

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

COMMITTEE MEETING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD
SUSTAINABILITY AND MARKET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

JOE SERNA, JR., CALEPA BUILDING
1001 I STREET
2ND FLOOR
COASTAL HEARING ROOM
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, JULY 8, 2004
1:30 P.M.

TIFFANY C. KRAFT, CSR, RPR
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
LICENSE NUMBER 12277

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

APPEARANCES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Michael Papanian, Chair

Rosario Marin

Rosalie Mul

STAFF

Mark Leary, Executive Director

Julie Nauman, Chief Deputy Director

Elliot Block, Staff Counsel

Marshalle Graham, Staff

Susan Kumpulainen, Committee Secretary

Dassi Pintar, Staff

Kyle Pogue, Staff

Pat Schiavo, Deputy Director, DPLA

Jill Simmons, Staff

Tabetha Willmon, Staff

Patty Wohl, Deputy Director, Waste Prevention and Market
Development

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

INDEX

	PAGE
Roll Call And Declaration Of Quorum	3
A. Waste Prevention And Market Development Deputy Director's Report	3
B. Consideration Of Application To Renew The Los Angeles County Recycling Market Development Zone Designation	9
Motion	15
Vote	15
C. Diversion, Planning And Local Assistance Deputy Director's Report	16
D. Consideration Of The 2001/2002 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The Following Jurisdictions (First Of Three Items): Fresno County: Clovis, Coalinga, Fowler, Orange Cove, Parlier, Reedley, Sanger; Glenn County: Glenn County Waste Management Regional Agency; Humboldt County: Blue Lake, Humboldt-Unincorporated; Imperial County: El Centro; Kern County: Kern-Unincorporated, Maricopa, Ridgecrest, Shafter, Taft, Tehachapi, Wasco; Los Angeles County: Rolling Hills Estates; Modoc County: Alturas, Modoc-Unincorporated; Mono County: Mono-Unincorporated; Monterey County: Carmel-By-The-Sea, King City, Marina, Monterey, Pacific Grove, Salinas; Nevada County: Nevada City; Orange County: Fountain Valley, Placentia, Villa Park, Westminster, Yorba Linda; Riverside County: Canyon Lake; San Bernardino County: Barstow, Big Bear Lake; San Joaquin County: Lathrop; San Luis Obispo County: San Luis Obispo County Integrated Waste Management Authority; Santa Barbara County: Lompoc, Santa Barbara-Unincorporated, Santa Maria, Solvang; Santa Cruz County: Scotts Valley, Watsonville; Shasta County: Shasta County Waste Management Agency; Siskiyou County: Siskiyou County Integrated Solid Waste Management Regional Agency; Trinity County: Trinity-Unincorporated; Yolo County: West Sacramento, Yolo-Unincorporated	22
Motion	26
Vote	26

INDEX CONTINUED

	PAGE
E. Consideration Of The 2001/2002 Biennial Review 1	22
Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The Following Jurisdictions (Second Of Three Items) : Monterey County: Del Rey Oaks; San Diego County: Solana Beach; Santa Barbara County: Santa Barbara; Santa Cruz County: Capitola, Santa Cruz	
Motion	26
Vote	27
F. Consideration Of The 2001/2002 Biennial Review	22
Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The Following Jurisdictions (Third Of Three Items): Alameda County: Berkeley; Contra Costa County: Contra Costa/Ironhouse/Oakley Regional Agency; Kings County: Kings Waste and Recycling Authority; Orange County: Los Alamitos; San Mateo County: Burlingame; Santa Clara County: Gilroy	
Motion	27
Vote	27
G. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base	27
Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element; And Consideration Of The 2001/2002 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Lakeport	
Motion	30
Vote	30
H. Consideration Of The Adequacy Of The Five-Year	30
Review Report Of The Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan For The County Of Santa Clara	
I. Consideration Of The Amended Nondisposal	30
Facility Element For The City Of Sacramento, Sacramento County	
Motion	31
Vote	31

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

v

INDEX CONTINUED

	PAGE
J. Consideration Of The Use Of Extrapolated Methodologies In New Base-Year Generation Studies	31
Motion	45
Vote	45
K. Adjournment	45
L. Reporter's Certificate	46

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Welcome, everybody. This
3 is a meeting of the Sustainability and Market Development
4 Committee. I'm Mike Paparian, now Chairing this
5 Committee.

6 I'd like to welcome the new members of the
7 Committee -- actually, I'm new to this Committee as
8 well -- the new members of the Board: Rosalie Mulé to my
9 left, your right; and Rosario Marin to my right, your
10 left.

11 Thanks to the Governor's fine new appointments,
12 we're able to resume our Committee meetings. And there's
13 already been a couple of Board Committee meetings this
14 week. I think they've gone really well. I think it
15 speaks well to the Committee process.

16 Those of you who are familiar with the Committee
17 process know that we are able to get much of the work of
18 the Board done in Committees. Often, items are placed on
19 the consent calendar of the full Board. And we also have
20 the opportunity in the Committees to hear in some more
21 depth and discuss important policy issues, when there may
22 not be time to do so at a full Board meeting.

23 I like to support a very open, transparent
24 process. I encourage workshops and roundtables and forums
25 to gain additional input from stakeholders and the public

1 at large. In fact, this week I think we've had some very
2 successful workshops, one on tires yesterday and one on
3 C&D ordinances today, which I sat in briefly on.

4 I think Ms. Mulé -- you were there for most or
5 all of it.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Very good.

7 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: And I know Board Member
8 Peace was there as well.

9 As far as this Committee, we're working on issues
10 that fall under the purview of the Waste Prevention and
11 Market Development Division, headed by Ms. Patty Wohl; the
12 Diversion, Planning, and Local Assistance Division, headed
13 by Mr. Pat Schiavo; and we are also working on e-waste
14 issues which currently are within the e-waste group within
15 the Board, which is headed up by Shirley Willd-Wagner.

16 Next month, we will start our normal meeting day
17 and time. We're unusual this month because of the holiday
18 on Monday and various workshops that were being held. But
19 starting in August, our normal meeting time will be
20 Tuesday mornings at 9:30.

21 Before we begin, I'd like to remind you to turn
22 off your cell phones or put them on vibrate mode. The
23 speaker slips are at the back of the room. If you want to
24 speak on any issue, please fill out a speaker slip and
25 give it to Ms. Kumpulainen here in the front of the room.

