 TO POINT OUT THIS MONTH THAT OUR MATCH OF THE
9 CATALOG FOR THE SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER ISSUE IS A MR.
10 LOU HERNANDEZ. THE REASON WHY WE SELECTED MR.
11 HERNANDEZ IS BECAUSE HE HAS RECENTLY BUILT HIS
12 HOUSE IN ENSENADA, MEXICO, MADE ENTIRELY OUT OF
13 MATERIALS THAT HE FOUND THROUGH THE SEPTEMBER-
14 OCTOBER OR PRIOR ISSUES OF THE CALMAX CATALOG.

15 MR. HERNANDEZ WAS FORMERLY RESIDING
16 IN LOS ANGELES, MOVED TO ENSENADA. AND BECAUSE HE
17 BECAME AWARE OF THE CALMAX CATALOG THROUGH
18 ATTENDANCE AT ECO EXPO AND OTHER CONFERENCES, HE
19 USED THAT AS PRINCIPALLY THE SOLE SOURCE OF
20 MATERIALS FOR HIS NEW HOME.

21 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: HAVE WE BEGUN
22 MEASURING YET WHAT THE EFFECT OF THE CALMAX
23 CATALOG IS ON THE BALANCE OF TRADE?

24 MS. TRGOVCICH: WE ARE ABOUT TO UNDERTAKE
25 A MAJOR INITIATIVE NOW TO LOOK AT HOUSING IN

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 BORDER COUNTRIES.

2 ANYWAY, I THINK THAT THIS, YOU KNOW,
3 REALLY STARTS TO HIGHLIGHT SOME OF THE DIVERSITY
4 OF USES, THAT THE CATALOG CAN REALLY GET OUT
5 THERE, AND THE TYPE OF STORIES THAT WE CONTINUE TO
6 BRING TO YOU AROUND SUCCESSES IN THE CATALOG.

7 THE NEXT ITEM, AND THESE FIRST THREE
8 ITEMS ARE REALLY TO PROMOTE SOME OF OUR CURRENT
9 ACTIVITIES. THE NEXT ITEM, I'M GOING TO ASK TOM
10 ESTES TO SHOW YOU OUR NEWEST POSTER. THIS IS THE
11 NEW GRASSCYCLING POSTER. AS YOU WILL REMEMBER,
12 THIS WAS A CONTRACT THROUGH THE '95-'96 CONTRACT
13 CYCLE. IT WAS JUST COMPLETED. WE JUST RECEIVED
14 THESE.

15 THESE POSTERS PROMOTE GRASSCYCLING.
16 AND WHAT WE ARE HOPING IS THAT THEY'RE GOING TO
17 MOTIVATE HOMEOWNERS, DO-IT-YOURSELFERS, AND
18 LANDSCAPE PROFESSIONALS TO CALL THE CALIFORNIA
19 WASTE HOTLINE FOR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT
20 GRASSCYCLING. ALL EXISTING MOWER MANUFACTURERS
21 WILL BE ASKED TO PROVIDE THEIR DEALERS WITH
22 POSTERS AS WELL AS MAJOR HOME IMPROVEMENT CHAINS
23 AND HARDWARE STORES. SO WE'RE REALLY HOPING TO
24 GET THOSE OUT SOON. WE'LL BE LOOKING -- WE'RE
25 TRYING TO WORK ON WAYS TO TRY TO EVALUATE THE

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 EFFECTIVENESS OF THESE POSTERS, SEE, YOU KNOW,
2 WHAT KIND OF INCREASED INTEREST WE REALLY DO SEE
3 IN GRASSCYCLING AS A RESULT OF THESE KIND OF
4 EFFORTS.

5 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: WELL, I THINK IT'S
6 GREAT. HAVING GRASSCYCLED FOR A WHILE MYSELF, I
7 FIGURED IT WAS JUST A MATTER OF TIME BEFORE PEOPLE
8 BEGIN TO FIGURE OUT THAT IT WAS THE ENVIRON-
9 MENTALLY RESPONSIBLE THING TO DO AND THAT IT MADE
10 A WHOLE LOT LESS WORK WHEN YOU MOW YOUR LAWN. AND
11 THE LANDSCAPERS TOO. YOU KNOW, THEY PAY PEOPLE TO
12 RAKE ALL THIS STUFF UP AND HAUL IT OFF AND PAY
13 SOMEBODY TO DISPOSE OF IT. SOONER OR LATER IT'S
14 GOING TO REALLY SINK IN, BUT I THINK WE CAN SPEED
15 IT UP WITH A CAMPAIGN LIKE THIS THAT EMPHASIZES
16 NOT JUST THE ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS, BUT THE FACT
17 THAT IT'S REALLY A WHOLE LOT EASIER IN THE CASE
18 OF
19 COMMERCIAL LANDSCAPERS AND A WHOLE LOT CHEAPER.

19 MS. TRGOVCICH: ABSOLUTELY. YOU KNOW,
20 WE
21 HAVE BEEN TRYING TO PROMOTE GRASSCYCLING AT OUR
22 BUILDINGS HERE, AND IT'S BEEN SOMEWHAT OF AN
23 UPHILL BATTLE, AS TOM CAN ATTEST TO.

23 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: WE GET TO WITNESS THE

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

24 MOVES FORWARD AND THE MOVES BACKWARDS ON A WEEKLY
25 AND MONTHLY BASIS.

1 MS. TRGOVCICH: I'M AFRAID RECENTLY
2 THEY'VE TAKEN A MOVE BACKWARDS, BUT WE'RE HOPING
3 TO -- THAT THEY WILL IN TIME SEE THE BENEFITS.
4 MAYBE WE'LL PUT ONE OF THE POSTERS UP RIGHT
5 OUTSIDE THE BUILDING.

6 I'M GOING TO SKIP AROUND A LITTLE,
7 SO, TOM, BEAR WITH ME. AND ACTUALLY IF YOU WANT
8 TO BRING THE NEXT ADVERTISEMENT UP. WE RECENTLY,
9 AS A RESULT OF OUR PARTNERSHIP WITH TORO, HAD AN
10 ADVERTISEMENT DISPLAY. TORO PREPARED IT AND HAD
11 IT PLACED IN THE SACRAMENTO -- OR THE SACRAMENTO
12 AND MODESTO "BEES."

13 AND THE ADVERTISEMENT FEATURES
14 GRASSCYCLING OR COMPOSTING AS PROMOTING AND BEING
15 AN EFFECTIVE WAY OF HANDLING YARD WASTE. IF YOU
16 WILL TAKE A LOOK, AND I'VE GOT ANOTHER COPY RIGHT
17 HERE, THE PRINCIPAL CENTER SECTION OF THE
18 ADVERTISEMENT FOCUSES, OF COURSE, ON TORO'S
19 PRODUCT LINE, BUT THE BACK PAGE OF THE
20 ADVERTISEMENT VERY PROMINENTLY DISPLAYS BOTH
21 THE
22 BOARD'S LOGO AS WELL AS QUITE A WONDERFUL
23 DESCRIPTION AROUND GRASSCYCLING AND WHERE YOU
CAN
GET MORE INFORMATION.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

24 I BELIEVE THIS WAS JUST PUBLISHED
IN
25 LAST SATURDAY'S EDITION OF "THE BEE," AND I

1 BELIEVE OUR PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE WAS TRYING TO
2 GET THE WORD OUT SO THOSE OF YOU THAT WERE
3 INTERESTED WOULD BE ABLE TO PICK UP A COPY AS
4 WELL.

5 THE TOTAL DISTRIBUTION TO THE
6 SACRAMENTO AND MODESTO "BEE" AREAS WAS ABOUT
7 42,000, I GUESS THAT'S HOMES, 42,000 PAPERS. THE
8 MODESTO DISTRIBUTION WAS 21,000. IT'S A GREAT
9 OPPORTUNITY FOR US TO BE ABLE TO GET THE WORD OUT
10 ON WASTE PREVENTION WITHOUT INCURRING ANY
11 FINANCIAL EXPENSE. AS YOU CAN TELL FROM THAT LAST
12 SENTENCE, WE'RE GOING TO BE LOOKING FOR A LOT OF
13 WAYS TO BE ABLE TO PROMOTE THIS TYPE OF
14 PARTNERSHIP IN THE FUTURE.

15 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: TORO -- DID WE PAY FOR
16 AD SPACE, OR DID TORO ESSENTIALLY DONATE AS PART
17 OF THEIR AD CAMPAIGN SPACE FOR OUR --

18 MS. TRGOVCICH: THEY ESSENTIALLY DONATED
19 THE SPACE. WE DID NOT PAY AT ALL FOR THIS. I
20 BELIEVE TORO EVEN WORKED ON THE INITIAL LAYOUT,
21 AND WE WERE ABLE TO PROVIDE EDITING COMMENTS TO
22 THEM ON THAT. SO IT'S A GREAT OPPORTUNITY FOR US.

23 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: EXCELLENT.

24 MS. TRGOVCICH: THE NEXT FEW ITEMS, I'M
25 GOING TO FOCUS ON SOME STAFF CONTRIBUTIONS HERE

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 BECAUSE I THINK THEY'RE EXTREMELY NOTEWORTHY GIVEN
2 THE TYPE OF EFFORTS THAT WE'RE UNDERTAKING.

3 WE JUST RECENTLY TRAINED ALL OF THE
4 WASTE REDUCTION PROS TO COVER THE FOUR AREAS BOTH
5 IN THE 8800, 8810, AND 8950 BUILDINGS HERE AT CAL
6 CENTER, ALL THE BOARD OFFICES. WE REVITALIZED,
7 REINITIATED THIS PROGRAM. THE WASTE REDUCTION
8 PROS, WHO EFFECTIVELY FUNCTION AS ON-SITE
9 CONSULTANTS FOR NEARBY CO-WORKERS ON WASTE
10 PREVENTION AND RECYCLING MATTERS, WERE PROVIDED
11 EXTENSIVE TRAINING RANGING FROM DUPLEX COPYING,
12 PAPER AND WORM BIN MAINTENANCE, TO IDENTIFYING
13 PAPER, AS WELL AS A TOUR OF WEYERHAUESER'S LOCAL
14 PAPER FACILITY, WHICH JUDY FRIEDMAN JUST
15 SUMMARIZED FOR YOU THERE. YOU WILL CONTINUE TO
16 SEE MESSAGES AND TIPS AROUND THE OFFICES, OVER
THE

17 E-MAIL, NEXT TO THE RECYCLING BINS AS WE
CONTINUE
18 TO ENHANCE THIS PROGRAM. SO THAT'S REALLY A
19 POSITIVE STEP FORWARD.

20 AND I KNOW I MENTIONED THIS
BRIEFLY
21 LAST MONTH AS WE WERE INITIATING THE TRAINING,
BUT
22 I THINK IT'S INTERESTING TO NOTE THAT THERE

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

WERE

23 INDIVIDUALS PRESENT IN THE AUDIENCE WHO HEARD

THAT

24 PART OF THE PRESENTATION AND CAME TO US

AFTERWARDS

25 AND WANTED TO SEE IF WE COULD TAKE OUR TRAINING

ON

1 THE ROAD, ESPECIALLY TO SOME OF THE MORE RURAL
2 JURISDICTIONS THAT DON'T HAVE THAT KIND OF, YOU
3 KNOW, IN-HOUSE WASTE PREVENTION TRAINING
4 OPPORTUNITIES. SO I KNOW BILL ORR HAS BEEN
5 CONTACTED TO POSSIBLY PROVIDE SOME OF THAT
6 ASSISTANCE TO SOME OF THE RURAL JURISDICTIONS.

