

CERTIFIED
COPY

APR 11 1964

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

MR. JOHN C. MOSCONE, CHAIRMAN (NOT PRESENT)
MR. PHILLIP BEAUTROW, (ACTING CHAIRMAN)
MS. GINGER BREMBERG
MR. JOHN E. GALLAGHER
MR. E. L. VARNER
MR. SAM ARAKALIAN
MR. LES BROWN
MR. JAMES W. CALLOWAY (NOT PRESENT)

STAFF PRESENT

MR. GEORGE T. EOWAN, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
MR. HERBERT IWAHIRO, CHIEF DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER
MR. ALAN OLDALL, DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER
MS. JOELLEN JACKSON, DIRECTOR OF LEGISLATION
AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
MR. ROBERT F. CONHEIM, GENERAL COUNSEL
MR. GEORGE LARSON, MANAGER OF PLANNING AND RESOURCE
CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISIONS

STEVEN AULT
JOHN SMITH, LOCAL PLANNING DIVISION
MICHAEL YOUNG
CY ARMSTRONG, LOCAL PLANNING DIVISION
DON DIER, STANDARDS AND REGULATIONS DIVISION
BILL ORR, STANDARDS AND REGULATIONS DIVISION
GARY KING, LOS ANGELES OFFICE
LISA DERNBACH, LOS ANGELES OFFICE
BRIAN FORAN, RESOURCE CONSERVATION DIVISION
JEAN BLAKESLY,
MR. STRICKLER



I N D E X

PAGE NO.

ITEM NO. 3: CONSIDERATION OF ACCEPTANCE OF THE
AMADOR COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW REPORT.

OPENING REMARKS BY MR. OLDALL	5
PRESENTATION BY CY ARMSTRONG	5, 9
COMMENTS BY MR. CONHEIM	8

QUESTIONS BY THE BOARD:

BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER	8
BOARD ACTION	24

ITEM NO. 5: CONSIDERATION OF THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE
RIVERSIDE COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW
REPORT.

OPENING REMARKS BY MR. OLDALL	11
PRESENTATION BY MR. STEVEN AULT	12
COMMENTS BY MR. SMITH	20
COMMENTS BY MR. NELSON	22
COMMENTS BY MR. PERRY	22

QUESTIONS BY BOARD MEMBERS:

CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW	19
BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER	20
BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG	21

ITEM NO. 6: CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF THE
SOLANO COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN REVISION.

OPENING REMARKS BY MR. OLDALL	24
PRESENTATION BY MR. YOUNG	24
COMMENTS BY MR. HUBBELL	29
BOARD ACTION	30



ITEM NO. 7: CONSIDERATION OF SANTA CLARA COUNTY
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT TO INCLUDE A
PROCEDURE FOR CONSIDERATION OF REQUESTS FOR IMPORT OF
OUT-OF-COUNTY WASTE.

PRESENTATION BY MR. YOUNG	30
COMMENTS BY MR. CONHEIM	33
COMMENTS BY MS. LOGOTHETTI	35

QUESTIONS BY THE BOARD:

BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG	33
CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW	35
BOARD ACTION	36

ITEM NO. 8: CONSIDERATION OF SANTA CLARA COUNTY
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT TO DESIGNATE THE
RECYCLERY AS A SOLID WASTE FACILITY.

PRESENTATION BY MR. YOUNG	36
COMMENTS BY MR. GAVRICH	38

QUESTIONS BY THE BOARD:

BOARD MEMBER VARNER	39
BOARD MEMBER BROWN	42
CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW	43
BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG	44
BOARD ACTION	45

ITEM NO. 9: CONSIDERATION OF SANTA CLARA COUNTY
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT TO MODIFY
SUBREGIONAL PLANNING AREAS TO PROVIDE CONTINUED ACCESS TO
GUADALUPE LANDFILL AND TO INCLUDE REPORTING PROCEDURE FOR
ATTAINING 25 PERCENT RECYCLING GOAL BY 1995.

PRESENTATION BY MR. YOUNG	46
COMMENTS BY MS. MC KENNA	49

QUESTIONS BY THE BOARD:

BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG	49
-----------------------	----





1600 EAST FOURTH STREET, SUITE 220
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92701
TELEPHONE (714) 953-4447

barristers'
reporting service

BOARD ACTION	52
ITEM NO. 10: STATUS OF COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANS.	
OPENING REMARKS BY MR. OLDALL	52
PRESENTATION BY MR. LARSON.	53
ITEM NO. 11: PRESENTATION BY THE ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS OF A PROPOSAL FOR THE BOARD TO ESTABLISH A TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANS.	
OPENING REMARKS BY MR. OLDALL	55
PRESENTATION BY MR. SMITH	56
PRESENTATION BY MR. TORLECKSON	56, 77
PRESENTATION BY MS. ST. JEWELL	59, 63
PRESENTATION BY MR. WYATT	61
COMMENTS BY MR. EOWAN	74
QUESTIONS BY THE BOARD:	
CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW	63
BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG	68
BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER	71, 75
BOARD MEMBER BROWN	72
BOARD MEMBER VARNER	76
ITEM NO. 13: CONSIDERATION OF CONCURRENCE IN THE ISSUANCE OF A PERMIT TO THE NEW HEALDSBURG LARGE VOLUME TRANSFER STATION, SONOMA COUNTY.	
OPENING REMARKS BY MR. IWAHIRO	80
PRESENTATION BY MR. DIER	80
COMMENTS BY MR. HASKINS	82
QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:	
BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG	82
BOARD MEMBER VARNER	83
CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW	83
BOARD ACTION	84



ITEM NO. 15: CONSIDERATION OF REMOVAL OF PENROSE
PIT LANDFILL, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, FROM THE FEDERAL RCRA
OPEN DUMP INVENTORY.

OPENING REMARKS BY MR. IWAHIRO	84
PRESENTATION BY MR. KING	85, 89
PRESENTATION BY MS. DERNBACH	85

QUESTIONS BY THE BOARD:

BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN	86
BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG	87

ITEM NO. 25: PRESENTATION BY ACME FILL CORPORATION
ON A PROPOSED TRANSFER STATION AT THE ACME LANDFILL,
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY.

OPENING REMARKS BY MR. IWAHIRO	90
PRESENTATION BY MR. REILLY	91
COMMENTS BY MR. CONHEIM	107

QUESTIONS BY THE BOARD:

CHAIRMAN BREUTROW	93, 99, 101, 107
BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN	93, 102
BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER	96, 105
BOARD MEMBER VARNER	106

ITEM NO. 21: QUARTERLY REPORT ON THE STATUS OF
RECYCLABLES MARKET.

OPENING REMARKS BY MR. OLDALL	109
PRESENTATION BY MR. FORAN	109

QUESTIONS BY THE BOARD:

BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER	119
BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG	121

ITEM NO. 12: CONSIDERATION OF A DETERMINATION OF
CONFORMANCE AND CONCURRENCE IN THE REVISED SOLID WASTE
FACILITIES PERMIT FOR THE STANTON TRANSFER STATION,
ORANGE COUNTY.