1 I think before we start, we should have a roll
2 call.

3 SECRETARY KUMPULAINIEN: Marin?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARIN: Here.

5 SECRETARY KUMPULAINIEN: Mulé?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Present.

7 SECRETARY KUMPULAINIEN: Papanian?

8 CHAIRPERSON PAPANIAN: Here.

9 Do any of the members of the Committee have any
10 ex partes they need to report?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: I'm up to date.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARIN: Well, except that I just
13 came from the Briggs tire site. And I did meet with the
14 owner. I shook his hand and talked a little bit about
15 him -- not about him. I talked to him about his site and
16 his son, but I forgot the son's name.

17 CHAIRPERSON PAPANIAN: I think that should be
18 adequate for ex parte purposes.

19 I'm up to date.

20 Any other comments before we get started?

21 Okay. Ms. Wohl, I think you're up first.

22 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Good afternoon,
23 Mr. Papanian and Committee members. My name is Patty
24 Wohl. I'm with the Waste Prevention and Market
25 Development Division. It's been a busy month for Market

1 Development, and I have a couple of announcements and then
2 just a few items to share with you.

3 First being in regards to the interest rate
4 change. The RMDZ Loan Program interest rate is adjusted
5 semiannually, in January and July. The Board currently
6 uses the national prime rate as the percentage rate for
7 all loans. During the past six months, the interest rate
8 has been 4 percent. The prime rate increased to 4.25
9 percent on June 30th, and therefore, all RMDZ loans
10 between July 1st, 2004, and then December 31st will have
11 the new interest rate of 4.25 percent.

12 Secondly, also in the area of loans, I wanted to
13 announce that we are beginning to do loan servicing within
14 the RMDZ Loan Program. We purchased a software program,
15 and this August 1st will be the first payments that we'll
16 be doing that way. And we expect to be saving \$95,000
17 annually by taking this in-house. So it's a good
18 accomplishment. It's been a long time coming.

19 And then, lastly, in the loan area, we also are
20 going out to notice for the bulk loan sale. This was a
21 previously-approved Board item. It looks like we have
22 \$28.9 million worth of commercial loans, and that was made
23 public on Friday, July 2nd, 2004. So there's 52 loans.
24 We're putting them up for sale.

25 Prospective bidders need to submit initial

1 applications by July 30th, and then the final bid will be
2 decided on August 30th. And then we'll bring an agenda
3 item forward probably in November. So it's really just
4 kind of a proposal. We're putting it out there. If
5 people are interested in bidding, they can bid any number
6 of those loans, any combination. And then we come back
7 and talk to you about that. And the idea at the time was
8 some of the funds were dwindling, and it was an
9 opportunity to maybe infuse the loan program back with
10 some money. So just to tell you the initial stuff is
11 happening.

12 And then in regards to the Third Annual
13 Sustainability Conference, this is a green building
14 conference, about 250 building professionals, facilities
15 managers, university administrators, student leaders,
16 experts in their field, met to talk about a whole host of
17 things, including energy, water, materials, acoustics.

18 And I think the interesting thing to note is that
19 last year they had this conference, and the theme was kind
20 of, you know, more talking about what is green building
21 and should we build green? And this year it was clearly,
22 here's what we are doing. We are building green, and
23 here's what we're doing, and more talking about compelling
24 demonstrations of that effort. So it just shows how far
25 that program is moving along, and staff was a big part of

1 that.

2 And then I wanted to highlight the building and
3 buying green in Indian County. I sent this to all the
4 Board members with a memo. So this was an interagency
5 agreement with Humbolt State University. The guide covers
6 ten modules in there, including things like siting and
7 design, building materials, water efficiency, sustainable
8 landscaping, a whole host of those.

9 And this was originally a two-phase contract. It
10 was cut down to one phase to put the project together
11 because of limited funds at the time. So I think we'll be
12 bringing a proposal back for a contract concept for Phase
13 2. We did apply for a U.S. EPA grant to kind of roll this
14 out to the Indian community, and that did not get awarded.

15 So our proposal is -- you know, we want to get it
16 out. We already have contacts, people asking about it,
17 which is fine. We can deliver it. But we want to do kind
18 of a more formal delivery mechanism to get it to the right
19 people at the right time. So we're excited to announce
20 that.

21 And then, I think lastly, I want to talk about
22 the California Green Lodging Program. In June 2003, the
23 Board approved a contract with California State University
24 for \$30,000 to develop a green lodging program. There
25 were -- Phase 1 of that included developing a criteria,

1 surveying the hotel industry, developing a green lodging
2 guide, a website, and then kind of marketing that piece.

3 Well, as part of that survey, we became in touch
4 with a model hotel, the Triton. And it's located in
5 San Francisco. They are currently diverting 66 percent of
6 their waste. So they really are a great model hotel for
7 this program.

8 They are looking at rolling out two floors of eco
9 suites and possibly attaching celebrities to those eco
10 suites. We're in the phase of we've gotten the surveys
11 back, so we are looking at updating the DGS website and
12 then doing a press kind of event to roll out our Green
13 Lodging Program. It's geared towards state government,
14 but obviously we would want to, you know, allow the public
15 at large to also know that these are green hotels, if you
16 want to go there.

17 So we're kind of excited to work with this
18 company and maybe do some press events in tandem with
19 them. Maybe the first one to roll out our program, and
20 the second to attach to when they roll out their eco
21 suites so we can kind of do a double hit. We're kind of
22 looking at the end of August to see if we can get
23 everything done in conjunction with NRC, the National
24 Recycling Council. We're not sure about that. But
25 there's a conference going on there.

1 So that is about it. Are there any questions?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARIN: I have a couple of
3 questions. First of all, you know, for some reason -- I'm
4 probably not hearing right. So when you first talked
5 about the prime rate that our loans -- I thought you said
6 the crime rate. And I was like, the crime rate is
7 attached to the crime rate? Must be very down.

8 Anyway, what is eco suites? I didn't know
9 whether it was suites or sweeps.

10 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Suites. It's actually
11 their term. They have called their hotel "eco sheik." So
12 they have their own little name for it. And they are
13 calling them eco suites. And they are doing things like
14 they are not giving you individual shampoos. They have a
15 large container that they refill, so they save money that
16 way. They use recycled paper products. They use reuse.
17 They have cups and those kinds of things that are washed.
18 They have organic sheets and towels. And they use all of
19 the cleaning liquids and things that, you know, do not
20 have indoor air quality.