7 OUR WASTE PREVENTION STAFF WILL BE
8 HONORED BY CAL/EPA FOR ITS CUSTOMER SERVICE AWARD
9 ON DECEMBER 4TH. I BELIEVE THE INITIAL AWARD DATE
10 WAS SCHEDULED FOR EARLY THIS MONTH IN NOVEMBER AND
11 IT'S MOVED TO DECEMBER. BOTH KATHY FREVERT AND
12 JEFF HUNTS, WHO'S IN THE AUDIENCE, WILL BE HONORED
13 BY AGENCY FOR THEIR EFFORTS IN CREATING AND
14 MAINTAINING "WASTE PREVENTION WORLD" ON THE
15 INTERNET AS A PART OF THE BOARD'S HOME PAGE.

16 YOU WILL RECALL LAST MONTH THAT I
17 MENTIONED THE VERY POSITIVE PRESS REVIEW THAT THIS
18 SITE HAS RECEIVED. AND AS WE MOVE TO FIND
19 CREATIVE SOLUTIONS TO ADDRESS OUR BUDGET
20 SHORTFALLS WHILE KEEPING OUR MESSAGES AND
21 INFORMATION OUT THERE, JEFF AND KATHY'S LEADERSHIP
22 IN HOW TO CAPITALIZE ON THE INTERNET STRENGTHS
23 WILL BE INVALUABLE. AND WE'RE CONTINUING TO LOOK
24 FOR WAYS TO IMPROVE OUR INFORMATION AS WELL AS
25 OTHER OPPORTUNITIES TO CREATE TIES AND LINKS WITH

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 THOSE INDIVIDUALS INTERESTED IN OUR PUBLICATIONS
2 OUT THERE VIA THE INTERNET. SO YOU'LL CONTINUE TO
3 SEE THAT OPPORTUNITY EXPANDING AS WELL.

4 AND FINALLY, JUST TO FOCUS, ONCE
5 AGAIN, ON OUR BUILDINGS HERE. YOU -- IN CASE YOU
6 HAVEN'T NOTICED, THE WASTE PREVENTION STAFF WERE
7 SUCCESSFUL IN PLACING A SIGN HIGHLIGHTING THE USE
8 OF WORM COMPOST IN THE PLANTER BETWEEN THE TWO
9 BUILDINGS HERE. A NEW SUPPLY OF COMPOST WAS
10 INCORPORATED INTO THE SOIL AS THE NEW FALL FLOWERS
11 WERE BEING PLANTED. IT'S JUST INTERESTING TO NOTE
12 BECAUSE I THINK THAT WHAT WE'RE HAVING IS BITS AND
13 STARTS HERE OVER OUR OWN BUILDINGS TRYING TO
14 PRESENT OURSELVES AS A LEADER IN PROMOTING WASTE
15 PREVENTION ACTIVITIES, RECYCLING ACTIVITIES
16 THROUGHOUT OUR BUILDINGS. AND WHILE WE MAY HAVE
17 HAD A SETBACK AS IT RELATES TO GRASSCYCLING, WE
18 ARE CONTINUING TO SEE SOME IMPROVEMENTS IN
OTHER
19 AREAS. THAT CONCLUDES MY REPORT.

20 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: OKAY. THANK YOU
VERY
21 MUCH. BOTH REPORTS, I THINK, INDICATE A LOT
OF
22 EXCITING ACTIVITY AND PROGRESS. APPRECIATE

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

THAT.

23

NEXT WE WILL MOVE TO AGENDA ITEM

3,

24

WHICH IS CONSIDERATION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

25

ITEMS. THERE ARE COPIES OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

IN

1 THE BACK OF THE ROOM FOR ANYBODY WHO WANTS TO
2 REVIEW THAT LIST. WE'LL ENTERTAIN REQUESTS TO
3 PULL THOSE -- ANY ITEMS THAT MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC
4 WOULD LIKE TO HAVE DISCUSSED SEPARATELY.

5 THE CONSENT AGENDA CONSISTS OF THE
6 SITING ELEMENT FOR ITEM 5, ITEMS 6 THROUGH 13, AND
7 ITEMS 15 THROUGH 20. THE -- ANY ITEMS THAT A
8 COMMITTEE MEMBER OR MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC WOULD
9 LIKE TO HAVE PULLED FOR SEPARATE DISCUSSION, I'LL
10 ENTERTAIN AT THIS POINT. ARE THERE ANY ITEMS? IF
11 NOT, THE MOTION WOULD BE TO ACCEPT STAFF
12 RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL OF THESE ITEMS AND
13 PLACE THE CONSENT AGENDA ON THE BOARD'S CONSENT
14 AGENDA AT ITS MONTHLY MEETING THIS MONTH.

15 MEMBER FRAZEE: SO MOVED.

16 MEMBER GOTCH: SECOND.

17 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND
18 SECONDED. CALL THE ROLL, PLEASE.

19 THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBERS FRAZEE.

20 MEMBER FRAZEE: AYE.

21 THE SECRETARY: GOTCH.

22 MEMBER GOTCH: AYE.

23 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN CHESBRO.

24 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: AYE. MOTION CARRIES.

25 NEXT ITEM IS ITEM 4, WHICH IS

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE 1996
2 WRAP-OF-THE-YEAR WASTE REDUCTION AWARDS PROGRAM
3 WINNERS.

4 MS. TRGOVCICH: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
5 LINDA HENNESSY AND JEFF HUNTS WILL BE PRESENTING
6 THIS ITEM. I'D JUST LIKE TO, BY WAY OF
7 INTRODUCTION, SAY THAT THIS IS THE FIRST TIME THAT
8 WE HAVE PRESENTED THESE AWARDS. SO LINDA AND JEFF
9 WILL BE OUTLINING WHAT WE'RE DOING, WHO WE'RE
10 PROMOTING HERE, AND WE'D BE VERY INTERESTED IN ANY
11 COMMENTS OR FEEDBACK THAT YOU MAY HAVE ON THE
12 PROCESS AS WELL.

13 MR. HUNTS: THANK YOU. MORNING
14 COMMITTEE, MEMBERS. I AM JEFF HUNTS, SUPERVISOR
15 OF THE BUSINESS EDUCATION AND ASSISTANCE SECTION.
16 WITH ME TODAY IS LINDA HENNESSEY, THE COORDINATOR
17 FOR THE WASTE REDUCTION AWARDS PROGRAM, ALSO KNOWN
18 AS WRAP.

19 WE ARE HERE THIS MORNING PRESENTING
20 THE PROPOSED WINNERS OF THE WRAP OF THE YEAR.
21 THIS IS A FIRST-TIME INITIATIVE, AS CAREN
22 INDICATED, BLENDING THE WRAP-OF-THE-YEAR PROGRAM
23 WITH -- OR MODELED AFTER THE CALMAX OR CALIFORNIA
24 MATERIALS EXCHANGE MATCH-OF-THE-YEAR AWARD. WE
25 SEE THIS AS AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE BOARD TO

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 RECOGNIZE INDUSTRY LEADERS, TRUE SHINING EXAMPLES
2 OF BUSINESS WASTE REDUCTION THAT WE CAN FORWARD
3 OUR MESSAGES TO THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY WITH.

4 TWO MONTHS AGO WE BROUGHT BEFORE
5 THIS COMMITTEE THE PROPOSED WRAP OF THE YEAR -- OR
6 EXCUSE ME -- THE WASTE REDUCTION AWARDS PROGRAM
7 WINNERS. THE REGULAR WRAP WINNERS. WE HAD 356
8 WRAP WINNERS THAT WERE APPROVED, AND THAT WAS THE
9 MOST OF ANY YEAR OF THE WRAP PROGRAM THUS FAR.

10 WHAT STAFF DID, THEN, IS TAKE THE
11 WRAP WINNERS. THERE WERE FOUR DISTINCT BUSINESS
12 CATEGORIES. WE REGROUPED THOSE INTO NINE BUSINESS
13 CATEGORIES AND ONE AT-LARGE CATEGORY, AND THEN
14 SELECTING FROM THE MOST OUTSTANDING CANDIDATES OR
15 WRAP WINNERS, WE SELECTED A CANDIDATE POOL FOR
16 WRAP-OF-THE-YEAR CANDIDATES.

17 WE AVERAGED ABOUT FIVE CANDIDATE
18 BUSINESSES FOR EACH BUSINESS CATEGORY. THE
19 BUSINESS CATEGORIES WERE RETAIL AND MERCHANDISE,
20 SERVICE -- HEALTH SERVICES, RETAIL EATING,
21 MANUFACTURING OF FOOD AND BEVERAGES, HOTEL AND
22 RESORTS, MANUFACTURING OF COMPUTER AND
23 ELECTRONICS, FINANCIAL AND BUSINESS SERVICES,
24 PRINTING AND MANUFACTURING, AMUSEMENT AND
25 RECREATION, AND THE ONE AT-LARGE MANUFACTURING

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 CATEGORY.

2 I SHOULD NOTE THAT WHILE WE DID HAVE
3 AN AVERAGE OF FIVE CANDIDATES WITHIN EACH BUSINESS
4 CATEGORY, STAFF PROPOSED ONLY ONE CANDIDATE FOR
5 THE RETAIL AND MERCHANDISE CATEGORY, THAT BEING
6 ALL OF THE TARGET STORES IN CALIFORNIA.

7 STAFF THEN ORGANIZED A PANEL --
8 EVALUATION PANEL OF ADVISORS AND COMMITTEE
9 ANALYSTS, PREPARED EVALUATION CRITERIA RANGING
10 FROM DOES THE CANDIDATE BUSINESS DIVERT A
11 SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT OF WASTE VERSUS A SUBSTANTIAL
12 PERCENTAGE OF THEIR WASTE? DO THEY BUY RECYCLED?
13 DOES THIS BUSINESS SIMPLY HAVE A STRONG PUBLIC
14 RELATIONS VALUE FOR THE WASTE BOARD?

15 PROVIDED THAT CRITERIA AND THE
16 CANDIDATE BUSINESSES TO THE EVALUATION PANEL AND
17 ALLOWED FOR THREE WEEKS OF CONSIDERATION.
18 SURPRISINGLY TO STAFF, THE EVALUATION PANEL CAME
19 BACK WITH PRETTY MUCH A CONSISTENT VIEW OF WHO
20 WERE THE -- WHO SHOULD BE THE PROPOSED
21 WRAP-OF-THE-YEAR RECIPIENTS.

22 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: JUST BECAUSE THE
BOARD
23 MEMBERS DON'T ALWAYS AGREE DOESN'T MEAN THAT OUR
24 STAFF PEOPLE CAN'T.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

25

MR. HUNTS: EXACTLY. EXACTLY. WHILE

25

1 THERE WERE TEN BUSINESS CATEGORIES, IN REVIEWING
2 THE CANDIDATES, IT WAS DECIDED THAT NOT ALL
3 CATEGORIES HAD WRAP-OF-THE-YEAR WINNER POTENTIAL.
4 SO SOME CATEGORIES ACTUALLY HAD MULTIPLE WINNERS
5 WHILE OTHERS DIDN'T HAVE ANY WINNERS AT ALL.