1600 EAST FOURTH STREET, SUITE 220
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92701
TELEPHONE (714) 953-4447

barristers'
reporting service

PRESENTATION BY MS. BLAKESLY	124
COMMENTS BY MR. SMITH	127
COMMENTS BY MR. DIER	128, 132

COMMENTS BY MR. SILVA	132
COMMENTS BY MR. CONHEIM	132

QUESTIONS BY THE BOARD:

BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG	126, 132
CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW	127, 134
BOARD MEMBER VARNER	133
BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN	134

ITEM NO. 14: CONSIDERATION OF DETERMINATION OF CONFORMANCE AND CONCURRENCE IN THE REVISED SOLID WASTE FACILITIES PERMIT FOR THE EXPANSION OF THE EASTERN REGIONAL LANDFILL, PLACER COUNTY.

OPENING REMARKS BY MR. IWAHIRO	136
PRESENTATION BY MR. ARMSTRONG	136
COMMENTS BY MR. DIER	138

COMMENTS BY MR. SCRIBNER	140
--------------------------	-----

QUESTIONS BY THE BOARD:

BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG	138
BOARD ACTION	141

ITEM NO. 23: CONSIDERATION OF FISCAL YEAR PLAN OF ACTION FOR HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE.

OPENING REMARKS BY MR. IWAHIRO	142
PRESENTATION BY MR. STRICKLER	143

PRESENTATION BY MR. CAMPBELL	157
------------------------------	-----

QUESTIONS BY THE BOARD:

BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG	149, 153, 162, 169
BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER	151
BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN	155, 160, 163, 165
BOARD MEMBER VARNER	156, 164, 167
CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW	168



ITEM NO. 18: CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT ON WASTE DISPOSAL REGIONS IN LOS ANGELES AS REQUIRED BY AB 223 (TANNER).

OPENING REMARKS BY MR. OLDALL 171
PRESENTATION BY MR. SMITH 171

QUESTIONS BY THE BOARD:

BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG 173

ITEM NO. 20: CONSIDERATION OF THE ACCEPTANCE OF SYNOPSIS OF "RECYCLING MARKETS: CALIFORNIA AND THE PACIFIC RIM" CONFERENCE.

PRESENTATION BY MR. RELLIS 175

QUESTIONS BY THE BOARD:

BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG 175

BOARD ACTION 176

ADJOURNMENT 177

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 178

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25



1 AUGUST 11, 1988

2
3 CALIFORNIA WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

4
5 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: WELCOME TO THE CONTINUATION OF
6 THE WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING FROM YESTERDAY.
7 BEFORE WE START, I'D LIKE TO GO OVER THE AGENDA ITEMS
8 THAT WERE CHANGED AT THE START OF YESTERDAY'S MEETING FOR
9 TODAY. THEN WE CAN SEE IF THERE'S ANY OTHER CHANGES THAT
10 NEED TO BE MADE.

11 TODAY WE'RE GOING TO TAKE UP -- WELL, WE TOOK
12 UP 1 AND 2 YESTERDAY, BUT IT WAS REQUESTED THAT WE HAVE 6
13 TODAY, 9, 10, 11, 13, 18, 20, AND 25, AND 27 WAS DELETED.
14 ARE THERE ANY OTHER CHANGES, GEORGE, OR NO?

15 MR. EOWAN: NOT REALLY. I THINK WE COULD PROBABLY
16 PROCEED DOWN THE LIST IN ORDER. AND WE'LL PROBABLY BE
17 ABLE TO REACH ALL OF THE ITEMS THAT YOU JUST MENTIONED.
18 THERE IS --

19 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: EXCEPT 25, OBVIOUSLY.

20 MR. EOWAN: YEAH. WE'LL MAKE SURE WE GET TO 25,
21 POSSIBLY EVEN 20; BUT I DON'T HAVE ANY OTHER ADDITIONS.
22 THERE HAVE BEEN A COUPLE OF REQUESTS TO HAVE ITEMS HELD
23 THIS AFTERNOON AS OPPOSED TO THIS MORNING. FOR EXAMPLE,
24 I BELIEVE IT'S ITEM NO. 14 FOR THIS AFTERNOON, BUT I
25 THINK WE WOULD PROBABLY END UP HAVING THAT ONE CLOSE TO



1 THIS AFTERNOON ANYWAY. I THINK WE CAN JUST PROCEED IF
2 IT'S YOUR PLEASURE.

3 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: AGAIN, IF ANYBODY FROM THE
4 PUBLIC WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PRESENTATION, WE'D REQUEST
5 THAT YOU FILL OUT ONE OF THESE CARDS BACK THERE
6 IDENTIFYING YOURSELF AND GIVE IT TO THE SECRETARY, CONNIE
7 DUNN BACK THERE IN THE PINK, SO WE'LL KNOW WHO'S GOING TO
8 SPEAK.

9 WE'LL PROCEED, THEN, WITH ITEM NO. 3, AMADOR
10 COUNTY.

11 MR. OLDALL: THAT'S THE CONSIDERATION OF THE AMADOR
12 COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW REPORT, MR.
13 CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. THIS ITEM WILL BE
14 PRESENTED BY CY ARMSTRONG FROM THE LOCAL PLANNING
15 DIVISION.

16 MR. ARMSTRONG: GOOD MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN, BOARD
17 MEMBERS.

18 ON JUNE 10TH OF THIS YEAR THE COUNTY SUBMITTED
19 A PLAN REVIEW REPORT INDICATING A PLAN REVISION WAS NOT
20 NECESSARY AT THIS TIME. THE COUNTY HAD DONE A COMPLETE
21 REVISION JUST THREE YEARS AGO IN JUNE.

22 AMADOR COUNTY IS A SMALL RURAL COUNTY LOCATED
23 ABOUT 65 MILES NORTH OF SACRAMENTO IN THE FOOTHILLS OF
24 CALIFORNIA WITH A POPULATION OF ABOUT 25,000. THERE ARE
25 FOUR INCORPORATED CITIES IN THE COUNTY WITH THE CITY OF



1 JACKSON SERVING AS THE COUNTY SEAT. THE ECONOMY OF THE
2 COUNTY IS BASED PRIMARILY ON TIMBER AND TOURISM.

3 THE COUNTY DISPOSAL SYSTEM IS FINANCED BY A
4 COMBINATION OF USERS FEES AND THE GENERAL FUND. THE
5 ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM IS FUNDED BY A CONTRACT WITH THE
6 STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AS IS TYPICAL OF OTHER SMALL
7 RURAL COUNTIES.

8 WASTE COLLECTION PROGRAMS ARE FINANCED BY
9 USERS FEES. APPROXIMATELY 28,000 TONS OF WASTE ARE
10 GENERATED IN THE COUNTY IN THE YEAR. THREE FRANCHISE
11 COLLECTORS PROVIDE COLLECTION SERVICES FOR THE CITIES AND
12 THE UNINCORPORATED AREAS, AND ONLY ONE TRANSFER STATION
13 IS LOCATED IN THE COUNTY. IT'S A SMALL PRIVATELY OWNED
14 TRANSFER STATION IN THE COMMUNITY OF PINE GROVE.

15 THE COUNTY HAS A VERY SIMPLE DISPOSAL SYSTEM.
16 THEY HAVE JUST ONE COUNTY OWNED LANDFILL CALLED THE BUENA
17 VISTA LANDFILL LOCATED NEAR JACKSON. THE FACILITY
18 RECEIVES ABOUT 80 TONS OF WASTE PER DAY AND HAS A LIFE
19 EXPECTANCY OF 20 YEARS PLUS. SEWAGE AND SEPTIC TANK
20 PUMPINGS ARE TAKEN TO THE LANDFILL SITE WHERE THEY ARE
21 DISPOSED OF IN A SERIES OF ROTATING PONDS THAT HAVE AN
22 ALMOST INDEFINITE SITE LIFE.