21 It's just sort of a term they've called them, eco
22 suites, and they're just rolling this out as a way to make
23 themselves unique from the rest of the hotel industry.
24 And we're hoping that with that, other hotels will follow
25 suit, because there will be a demand for people to get

1 this type of hotel room.

2 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Thank you. As usual,
3 you're doing some incredible stuff in that division.

4 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: So with that, I'll move
5 right into the agenda, then. And we have the first item,
6 and the only item for us, which is Consideration of the
7 Application to Renew the Los Angeles County Recycling
8 Market Development Zone Designation.

9 And Dassi Pintar will present.

10 MS. PINTAR: Good afternoon, Chairman Paparian
11 and Committee members. My name is Dassi Pintar, and I
12 work in the Board's Recycling Market Development Zone
13 Program.

14 I'm here to speak about the renewal of the L.A.
15 County Recycling Market Development Zone. The L.A. County
16 RMDZ is comprised of the entire unincorporated L.A.
17 County, as well as seven individual cities, including
18 Burbank, Carson, Commerce, El Monte, Glendale, South Gate,
19 and Vernon. The zone accounts for more than two-thirds of
20 the total area of the county of Los Angeles.

21 Los Angeles is the largest manufacturing center
22 in the nation. It has been described as the most
23 significant and diversified economic base in California.
24 For the last 10 years, the Los Angeles County Zone has
25 been administered by the L.A. County Community Development

1 Commission, or CDC. The CDC supports local economies in
2 L.A. County by promoting business growth and encouraging
3 job creation and retention through a variety of programs,
4 including commercial industrial lending, neighborhood
5 revitalization, incubators, redevelopment areas, and
6 economic incentives.

7 As of this month, the County has transferred the
8 responsibility for administering its RMDZ program to L.A.
9 County Public Works. Public Works will now have primary
10 responsibility for administering and promoting the L.A.
11 County RMDZ to local businesses and to other local
12 government entities within the county. The CDC will
13 continue to support county RMDZ businesses and the new
14 zone administrator through its various economic
15 development programs.

16 The business incentives offered by the L.A.
17 County zone include assistance with permits, siting,
18 finding feedstock, business plan evaluation, financing,
19 and a variety of other incentives specific to specific
20 areas. The L.A. County zone has generated more loans than
21 any other RMDZ, 19 in total to 15 different companies.
22 And the total dollar amount loaned to L.A. County RMDZ
23 businesses is approximately \$10 1/2 million.

24 Those loan recipients are currently diverting
25 just shy of 275,000 tons per year of plastics, green

1 waste, textiles, carpet, paper, tires, and wood from local
2 landfills. Two out of three businesses that received RMDZ
3 services actually received an RMDZ loan.

4 Just to give you a brief summary of some of the
5 companies that have benefited from the RMDZ program in
6 L.A. County, I thought I would highlight three specific
7 companies. The first is Three D Plastics or Three D
8 Traffic Works. This company is located in the city of
9 Burbank. They're a family-owned business that has been in
10 existence for more than 40 years. They make injection
11 molded plastic items and plastic traffic control equipment
12 of various sorts.

13 We have given them two loans. The first loan
14 helped them to purchase and construct equipment to mold
15 their own rubber bases for their traffic control equipment
16 out of crumb rubber. And that project diverted nearly
17 1,000 tons per year of crumb rubber.

18 The second loan was to purchase equipment to
19 expand their production of equipment made from recycled
20 polypropylene. That particular project diverted
21 approximately 1,750 tons per year of polypropylene. Three
22 D Traffic or Three D Plastics has become a supporter of
23 the Board, and they have participated in the Recycled
24 Content Products Trade Show.

25 The second company I'd like to talk about is

1 Barry Sandler Enterprise, or Sandler Brothers. This
2 company is located in unincorporated L.A. County just east
3 of downtown L.A. They make wiping clothes out of
4 post-consumer and post-industrial woven and non-woven
5 fiber. The loan they received from the RMDZ allowed them
6 to purchase real estate and greatly expand their
7 operation, which resulted in the additional diversion of
8 820 tons per year of textile.

9 And, finally, the first company I'd like to
10 highlight is Los Angeles Fiber Company, or L.A. Fiber.
11 This company is located in the city of Vernon. They've
12 evolved over the last decade from a recycler of
13 post-consumer and post-industrial textile to a recycler of
14 post-consumer carpet.

15 The fiber they produce from the textile and more
16 recently from the carpet is used to produce 100 percent
17 post-consumer carpet padding they make in one of their
18 other companies. According to their 2003 annual
19 reporting, they diverted 26,587 tons per year of fiber
20 from local landfills in '03. L.A. Fiber has also
21 participated in the RCP Trade Show for the last several
22 years.

23 Approval of the Los Angeles County's application
24 to renew their RMDZ for another ten years will allow them
25 to continue offering these services to recycling base

1 manufacturers and processors within their zone.

2 That concludes my presentation.

3 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Thank you.

4 Any questions?

5 Ms. Marin.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARIN: Mr. Chairman, one of the
7 things -- and I'm reading, and I'm certainly very
8 supportive of this effort. And I don't know whether it's
9 just my own desire, if you will. But when we do the
10 findings on the resolutions and we find they will not have
11 a significant impact on the region's environment, and a
12 couple of other times we specifically state that, would it
13 be possible to change it so that, in fact, it says that it
14 will have a positive impact? You see what I'm saying?

15 When we're looking at our own paperwork at the
16 bottom here on the second page, the program long-term
17 impacts. The continuation of this RMDZ will have a
18 positive impact on the diversion of waste material, job
19 creation, and the local economy. I'd much rather have the
20 positive.

21 I mean, this is fine. This is fine. But if
22 we're finding that, in fact, this is really good for the
23 environment, instead of saying that it's not going to have
24 a significant impact on the environment, I think we should
25 clearly state that this will have a positive impact. And

1 maybe it's just my preference, Mr. Chairman.

2 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Yeah. I think you have
3 some sympathy, but I think there's a policy and a legal
4 question. I think our legal staff perhaps --

5 STAFF COUNSEL BLOCK: Elliot Block with the Legal
6 Office.

7 Just quickly, there certainly isn't any reason we
8 couldn't look at adding some additional language. That
9 particular language is there for CEQA. It needs to be
10 phrased the way it is, because that's a requirement for a
11 negative declaration, is that we find there is no negative
12 impact.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARIN: I do understand that.
14 And I think it's a matter of instead of going on the
15 negative, I think -- this Board does great things, you
16 know. And if there is a finding that this is something
17 good, we should state it, and clearly and proudly.