6 THE PROPOSED WINNERS ARE TARGET
7 STORES OF CALIFORNIA, THE SOUTH BAY MEDICAL CENTER
8 IN REDONDO BEACH, DOLE FRESH VEGETABLES
9 INCORPORATED IN SALINAS, BEAULIEU VINEYARDS, ALSO
10 KNOWN AS BV, IN RUTHERFORD, NAPA COUNTY, MAD RIVER
11 BREWING COMPANY UP IN BLUE LAKE IN HUMBOLDT
12 COUNTY, SIERRA AT TAHOE ON HIGHWAY 50, HEWLETT
13 PACKARD OF ROSEVILLE, AND AMVELL CORPORATION IN
14 SUNNYVALE, SAN DIEGO WILD ANIMAL PARK, AND THE
15 WALT DISNEY COMPANY IN THE LOS ANGELES AREA.

16 UPON APPROVAL OF THESE WINNERS,
17 STAFF WILL BE WORKING WITH PUBLIC AFFAIRS TO
18 PROMOTE THEIR RECEIPT OF THIS ACKNOWLEDGMENT,
19 WORKING WITH BOARD MEMBERS TO PRESENT THE
AWARDS

20 TO THE ACTUAL BUSINESSES, HOLDING PRESS
EVENTS.

21 WE'VE BEEN WORKING WITH THE GRAPHICS UNIT TO
22 DESIGN A VERY NICE PLAQUE THAT EACH WINNING
23 BUSINESS WILL RECEIVE MADE OF MALACHITE MADE

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

OF

24 RECYCLED NEWSPRINT HELD TOGETHER WITH A SOY

BEAN

25 BINDER. EACH RECIPIENT BUSINESS WILL
RECEIVE A

1 PLAQUE. WE'LL ALSO HAVE A PLAQUE MADE FOR
THE
2 BOARD ITSELF CONTAINING THE NAMES OF ALL
APPROVED
3 WINNERS THAT WE CAN HANG HERE AT THE BOARD
FOR ALL
4 TO SEE AND LEARN FROM.

5 THE SUGGESTED OPTIONS FOR THE
6 COMMITTEE ARE TO ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATIONS
OF THE
7 EVALUATION PANEL AND APPROVE THE PROPOSED
WINNERS
8 OR PASS ALONG TO THE BOARD THOSE THAT HAVE
BEEN
9 SELECTED BY THE EVALUATION PANEL OR TO
DIRECT THE
10 PANEL TO REEVALUATE THE PROPOSED WINNERS.

11 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: SO THE NEXT TEST
IS
12 WHETHER OR NOT THE BOARD MEMBERS WILL AGREE
WITH
13 COMMITTEE ANALYSTS?

14 MR. HUNTS: EXACTLY.

15 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I'D LIKE TO
PERSONALLY

16 THANK BOTH LINDA HENNESSY AND JEFF HUNTS FOR

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

ALL

17 OF THEIR WORK ON THIS PROJECT. THIS IS --

AS WAS

18 STATED EARLIER, THIS IS THE FIRST TIME THAT

THE

19 BOARD HAS SELECTED WRAP-OF-THE-YEAR WINNERS,

AND

20 IT TOOK A LOT OF TIME TO REVIEW THE 411

CANDIDATES

21 AND NARROW THE FIELD TO 50 OR SO FOR THE

PANEL TO

22 THEN REVIEW FURTHER.

23 THE STAFF MADE WHAT COULD BE A

VERY

24 DIFFICULT AND TEDIOUS JOB, ACCORDING TO ONE

SOURCE

25 ON THE REVIEW PANEL THAT SPEAKS TO ME
FREQUENTLY,

1 MADE THAT PROCESS A FUN PROCESS AND LEARNING
2 PROCESS. AND I HAD SEVERAL OF THE COMMITTEE
3 ANALYSTS, INCLUDING MY OWN COMMENT ON THE POSITIVE
4 NATURE OF THE STAFF'S WORK ON THIS, SO I WANTED TO
5 NOTE THAT.

6 MR. HUNTS: I HAVE TO SAY STAFF REALLY
7 APPRECIATES THE EVALUATION PANEL'S WORK. IT TOOK
8 A LOAD OFF OF US IN REVIEWING THESE CANDIDATES.

9 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: THANKS AGAIN FOR YOUR
10 GOOD WORK.

11 THE MOTION WOULD BE TO ACCEPT
12 STAFF'S RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE 1996
13 WRAP-OF-THE-YEAR WINNERS AND FORWARD THEM TO THE
14 BOARD'S CONSENT CALENDAR. I GUESS WE'RE NOT GOING
15 TO MAKE THE BIG PRODUCTION AT THE BOARD MEETING.
16 WE'RE GOING TO HOLD IT IN A SERIES OF EVENTS
17 AROUND THE STATE AND TRY TO GET THE WORD OUT ON
18 THE LOCAL LEVEL. SO THAT WOULD BE THE MOTION.

19 MEMBER GOTCH: SO MOVED.

20 MEMBER FRAZEE: SECOND.

21 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND
22 SECONDED.

23 LET ME ASK ONE MORE QUESTION. THIS
24 IS SORT OF A PUBLIC RELATIONS, TECHNICAL
QUESTION.

25 BUT THERE'S TWO LEVELS OF PUBLIC EDUCATION VALUE

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 HERE. ONE IS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL, IT BEING NOTED
2 BY THE LOCAL COMMUNITY THAT BUSINESS IN THEIR
3 COMMUNITY IS DOING A GREAT JOB. AND THAT'S
4 PROBABLY THE EASIEST PLACE TO GET ATTENTION. BUT
5 ALSO, AS A GROUP, HAS SOME STATEWIDE INTEREST, IT
6 SEEMS TO ME, AT LEAST IN TRADE PUBLICATIONS AND
7 BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS AND THAT SORT OF THING.

8 SO YOU MIGHT TRY TO FIGURE OUT HOW
9 TO DO BOTH. I'M SURE FROM A TIMING STANDPOINT IT
10 BECOMES A NIGHTMARE WHEN YOU RELEASE WHAT
11 INFORMATION. BUT IT SEEMS LIKE WE COULD WORK ON
12 GETTING SOME STORIES IN SOME OF THE STATEWIDE AND
13 NATIONAL PUBLICATIONS ABOUT THE WHOLE STORY, AS
14 WELL AS THESE INDIVIDUAL EVENTS THAT WE'RE GOING
15 TO HOLD IN THE COMMUNITIES WHERE THE BUSINESSES
16 ARE HEADQUARTERED.

17 MR. HUNTS: STAFF FEEL THAT THESE WINNERS
18 WILL PROVIDE SHINING EXAMPLES AROUND WHICH WE CAN
19 DEVELOP CASE STUDIES AND WORK WITH PUBLIC AFFAIRS
20 TO GET ARTICLES PLACED IN TRADE JOURNALS. WHILE
21 THE REGULAR WRAP WINNERS DO HAVE A STRONG BOTH
22 STATEWIDE AND LOCAL IMPACT AND AWARENESS, THESE
23 WRAP OF THE YEARS WILL BE EXAMPLES THAT THEIR
24 PEERS AND COMPETITORS WITHIN THE BUSINESS
25 COMMUNITY CAN LOOK UP TO.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I THINK THAT KIND OF
2 PUBLICITY ALSO IS AN ADDITIONAL INCENTIVE THEN FOR
3 COMPANIES TO TRY TO MEET THE STANDARDS NECESSARY
4 AND THEN APPLY AND GO THROUGH THE PROCESS OF
5 ATTEMPTING TO BE RECOGNIZED FOR THEIR ACTIVITIES.
6 IT'S HOPEFULLY A SELF-GENERATING -- WE GENERATE
7 MORE AND MORE INTEREST.

8 OKAY. WE'LL CALL THE ROLL OR THE
9 VOTE ON THIS QUESTION.

10 THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBERS FRAZEE.

11 MEMBER FRAZEE: AYE.

12 THE SECRETARY: GOTCH.

13 MEMBER GOTCH: AYE.

14 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN CHESBRO.

15 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: MOTION CARRIES.

16 NEXT IS ITEM 5, WHICH IS
17 CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE
18 ADEQUACY OF THE SUMMARY PLAN FOR KERN COUNTY.

19 MS. FRIEDMAN: YES. THIS IS THE SUMMARY
20 PLAN FOR KERN COUNTY, AND ALAN WHITE WILL BE
21 MAKING THE PRESENTATION FOR STAFF. ALAN.

22 MR. WHITE: GOOD MORNING, CHAIRMAN
23 CHESBRO AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS. THE FOLLOWING IS

A

24 BRIEF OVERVIEW OF STAFF REVIEW OF THE SUMMARY
PLAN

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

25 FOR KERN COUNTY. AS YOU KNOW, THE CALIFORNIA

1 PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE REQUIRES EACH COUNTY TO
2 PREPARE A COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT
3 SUMMARY PLAN. THE REQUIRED PLAN INCLUDES A
4 SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT WASTE MANAGEMENT
5 PROBLEMS FACING THE COUNTIES AND THE CITIES. THE
6 PLAN IS ALSO REQUIRED TO PROVIDE AN OVERVIEW OF
7 THE SPECIFIC STEPS THAT WILL BE TAKEN BY THE LOCAL
8 AGENCIES ACTING INDEPENDENTLY AND IN CONCERT.

9 FURTHERMORE, THE SUMMARY PLAN IS
10 REQUIRED TO CONTAIN A STATEMENT OF THE GOALS AND
11 OBJECTIVES SET FORTH BY THE LOCAL COUNTYWIDE TASK
12 FORCE. DUE TO THE LARGE SIZE OF KERN COUNTY, THE
13 KERN COUNTY WASTE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT IS ACTING
14 AS THE LEAD IN PREPARING A SUMMARY PLAN AND IN
15 COORDINATING THE DIVERSION PROGRAMS ON A
16 COUNTYWIDE BASIS.

17 THE PLAN INCLUDES THE UNINCORPORATED
18 COUNTY AND THE CITIES OF ARVIN, BAKERSFIELD,
19 CALIFORNIA CITY, DELANO, MARICOPA, MCFARLAND,
20 RIDGE CREST, SHAFTER, TAFT, TEHACHAPI, AND WASCO.

21 THE PROGRAM SELECTED FOR COUNTYWIDE
22 COORDINATION INCLUDES: CONTINUED USE OF
23 RESIDENTIAL LAND USE FEES AND NONRESIDENTIAL
24 TIPPING FEES, EDUCATION AND PUBLIC INFORMATION,
25 SEASONAL COLLECTION SUCH AS THE PHONE BOOKS AND

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 CHRISTMAS TREE PROGRAMS, REGIONAL COMPOSTING
2 FACILITIES, SPECIAL WASTE COLLECTIONS SUCH AS THE
3 TIRE, CONSTRUCTION DEMOLITION DEBRIS, AND
4 APPLIANCE PROGRAMS, EXISTING AND PROPOSED MATERIAL
5 RECOVERY FACILITIES, THE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE
6 COLLECTION PROGRAM, AND A NEW REGIONAL LANDFILL.