23 RESOURCE RECOVERY IN THE COUNTY IS
24 ACCOMPLISHED THROUGH A NUMBER OF ENTITIES. THERE'S A
25 PROGRAM AT THE PINE GROVE TRANSFER STATION, AND THERE'S



1 FURTHER RECYCLING DONE AT THE COUNTY'S SINGLE LANDFILL.
2 THERE'S SEVERAL CIVIC GROUPS IN THE COUNTY THAT ALSO HAVE
3 ONGOING PROGRAMS AS ALSO THEY HAVE SOME THRIFT STORES,
4 AND THERE IS A WASTE-TO-ENERGY PLANT NEAR MARTEL WHICH
5 BURNS WOOD WASTE AND PRODUCES ENERGY FOR THE TIMBER MILL
6 THAT OPERATES THERE.

7 THE ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM, AS I MENTIONED, IS
8 CONDUCTED THROUGH THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT, WHO ENFORCES THE
9 MINIMUM STANDARDS ON VEHICLES AND ON THE SITES AND
10 ANSWERS COMPLAINTS.

11 AS FAR AS CURRENT ISSUES, THE COUNTY, LIKE
12 MANY COUNTIES, IS COMPLETING THEIR CALDERON AND
13 SUBCHAPTER 15 REQUIREMENTS, AND THEY ARE NOW STUDYING THE
14 POSSIBILITY OF FUTURE IMPOSITION OF LAND USE FEES FOR
15 FINANCING THEIR PROGRAM.

16 THERE HAVE BEEN A NUMBER OF IMPROVEMENTS SINCE
17 THE LAST PLAN REVISION. THERE HAS BEEN SOME IMPROVED
18 EQUIPMENT AT THE COUNTY LANDFILL SITE FOR COMPACTION,
19 INTRODUCTION OF THE IMPROVED COMPACTING EQUIPMENT,
20 INSTALLATION OF WATER QUALITY TEST WELLS AT THE COUNTY'S
21 SINGLE LANDFILL, AND NOW ALL THE COLLECTION VEHICLES ARE
22 RADIO EQUIPPED.

23 IN SUMMARY, THE COUNTY STATES THAT THEY FEEL
24 THAT THE REPORT IS CURRENT. THERE'S BEEN VERY LITTLE
25 CHANGE SINCE THE LAST PLAN. THE IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE



1 HAS ESSENTIALLY BEEN MET. BOARD STAFF FEELS THAT THE
2 ADMINISTRATION AND FUNDING SOURCES REMAIN APPROXIMATELY
3 THE SAME. THERE IS ADEQUATE DISPOSAL. THERE'S A
4 RESOURCE RECOVERY PROGRAM AND THE IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE
5 HAS BEEN MET; THEREFORE, BOARD STAFF AGREES WITH THE
6 COUNTY THAT THERE IS LITTLE CHANGE FOR A REVISION AT THIS
7 TIME.

8 IF THE BOARD MEMBERS HAVE NO QUESTIONS OF ME,
9 I BELIEVE WE HAVE MR. DENNIS GRADY OF THE COUNTY PUBLIC
10 WORKS DEPARTMENT IN THE AUDIENCE, WHO WOULD ALSO LIKE TO
11 MAKE A SHORT PRESENTATION.

12 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: MR. GALLAGHER WOULD LIKE TO ASK
13 A QUESTION.

14 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU A
15 QUESTION REGARDING TWO ITEMS. ARE WE TO UNDERSTAND THAT
16 YOUR COMMENTS ABOUT RESOURCE RECOVERY WOULD MEET THE
17 REQUIREMENTS OF A 20-PERCENT RECYCLING OBJECTIVE IN THE
18 PLAN? AND THE SECOND ONE: IS THERE ANY REFERENCE TO
19 HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE FOR THAT COUNTY?

20 ATTORNEY CONHEIM: MR. CHAIRMAN, IF I COULD FIELD
21 MR. GALLAGHER'S FIRST QUESTION ON THE 20-PERCENT
22 RECYCLING GOAL UNDER AB 1462. WE'VE HAD THIS DISCUSSION
23 BEFORE. THE LANGUAGE THAT WAS ENACTED UNDER AB 1462 DID
24 NOT CLEARLY REQUIRE THAT A PLAN BE REVISED ONLY FOR THAT
25 PARTICULAR REQUIREMENT.



1 AND THE BOARD HAS -- WE HAVE ADVISED THE BOARD
2 AND THE BOARD HAS MADE DECISIONS IN A NUMBER OF OTHER
3 CASES THAT WHERE THE PLAN DID NOT REQUIRE REVISION FOR
4 ANY OTHER REASON, THAT THE 20-PERCENT GOAL WOULD NOT
5 DRIVE THE REVISION.

6 BECAUSE THERE WAS SOME DISSATISFACTION WHERE
7 THAT MAY NOT -- WITH THAT NOT BEING THE INTENT OF THE
8 LAW, WE CONTACTED THE AUTHOR'S OFFICE AND HAVE WORKED
9 WITH THE AUTHOR AND SUBMITTED LANGUAGE THAT MR. CORTESE
10 INTENDS TO ADD TO HIS CURRENT AB 3462, WHICH WILL CLARIFY
11 THAT SITUATION SO THAT THAT BECOMES A REQUIREMENT UPON
12 EACH REVISION AT EACH REVISION TIME AND THAT, EVEN IF NO
13 OTHER PART OF THE PLAN NEEDS REVISION, THAT THE RESOURCE
14 RECOVERY AND RECYCLING PORTIONS OF THE PLAN WILL HAVE TO
15 BE REVISED TO INCLUDE THE 20-PERCENT GOAL.

16 WE HAVE FELT AND ADVISED YOU THAT WE FELT IT
17 WOULD BE BETTER TO CLARIFY THAT IN THE LEGISLATION
18 BECAUSE THE ORIGINAL BILL DID NOT MAKE THAT AN
19 INDEPENDENT MANDATE.

20 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: HOW ABOUT THE HAZARDOUS
21 WASTE THING?

22 MR. ARMSTRONG: MR. GALLAGHER, IF I MAY ADD TO YOUR
23 ORIGINAL QUESTION, IN CONTACT WITH THE COUNTY STAFF --
24 AND I DON'T WANT TO TAKE ANYTHING AWAY FROM MR. GRADY'S
25 PRESENTATION -- HE BELIEVES THAT THEY WERE MEETING



1 APPROXIMATELY A 20-PERCENT RECYCLING GENERATION RATE IN
2 THE COUNTY AT THIS POINT. AND MR. GRADY WILL MENTION
3 THIS A LITTLE LATER.

4 AS FAR AS THE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS PROGRAM,
5 THEY FEEL THAT THERE IS A VERY, VERY SMALL AMOUNT OF
6 HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE BEING GENERATED IN THE COUNTY;
7 HOWEVER, THAT WILL BE ADDRESSED IN THEIR COUNTY HAZARDOUS
8 WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN, BUT I BELIEVE ANOTHER DEPARTMENT
9 WOULD BE DEVELOPING THAT.