18 But I'm fine, Mr. Chairman, if you're ready for a
19 motion.

20 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: I think there maybe
21 another question.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Actually, I just have a
23 comment.

24 I had the opportunity to attend the RMDZ Workshop
25 held a few weeks ago in San Francisco. And I just want to

1 share with my fellow Committee members, I am very
2 impressed with the work that our staff and the zone
3 administrators do around the state in terms of economic
4 development and environmental protection and marrying
5 those two concepts and being very successful at it.

6 One thing I would like to see, though, is I have
7 heard of many, many success stories while I was at the
8 workshop. And I would like to see us do a better job.
9 Kind of tying into what you were saying, is that we've got
10 all these success stories out there, and we need to get
11 the word out about all the good things and the
12 accomplishments we've made over the years. That's all. I
13 just wanted to share that.

14 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Thank you.

15 And thank you for including the examples. I
16 think that helps make some of these RMDZ items a little
17 more real.

18 So we have a Resolution 2004-200. It's moved by
19 Board Member Marin, seconded by Board Member Mulé.

20 Secretary please call the roll.

21 SECRETARY KUMPULAINIEN: Marin?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARIN: Aye.

23 SECRETARY KUMPULAINIEN: Mulé?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Aye.

25 SECRETARY KUMPULAINIEN: Papanian?

1 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Aye.

2 And I think that's a candidate for consent.

3 Boy, you got off easy this month. That's it,
4 huh.

5 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Wait until next month.

6 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Mr. Schiavo.

7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Pat Schiavo, Diversion
8 Planning, Local Assistance Division.

9 And as Mr. Paparian mentioned a little while ago,
10 we had a construction demolition workshop. And while I
11 can't name specific names, because there are too many
12 people involved, I want to thank all the staff for the
13 hard work and diligence. It was a long process and a lot
14 of work. So I hope everybody hears that.

15 Regarding our education efforts, education and
16 diversion, Board Member Marin and Washington were at
17 Desert Sands School last month to kick off the Compost
18 Program. I just want to mention the program kicked off to
19 a very successful start. It's about two tons in the first
20 month. That material will go back and get composted and
21 be spread out on the playing fields. So it's going to
22 have a useful purpose.

23 And, again, I'd like to thank Melissa Vargas,
24 Terri Gray, and Valorie Shatynski -- she's from the Office
25 of Environmental Education down in Southern California.

1 And her and our staff worked very closely together to make
2 this happen.

3 Regarding our 2003 district survey regarding the
4 status of diversion programs throughout the state, that
5 process is completed. We're working closely with the
6 information management branch to put it on our website.
7 We hope that will be up this month. And then we're going
8 to go through the process of e-mailing people, publicizing
9 it at different venues, workshops, via telephone, whatever
10 means we have. We're also going to put it in our info
11 cycling newsletter that goes out to all the jurisdictions
12 and interested parties. So that's gone really well.

13 Regarding our efforts, characterizing the waste
14 stream, the 2003/2004 efforts are just about completed.
15 The last surveys were completed in April. We're hoping
16 for the final report in September after all the edits and
17 so forth.

18 And regarding the new process, which the Board
19 just approved a couple of months ago, we met with the
20 contractor just a few days ago, and we're looking to kick
21 that off. And we're looking at the first surveys to be
22 taking place in December of this year. That study will be
23 more comprehensive in nature, because we're looking at
24 generator-based data. We're looking at material recovery
25 residues. We're looking at materials from construction

1 demolition, as well as self-haul. It's going to be very
2 comprehensive and probably 18 months until we get results
3 from that effort.

4 Now regarding the biennial review process. We
5 just recently sent out a notice to jurisdictions --
6 recently meaning this morning -- letting them know --
7 right up to date here -- letting them know that the
8 process will be delayed somewhat, just like the last
9 two years because we can't get all the adjustment factor
10 data we need to do the calculation of the numbers. It
11 seems like this is going to be a common pattern now into
12 the future. So as soon as we find out or get any
13 information from those other departments, we'll be sending
14 that out to local jurisdictions.

15 One other thing of note, in our efforts to
16 continue to streamline the effort in our reporting, we're
17 looking at -- essentially, it's going to be a one-button
18 effort for those jurisdictions whose programs have not
19 changed. They can just click a button. Everything is
20 transferred over. They don't have to do any work.
21 Calculations will be done for them. For those who need to
22 make edits, that will still be a little easier for them.
23 We're trying to save time for ourselves as well as the
24 locals so we can focus again on what the primary effort
25 needs to be, and that's program development.

1 And then regarding Item Number 9 that's in our
2 binders, that's going to be held. We're not going to
3 present that today. That will be at the full Board next
4 week.

5 Now I'd like to -- for Items 2, 3, and 4, I'd
6 like to do a few slides to just segue into that process.
7 Since this is our first Committee meeting, and this will
8 be the second time you've seen some of these items.

9 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
10 presented as follows.)

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Just a little bit of
12 the history of where we've come from and where we are.
13 1989, when the law was passed, we were at about 10 percent
14 diversion. And the yellow bar, which I think is the most
15 critical, shows you our disposal trend. And our disposal
16 trend has gone down every year for the most part, with a
17 few exceptions, until this last year in which we increased
18 by about 2 million tons, which is very important to note.
19 That seems to coincide with the big boom in construction
20 effort throughout the state. And so today's workshop
21 actually ended up being pretty timely looking at this.

22 And, again, it shows a lot of program success
23 when you think about how the population has grown and the
24 economic increases over those years. So it's been a very
25 successful effort on everybody's part. But we need to

1 focus on getting rid of those 2 million tons.

2 --o0o--

3 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Now as far as -- and
4 this is focusing more on jurisdiction performance related
5 to numbers. And if you look at the very bottom of the
6 table, it shows you those numbers, 464, 464, and it goes
7 down to 434 in 2002. That's not showing that
8 jurisdictions are seceding from the state. It means
9 they've regionalized, which is a good thing. The actual
10 total number of jurisdictions in the state is about 540.
11 But as a product of regionalization, we have about 434.

12 The bottom bar, the purple I guess you call it --
13 I'm not very good with colors -- shows we had 64
14 jurisdictions that were at 50 percent or above. We're
15 now -- in 2000, we're at 209.