7 THE BOARD HAS NOT YET ACTED ON THE
8 HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENTS FOR THE CITIES
9 OF BAKERSFIELD, TAFT, OR TEHACHAPI, NOR ON ANY OF
10 THE ELEMENTS FOR THE CITIES OF MARICOPA OR
11 MCFARLAND. THEREFORE, STAFF RECOMMENDS
12 CONDITIONAL APPROVAL UNTIL THE REMAINING DOCUMENTS
13 ARE SUBMITTED AND ACTED ON BY THE BOARD.

14 STAFF WILL CONTINUE TO WORK WITH THE
15 JURISDICTIONS INVOLVED TO COMPLETE THE PREPARATION
16 AND SUBMITTAL OF THE REMAINING DOCUMENTS. ONCE
17 THE BOARD HAS ACTED ON THESE PLANNING DOCUMENTS,
18 THE SUMMARY PLAN MAY NEED TO BE REVISED TO
19 ACCURATELY REFLECT THE REMAINING DOCUMENTS. THEN
20 THE KERN COUNTY INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN
21 WILL BE COMPLETE AND ELIGIBLE FOR BOARD APPROVAL.
22 BASED ON THIS INFORMATION AND THE INFORMATION
23 CONTAINED IN THE SUMMARY PLAN, BOARD STAFF
24 RECOMMEND CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF THE KERN COUNTY
25 SUMMARY PLAN.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 THAT CONCLUDES MY BRIEF
2 PRESENTATION. I'LL BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY
3 QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE.

4 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: ANY QUESTIONS?

5 MEMBER GOTCH: NO QUESTIONS.

6 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: THERE ARE NO
7 QUESTIONS. SO THE MOTION WOULD BE TO ACCEPT STAFF
8 RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONALLY APPROVE THE
9 SUMMARY PLAN FOR KERN COUNTY AND FORWARD IT TO THE
10 BOARD'S CONSENT CALENDAR

11 MEMBER FRAZEE: SO MOVED.

12 MEMBER GOTCH: SECOND.

13 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I DON'T HAVE ANY
14 SPEAKER SLIPS. I ASSUME THAT THERE'S NOBODY HERE
15 REPRESENTING THE COUNTY OR ANY OF THE CITIES?
16 OKAY. WE'LL SUBSTITUTE THE PRIOR ROLL CALL.
17 MOTION PASSES THREE TO ZERO. THANK YOU.

18 NEXT IS ITEM 14, WHICH IS
19 CONSIDERATION OF THE PETITION FOR DISPOSAL
20 REDUCTION FOR SLUDGE DIVERSION CREDIT FOR THE
21 CITY

21 OF WATSONVILLE, SANTA CRUZ COUNTY

22 MS. FRIEDMAN: YES. THE CITY OF
23 WATSONVILLE IS THE FIRST JURISDICTION TO APPLY
24 FOR

24 A SLUDGE DIVERSION CREDIT FOR DISPOSAL REDUCTION

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

25 CREDIT.

1 IN FEBRUARY OF THIS YEAR, YOU HEARD
2 A PREVIOUS INFORMATIONAL AGENDA ITEM ON SLUDGE
3 DIVERSION PETITIONS. AT THE COMMITTEE'S
4 DIRECTION, STAFF HAVE WORKED WITH THE DEPARTMENT
5 OF HEALTH SERVICES AND THE DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC
6 SUBSTANCE CONTROL SINCE THEN BECAUSE CONCURRENCE
7 FROM VARIOUS STATE AGENCIES REQUIRE IT, AND THAT
8 WAS ONE OF THE REASONS WE WERE ONLY ABLE TO
9 DISCUSS THIS AS AN INFORMATIONAL ITEM ORIGINALLY.

10 AND JENNIFER KIGER OF THE BAY
11 SECTION OF THE OFFICE OF LOCAL ASSISTANCE WILL
12 PRESENT THE ITEM WITH LORRAINE VAN KEKERIX'
13 ASSISTANCE.

14 MS. KIGER: GOOD MORNING, CHAIRMAN
15 CHESBRO, COMMITTEE MEMBERS. THE PETITION BEFORE
16 YOU TODAY IS A REQUEST TO RECEIVE DISPOSAL
17 REDUCTION CREDIT FOR BIOSOLIDS REUSED IN THE CITY
18 OF WATSONVILLE'S SLUDGE DIVERSION PROJECT.

19 IN MY PRESENTATION TODAY I'M GOING
20 TO BRIEFLY INTRODUCE THE PROJECT, STATUTORY AND
21 REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS, GIVE AN UPDATE ON WHAT'S
22 TRANSPIRED SINCE THE ITEM WAS HEARD AT THE
23 FEBRUARY COMMITTEE MEETING, AND I'LL FINISH UP
24 WITH THE CONCLUSION OF THE WATSONVILLE PETITION
25 AND STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE'S PROJECT
2 REUSES MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT SLUDGE,
3 BIOSOLIDS, AS A SOIL AMENDMENT AT THE CITY OF
4 WATSONVILLE LANDFILL IN SANTA CRUZ COUNTY AND AT
5 CRAZY HORSE LANDFILL IN MONTEREY COUNTY. THIS
6 PROJECT IS PART OF BOTH LANDFILLS' ANNUAL
7 WINTERIZATION PROJECT TO ENHANCE VEGETATIVE GROWTH
8 AND MINIMIZE SOIL EROSION OF THE INTERMEDIATE
9 COVER.

10 THE BIOSOLIDS REUSE PROJECT IS
11 IDENTIFIED IN THE WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
12 ISSUED BY THE CENTRAL COAST REGIONAL WATER CONTROL
13 BOARD AND IS ALSO IDENTIFIED IN THE BOARD'S SOLID
14 WASTE PERMIT -- FACILITY PERMIT.

15 STATUTE ALLOWS THE BOARD TO GRANT
16 DISPOSAL REDUCTION TOWARD THE WASTE DIVERSION
17 REQUIREMENTS TO JURISDICTIONS PETITIONING FOR
18 SLUDGE DIVERSION CREDIT. CALIFORNIA CODE OF
19 REGULATIONS IDENTIFIES THE QUALIFICATIONS THAT
20 EACH JURISDICTION MUST MEET PRIOR TO SUBMITTING
21 THE PETITION.

22 THESE QUALIFICATIONS ARE, FIRST, THE
23 FACILITY GENERATING THE SLUDGE MUST BE LOCATED
24 WITHIN THE JURISDICTION PETITIONING. SECOND, THE
25 SLUDGE MUST HAVE BEEN DISPOSED OF IN A BOARD

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 PERMITTED DISPOSAL FACILITY IN THE BASE YEAR; AND,
2 FINALLY, THE SOLID WASTE GENERATION STUDY MUST
3 INCLUDE THE AMOUNTS OF SLUDGE DISPOSED OF IN THE
4 BASE YEAR.

5 THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS
6 ALSO OUTLINES THE REQUIRED CONTENT FOR A COMPLETE
7 PETITION. STAFF HAVE DETERMINED THAT THE CITY OF
8 WATSONVILLE HAS MET THESE QUALIFICATIONS AND HAS
9 SUBMITTED A COMPLETE PETITION.

10 PRIOR TO GRANTING A DISPOSAL
11 REDUCTION CREDIT, STATUTE REQUIRES THE BOARD TO
12 MAKE A FINDING AT A PUBLIC HEARING WITHIN 180 DAYS
13 OF RECEIVING THE PETITION. THE BOARD'S FINDING
14 MUST BE BASED ON SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE THAT THE
15 SLUDGE REUSE PROJECT MEETS ALL REQUIREMENTS OF
16 STATE AND FEDERAL LAW. AS PART OF THIS FINDING,
17 THE BOARD IS REQUIRED TO CONSULT WITH AND OBTAIN
18 CONCURRENCE IN THE BOARD'S FINDING FROM THE
19 FOLLOWING AGENCIES: THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL
20 WATER BOARD, THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
21 SERVICES, THE STATE AIR RESOURCES BOARD, AND AIR
22 POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT, AND FINALLY THE
23 DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCE CONTROL.

24 AS YOU MAY RECALL, THIS PETITION WAS
25 PREVIOUSLY HEARD AT THE FEBRUARY 15, 1996,

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 COMMITTEE MEETING AS AN INFORMATIONAL ITEM. AT
2 THE TIME OF THE FEBRUARY COMMITTEE MEETING, STAFF
3 HAD CONSULTED WITH, BUT HAD NOT YET OBTAINED
4 CONCURRENCE FROM THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
5 SERVICES OR THE DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCE
6 CONTROL. AT THE FEBRUARY MEETING THE COMMITTEE
7 DIRECTED STAFF TO CONTINUE WORKING WITH BOTH STATE
8 AGENCIES TO GAIN A CONCURRENCE IN THE BOARD'S
9 FINDING.

10 SINCE THE PREVIOUS COMMITTEE MEETING
11 AND FOLLOWING THE COMMITTEE'S DIRECTION, STAFF
12 OUTLINED AN ACTION PLAN FOR CLARIFYING AND
13 FACILITATING THE REVIEW OF FUTURE SLUDGE DIVERSION
14 PETITIONS. THE ACTION PLAN WAS APPROVED, AND
15 STAFF HAVE COMPLETED THE FOLLOWING TASKS: FIRST,
16 STAFF MET WITH DTSC STAFF THE DISCUSS DTSC'S ROLE
17 IN THE REVIEW OF THE SLUDGE DIVERSION PETITIONS
18 AND THE ROLE IN ASSISTING THE BOARD WITH MAKING
19 ITS FINDING AS PROSCRIBED BY STATUTE.

20 AS A RESULT OF THAT MEETING, DTSC
21 STAFF DRAFTED A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WHICH
22 SUMMARIZED THE CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH DTSC WOULD
23 CONCUR ON SLUDGE DIVERSION PETITIONS WHEN THE
24 BOARD MAKES ITS FINDING. THE PROPOSED MOU IS
25 CURRENTLY UNDER REVIEW AT THE BOARD. TWO, STAFF

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 WERE ABLE TO CLARIFY AND ADDRESS THE CONCERNS OF
2 DTSC AND THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES AS TO
3 THEIR ROLE IN THE BOARD MAKING ITS FINDING ON THE
4 CITY OF WATSONVILLE'S PETITION.

5 STAFF RECEIVED A LETTER CONCURRING
6 IN THE BOARD'S FINDING FROM THE STATE DEPARTMENT
7 OF HEALTH SERVICES. IN ADDITION, STAFF RECEIVED A
8 MEMO FROM DTSC INDICATING THAT THE CITY OF
9 WATSONVILLE'S SLUDGE REUSE PROJECT FALLS OUTSIDE
10 OF DTSC'S JURISDICTION.

11 THIRD, STAFF SUBMITTED A LEGISLATIVE
12 PROPOSAL CONCEPT FOR 1997 PROPOSING AMENDMENTS TO
13 CLARIFY STATUTE. STAFF HAVE RECENTLY BEEN
14 INFORMED THAT THE LEGISLATIVE CONCEPT PROPOSAL HAS
15 BEEN APPROVED.

16 IN CONCLUSION, REGARDING
17 WATSONVILLE'S PETITION, STAFF HAVE FOUND THAT THE
18 CITY HAS MET THE SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS OF STATUTE
19 AND REGULATIONS FOR REQUESTING DISPOSAL REDUCTION
20 CREDIT FOR ITS SLUDGE REUSE PROJECT. STAFF HAVE
21 CONSULTED WITH AND GAINED CONCURRENCE FROM THE
22 CENTRAL COAST REGIONAL WATER CONTROL BOARD, THE
23 MONTEREY BAY UNIFIED AIR POLLUTION CONTROL
24 DISTRICT, AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
25 SERVICES IN THE BOARD'S FINDING AS REQUIRED BY

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 STATUTE.