10 MR. GRADY IS IN THE AUDIENCE TODAY, PLEASE.
11 I'M SORRY. HE ASSURED ME HE WOULD BE DOWN, MUST NOT HAVE
12 QUITE MADE IT YET.

13 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: I'M SATISFIED IF YOU ARE
14 ALL SATISFIED THAT WE'RE NOT LEAVING ONE COUNTY FREE OF
15 ANY OBLIGATION THAT OTHER COUNTIES HAVING TO GO AHEAD
16 WITH THESE THINGS.

17 MR. ARMSTRONG: I DON'T BELIEVE SO, MR. GALLAGHER.
18 THEY HAVE HAD AN ONGOING RESOURCE RECOVERY PROGRAM BY THE
19 ENTITIES I MENTIONED: THE PINE GROVE TRANSFER STATION,
20 ALSO AT THE LANDFILL, ALSO THE CIVIC GROUPS, ALSO THE
21 AB 2020 PROGRAM THAT'S IN BUSINESS NOW, ALSO THE WOOD
22 WASTE AT MARTEL THAT THEY'RE RECOVERING, ALSO AGAIN THE
23 THRIFT STORES, THE AUTO DISMANTLING OPERATIONS. AND,
24 AGAIN, IN MY CONVERSATION, HE FELT THAT APPROXIMATELY 20
25 PERCENT WAS BEING RECYCLED. I WISH HE WAS HERE TO TELL



1 YOU THAT HIMSELF. I DON'T SEE HIM IN THE AUDIENCE.

2 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: THAT'S FINE, NOT NECESSARY
3 AS FAR AS I'M CONCERNED.

4 ALL RIGHT. IS THERE ANYONE ELSE IN THE
5 AUDIENCE THAT WANTS TO COMMENT ON THE AMADOR COUNTY SOLID
6 WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN? IF NOT, STAFF HAS MADE A
7 RECOMMENDATION THAT WE APPROVE THE FACT THAT THERE IS NOT
8 A NEED FOR A REVISION. AND WHAT'S THE PLEASURE OF THE
9 BOARD?

10 ATTORNEY CONHEIM: MR. CHAIRMAN, YOU NEED A QUORUM.

11 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: WELL, WE'LL HAVE TO PUT
12 OFF A VOTE ON IT BECAUSE THERE IS NOT A QUORUM PRESENT AT
13 THE ROSTRUM.

14 WE'LL MOVE ON TO NO. 5, CONSIDERATION OF
15 ACCEPTANCE OF THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY SOLID WASTE
16 MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW REPORT.

17 MR. OLDALL: MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT WAS REQUESTED FOR
18 FRIDAY, I BELIEVE. WE CAN PROCEED WITH NO. 5.

19 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: ITEM NO. 5, CONSIDERATION
20 OF ACCEPTANCE OF THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY SOLID WASTE
21 MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW REPORT.

22 MR. OLDALL: THIS WILL BE PRESENTED BY STEVEN AULT,
23 ONE OF THE NEWER MEMBERS OF THE LOCAL PLANNING DIVISION,
24 MR. CHAIRMAN.

25 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: UNDERSTAND, PLEASE, THAT,



1 AGAIN, THIS INFORMATION WILL BE ADVISORY TO THE BOARD AND
2 WE WILL NOT BE ABLE TO VOTE ON IT UNTIL A QUORUM IS
3 PRESENT. YOU WANT TO PROCEED?

4 MR. AULT: MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN AND BOARD
5 MEMBERS. I'D LIKE TO PRESENT THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLAN
6 REVIEW REPORT AND STAFF REPORT.

7 RIVERSIDE COUNTY IS BORDERED BY LOS ANGELES
8 AND ORANGE COUNTIES ON THE WEST, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY ON
9 THE NORTH, SAN DIEGO AND IMPERIAL COUNTIES ON THE SOUTH,
10 AND, FINALLY, THE COLORADO RIVER AND THE STATE OF ARIZONA
11 ON THE EAST. THE COUNTY IS A LARGE ONE AT 7300 SQUARE
12 MILES AND HAS 20 INCORPORATED CITIES. THE CITY OF
13 RIVERSIDE SERVES AS THE COUNTY SEAT.

14 GEOGRAPHICALLY IT'S VERY DIVERSE, THE MORE
15 METROPOLITANIZED WESTERN AREA HAS A MEDITERRANEAN CLIMATE
16 AND MORE SPARSELY POPULATED THAN THE EASTERN AREA, MORE
17 DESERT LIKE CLIMATE. THE CURRENT POPULATION IS
18 APPROXIMATELY 978,000 PEOPLE WITH A HIGH 6.6 PERCENT
19 ANNUAL POPULATION GROWTH RATE. ABOUT 67 PERCENT OF THE
20 POPULATION LIVE IN THE 20 INCORPORATED CITIES.

21 WITH REGARD TO ADMINISTRATIVE
22 RESPONSIBILITIES, THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY BOARD OF
23 SUPERVISORS ESTABLISHES A COUNTY SOLID WASTE POLICY AND
24 ENACTS ALL THE WASTE ORDINANCES, AND ALSO ADMINISTERS AND
25 IMPLEMENTS THE COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN.



1 THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY WASTE MANAGEMENT
2 DEPARTMENT MAINTAINS AND UPDATES THE SOLID WASTE
3 MANAGEMENT PLAN AND ALSO ADMINISTERS THE COUNTY
4 COLLECTION LITTER AND DISPOSAL PROGRAMS.

5 THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT
6 ADVISORY COMMITTEE WAS ESTABLISHED BY THE BOARD OF
7 SUPERVISORS AND ADVISES THAT BOARD ON SOLID WASTE
8 POLICIES AND ISSUES IN THE COUNTY AND IN THE REGION. THE
9 RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT IS CURRENTLY
10 DEVELOPING A HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
11 COUNTYWIDE WHICH WILL IN TURN BE IMPLEMENTED BY THE
12 RIVERSIDE COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT.

13 FINALLY, THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY SOLID WASTE
14 ENFORCEMENT AGENCY ACTS AS THE LEA IN RIVERSIDE COUNTY TO
15 ENFORCE MINIMUM STANDARDS AND TO ISSUE SOLID WASTE
16 FACILITIES PERMITS.

17 WITH REGARD TO WASTE GENERATION IN RIVERSIDE
18 COUNTY, THERE IS APPROXIMATELY ONE AND A HALF MILLION
19 TONS OF WASTE THAT ARE GENERATED ANNUALLY. THIS IS ABOUT
20 25 PERCENT HIGHER THAN WAS PREDICTED IN THE 1984 COSWMP.
21 THIS INCREASE HAS BEEN CAUSED BY A STRONG RESIDENTIAL
22 POPULATION GROWTH, A GROWING ECONOMY, AND ALSO MORE
23 ACCURATE MEASURES OF WASTES RECEIVED AT LANDFILLS.