16 The yellow bar decreased. That's a product of
17 more jurisdictions getting to 50 percent.

18 And the focus -- the very top bar, light blue,
19 green, whatever, 87, 88, 85 numbers, those represented
20 jurisdictions that had negative numbers. To have a
21 negative diversion number is not possible. You have to be
22 at a baseline of zero. And as a result, those
23 jurisdictions in 1995, 1996, and some in '97, they were
24 put on compliance orders to fix their numbers because they
25 were so unique. So they successfully went ahead and put

1 below 50 percent with their numbers. However, they were
2 doing an excellent job in program implementation.

3 And then you can see the remainder are some
4 jurisdictions that had reduced compliance or were put on
5 compliance orders. So that's for 2000.

6 --o0o--

7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: For 2002, this is a
8 very simple one. The Board has approved to date 14
9 percent of the jurisdictions as meeting the goals, and
10 there's 51 percent that are still under review. And then
11 35 percent or so that are still on time extensions that we
12 won't be hearing in this cycle.

13 So that concludes my presentation. Are there any
14 questions yet?

15 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Any questions on that?

16 Okay. Go ahead.

17 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: We will begin. We'll
18 combine Items 2, 3, and 4. And that is essentially
19 consideration of the 2001/2002 biennial review findings
20 for a lot of jurisdictions. I'm not going to name them
21 all.

22 And Tabetha Willmon will go ahead and make the
23 presentation for Items 2, 3, and 4.

24 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Just in case anybody is
25 tracking on the Committee agenda, it's Items D, E, and F

1 on the Committee agenda.

2 MS. WILLMON: Good afternoon, Chairman and
3 Committee members.

4 Staff have conducted their biennial reviews and
5 found that the jurisdictions in Items D and E have
6 achieved a 2002 diversion rate of at least 50 percent or
7 attainment of a reduced goal under a rural reduction and
8 are adequately implementing source reduction, recycling,
9 composting, public education, and information programs as
10 outlined in their source reduction and recycling element
11 and their household hazardous waste elements.

12 While the 2002 diversion rate still remains below
13 the 50 percent diversion requirement for the jurisdictions
14 in Item F, Board staff, in conducting their biennial
15 reviews, has determined that these jurisdictions are
16 continuing to make all reasonable and feasible efforts to
17 implement new and/or maintain their diversion programs.

18 Agenda Items D, E, and F list those jurisdictions
19 for which staff is recommending approval of the 2001 and
20 2002 biennial review. Should the Board not accept staff
21 recommendations, these jurisdictions have reserved the
22 right in their 2002 annual reports to submit an SB 1066
23 time extension or an alternative diversion requirement
24 request.

25 This concludes my presentation. Both Board staff

1 and representatives for some of the jurisdictions may be
2 available to answer questions.

3 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Any questions, Members?

4 Let me -- is this the first batch under the
5 abbreviated agenda item? Or am I confusing or forgetting
6 what the abbreviated agenda item was for?

7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Last month there were
8 60 jurisdictions that came forward.

9 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Under the abbreviated?

10 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Under the abbreviated.

11 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Would it be difficult in
12 the future on these to include some sort of summary table
13 about the jurisdiction and what their rates are?

14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay.

15 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: I know it's in the
16 attachments that are on line. There's a 250-page
17 attachment. I wouldn't mind seeing --

18 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Just the rates?

19 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: -- the jurisdictions and
20 what their rates are, or if it's changing, what the rates
21 have been the last couple of years, just to get a sense of
22 where these jurisdictions are. If it's a huge undertaking
23 to put together such a table, then we can talk about it.
24 Having a summary like that I would find helpful.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARIN: Or, Mr. Chairman, if

1 maybe just like the previous presenter where she
2 highlighted a couple of them. And I don't know whether
3 we -- if it was to be presented in some random -- so that
4 it wouldn't be all of the jurisdictions. After all, we're
5 talking about 500 or so total. Maybe a random sample,
6 would that -- I mean, if it's available for one, it should
7 be available for all of them. But I don't know that we
8 need every single detail. I know I don't need it.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: I think I understand
10 Mike's point here in that you're trying to look at
11 trending information, it sounds like. And so it would be
12 helpful to have some kind of a summary table, very brief,
13 very simple, but something that, you know, we can look at,
14 you know, all the jurisdictions in the item and just their
15 diversion rate for the last, what, three years or
16 something like. Is that what you're --

17 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: In the one attachment you
18 had the 2001 and 2002 rates for four jurisdictions.
19 Something like that. Again, if it's not too much
20 difficulty to put together.

21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: I want to get this
22 clear. Just the diversion rate table, and then how many
23 years out would you like? I just want to make sure we're
24 all in agreement, or you guys all are.

25 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: I think for the

1 jurisdictions like this, just a couple years is fine. If
2 you have some anomalies or something you need to bring to
3 our attention, that's, I think, a different situation.
4 But for the ones that are basically fine, I certainly find
5 useful having that information summarized and available.

6 So the first item, we need a motion on 2004-294.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Move approval.

8 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Moved by Board Member

9 Mulé.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARIN: Second.

11 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Seconded by Board Member

12 Marin.

13 Do you want to read all these jurisdictions?

14 Just kidding.

15 Would the secretary call the roll?

16 SECRETARY KUMPULAINIEN: Marin?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARIN: Aye.

18 SECRETARY KUMPULAINIEN: Mulé?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Aye.

20 SECRETARY KUMPULAINIEN: Papanian?

21 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Aye.

22 I think that's a candidate for consent.

23 So the next item is 2004-195.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Move.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARIN: Yes

1 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Also moved by Mulé,
2 seconded by Marin. Substitute the previous roll call
3 without objection. I think that's a candidate for consent
4 as well.

5 And then final item is 2004-196.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Move approval.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARIN: Second.

8 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Moved by Mulé, seconded by
9 Marin. Substitute the previous roll call, and again a
10 candidate for consent. And that covered all the
11 resolutions; correct?

12 Next item.

13 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Next item is G, or
14 Board Item 5, is Consideration of Request to Change the
15 Base Year to 2000 and the Biennial Review Findings for the
16 Source Reduction Recycling Element and Household Hazardous
17 Waste Element for the City of Lakeport in Lake County.

18 And Jill Simmons will present this item.

19 MS. SIMMONS: Good afternoon, Chairman and
20 Committee members.

21 Before I begin my presentation, I need to
22 announce that a minor change needs to be made to the
23 second sentence of the first paragraph of the agenda item.
24 The city's requested diversion rate should read 48 percent
25 instead of 51 percent.