2 IN ADDITION, STAFF HAVE CONSULTED
3 WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCE CONTROL.
4 DTSC HAS INDICATED THAT WATSONVILLE'S SLUDGE REUSE
5 FALLS OUTSIDE THE DEPARTMENT'S JURISDICTION.
6 STAFF RECOMMEND BOARD APPROVAL OF THE CITY OF
7 WATSONVILLE'S PETITION FOR DISPOSAL REDUCTION
8 CREDIT FOR SLUDGE DIVERSION. THAT CONCLUDES MY
9 PRESENT. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS?

10 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I HAVE A QUESTION.
11 DID YOU?

12 MEMBER FRAZEE: MY QUESTION RELATES TO
13 THE STATEMENT THAT ONLY DIVERSION CREDIT WILL BE
14 GIVEN FOR THE JURISDICTION THAT IS USING THE
15 SLUDGE. DID I UNDERSTAND YOU CORRECTLY?

16 MS. KIGER: IT'S THE JURISDICTION -- THE
17 FACILITY THAT GENERATES THE SLUDGE MUST BE LOCATED
18 WITHIN THE JURISDICTION PETITIONING. SO IT'S THE
19 CITY OF WATSONVILLE'S WASTEWATER TREATMENT.

20 MEMBER FRAZEE: IN THE CASE OF A REGIONAL
21 FACILITY THAT GENERATES SLUDGE WHERE THERE MAY BE
22 FIVE OR SIX CITIES PARTICIPATING, IF THAT SLUDGE
23 IS USED FOR BENEFICIAL USE, HOW IS THE CREDIT
24 DIVIDED? AND THEN A FOLLOW-UP SO THAT YOU CAN
25 ANSWER THE WHOLE THING. THE -- IN ORDER TO

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 QUALIFY FOR DIVERSION CREDIT, IT MUST HAVE BEEN
2 SHOWN AS DISPOSAL AT THE 1990 LEVEL?

3 MS. VAN KEKERIX: WHAT HAPPENS IS THAT
4 THE WASTE -- YOU DON'T HAVE A SOLID WASTE UNTIL
5 YOU GO THROUGH THE TREATMENT PROCESS. SO THE
6 WASTE IS CREATED OR GENERATED IN THE JURISDICTION.
7 SO WHETHER OR NOT THE FACILITY RECEIVES INCOMING
8 WASTE WATERS FROM MULTIPLE JURISDICTIONS, YOU
9 DON'T HAVE THE SOLID WASTE GENERATED UNTIL IT GETS
10 TO THE JURISDICTION WHERE THE FACILITY IS LOCATED.
11 SO ALL OF THE WASTE IS GENERATED IN THE -- WHERE
12 THE FACILITY IS LOCATED.

13 IN TERMS OF NEEDING TO HAVE THE
14 SLUDGE IN THE BASE YEAR, STATUTE DOES REQUIRE THAT
15 THE SLUDGE HAD TO HAVE BEEN NORMALLY DISPOSED,
16 WHICH MEANS THAT AT LEAST .001 PERCENT OF THE
17 WASTE STREAM IN THE BASE YEAR. SO IT'S A
18 RELATIVELY SMALL PERCENTAGE.

19 MEMBER FRAZEE: SO IF IT WAS ALREADY
20 BEING USED FOR BENEFICIAL USE, THEN IT COULD NOT
21 BE COUNTED AS DIVERSION?

22 MS. VAN KEKERIX: NOTHING COUNTS AS
23 DIVERSION IF IT WASN'T DISPOSED IN THE BASE YEAR.

24 MEMBER FRAZEE: AND THERE'S NO WAY OF
25 ADJUSTING THAT. IF THEY WERE IN AND OUT, IF THEY

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 HAD BENEFICIAL USE AND THEN CEASED TO HAVE
2 BENEFICIAL USE AND THEN WENT BACK AGAIN, THE BASE
3 YEAR IS STILL THE TRIGGER AND THE ONE THAT COUNTS.

4 MS. FRIEDMAN: IF I MAY, I THINK THE
5 POINT THAT LORRAINE WAS MAKING ABOUT .001 PERCENT
6 IS THAT SUCH A SMALL AMOUNT -- AT THAT SMALL
7 AMOUNT, IF IT'S IN THE BASE YEAR, IF IT'S BEING
8 DISPOSED, THEN IT COULD ALL COUNT. SO THE TEST IS
9 PRETTY -- I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE WORD TO USE THERE
10 IS -- YOU DON'T HAVE TO HAVE A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT
11 OF MATERIAL.

12 MEMBER FRAZEE: NOT ALL OF IT THEN.

13 MS. FRIEDMAN: RIGHT. AS LONG AS YOU
14 FIND .001 PERCENT IN YOUR BASE YEAR, YOU CAN COUNT
15 ALL OF IT AS DISPOSED.

16 MEMBER FRAZEE: SO THAT WOULD BE OF GREAT
17 BENEFIT TO JURISDICTIONS SUCH AS THE COMMUNITY
18 THAT I RESIDE THAT PROCESSES SEWAGE FROM SEVEN
19 OTHER JURISDICTIONS.

20 MS. FRIEDMAN: IT POTENTIALLY COULD BE,
21 YES, DEPENDING ON THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES.

22 MEMBER FRAZEE: IF THEY GO TO BENEFICIAL
23 USE, AND THAT USE CAN BE OUTSIDE THE JURISDICTION.

24 MS. FRIEDMAN: YES.

25 MS. VAN KEKERIX: THERE ARE NO

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 RESTRICTIONS ON WHERE THE DIVERSION OCCURS.

2 MS. FRIEDMAN: BUT JUST LIKE TO POINT
3 ABOUT WHERE THE WASTE IS GENERATED, IT'S JUST LIKE
4 ANY REGIONAL FACILITY. IT'S WHERE THE WASTE IS
5 GENERATED, NOT WHERE THE MATERIAL GOING INTO IT
6 COMES FROM.

7 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: MY QUESTION HAS TO DO
8 WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCE CONTROL'S
9 LETTER, WHICH I SUPPOSE I'LL ASK MR. BLOCK THIS
10 QUESTION. IT DANCES AROUND THE REQUIREMENT AND
11 DOESN'T SEEM TO QUITE -- I'M MIXING MY METAPHORS
12 HERE -- BUT QUITE HIT THE NAIL ON THE HEAD.
13 DANCING AROUND THE NAIL, WHATEVER.

14 IT'S A PRETTY INDIRECT ANSWER TO THE
15 QUESTION OF WHETHER OR NOT THIS IS, IN FACT, NOT A
16 TOXIC MATERIAL. IT DOESN'T MEET THE
17 REQUIREMENTS -- WHETHER IT DOES OR DOESN'T MEET
18 THE REQUIREMENTS FOR BEING A TOXIC MATERIAL. IT
19 TALKS ABOUT -- IT SAYS IT -- THAT IT -- THEY'RE
20 NOT GOING TO CHARGE US A FEE FOR THE CITY OF
21 WATSONVILLE'S SEWAGE SLUDGE DIVERSION PROJECT AS
22 THE WAY OF INDIRECTLY, APPARENTLY, SAYING WHAT
23 WATSONVILLE NEEDS THEM TO SAY. DOES THIS MEET THE
24 REQUIREMENTS, OUR REQUIREMENTS FOR TOXICS'
25 SIGN-OFF? READING IT, IT'S HARD TO FIGURE OUT.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 I'LL -- I THINK WE OBVIOUSLY NEED TO RELY ON OUR
2 LEGAL COUNSEL'S JUDGMENT.

3 MR. BLOCK: THIS, IN COMBINATION WITH
4 SOME ADDITIONAL MEETINGS THAT WE'VE HAD WITH DTSC
5 AND, IN FACT, THE DRAFT THAT JENNIFER REFERRED TO,
6 IF YOU NOTICE THIS IS DATED BACK IN APRIL. THE
7 LETTER THAT'S IN THE PACKET IS WORDED IN KIND OF A
8 STRANGE WAY BECAUSE OF A QUIRK OF LANGUAGE IN OUR
9 STATUTE VERSUS SOME TITLE 22 LANGUAGE.

10 OUR STATUTE TALKS ABOUT CONCURRENCE
11 FROM OTHER AGENCIES, AND DTSC HAS ITS OWN
12 NONHAZARDOUS CONCURRENCE PROCESS IN TITLE 22.
13 IT'S A VOLUNTARY PROCESS. IT'S NOT REQUIRED.
14 WHEN THEY INITIALLY LOOKED AT OUR STATUTE, THEY
15 THOUGHT THAT OUR STATUTE REQUIRED OPERATORS TO GO
16 THROUGH THEIR PROCESS AS WELL.

17 WE HAD A SERIES OF MEETINGS WITH
18 THEM AND POINTED OUT OTHER PARTS OF OUR STATUTE
19 THAT SAID SPECIFICALLY THIS IS NOT TO REQUIRE
20 ADDITIONAL TESTING THAT'S ALREADY NOT REQUIRED.
21 IT'S A DIFFERENT PROCESS.

22 SO WE'VE FURTHER REFINED THEIR
23 UNDERSTANDING OF OUR STATUTE SINCE THEN. IT'S
24 EMBODIED IN THE MOU THAT WE'RE TRYING TO GET
25 FINALIZED NOW. AND I THINK, AS JENNIFER

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 INDICATED, THEY HAVE SPECIFICALLY CONFIRMED THAT
2 THIS SLUDGE PROJECT IS DEALING WITH NONHAZARDOUS
3 SLUDGE; THEREFORE, IT'S NOT IN THEIR JURISDICTION.

4 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: AND IT WAS NOT
5 POSSIBLE OR NECESSARY TO GET A CLEARER LETTER FROM
6 THEM?

7 MR. BLOCK: I THINK IT WAS A QUESTION OF
8 TIMING, AND I THINK WE'RE ACTUALLY HOPING THAT THE
9 MOU WILL BE SIGNED AND FINALIZED BEFORE THE BOARD
10 MEETING.

11 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: SO ONCE THE MOU IS
12 FINALIZED, THEN IT CHANGES THE -- WILL WE STILL
13 NEED SOMETHING IN WRITING UNDER THE MOU TO ACHIEVE
14 THAT CONCURRENCE?

15 MR. BLOCK: WELL, THE STATUTE -- WE'RE
16 FINE AS WE ARE NOW. THE STATUTE TALKS ABOUT
17 CONCURRENCE FROM OTHER AGENCIES TO THE EXTENT THAT
18 IT'S WITHIN THEIR JURISDICTION. AND RIGHT NOW WE
19 HAVE CONFIRMATION FROM THE REGIONAL WATER BOARDS
20 AND THE TESTING THAT'S BEEN DONE THAT THIS
21 MATERIAL IS NOT HAZARDOUS. SO IN A SENSE, THERE'S
22 ACTUALLY NO REQUIREMENT THAT DTSC GIVE US
23 SOMETHING IN WRITING SAYING IT'S NOT IN OUR
24 JURISDICTION. WE'VE GONE AND DONE THAT, AND THE
25 REASON WE HAVEN'T GOTTEN AN ADDITIONAL LETTER, I

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 GUESS, IS WE'RE TRYING NOT TO OVERKILL THE ISSUE
2 OF CONFIRMING THAT THEY DON'T HAVE JURISDICTION.
3 WE CAN CERTAINLY GET THAT IF THAT'S NECESSARY.