24 CURRENTLY THERE ARE ABOUT 20,000 TONS OF
25 SLUDGE THAT ARE GENERATED IN THE COUNTY ANNUALLY AND



1 DISPOSED OF IN THE COUNTY.

2 WITH REGARD TO STORAGE AND COLLECTION, THE
3 PRIVATE SECTOR CONDUCTS MOST OF THE REFUSE COLLECTION
4 OPERATIONS IN THE COUNTY. ONLY THE CITIES OF RIVERSIDE,
5 BLYTHE, AND HEMET PROVIDE THEIR OWN RESIDENTIAL
6 COLLECTION SERVICES. THE MONTHLY RESIDENTIAL REFUSE
7 COLLECTION RATE RANGES FROM ABOUT \$5.40 UP TO ABOUT
8 \$13.30. THE AVERAGE MONTHLY COST FOR RESIDENTIAL SOLID
9 WASTE COLLECTION IS ABOUT \$29 PER TON.

10 HEMET -- THE CITIES OF HEMET AND BLYTHE ARE
11 BEGINNING TO USE A MORE AUTOMATED COLLECTION SYSTEM AT
12 PRESENT. THIS TREND IS EXPECTED TO CONTINUE IN THE
13 COUNTY.

14 THERE IS NO HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE
15 COLLECTION PROGRAM AS YET; BUT, AS MENTIONED EARLIER,
16 THIS IS PLANNED AND WILL BE IMPLEMENTED. THE PRIVATE
17 WASTE COLLECTORS ARE REPRESENTED IN THE COUNTY BY THE SAN
18 BERNARDINO AND RIVERSIDE COUNTIES DISPOSAL ASSOCIATION AS
19 WELL AS THE CALIFORNIA LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT
20 ASSOCIATION.

21 FOR TRANSFER ACTIVITIES, THERE ARE THREE
22 PERMITTED TRANSFER STATIONS CURRENTLY WHICH TRANSFER A
23 TOTAL OF ABOUT 5,200 TONS PER YEAR. THIS IS LESS THAN A
24 HALF OF 1 PERCENT ON THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF WASTE THAT IS
25 LANDFILLED IN THE COUNTY. THE AVERAGE COST OF TRANSFER



1 IS CURRENTLY RUNNING BETWEEN 42 AND \$45 PER TON.

2 WITH REGARD TO DISPOSAL CAPACITY, THERE ARE
3 APPROXIMATELY 40 MILLION TONS OF DISPOSAL CAPACITY
4 REMAINING AMONG THE 14 LANDFILLS IN THE COUNTY. THIS IS
5 EXPECTED TO PROVIDE DISPOSAL CAPACITY TO THE YEAR 2009.
6 THE SIX LANDFILLS -- THERE ARE SIX LANDFILLS THAT TAKE
7 APPROXIMATELY 79 PERCENT OF THE COUNTY'S WASTE STREAM AT
8 THE PRESENT. THE EL SOBRANTE LANDFILL IS THE NEWEST
9 LANDFILL IN RIVERSIDE COUNTY AND THE FIRST NEW LANDFILL
10 IN THE STATE TO BE BUILT TO CURRENT SUBCHAPTER 15, GROUP
11 2 STANDARDS.

12 EL SOBRANTE IS AN INTERESTING COOPERATIVE AND
13 TURNKEY VENTURE BETWEEN THE COUNTY AND WESTERN WASTE
14 INDUSTRIES INCORPORATED. WESTERN WASTE INDUSTRIES IS THE
15 OWNER OF THE PROPERTY BUT COOPERATES WITH THE COUNTY.

16 THERE IS A \$12 PER TON GATE FEE COUNTYWIDE,
17 WHICH PROVIDES A COMPREHENSIVE FUNDING OF ALL THE
18 COUNTY'S WASTE DISPOSAL PROGRAMS.

19 WITH REGARD TO LITTER, THERE IS A NEWLY
20 APPOINTED COUNTY REFUSE CONTROL COORDINATOR WHO
21 SUPERVISES SEVEN PERSONNEL, DIRECTS THE WORK RELEASE
22 PEOPLE AND ALSO VOLUNTEERS IN LITTER AND CLEANUP
23 COUNTYWIDE, AND ALSO IMPLEMENTS THE COMMUNITY LITTER
24 AWARENESS PROGRAM.

25 THE RESOURCE RECOVERY ELEMENT IN RIVERSIDE



1 COUNTY CONSISTS OF SEVERAL FACTORS. THE LIONS CLUB IN
2 THE CITY OF HEMET HAS A BUY-BACK AND DROPOFF RECYCLING
3 FACILITY. THIS CITY ALSO HAS A LANDSCAPE WASTE
4 COMPOSTING FACILITY THAT OPERATES ON A SEASONAL BASIS.
5 THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE ITSELF OPERATES A USED OIL, SCRAP
6 METAL, AND A WHITE OFFICE PAPER RECYCLING PROGRAM AT ALL
7 THEIR COUNTY FACILITIES.

8 THE RIVERSIDE SCRAP IRON AND METAL
9 CORPORATION, PRIVATE COMPANY, OPERATES A LARGE RECYCLING
10 FACILITY IN THE CITY OF RIVERSIDE AS WELL AS TWO
11 SATELLITE CENTERS WHICH TAKE MARKETABLE METALS,
12 CARDBOARD, AND PAPER. THE CLOSED CORONA LANDFILL HAS A
13 LANDFILL GAS EXTRACTION PROGRAM. THIS GAS IS BURNED AND
14 SOLD FOR ELECTRICITY.

15 RIVERSIDE COUNTY HAS A NUMBER OF FUTURE
16 FACILITIES THAT ARE EXPECTED TO ARISE. WASTE MANAGEMENT
17 OF NORTH AMERICA INCORPORATED PLANS TO SITE A TRANSFER
18 STATION -- A NEW TRANSFER STATION FOR THE RANCHO
19 CALIFORNIA AREA. THERE IS A PRESENT DRAFT EIR
20 CIRCULATING FOR THE NUCO TRANSFER STATION TO SERVE THE
21 CITY OF RIVERSIDE.

22 THE CLOSED KAISER EAGLE MOUNTAIN LINE COULD
23 BECOME A SITE FOR A NEW COUNTY OR REGIONALWIDE LANDFILL.
24 THIS IS STILL IN THE DISCUSSION STAGE ONLY. COMACK
25 ENERGY COMPANY HAS PROPOSED AN AGRICULTURAL



1 BIOMASS-TO-ENERGY PLANT NEAR THE CITY OF MECCA IN THE
2 COACHELLA VALLEY.

3 ENFORCEMENT IN RIVERSIDE COUNTY, THERE IS ONE
4 CURRENT ACTIVITY. THE CLOSED WASTE -- EXCUSE ME -- THE
5 CLOSED WEST RIVERSIDE COUNTY LANDFILL IS ON THE RCRA OPEN
6 DUMP LIST AND ALSO THE STATE LIST OF NONCOMPLYING
7 FACILITIES DUE TO GAS MIGRATION.

8 WITH REGARD TO CURRENT ISSUES IN RIVERSIDE
9 COUNTY, IF WE TAKE A LOOK AT DISPOSAL CAPACITY, THE
10 WESTERN COUNTY ACCOUNTS FOR MOST OF THE 6.6 PERCENT
11 ANNUAL POPULATION GROWTH THAT I REFERRED TO EARLIER.
12 THERE IS A KEY LANDFILL IN WESTERN COUNTY, DOUBLE BUTTE
13 LANDFILL, WHICH WILL BE CLOSING IN ABOUT TWO YEARS THAT
14 PRESENTLY SERVES THE CITY OF HEMET AND ADJACENT AREAS.