1 The city of Lakeport has submitted a letter
2 requesting to change its base year from 1990 to 2000 using
3 its 2000 generation study approved at the June 2002 Board
4 meeting. With the staff recommended new base year, the
5 city's diversion rate would be 51 percent for 2000, 46
6 percent for 2001, and 50 percent for 2002.

7 Since the city is relatively small, they had
8 elected to conduct annual generation studies to ensure
9 that their diversion and disposal activities were being
10 accurately reflected. After completing studies for 1999
11 and 2000, the city found that the level of effort needed
12 to obtain generation data was substantial. And with its
13 limited resources and reduced staff, the city was having
14 difficulty completing studies for 2001 and 2002.

15 The city reached the conclusion it would be in
16 its best interest to request that the data from its
17 previously-approved 2000 generation study be used to
18 establish a new 2000 base year. The city as well as Board
19 staff considers the data used in the approved 2000
20 generation study to be more representative than what was
21 determined by the 1990 base year generation study.

22 Staff verified that the data included in the
23 generation study is representative data to establish the
24 base year. The verification review of the original 2000
25 study uncovered additional diversion data resulting in a

1 51 percent diversion rate. Additionally, data
2 verification determined that the majority of generation
3 comes from the non-residential sector.

4 Staff also conducted a review of the city's
5 diversion programs. The city reported that they have
6 successfully implemented source reduction, recycling,
7 composting, and public education programs in order to
8 maintain the 50 percent diversion goal.

9 Board staff is recommending Option 1 of the
10 agenda item, which would accept the 2001/2002 biennial
11 review findings and approve the city's request to use its
12 previously-approved 2000 generation study to establish a
13 new 2000 base year.

14 This concludes my presentation. Board staff are
15 available to answer any questions. Thank you.

16 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Thank you.

17 Any questions?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARIN: I just want to make
19 sure. They're requesting a 48 percent diversion rate and
20 we're suggesting 51 percent. And are we granting them the
21 48 percent?

22 MS. WILLMON: It would be 51 percent.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARIN: So we would still
24 maintain the 51 percent?

25 MS. WILLMON: Yes. That's correct.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARIN: Okay. All right.

2 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: We have Resolution
3 2004-197.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Move approval.

5 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Moved by Board Member
6 Mulé, seconded by Board Member Marin.

7 Substitute the previous roll call, and consent.

8 Next item.

9 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item 6, H actually
10 shows up deleted in the -- 6 shows up deleted, and it
11 should be deleted in your Committee binder as well.

12 And so that brings us to Item 7 or I in the
13 Committee binder. This is Consideration of the Amended
14 Non-Disposal Facility Element for the City of Sacramento,
15 Sacramento County.

16 And this item will be presented by our man
17 playing a dual roll, Kyle Pogue.

18 MR. POGUE: Good afternoon, Committee members.
19 Kyle Pogue with the Office of Local Assistance.

20 The city of Sacramento is amending its
21 non-disposal facility element, NDFE, by identifying and
22 describing three additional facilities: The California
23 Concrete Crushing Facility, which receives concrete and
24 asphalt; and two Grover Landscape, Incorporated,
25 facilities, which produce compost materials.

1 The Permits and Enforcement Division may be
2 presenting an agenda item for the proposed permits for
3 these facilities in the future. The city has submitted
4 all required documentation for these facilities and,
5 therefore, staff recommends approval of this amendment to
6 the city of Sacramento's NDFE.

7 This concludes my presentation. And Marty
8 Strauss from the city of Sacramento is available if you
9 have any questions. Thank you.

10 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Any questions, Members?

11 A motion.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARIN: I move the item.

13 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Moved by Board Member
14 Marin.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Second.

16 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Seconded by Board Member
17 Mulé.

18 Substitute the previous roll call, and we'll
19 place this on consent.

20 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item 8, or J, on the
21 Committee packet is Consideration of the Use of
22 Extrapolated Methodologies in New Base Year Generation
23 Studies.

24 And Marshalle Graham will present this item.

25 MS. GRAHAM: Good afternoon, Committee members.

1 At the May 2004 Board meeting, Board staff
2 presented an informational item, Agenda Item 30, with the
3 findings and recommendations from the independent
4 third-party review of new base year generation study
5 designs that use extrapolated methodologies to estimate
6 non-residential diversion. A synopsis of this project's
7 findings is provided in the background section of this
8 agenda item. Each of you should also have a copy of the
9 presentation that staff prepared and presented to the
10 Board in May. Additional copies are also available in the
11 back of the room for the public.

12 At the conclusion of staff's presentation in May,
13 Board members raised the question as to whether the Board
14 should consider discontinuing the acceptance of such
15 studies. In response, Board staff volunteered to prepare
16 an action item for this Board meeting.

17 Board staff has prepared three options for the
18 Board's consideration and they are as follows.

19 Option 1 is to continue to allow jurisdictions to
20 submit extrapolated new base year generation studies using
21 the Board's base year modification certification request
22 form as updated based on the recommendations outlined in
23 Agenda Item 30 at the May 2004 Board meeting.

24 Option 2 is to direct staff to conduct a workshop
25 or workshops to solicit feedback regarding continued use

1 of extrapolated new base year generation study
2 methodologies and to come back to the Board with the
3 results.

4 And, lastly, Option 3 is to not allow future
5 submissions of extrapolated new base year generation
6 studies.

7 Board staff is recommending Option 1, to continue
8 to allow jurisdictions to submit extrapolated studies
9 using the Board's updated certification form.

10 Board staff's recommendation is based on two
11 primary things. The first is the feedback received during
12 the two-year peer review and testing period for the
13 Board's diversion study guide, which specifically
14 addresses accuracy issues relating to extrapolated
15 methodologies and resulted in the development of the
16 Board's certification form.

17 The Board's staff recommendation is also based on
18 the aforementioned third-party independent review of 20
19 extrapolated new base year generation studies. As was
20 presented to the Board in May, this independent
21 third-party review and analysis addressed common accuracy
22 issues observed in most of the 20 extrapolated new base
23 year studies reviewed. The majority of these issues
24 related to specific errors in or insufficient
25 documentation of critical study design components, such as

1 sampling frame, sample selection, non-response, outliers,
2 and the selection use of an estimator.