4 I WAS IN A COUPLE OF THOSE MEETINGS,
5 AND I CAN CERTAINLY CONFIRM ON THE RECORD TODAY
6 THAT THEY'VE INDICATED IT'S NOT WITHIN THEIR
7 JURISDICTION.

8 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: OKAY. WELL, THEN
9 UNLESS THERE'S FURTHER QUESTIONS --

10 MEMBER FRAZEE: JUST TO FOLLOW UP ON
11 THAT. THE MOU IS A BLANKET CONSIDERATION OF ALL
12 SIMILAR --

13 MR. BLOCK: WELL, BASICALLY WHAT THE MOU
14 SAYS IS THAT TO THE EXTENT THAT EXISTING TESTS
15 AND/OR PERMITS, IN THE CASE OF WATSONVILLE, FOR
16 INSTANCE, THERE'S WDR'S, INDICATE THAT THE
17 MATERIAL WE'RE DEALING WITH IS NOT HAZARDOUS, THAT
18 THEY'RE CONFIRMING IN WRITING THAT THEY HAVE NO
19 JURISDICTION. WE ACTUALLY CALLED IT AN MOU, AND
20 IT'S NOT REALLY AN MOU BECAUSE WE'RE NOT AGREEING
21 TO DO ANYTHING.

22 MEMBER FRAZEE: BUT THE NEXT TIME WE HAVE
23 ONE OF THESE APPLICATIONS TO PROCESS, IT WILL BE A
24 LOT EASIER?

25 MR. BLOCK: RIGHT. WE'RE BASICALLY NOT

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 GOING TO HAVE TO MAKE A SEPARATE CONTACT WITH DTSC
2 AT ALL.

3 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: THAT CLARIFIES IT
4 QUITE A BIT. THANK YOU. OKAY.

5 THEN I WILL ENTERTAIN A MOTION, AND
6 THE MOTION WOULD BE TO ACCEPT STAFF RECOMMENDATION
7 AND APPROVE THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE'S PETITION FOR
8 DISPOSAL REDUCTION CREDIT FOR SLUDGE DIVERSION AND
9 FORWARD IT TO THE BOARD'S CONSENT CALENDAR.

10 MEMBER GOTCH: SO MOVED.

11 MEMBER FRAZEE: SECOND.

12 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: WE'LL SUBSTITUTE THE
13 PRIOR ROLL CALL. MOTION CARRIES. THANK YOU VERY
14 MUCH.

15 THE NEXT REGULAR AGENDA ITEM IS ITEM
16 21, WHICH IS CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF THE
17 NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO
18 THE SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT
19 REGULATIONS.

20 MS. FRIEDMAN: YES. ITEMS 21, 22, AND 23
21 ARE PURE REGULATION ITEMS, AND THEY HAVE -- THEY
22 DEAL WITH LIMITED CHANGES TO CURRENT EMERGENCY
23 REGULATIONS AND OUR PROPOSED PERMANENT REGULATIONS
24 FOR SRRE CONTENT, WHICH IS ARTICLE 6.2; NDFE
25 CONTENT, ARTICLE 6.4; AND PROCEDURES FOR PREPARING

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 AND REVISING SRRE'S, HHWE'S, AND NDFE'S, ARTICLE
2 7.0.

3 THE EMERGENCY REGULATIONS WILL
4 EXPIRE ON JANUARY 3, 1997. CHRIS DEIDRICK WILL
5 MAKE THE STAFF PRESENTATION FOR ARTICLE 6.2, AND I
6 BELIEVE KAORU CRUZ WILL BE MAKING THE PRESENTATION
7 FOR 6.4, AND THEN CHRIS WILL COME BACK AND DO
8 ARTICLE 7.0. I MAY BE WRONG ON THAT, BUT THAT'S
9 MY INDICATION.

10 WITH THAT, I'LL TURN IT OVER TO
11 CHRIS.

12 MR. DEIDRICK: GOOD MORNING, CHAIRMAN
13 CHESBRO, COMMITTEE MEMBERS. FOR THE RECORD MY
14 NAME IS CHRIS DEIDRICK, AND I REPRESENT THE
15 BOARD'S OFFICE OF LOCAL ASSISTANCE.

16 THIS MORNING I WILL PRESENT FOR YOUR
17 CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION
18 AND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE SOURCE REDUCTION
19 AND RECYCLING ELEMENT REGULATIONS.

20 THESE REGULATIONS ARE IN TITLE 14,
21 CALIFORNIA CODES OF REGULATIONS, DIVISION 7,
22 CHAPTER 9, ARTICLE 6.2, SECTIONS 18730 THROUGH
23 18748.

24 A BIT OF HISTORY ON THE DEVELOPMENT
25 OF THESE REGULATIONS. IN 1993 ASSEMBLY BILL 440

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 AMENDED SECTION 40502. THIS AMENDMENT IN PART
2 REQUIRED THE BOARD TO ADOPT EMERGENCY REGULATIONS
3 REGARDING CITY, COUNTY, AND REGIONAL AGENCY SOURCE
4 REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENTS. THESE EMERGENCY
5 REGULATIONS HAD TO BE FILED WITH THE OFFICE OF
6 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW BY DECEMBER 31, 1993, AND
7 REMAIN IN EFFECT FOR NO LONGER THAN THREE YEARS
8 FROM THE DATE OF ADOPTION.

9 ON JANUARY 3, 1994, THE BOARD FILED
10 AN AMENDMENT TO THE SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING
11 ELEMENT REGULATIONS WITH THE OFFICE OF
12 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW. ON THE SAME DATE THE
13 EMERGENCY REGULATIONS BECAME OPERATIVE.

14 THE BOARD NOW HAS UNTIL JANUARY 4,
15 1997, TO ADOPT PERMANENT REGULATIONS AND SUBMIT A
16 CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE TO THE OFFICE OF
17 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW, OR THE EMERGENCY LANGUAGE IN
18 THESE REGULATIONS WILL BE REPEALED.

19 THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW
20 PROCEDURES FOR DEVELOPING REGULATIONS REQUIRE A
21 45-DAY PUBLIC REVIEW AND PUBLIC HEARING, IF
22 REQUESTED. THE 45-DAY PUBLIC REVIEW FOR AMENDMENT
23 TO THE SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT
24 REGULATIONS ENDED ON OCTOBER 28, 1996. THE BOARD
25 STAFF HELD ONE PUBLIC HEARING ON NOVEMBER 4, 1996.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 DURING THE PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD, SIX
2 COMMENT LETTERS WERE RECEIVED AND ONE PERSON
3 PRESENTED COMMENTS AT THE PUBLIC HEARING. THESE
4 COMMENT LETTERS INCLUDED THREE GENERAL COMMENTS
5 AND NINE SPECIFIC COMMENTS. MOST OF THE COMMENTS
6 WERE OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS
7 OR WOULD REQUIRE A LEGISLATIVE CHANGE TO TAKE
8 ACTION.

9 THE FOLLOWING IS A SUMMARY OF THE
10 COMMENTS RECEIVED: THE CITY OF FORTUNA THINKS
11 THAT SECTION 18730 SHOULD INCLUDE PROVISIONS THAT
12 JURISDICTIONS WHICH MEET THEIR GOALS NOT BE
13 REQUIRED TO DO ADDITIONAL REPORTING AND THAT THE
14 DEFINITION OF FUNDED OR OPERATED BY A JURISDICTION
15 OR LOCAL GOVERNING BODY BE EXPANDED TO INCLUDE
16 PROGRAMS PROMOTED BY A JURISDICTION. BOTH OF
17 THESE RECOMMENDATIONS WOULD REQUIRE LEGISLATIVE
18 CHANGE PRIOR TO REGULATORY CHANGE.

19 THE OJAI VALLEY SANITARY DISTRICT
20 MADE SEVERAL SUGGESTIONS TO STREAMLINE THE
21 REGULATIONS. ALL OF THESE SUGGESTIONS, ALTHOUGH
22 WORTHY OF CONSIDERATION, ARE OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF
23 THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS.

24 THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO APPRECIATED
25 THE OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 AMENDMENTS TO THESE REGULATIONS. THE DIRECTOR OF
2 THE CITY STATED THAT HIS COMMENTS HAD ALREADY BEEN
3 INSERTED; THAT IS, THERE WAS AN INFORMAL COMMENT
4 PERIOD EARLIER TO THE FORMAL COMMENT PERIOD, AND
5 CHANGES THAT HE SUGGESTED IN A WRITTEN
6 CORRESPONDENCE WERE PUT IN THE PROPOSED TEXT.

7 THE CITY OF OAKLAND OBJECTED TO THE
8 DELETION OF THE TERM "OR" IN SECTION 18733.6(C).
9 THIS IS ON PAGE 629. AND THE DELETION OF OR --
10 LET ME STRIKE THAT -- THE DELETION OF "OR" WAS NOT
11 INTENTIONALLY DELETED BY BOARD STAFF; THEREFORE,
12 IN THE FINAL VERSION WE REPLACE "OR." THIS SHOULD
13 HAVE NO EFFECT AS FAR AS CAUSING AN ADDITIONAL
14 15-DAY COMMENT PERIOD.

15 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: IT'S NICE TO KNOW
16 SOMEBODY OUT THERE WAS READING THEM REAL
17 CAREFULLY.

18 MR. DEIDRICK: CALIFORNIANS AGAINST WASTE
19 OBJECTED TO THE REPLACEMENT OF DISPOSAL WITH THE
20 TERMS "DISPOSAL" AND "TRANSFORMATION" IN SECTION
21 18731(B). THIS IS FOUND ON PAGE 6.23. AND THE
22 DELETION OF LANDFILL AND THE ADDITION OF
DISPOSAL

23 IN SECTION 18733.6(A)(2). AND THIS IS ON PAGE
24 6.28.

25 THE POLICY DIRECTOR OF

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

CALIFORNIANS

1 AGAINST WASTE STATED THAT THIS WAS IN CONFLICT
2 WITH THE DEFINITION OF DISPOSAL AS PRESENTED IN
3 PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 40192. THE POLICY
4 DIRECTOR, STAFF BELIEVES, IS CORRECT, AND THE TEXT
5 IN THESE SECTIONS WILL BE REVERTED BACK TO THE
6 ORIGINAL VERSION.

7 THE REGIONAL COUNCIL OF RURAL
8 COUNTIES MADE SEVERAL SUGGESTIONS ON HOW TO
9 STREAMLINE THESE PLANNING REGULATIONS. THESE
10 COMMENTS WERE OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE PROPOSED
11 REGULATIONS AND WOULD, IN MANY CASES, REQUIRE
12 LEGISLATIVE CHANGE. THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
STATED

13 THAT HER ORGANIZATION WOULD BE WILLING TO
ASSIST
14 THE BOARD IN MAKING FUTURE LEGISLATIVE CHANGE
THAT
15 WOULD STREAMLINE THESE REGULATIONS.