15 UPON CLOSURE, HEMET REFUSE MAY HAVE TO GO TO
16 LAMB'S CANYON, NECESSITATING ROAD IMPROVEMENTS AT THAT
17 FACILITY OR PERHAPS A NEW TRANSFER STATION NEEDED FOR THE
18 CITY OF HEMET. HIGH GROVE LANDFILL IN THE NORTHWESTERN
19 PORTION OF THE COUNTY WILL CLOSE IN APPROXIMATELY NINE
20 YEARS OR LESS, NECESSITATING THAT THE RIVERSIDE
21 METROPOLITAN AREA WASTE BE HAULED EITHER TO EL SOBRANTE
22 OR BADLANDS LANDFILLS. THESE CHANGES WILL BE OCCURRING
23 OVER THE NEXT 12 YEARS AND WILL REPRESENT A CHALLENGE FOR
24 RIVERSIDE COUNTY.

25 WITH REGARD TO TRANSFER STATIONS, THERE ARE



1 THREE CURRENT TRANSFER STATIONS IN THE COUNTY HANDLE LESS
2 THAN HALF OF 1 PERCENT OF THE COUNTY'S LANDFILLED WASTE.
3 THIS IS DUE TO THE ISOLATION OF TWO OF THESE LANDFILLS
4 AND APPARENT UNDERUTILIZATION OF THE THIRD.

5 WITH REGARD TO RESOURCE RECOVERY, AT PRESENT
6 THERE ARE NO RELIABLE ESTIMATES OF THE AMOUNTS OF WASTE
7 THAT ARE BEING DIVERTED FROM LANDFILLS. FIGURES FROM THE
8 PRIVATE SECTOR ARE DIFFICULT TO OBTAIN TO DATE. THE
9 COUNTY IS ACTIVELY WORKING ON THIS. THERE IS NO CURBSIDE
10 COLLECTION PROGRAM IN THE COUNTY AS YET, BUT THE CITY OF
11 HEMET IS PLANNING TO BEGIN ONE IN THE NEAR FUTURE. THE
12 SALVAGE PROGRAMS AT THE COUNTY LANDFILLS CURRENTLY DIVERT
13 LESS THAN ONE-TENTH OF 1 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF
14 WASTE LANDFILLED IN THE COUNTY.

15 THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLAN REVIEW REPORT, WHICH
16 YOU HAVE IN FRONT OF YOU, WAS A WELL PREPARED DOCUMENT,
17 THE STAFF FELT. THERE WAS A GREAT DEAL OF INPUT FROM THE
18 SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COUNCIL, WHICH ASSISTED THE COUNTY
19 IN PREPARING THE PLAN REVIEW REPORT OVER A PERIOD OF
20 SEVERAL MONTHS.

21 THE COUNTY WISHES TO REVISE THE SOLID WASTE
22 MANAGEMENT PLAN, AND THE COUNTY HAS IDENTIFIED AT LEAST
23 12 OF 15 PLANNED CHAPTERS WHICH NEED TO BE REVISED.
24 BOARD STAFF AGREES THAT THE PLAN SHOULD BE REVISED.

25 AND IF THE BOARD HAVE ANY QUESTIONS AT THIS



1 TIME, I'LL BE HAPPY TO ANSWER THEM. OTHERWISE, WE DO
2 HAVE TWO REPRESENTATIVES FROM RIVERSIDE COUNTY WASTE
3 MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT, MR. NELSON AND MR. PERRY, WHO
4 WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS THE BOARD.

5 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: I'D LIKE TO ASK ONE QUESTION.
6 YOU KNOW THAT THERE'S A REQUIREMENT IN THE PLAN UPDATE
7 ABOUT THE EIGHT YEARS, DEMONSTRATED 'EIGHT YEARS'
8 CAPACITY. NOW, YOU JUST FINISHED SAYING THAT A FEW OF
9 THE LANDFILLS TAKE 79 PERCENT OF THE COUNTY'S WASTE.

10 MR. AULT: CORRECT.

11 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: THERE'S THE DILEMMA THAT
12 ALTHOUGH COUNTYWIDE A COUNTY MIGHT HAVE 20 YEARS OF
13 CAPACITY, THEY, IN FACT, MIGHT NOT HAVE THE EIGHT YEARS
14 IN THE AREAS THAT NEED IT THE MOST. HOW DO WE DEAL WITH
15 THAT ISSUE?

16 MR. AULT: VERY GOOD POINT. THE FIGURE THAT I
17 GAVE, THE TOTAL REMAINING CAPACITY FOR THE COUNTY WILL
18 CARRY THROUGH TO THE YEAR 2009, IS ACCURATE. WESTERN
19 COUNTY, AS I INDICATED, IS GOING TO BE UNDERGOING SOME
20 SIGNIFICANT CHANGES OVER THE NEXT NINE OR SO YEARS, BUT
21 THERE IS A DEFINITE ROOM FOR EXPANSION AT THREE -- AT
22 LEAST TWO AND THREE OF THE LANDFILLS IN THE WESTERN
23 COUNTY REGION. BADLANDS AND THE LAMB'S CANYON LANDFILL
24 DO APPEAR TO HAVE A SIGNIFICANT ROOM FOR EXPANSION AND
25 POSSIBLY ALSO THE EL SOBRANTE LANDFILL.



1 SO WITH TIMELY ACTIVITY ON THE PART OF THE
2 COUNTY AND PRIVATE SECTOR, WE ANTICIPATE THAT THERE WILL
3 BE SUFFICIENT CAPACITY IN THE WESTERN COUNTY AS WELL AS
4 COUNTYWIDE.

5 MR. SMITH: MR. BEAUTROW, IF I COULD CLARIFY THAT
6 REQUIREMENT. IT SAYS EIGHT YEARS OF COMBINED PERMITTED
7 CAPACITY. SO THE LEGISLATION TALKS ABOUT THE COMBINED
8 EIGHT YEARS. IT DOESN'T SAY FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL REASON
9 THERE HAS TO BE EIGHT YEARS.

10 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: I CAN SEE IN CERTAIN INSTANCES
11 WHERE THEORETICALLY IT PENCILS OUT AND IN ACTUALITY IT'S
12 A REAL PROBLEM.

13 MR. SMITH: IF WE SAW AN AREA THAT THEY HADN'T
14 IDENTIFIED THAT WAS WITHOUT ADEQUATE DISPOSAL, WE WOULD
15 ASK THEM TO ADDRESS THAT. WITH OUR PLANNING GUIDELINES,
16 I THINK WE CAN REQUIRE THAT THAT PART BE COMPLIED WITH.

17 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: THE QUESTION I HAD IS IT
18 SEEMS THAT EVERYTHING THAT'S BEEN GIVEN TO US IS SILENT
19 ON WHAT HAPPENS TO MARCH AIR FORCE BASE. THAT'S A FAIRLY
20 BIG INSTALLATION IN RIVERSIDE COUNTY, AND I DON'T SEE
21 ANYTHING IN HERE THAT EVEN TALKS TO IT. ARE THEY
22 SEPARATE FROM THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANS? DO THEY HAVE
23 THEIR OWN DISPOSAL, THEIR OWN LANDFILL?