3 As recommended in the project's final report,
4 these accuracy issues are being addressed through
5 modifications to the Board's certification form.
6 Therefore, in cases where extrapolated study design is
7 utilized, the jurisdiction would be expected to submit to
8 the Board for review appropriate documentation related to
9 these critical study design components. With this
10 necessary information, Board staff would be able to
11 determine whether the study meets acceptable statistical
12 standards.

13 In the absence of such documentation, however,
14 Board staff would have to recommend adjustments be made to
15 the study such that only actual diversion data collected
16 and verified by Board staff are used in the new base year
17 and diversion rate calculations. In other words, Board
18 staff would recommend that a non-extrapolated method be
19 used.

20 Additionally, although Board staff continues to
21 analyze new base year study data with respect to trends,
22 staff cannot quantitatively determine when and if a
23 jurisdiction should use an extrapolated methodology in
24 developing its new base year generation study design.
25 Theoretically, by using such a study design, jurisdictions

1 can estimate total diversion from their non-residential
2 sector.

3 Although Board staff's analysis suggests that
4 most jurisdictions really should be able to adequately
5 estimate their diversion tonnage by collecting data from
6 locally-run programs, local recyclers, material handlers,
7 large turf areas, and through the diversion surveys at
8 their largest businesses, there may be cases in which an
9 extrapolated methodology is appropriate. As a result,
10 some jurisdictions may need to have the opportunity to
11 develop and submit study design and resulting data using
12 extrapolation.

13 Taking into account the findings of the
14 aforementioned independent third-party review of
15 extrapolated methodologies and Board staff's analyses,
16 Board staff is recommending that jurisdictions be allowed
17 to submit extrapolated studies. Jurisdictions would also
18 need to continue to provide the Board information outlined
19 in its certification form. Ultimately, it would continue
20 to be a jurisdiction's responsibility to assess the cost
21 benefit of using an extrapolated methodology in its new
22 base year generation study design.

23 Board staff could also continue to encourage
24 jurisdictions to evaluate the pros and cons to their study
25 design options with respect to their available resources

1 and the impact that the decision will have on their
2 program implementation efforts.

3 And that concludes my presentation. If you have
4 any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

5 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Questions?

6 I have a couple questions. I seem to recollect
7 when we dealt with this a couple months ago and we were
8 asking about whether there was any real benefit to the
9 extrapolations that the answer was basically no, that the
10 staff didn't see any real benefit to cities or
11 jurisdictions using extrapolations. Am I oversimplifying?
12 Mr. Schiavo, it was you --

13 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Well, I don't remember
14 the response. But it was a general response in that, to
15 date, we haven't seen the benefit. But we've only seen 40
16 out of these 430-plus jurisdictions. And we have too
17 limited information to really know from the whole
18 population. That's what we're up against. We just don't
19 know for sure. But what we've seen to date, it seems
20 very -- like there's been little benefit, but we just
21 don't know for sure in the whole picture.

22 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: And then you've had some
23 problems with some of them that have come forward?

24 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Historically, we had an
25 awful problem with some of those that have come forward.

1 We have some of those who have real questionable data that
2 got through the system before we became aware of the
3 problem. Once we became aware of the problem and went
4 through the workshop process, we tightened up the
5 standards and enhanced the certification form which people
6 had to respond to us. I think the problems dissipated
7 quite a bit.

8 Two jurisdictions over the last year were very
9 successful in how they approached it. They documented
10 everything appropriately. We have a third this particular
11 year that's coming forward that staff's worked closely
12 with them on it. And it looks like it's an appropriate
13 use. Whether or not there's a large benefit there is very
14 questionable in that particular one.

15 We feel confident since over the last couple of
16 years we have a couple of staff that are well trained now
17 in statistical analysis. We purchased some software to
18 support them. We obtained a contractor to do third-party
19 analyses. Along with that came the training for our
20 staff. And that's helped enhance our ability to look at
21 these studies.

22 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: In terms of the benefit to
23 jurisdictions, is there a real benefit to the
24 jurisdictions to allow this kind of stuff, other than, you
25 know -- I know they have to go out and hire a consultant

1 and do the surveys and so forth.

2 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Again, it's a big
3 unknown. What we've seen today, I would generalize not a
4 big benefit. But, again, looking at those other 400
5 jurisdictions out there, there may be. We just don't want
6 to preclude the option.

7 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: And then my last question
8 for now is more of a legal one. And that is, it's
9 suggested in the agenda item that if we disallowed
10 extrapolations, we would probably have to do so through
11 regulations going through OAL. If that's the case, why
12 don't we need regulations to allow extrapolations?

13 STAFF COUNSEL BLOCK: Well, the issue is not --
14 Elliot Block for the Legal Office.

15 The issue is one of whether we deal with these as
16 a case-by-case basis or what's known as a rule of general
17 application, an across-the-board ban. It's doing a
18 general rule that applies to everybody. That's what
19 throws us into the regulation realm, if you will.

20 What we've been doing up until now with
21 extrapolations and what we've allowed is reviewing those
22 on a case-by-case basis. We're using some general
23 principles of -- generally-accepted statistical
24 principles, I guess that's what they're called, and
25 verifications of numbers and that sort of thing. But each

1 of those analyses is taken based on a case-by-case basis.

2 So they stand on their own.

3 In the context of a ban, so regardless of what
4 the individual situation of a jurisdiction is, if we'd be
5 establishing a rule you couldn't do extrapolation, that's
6 what would require regulations.

7 And then Pat has alluded to we'd have another
8 hurdle in that regard as well, because in order to do
9 that, we'd also have to show that that's necessary that
10 there's really a legal necessity for banning that, if you
11 will, overall.

12 And it's not to say we couldn't do that. But, in
13 fact, there are some jurisdictions -- and Pat mentioned
14 that in the last year we have approved a couple of new
15 base years that included extrapolations. So I think a lot
16 of the issues that came up last month were not so much
17 that they can't be done correctly. There's some cost
18 benefit issues that I think we were really looking at and
19 whether -- it's not that there might not be some benefit
20 to doing extrapolation. It's, is the amount of the
21 benefit, the additional diversion that could be captured,
22 worth the effort of doing extrapolation? That was kind of
23 the main point of that, as opposed to we shouldn't allow
24 it at all.

25 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: So I'm wondering whether

1 perhaps we should put some more stuff in the resolution to
2 discourage the use of extrapolations, because it sounds
3 like our staff sees little benefit in jurisdictions going
4 through the added cost of doing an extrapolation versus
5 just using the straight data that's available to them.