16 AND FINALLY, THE FLANNIGAN LAW
FIRM
17 REPRESENTING THE INSTITUTE OF SCRAP RECYCLING
18 INDUSTRIES IS CONCERNED THAT THE PROPOSED
19 REGULATIONS WILL GIVE JURISDICTIONS THE
IMPRESSION

20 THAT SCRAP RECYCLING INDUSTRY MUST COMPLY
WITH

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

21 THESE REGULATIONS. 18 -- SECTION 18732(A)
WAS
22 SPECIFICALLY CITED IN THEIR COMMENTS AS
SECTIONS
23 THAT MAY LEAD TO THIS IMPRESSION. SINCE THE
24 COMMENTS MADE BY THE INSTITUTE WERE OUTSIDE
OF THE
25 SCOPE OF THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS, NO CHANGES
WERE

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 MATERIALS, HOWEVER YOU CHARACTERIZE THEM,
2 DEPENDING ON HOW THEY'RE USED, ARE EITHER DISPOSED
3 OR DIVERTED. AND THERE'S NO METHOD FOR SAYING --
4 THERE'S NO WAY TO IDENTIFY SOLID WASTE MATERIAL
5 TYPES SEPARATELY IN THAT REGARD.

6 SO IT'S A CONSISTENT THEME THAT
7 THEY'VE RAISED, AND WE, I THINK, HAVE TRIED TO BE
8 AS RESPONSIVE AS POSSIBLE TO NOT SAY MORE THAN
9 WE'RE REQUIRED TO UNDER STATUTE SO THAT WE'RE NOT
10 GIVING THE WRONG IMPLICATION. AND I THINK WE VERY
11 CLEARLY INDICATED WE'RE NOT TRYING TO REGULATE THE
12 SCRAP INDUSTRY OR RECYCLERS, BUT THIS IS BASICALLY
13 THE SIMILAR COMMENT THEY MADE.

14 THESE REGULATIONS DON'T REQUIRE --
15 THESE REGULATIONS, THE ONE THAT THEY'VE CITED
16 SPECIFICALLY IS NOT SOLID WASTE GENERATION
17 ANALYSIS IN THE SRRE DONE BY A CITY OR A COUNTY.
18 SO TO THE EXTENT THE PERSON IS SAYING THEY'RE NOT
19 SURE WHAT THEIR POINT IS, THEIR COMMENTS ARE NOT
20 REALLY SPECIFIC TO THESE REGS. THEY WERE MAKING A
21 BROADER PHILOSOPHICAL COMMENT ON DIVERSION.

22 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: OKAY. THANKS.

23 MR. DEIDRICK: AND TO FOLLOW UP ON
THAT,

24 I DID TALK WITH THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE
25 FLANNIGAN LAW FIRM YESTERDAY, AND I TOLD HER

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

THAT

1 WE WEREN'T GOING TO MAKE ANY CHANGES BASED ON
2 THEIR COMMENTS. AND SHE SAID THEY EXPECTED SO,
3 BUT THEY JUST WANTED IT TO BE ON THE RECORD THAT
4 THEY SHOULDN'T BE REGULATED ANY MORE THAN THEY
5 CURRENTLY ARE BASED ON THE AMENDMENTS TO THIS
6 ARTICLE.

7 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: WELL, I GUESS THERE'S
8 BEEN SOME CASES WHERE LOCAL JURISDICTIONS HAVE
9 GONE FURTHER THAN WE REQUIRED THEM TO. I KNOW
10 I'VE BEEN APPROACHED IN THE PAST -- I'M SURE I'VE
11 REPORTED THESE AS EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS -- ABOUT
12 TRYING TO GET THE BOARD TO MORE ACTIVELY INTERVENE
13 IN -- YOU KNOW, WITH LOCAL JURISDICTIONS AS TO
14 WHAT THEY SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT DO.

15 AND I INDICATED AT THAT TIME THAT
16 THAT'S PRETTY CONTRARY TO THE UNDERLYING PREMISE
17 OF AB 939, WHICH IS HOW -- WHAT TOOLS LOCAL
18 GOVERNMENTS CHOOSE TO USE IS PRETTY MUCH UP TO
19 THEM. WE'RE NOT REQUIRING THEM TO DO THINGS THAT
20 ISRI WOULDN'T LIKE, BUT WE ALSO -- IT'S UP TO THEM
21 TO TRY AND CONVINCING THE LOCAL JURISDICTION TO
22 VOLUNTARILY NOT DO THOSE THINGS IF THEY SO CHOOSE
23 OR NOT.

24 SO I THINK THERE IS SOME FRUSTRATION
25 WITH SOME OF THE WAYS SOME OF THESE HAVE BEEN

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 APPLIED AT THE LOCAL LEVEL BY LOCAL JURISDICTIONS.

2 MR. DEIDRICK: OKAY. THAT CONCLUDED THE
3 SUMMARY ON THE COMMENTS RECEIVED. WHAT I'D LIKE
4 TO DO IS JUST TOUCH ON WHERE WE'RE AT WITH THE
5 ADOPTION OF THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION.

6 THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
7 ACT OR CEQA REQUIRES THAT POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL
8 IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH AMENDMENT AND
9 IMPLEMENTATION OF THESE REGULATIONS BE ASSESSED
10 WITH THE SCOPE OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.

11 STAFF PREPARED AN INITIAL STUDY AND
12 PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND FILED IT WITH
13 THE STATE CLEARINGHOUSE FOR PUBLIC CIRCULATION ON
14 NOVEMBER 3, 1996. THE CLEARING -- THE STATE --
15 THE CEQA PUBLIC NOTICE WAS PUBLISHED IN THE "LOS
16 ANGELES TIMES," THE "SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE," AND
17 "SACRAMENTO BEE" ON OCTOBER 4, 1996.

18 THE REVIEW PERIOD FOR CEQA CLOSED ON
19 NOVEMBER 4, 1996. BOARD STAFF RECEIVED NO
20 COMMENTS DURING THIS REVIEW PERIOD. IN ADDITION,
21 THE STATE CLEARINGHOUSE HAS ACKNOWLEDGED THAT THE
22 BOARD HAS COMPLIED WITH THE STATE CLEARINGHOUSE
23 REVIEW REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL
24 DOCUMENTS.

25 BASED ON THE COMMENTS RECEIVED,

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE
2 ADOPTION OF THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION, STATE
3 CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 96-102008 AND THE PROPOSED
4 AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE 6.2 AND FORWARD THEM TO THE
5 FULL BOARD FOR CONSIDERATION.

6 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: OKAY. ARE THERE
7 FURTHER QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE
8 COMMITTEE?

9 MEMBER FRAZEE: DOES THAT -- THAT TAKES
10 TWO VOTES, I BELIEVE, ONE ON THE NEGATIVE DEC AND
11 ONE ON THE APPROVAL OF THE REGULATIONS.

12 MS. FRIEDMAN: THAT'S CORRECT.

13 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I'LL ENTERTAIN A
14 MOTION THEN TO ACCEPT STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND
15 APPROVE THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE PROPOSED
16 AMENDMENTS TO THESE REGULATIONS.

17 MEMBER GOTCH: SO MOVED.

18 MEMBER FRAZEE: SECOND.

19 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND
20 SECONDED. WE'LL SUBSTITUTE THE PRIOR ROLL CALL.
21 MOTION CARRIES THREE ZERO.

22 AND THEN I'LL ENTERTAIN A MOTION TO
23 APPROVE THE REGULATIONS THEMSELVES AND FORWARD
24 THEM TO THE BOARD.

25 MEMBER GOTCH: SO MOVED.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 MEMBER FRAZEE: SECOND.

2 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: WE'LL SUBSTITUTE THE
3 PRIOR CALL. MOTION PASSES THREE TO ZERO.

4 AND THE NEXT ITEM IS ITEM 22, WHICH
5 IS THE CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF THE NEGATIVE
6 DECLARATION AND PROPOSED NONDISPOSAL FACILITY
7 ELEMENT REGULATIONS.

8 MS. CRUZ: GOOD MORNING, CHAIRMAN CHESBRO
9 AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS. I'M KAORU CRUZ OF THE
10 BOARD'S OFFICE OF LOCAL ASSISTANCE.

11 THIS MORNING I WILL PRESENT FOR YOUR
12 CONSIDERATION THE ADOPTION OF THE NEGATIVE
13 DECLARATION AND PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE
14 NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT REGULATIONS.

15 THESE REGULATIONS ARE IN
CALIFORNIA

16 CODE OF REGULATIONS TITLE 14, DIVISION 7,
CHAPTER

17 9, ARTICLE 6.4, SECTIONS 18752 THROUGH
18750.5.

18 AS STATED IN AGENDA ITEM NO. 21,
IN

19 ORDER TO COMPLY WITH STATUTE, THE BOARD FILED
AN

20 AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 6.4 WITH THE OFFICE OF
21 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW ON JANUARY 3, 1994. THE

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

BOARD

22 NOW HAS UNTIL JANUARY 4, 1997, TO ADOPT THE
23 PERMANENT REGULATIONS AND SUBMIT A CERTIFICATE
OF
24 COMPLIANCE TO THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW
OR
25 EMERGENCY LANGUAGE IN THESE REGULATIONS WILL
BE

1 REPEALED.

2 THE 45-DAY PUBLIC REVIEW FOR THE
3 AMENDMENTS TO THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT
4 REGULATION ENDED ON OCTOBER 28, 1996. BOARD STAFF
5 HELD ONE PUBLIC HEARING ON NOVEMBER 4, 1996.
6 DURING THE PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD, TWO COMMENT
7 LETTERS WERE RECEIVED, AND NO ONE PRESENTED
8 COMMENTS AT THE PUBLIC HEARING ON THESE PROPOSED
9 AMENDMENT.

10 THESE COMMENT LETTERS INCLUDE ONE
11 GENERAL COMMENT AND ONE SPECIFIC COMMENT. THE
12 FOLLOWING IS THE SUMMARY OF THE COMMENT RECEIVED.
13 THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO APPRECIATED THE OPPORTUNITY
14 TO COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THESE
15 REGULATIONS. THE DIRECTOR OF THE CITY STATED THAT
16 HIS COMMENTS DURING AN INFORMAL COMMENT PERIOD
17 HAVE BEEN INCORPORATED INTO THE CURRENT PROPOSED
18 TEXT.

19 THE CALIFORNIA TRADE AND COMMERCE
20 AGENCY REGULATION REVIEW UNIT COMMENTED ON THE
21 TERMINOLOGY USED IN SECTION 18752(D) AND 18753.5.
22 THROUGHOUT THE TEXT THE TERMINOLOGY "CITY OR
23 COUNTY" HAS BEEN REPLACED WITH "JURISDICTION."
24 HOWEVER, IN SECTION 18752(D) AND 18753.5, THE
25 TERMINOLOGY "CITY OR COUNTY" WAS INADVERTENTLY

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 USED INSTEAD OF "JURISDICTION."

2 STAFF HAS DETERMINED THAT IT WAS A
3 CRITICAL MISTAKE AND CHANGING THE TERMINOLOGY
4 "CITY OR COUNTY" TO "JURISDICTION" DOES NOT HAVE
5 ANY SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE AFFECTED PARTIES.

6 THIS CONCLUDES THE UPDATE OF THE
7 COMMENTS RECEIVED FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
8 THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY REGULATIONS.