24 WE HEARD SOME OF THE HORROR STORIES YESTERDAY
25 FROM THE GUY THAT WAS REPRESENTING THE AIR FORCE. I HOPE



1 WE'RE NOT GETTING OURSELVES IN THE SAME BOX WITH
2 RIVERSIDE COUNTY.

3 MR. AULT: YES, MR. GALLAGHER. TO MY
4 UNDERSTANDING, THE AIR FORCE BASE HAS NO SEPARATE
5 DISPOSAL, BUT UTILIZES COUNTY FACILITIES.

6 PERHAPS MR. PERRY OR MR. NELSON MAY BE ABLE TO
7 GIVE YOU ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THAT, BUT I'M NOT
8 AWARE THAT THERE IS ANY SIGNIFICANT ANTICIPATED PROBLEM
9 WITH THE WASTE STREAM FROM THAT AIR FORCE BASE.

10 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: THAT SEEMS TO BE AN AREA
11 OUT THERE AROUND SUNNYMEAD AND DOWN TOWARD HEMET AND
12 RANCHO CALIFORNIA ALL GOING DOWN 215. TREMENDOUS AMOUNT
13 OF RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY GOING IN THERE, AND I WOULD THINK
14 THAT THAT MIGHT EXACERBATE THE PROBLEM. YOU KNOW, PEOPLE
15 CAN'T AFFORD ORANGE COUNTY; THEY'RE MOVING INTO THAT
16 SECTION SO THAT MAY BE A REASON TO GIVE SOME SPECIAL
17 CONSIDERATION TO LOOK AT MARCH AIR FORCE BASE.

18 MR. AULT: I'M SURE THAT THE WASTE MANAGEMENT
19 DEPARTMENT WILL TAKE THAT THOUGHT UNDER CONSIDERATION.

20 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: ONE THING, JOHN, THAT YOU
21 TRIGGERED ABOUT MARCH AIR FORCE BASE. THE FEDERAL
22 GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN NOTORIOUSLY CAVALIER IN THEIR
23 ATTITUDE TOWARD REGULATIONS CONCERNING WASTE, AND THERE
24 HAVE BEEN SERIOUS PROBLEMS WITH THE HAZARDOUS WASTE OUT
25 OF ALL THE AIR FORCE BASES BECAUSE THEY HAVEN'T COMPLIED



1 NECESSARILY WITH ANYBODY'S LAWS, INCLUDING THE FEDERAL
2 LAWS.

3 AND I THINK IT'S VERY INCUMBENT UPON THE
4 STAFF, AND THANK YOU FOR POINTING THAT OUT. WE SHOULD BE
5 QUITE VIGILANT BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT, NOT ONLY IN THEIR
6 WASTE MANAGEMENT, BUT IN THEIR SEWAGE TREATMENT AND
7 HAZARDOUS WASTE. ALTHOUGH WE DON'T ADDRESS THOSE
8 PARTICULAR ISSUES, THEY CERTAINLY DO IMPACT. AND SOME OF
9 THE LEACHATE, I'M SURE, IN RIVERSIDE COUNTY NEAR MARCH
10 AIR FORCE WILL SHOW THAT THEY HAVE BEEN QUITE CRIMINAL IN
11 THEIR DISPOSAL PRACTICES IN THE PAST. THEY MAY NOT BE
12 DOING IT NOW, BUT THEY WERE SEVERAL YEARS AGO.

13 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY OTHER COMMENTS FROM BOARD
14 MEMBERS? MR. NELSON, DID YOU WANT TO SAY ANYTHING AT
15 ALL?

16 MR. NELSON: BOARD MEMBERS, MY NAME IS BOB NELSON.
17 I'LL WILL SIMPLY INTRODUCE MIKE PERRY, WHO IS OUR STAFF
18 MEMBER THAT'S BEEN WORKING ON THE COSWMP FOR ACTUALLY
19 OVER A YEAR NOW. AND I WOULD ASK MIKE AT THIS TIME TO
20 ADDRESS SOME OF THE POINTS WE THINK ARE OF INTEREST TO
21 YOU.

22 MR. PERRY: THANK YOU. IN REFERENCE TO THE BOARD'S
23 QUESTIONS REGARDING ADEQUATE CAPACITIES ON THE WEST END
24 OF THE COUNTY VERSUS THE EAST END OF THE COUNTY, STAFF
25 HAS DONE CONSIDERABLE WASTE STREAM ANALYSIS IN



1 DETERMINING WHAT WOULD HAPPEN TO THE WASTE GENERATED FROM
2 BOTH AREAS OF THE COUNTY AS LANDFILLS CLOSE.

3 BASED UPON THOSE STUDIES THAT WE'VE CONDUCTED,
4 THE WEST END OF THE COUNTY HAS APPROXIMATELY 16 YEARS
5 REMAINING LANDFILL CAPACITY THAT IS CURRENTLY PERMITTED
6 AND SITED. THE COACHELLA VALLEY HAS THE LARGEST
7 PERMITTED CAPACITY ACTUALLY AVAILABLE THAT WOULD LAST IN
8 EXCESS OF 20 YEARS. THE COMBINED CAPACITIES OF BOTH
9 REACH ROUGHLY 21 YEARS.

10 THE SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL
11 HAS BEEN MAKING SIGNIFICANT PROGRESS IN DEVELOPING THE
12 REVISION TO THE PLAN AS OUTLINED WITHIN THE PLAN REVIEW
13 REPORT.

14 IN PARTICULAR, WE'VE ALREADY GONE AHEAD AND
15 DEVELOPED A PUBLIC AWARENESS PROGRAM WHERE WE'RE GOING
16 OUT AND MEETING WITH THE PUBLIC AND SERVICE GROUPS TO
17 INFORM THEM OF THE ISSUES RELATED TO SOLID WASTE
18 MANAGEMENT. AND, IN ADDITION, THE COUNTY HAS DEVELOPED
19 WHAT WE BELIEVE IS A COMPREHENSIVE RECYCLING AND WASTE
20 REDUCTION PLAN THAT WILL MEET THE GOALS STIPULATED IN
21 AB 1462.

22 THAT'S ALL I HAVE TO SAY AT THIS TIME. I'LL
23 BE MORE THAN HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE.

24 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS? THANK YOU
25 VERY MUCH. WE'RE READY TO CONSIDER THIS PLAN REVIEW



1 REPORT FOR A MOTION.

2 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I MOVE 88-46.

3 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: SECOND.

4 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED.

5 ALL IN FAVOR? OPPOSED? SO MOVED.

6 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: COULD I MOVE RESOLUTION
7 88-37 IN REFERENCE TO AMADOR COUNTY?

8 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: I UNDERSTAND WE DID NOT VOTE ON
9 AMADOR COUNTY, SO GO AHEAD AND --

10 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: I WOULD MOVE RESOLUTION
11 88-37.

12 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: SECOND.

13 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED.
14 ALL IN FAVOR? OPPOSED? NONE. CARRIED. THANK YOU.

15 THANKS A LOT FOR COMING UP HERE AND BEING
16 RESPONSIVE. IT'S ALWAYS GRATIFYING TO SEE THAT THE
17 COUNTIES ARE MOVING AHEAD AND THAT WE DON'T HAVE TO NUDGE
18 THEM A LITTLE. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

19 NEXT ONE IS ITEM NO. 6, SOLANO COUNTY SOLID
20 WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN.

21 MR. OLDALL: WE'LL MOVE FROM THE SOUTHERN END OF
22 THE STATE TO THE NORTH END OF THE STATE. SOLANO COUNTY
23 IS GOING TO BE PRESENTED BY MICHAEL YOUNG.