6 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: One of the
7 considerations -- and this is what we've been trying to
8 get out to jurisdictions, is before they decide to
9 endeavor on whether to use extrapolations or not, there's
10 a bigger picture out there. And part of that bigger
11 picture you can see on 8-9, the pie chart we put together.

12 There's a lot of components of your waste stream.
13 When you extrapolate the commercial sector, that's just
14 one piece of that waste stream. And in this particular
15 instance, example jurisdiction we are showing here, the
16 diversion from the extrapolation is 8 percentage points.
17 You have to make a cost benefit analysis on is it worth --
18 and you don't know it's 8 percent when you're going into
19 this. But what you can do is get a pretty reasonable
20 estimate on it as far as the other components because a
21 lot of them get their numbers from single sources or maybe
22 multiple sources, but you know where they are.

23 The commercial sector is a little bit of a
24 mystery. But if you have an exclusive franchise or just a
25 handful of haulers in your area, you should be able to

1 query them and get a good handle on what is out there.

2 And you may find that it's just a handful of the big
3 businesses that are driving what's out there.

4 In other cases, we may run into a scenario where
5 that piece of the pie that represents the commercial
6 sector is much bigger, and it's guided by more medium to
7 small size businesses, which then that could possibly lend
8 itself to extrapolation. But, again, you have to look at
9 what the potential cost of undergoing that process is
10 versus just going down and surveying your top 100 or so.

11 So it's a cost benefit issue for jurisdictions.
12 But, again, they need to open their eyes up and look at
13 the whole piece of the pie before they decide what weight
14 to undertake.

15 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Board Member Marin and
16 then Board Member Mulé.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARIN: Mr. Chairman, I think
18 the issue for me here -- and, obviously, I come from local
19 government. So my issue here would be to enable the
20 jurisdictions the ability to make their own determination.

21 You know, I think that by us adding any more
22 language discouraging them from doing this, I think that
23 we may be interfering in their own ability for themselves
24 to decide whether this is good or bad or whether this is
25 worth it or not.

1 I would go for letting the jurisdictions make
2 that determination completely. Having the ability for
3 them to do that the way that is written, I think it truly
4 puts the onus on them. Let them decide. If they would so
5 choose for whatever reason that they want to spend the
6 money and they see it as a worthwhile effort, it is their
7 money. Of course, now they're going to have to do it with
8 this particular -- as I understand it, you know, with this
9 particular form that we're asking them for very specific
10 things. So this certificate request -- what is it?

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Certification.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARIN: It would seem to me this
13 would give the jurisdictions the ability to decide for
14 themselves whether they want to use extrapolation or not.
15 But it leaves it in their hands, where I believe it should
16 be.

17 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Board Member Mulé.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19 I just want to agree with what Committee Member
20 Marin said. Having worked with many local jurisdictions,
21 I know that every community is unique. And the way that
22 they come up with their diversion rates can vary based on
23 the makeup of that community, based on whether or not they
24 are a franchised community or not.

25 One of the things I found in one of the

1 communities I was working with, even though it was a
2 franchised community, there were several businesses that
3 utilized other recyclers, which they are allowed to do
4 under law, to recycle their -- whatever materials they
5 had. Therefore, the franchise hauler was not able to
6 capture that information.

7 So I think I agree with what you were saying. I
8 think we should put the responsibility back on the local
9 community to make that decision on how they best want to
10 utilize their resources in determining their diversion
11 rate.

12 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Okay.

13 CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR NAUMAN: I was going to ask
14 maybe staff to comment. There may be some help, in
15 essence, that we provide through the diversion study guide
16 that's not a directive that you must do it this way or you
17 must do it that way. But in making your local decision,
18 you may want to take into account some factors. So that
19 may be already in our study guide as a little bit of an
20 assist.

21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Looking historically
22 when we completed the diversion study guide, we had a work
23 group comprised of a lot of the consultants that did the
24 bulk of the study throughout the state. We had three
25 people who are well versed in statistics. In addition to

1 that, we had literally hundreds of reviewers. And we
2 hashed this and rehashed it and went over and over it and
3 could not make a determination whether extrapolation was
4 merited or not. It was decided that jurisdictions need to
5 make their decisions and determinations based on the
6 specific conditions because they're all so unique.

7 And, again, when the item -- just before it was
8 approved, we solicited more input, and it was pretty much,
9 you know, people seem to feel that way, that just
10 everything is so unique out there, it's hard to make one
11 size fit all. So that's part of the basis of this. And
12 we do work with jurisdictions up front when they're going
13 into a study. And we do try to promote, again, them
14 looking at the big picture. Again, whether or not we're
15 listened to, that's another issue at the time, but we try.

16 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Okay. I think where we're
17 at, I think we have -- if I'm reading things right, I
18 think we have two members who are comfortable with the
19 resolution as is. I don't have any specifics in terms of
20 language that I would want. So I think what will probably
21 happen here is we'll get a two to zero vote, and I'll
22 probably withhold my vote and ask that it go to the full
23 Board and take it from there.

24 So do we have a motion?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARIN: I'll move, Mr. Chair.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Second.

2 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Moved by Marin, seconded
3 by Mulé.

4 Secretary, call the roll.

5 SECRETARY KUMPULAINIEN: Marin?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARIN: Aye.

7 SECRETARY KUMPULAINIEN: Mulé?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Aye.

9 SECRETARY KUMPULAINIEN: Paparian?

10 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Show me as not voting at
11 this time.

12 So we'll send it to the full Board with a 2 to 0
13 recommendation and not put it on consent at this time.

14 Anything else?

15 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: That pretty much
16 concludes all the items here.

17 Do you have any questions on anything?

18 CHAIRPERSON PAPARIAN: Any questions?

19 Any public comment?

20 Okay. Thank you very much. The meeting is
21 adjourned.

22 (Thereupon the California Integrated Waste
23 Management Board, Sustainability and Market
24 Development Committee adjourned at 2:35 p.m.)

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2 I, TIFFANY C. KRAFT, a Certified Shorthand
3 Reporter of the State of California, and Registered
4 Professional Reporter, do hereby certify:

5 That I am a disinterested person herein; that the
6 foregoing hearing was reported in shorthand by me,
7 Tiffany C. Kraft, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the
8 State of California, and thereafter transcribed into
9 typewriting.

10 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
11 attorney for any of the parties to said hearing nor in any
12 way interested in the outcome of said hearing.

13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
14 this 19th day of July, 2004.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TIFFANY C. KRAFT, CSR, RPR
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 12277