9 NEXT I WILL PROVIDE AN UPDATE ON
10 ADOPTING THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE PROPOSED
11 REGULATION. THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
12 ACT OR CEQA REQUIRES POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL
13 IMPACT ASSOCIATED WITH AMENDMENT AND IMPLEMEN-
14 TATION OF THESE REGULATIONS BE ASSESSED WITHIN THE
15 SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.

16 STAFF PREPARED AN INITIAL STUDY AND
17 PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND FILED IT WITH
18 THE STATE CLEARINGHOUSE FOR PUBLIC CIRCULATION ON
19 OCTOBER 3, 1993. THE CEQA PUBLIC NOTICE WAS
20 PUBLISHED IN THE "LOS ANGELES TIMES," "SAN
21 FRANCISCO CHRONICLE," AND "SACRAMENTO BEE" ON
22 OCTOBER 4, 1996.

23 THE REVIEW PERIOD FOR CEQA CLOSED ON
24 NOVEMBER 4, 1996. BOARD DID NOT RECEIVE COMMENT
25 DURING THESE REVIEW PERIOD. IN ADDITION, THE

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 STATE CLEARINGHOUSE HAS ACKNOWLEDGED THAT THE
2 BOARD HAS COMPLIED WITH THE STATE CLEARING REVIEW
3 REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.

4 BASED ON THE COMMENTS RECEIVED,
5 STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE COMMITTEE RECOMMEND
6 ADOPTION OF NEGATIVE DECLARATION, STATE
7 CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 96-102009, AND PROPOSED
8 AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE 6.4 AND FORWARD THEM TO THE
9 FULL BOARD. DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS?

10 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: QUESTIONS?

11 MEMBER GOTCH: NO QUESTIONS.

12 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: HEARING NO QUESTIONS,
13 THE MOTION WOULD BE TO ACCEPT STAFF RECOMMENDATION
14 AND APPROVE THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE
15 NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT REGULATIONS.

16 MEMBER FRAZEE: SO MOVED.

17 MEMBER GOTCH: SECOND.

18 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND
19 SECONDED. WE'LL SUBSTITUTE THE PRIOR ROLL CALL.

20 THE MOTION I WOULD ENTERTAIN WOULD
21 BE TO ADOPT THE PROPOSED NONDISPOSAL FACILITY
22 ELEMENT REGULATIONS AND FORWARD THEM TO THE BOARD.

23 MEMBER GOTCH: SO MOVED.

24 MEMBER FRAZEE: SECOND.

25 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: IT'S MOVED AND

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 SECONDED. SUBSTITUTE THE PRIOR CALL. THE MOTION
2 CARRIES THREE TO ZERO.

3 AND WE'LL MOVE ON TO ITEM 23, WHICH
4 IS CONSIDERATION OF THE ADOPTION OF THE NEGATIVE
5 DECLARATION AND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE ARTICLE
6 7.0 REGULATIONS. MR. DEIDRICK.

7 MR. DEIDRICK: MR. CHESBRO, COMMITTEE
8 MEMBERS, FOR THE RECORD, MY NAME IS CHRIS DEIDRICK
9 WITH THE BOARD'S OFFICE OF LOCAL ASSISTANCE.

10 THIS ITEM IS FOR CONSIDERATION OF
11 ADOPTION OF THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND PROPOSED
12 AMENDMENTS TO THE PROCEDURES FOR PREPARING AND
13 REVISING CITY, COUNTY, AND REGIONAL AGENCY SOURCE
14 REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENTS, HOUSEHOLD
15 HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENTS, AND NONDISPOSAL FACILITY
16 ELEMENTS. THESE REGULATIONS CAN OR ARE FOUND IN
17 TITLE 14 OF THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS,
18 DIVISION 7, CHAPTER 9, ARTICLE 7.0, SECTIONS 18760
19 THROUGH 18775,4.

20 AS STATED IN AGENDA ITEM NO. 21, IN
21 ORDER TO COMPLY WITH STATUTE, THE BOARD FILED AN
22 AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 7.0 WITH THE OFFICE OF
23 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW ON JANUARY 3, 1994. THE BOARD
24 HAS UNTIL JANUARY 4, 1997, TO ADOPT PERMANENT
25 REGULATIONS AND SUBMIT A CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 TO THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW OR THE
2 EMERGENCY LANGUAGE IN THESE REGULATIONS WILL BE
3 REPEALED.

4 THE 45-DAY COMMENT PERIOD FOR THE
5 AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE 7 ENDED ON OCTOBER 28, 1996.
6 BOARD STAFF HELD ONE PUBLIC HEARING ON NOVEMBER 4,
7 1996. DURING THE PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD, THREE
8 COMMENT LETTERS WERE RECEIVED, AND ONE PERSON
9 PRESENTED COMMENTS AT THE PUBLIC HEARING.

10 WHAT FOLLOWS ARE -- IS A SUMMARY OF
11 THE COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE PUBLIC REVIEW
12 PERIOD. THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO, AS THEY DID IN
13 ITEMS 21 AND 22, APPRECIATED THE OPPORTUNITY TO
14 COMMENT ON THESE REGULATIONS AND WERE SATISFIED
15 WITH THE FINAL PROPOSAL.

16 THE WEST CONTRA COSTA INTEGRATED
17 WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY MADE FOUR SPECIFIC
18 COMMENTS ON THE AMENDED REGULATIONS. THREE OF
19 THESE COMMENTS WERE OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE
20 PROPOSED REGULATIONS. ONE COMMENT ON THE
21 COMPOSITION OF REGIONAL AGENCY IS ALREADY
INCLUDED

22 IN THE AMENDED TEXT. THEY MUST HAVE NOT SEEN
23 THAT, AND SO I BELIEVE THAT COMMENT WAS ANSWERED.

24 THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO WASTE
25 SYSTEMS DIVISION HAD COMMENTS ON SECTION

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 18775(A)(2). THE COUNTY'S CONCERNED THAT IT DOES
2 NOT QUALIFY FOR DIVERSION RATE REDUCTION UNDER
3 THIS REQUIREMENT. THIS COMMENT IS OUTSIDE THE
4 SCOPE OF THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS. HOWEVER, I
5 SPOKE WITH THE PERSON THAT MADE THE COMMENTS, AND
6 STAFF WILL BE WORKING WITH HIM IN THE NEAR FUTURE.

7 FINALLY, THE CALIFORNIA WASTE
8 ASSOCIATION OR ASSOCIATES PRESENTED SEVERAL
9 COMMENTS. FIVE OF THE COMMENTS WERE OUTSIDE THE
10 SCOPE OF THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS. FOUR OF THE
11 COMMENTS CONCERNED PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT. THE
12 COMMENTER'S CONCERN ON THESE CHANGES WILL BE
13 ADDRESSED IN THE FINAL RULEMAKING FILE. I SPOKE
14 WITH THE COMMENTER ON THE PHONE, AND HE WAS
15 SATISFIED WITH THIS.

16 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: SO THERE WEREN'T ANY
17 ISSUES RAISED ON THAT LIST THAT WERE SUBSTANTIVE?

18 MR. DEIDRICK: NO. MOST OF THEM WERE
19 CLERICAL IN NATURE. ACTUALLY SOME WERE PRETTY
20 GOOD AS FAR AS MAKING THE LANGUAGE MORE
21 UNDERSTANDABLE OR READABLE. BUT AS I TOLD HIM,
22 SINCE WE'RE IN THIS TIME CRUNCH TO GET THESE
23 EMERGENCY REGULATIONS ADOPTED AS PERMANENT
24 REGULATIONS, THAT WE WOULD KEEP HIS INFORMATION
ON
25 FILE. AND IF THERE ARE FURTHER CHANGES TO THIS

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 ARTICLE, WE WILL THEN CONSIDER THEM.

2 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: THEY DIDN'T HAVE
3 SUBSTANTIAL ENOUGH POLICY IMPLICATIONS TO WARRANT
4 CHANGES AND CHANGING THE SCHEDULE?

5 MR. DEIDRICK: NO, THEY DIDN'T.

6 NEXT I'D LIKE TO ONCE AGAIN GO
7 THROUGH THE CEQA ADOPTION PROCESS. THE CEQA
8 REQUIRES POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
ASSOCIATED

9 WITH AMENDMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THESE
10 REGULATIONS BE ASSESSED WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE
11 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT. STAFF PREPARED AN
INITIAL

12 AND PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION -- LET ME CHECK
13 THAT -- AN INITIAL STUDY AND A PROPOSED NEGATIVE
14 DECLARATION AND FILED IT WITH THE STATE
15 CLEARINGHOUSE FOR PUBLIC CIRCULATION ON OCTOBER
16 3,
17 1996.

18 THE CEQA PUBLIC NOTICE WAS
PUBLISHED

19 IN THE "LOS ANGELES TIMES," "SAN FRANCISCO
20 CHRONICLE," AND "SACRAMENTO BEE" ON OCTOBER 4,
21 1996. THE REVIEW PERIOD FOR CEQA CLOSED NOVEMBER
22 4, 1996.

BOARD STAFF RECEIVED NO COMMENTS

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

23 DURING THIS REVIEW PERIOD. IN ADDITION, THE
STATE

24 CLEARINGHOUSE HAS ACKNOWLEDGED THAT THE BOARD HAS
25 COMPLIED WITH STATE CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW

1 REQUIREMENTS.

2 BEFORE I MAKE MY STAFF RECOMMEN-
3 DATION, I'D LIKE TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE HELP THAT THE
4 REGULATION UNIT PROVIDED IN GETTING THESE THREE
5 ARTICLES THROUGH THE SYSTEM. THE -- DAVID JUDD
6 WAS A BIG HELP AND CHRIS PECK. I THINK WITHOUT
7 THEM IT WOULDN'T HAVE RUN AS SMOOTHLY.

8 FOR STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION, BASED ON
9 THE COMMENTS RECEIVED, WE RECOMMEND THAT THE
10 COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE ADOPTION OF THE NEGATIVE
11 DECLARATION, STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 96-102010,
12 AND THE ADOPTION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO
13 ARTICLE 7.0 AND FORWARD THEM TO THE FULL BOARD.

14 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: OKAY. ARE THERE ANY
15 QUESTIONS? COMMENTS? IF NOT, I WILL ENTERTAIN
16 THE FIRST MOTION TO ACCEPT AND APPROVE THE
17 NEGATIVE DECLARATION ON THE PROPOSED ARTICLE 7.0
18 REGULATIONS AMENDMENTS.

19 MEMBER GOTCH: SO MOVED.

20 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND
21 SECONDED. WE'LL SUBSTITUTE THE PRIOR ROLL CALL.

22 AND THE NEXT MOTION I WILL ENTERTAIN
23 WILL BE TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS AND
24 FORWARD THEM TO THE FULL BOARD AT THIS MONTH'S
25 REGULAR MEETING.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: SO MOVED.

2 MEMBER FRAZEE: SECOND.

3 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND
4 SECONDED. WE WILL SUBSTITUTE THE PRIOR ROLL CALL.
5 MOTION CARRIES THREE ZERO. AND THANK YOU VERY
6 MUCH.

7 AND UNLESS ANYBODY HAS ANY OTHER
8 COMMENTS TO MAKE, THAT'S A WRAP.

9

10 (END OF PROCEEDINGS AT 10:45 A.M)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