24 MR. YOUNG: MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN, BOARD MEMBERS.
25 THE ORIGINAL SOLANO COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN



1 WAS APPROVED BY THIS BOARD IN 1978. THE FIRST REVISION
2 TO THAT PLAN WAS APPROVED BY THIS BOARD IN 1984. THE
3 SUBSEQUENT TRIENNIAL PLAN REVIEW REPORT WAS SUBMITTED BY
4 THE COUNTY ON MARCH 10, 1987.

5 AT THAT TIME THE COUNTY INDICATED THE NEED TO
6 REVISE THEIR PLAN. AT THE BOARD'S JULY 16 THROUGH 17,
7 1987, MEETING, THE BOARD APPROVED THE PLAN REVIEW REPORT
8 AND DIRECTED THE COUNTY TO REVISE ITS PLAN IN THE AREAS
9 INDICATED ON PAGE 197 OF YOUR AGENDA PACKET.

10 THE PRELIMINARY DRAFT WAS RECEIVED BY BOARD
11 STAFF ON JANUARY 9, 1988. BOARD STAFF REVIEWED THE DRAFT
12 AND SUBMITTED COMMENTS TO THE COUNTY.

13 BASED ON THOSE COMMENTS AND OTHERS, THE COUNTY
14 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVED THE FINAL PLAN REVISION
15 APRIL 19, 1988. BOARD STAFF RECEIVED THE 20 COPIES OF
16 THE FINAL PLAN REVISION ON JUNE 15, 1988.

17 BEFORE DISCUSSING THE REVISION FEATURES, I
18 WOULD LIKE TO DISCUSS THE COUNTY'S CHARACTERISTICS IN
19 EXISTING SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM. THE COUNTY IS
20 BOUNDED BY NAPA COUNTY ON THE WEST, YOLLO COUNTY ON THE
21 NORTH, SACRAMENTO COUNTY ON THE EAST, AND CONTRA COSTA
22 COUNTY ON THE SOUTH. THE COUNTY IS COMPOSED OF 827
23 SQUARE MILES OF LAND. THE POPULATION OF THE COUNTY AS OF
24 MAY 1, 1988, IS APPROXIMATELY 303,500. THE COUNTY
25 CURRENTLY GENERATES APPROXIMATELY 365,700 TONS PER YEAR



1600 EAST FOURTH STREET, SUITE 220
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92701
TELEPHONE (714) 953-4447

Barristers'
reporting service

1 OF SOLID WASTE.

2 COLLECTION IS PROVIDED BY SIX PRIVATE
3 COMPANIES. THE COUNTY IS SERVED BY NINE LANDFILLS. SIX
4 OF THESE ARE LOCATED IN COUNTY AND THREE ARE LOCATED OUT
5 OF COUNTY. THE LOCATION OF THESE FACILITIES ARE SHOWN ON
6 THE MAP ON PAGE 207 OF YOUR AGENDA PACKET.

7 THE COUNTY IS CURRENTLY RECYCLING
8 APPROXIMATELY 13 PERCENT OF ITS WASTE STREAM. RECYCLING
9 PROGRAMS INCLUDE DROPOFF AND BUY-BACK CENTERS, PAPER,
10 NEWSPRINT, AND CARDBOARD RECYCLING, AND BRUSH CHIPPING
11 FOR MULCH BY THE CITY OF VACAVILLE.

12 IN REGARD TO SIGNIFICANT REVISION FEATURES,
13 THE COUNTY HAS IDENTIFIED 35 YEARS OF EXISTING LANDFILL
14 CAPACITY. IN ADDITION, THE COUNTY HAS IDENTIFIED A
15 HANDLING AND DISPOSAL PROGRAM FOR ASBESTOS WASTE FROM
16 BUILDING REMOVAL PROJECTS, AND THE COUNTY HAS INCLUDED A
17 HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE PROGRAM.

18 IN ADDITION, THE COUNTY HAS ESTABLISHED A
19 POLICY THAT A PLAN AMENDMENT WILL BE REQUIRED FOR WASTE
20 IMPORT UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS. THESE CONDITIONS ARE
21 THAT IF THE FACILITY WHICH IS TO RECEIVE THAT WASTE HAS
22 ITS ANNUAL TONNAGE INCREASED BY MORE THAN 10 PERCENT OR
23 IF THERE ARE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE TRANSPORTATION AND
24 LITTER PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROJECT, THEN A PLAN
25 AMENDMENT WILL BE REQUIRED BEFORE THAT PROJECT CAN BE



1 APPROVED AND IMPLEMENTED.

2 IN ADDITION, THE COUNTY HAS ESTABLISHED A
3 RECYCLING GOAL OF 20 PERCENT AND INCLUDED PROGRAMS FOR
4 ACHIEVING THAT GOAL. THE COUNTY PREPARED AND CERTIFIED A
5 NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE PLAN REVISION. THE COUNTY
6 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CERTIFIED THAT DOCUMENT ON APRIL 19,
7 1988.

8 BOARD STAFF HAS REVIEWED THE NEGATIVE
9 DECLARATION AND FOUND IT ADEQUATE FOR THE BOARD'S USE IN
10 EVALUATING THIS PROJECT.

11 IN ADDITION, BOARD STAFF REVIEWED THE PLAN
12 REVISION TO DETERMINE IF IT COMPLIES WITH STATE POLICY
13 AND BOARD PLANNING GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING, REVISING,
14 AND AMENDING COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANS. BOARD
15 STAFF REVIEWED THAT DOCUMENT AND DETERMINED THAT IT DOES
16 MEET THOSE REQUIREMENTS AND THAT THE COUNTY HAS
17 ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED THE AREAS IDENTIFIED BY THE COUNTY
18 AND THE BOARD AT THE TIME THE PLAN REVIEW REPORT WAS
19 ACCEPTED.

20 IN ADDITION, BOARD STAFF HAS DETERMINED THAT
21 THE COUNTY HAS ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED RECENT CHANGES IN
22 GOVERNMENT CODE. THIS INCLUDES THE IDENTIFICATION OF
23 EIGHT YEARS OF LANDFILL CAPACITY, THE IDENTIFICATION OF
24 THE 20-PERCENT RECYCLING GOAL, IDENTIFICATION OF A
25 HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE PROGRAM, AND IDENTIFICATION OF



1 HANDLING AND DISPOSAL PROGRAM FOR ASBESTOS WASTE REMOVAL
2 PROJECTS.

3 STAFF BELIEVES THAT THE PLAN REVISION IS
4 ADEQUATE FOR DIRECTING THE COUNTY'S LONG-TERM HANDLING
5 DISPOSAL OF SOLID WASTE AND RECOMMENDS THAT THE BOARD
6 ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 88-47 AND APPROVE THE SOLANO COUNTY
7 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN REVISION.

8 THIS CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION. IF THERE ARE
9 NO QUESTIONS FOR ME, MR. DAVE HUBBELL OF SOLANO COUNTY'S
10 ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
11 DEPARTMENT IS HERE TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS WHICH THE
12 BOARD MAY HAVE ON THE REVISION.

13 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: BEFORE MR. HUBBELL, DOES ANY
14 BOARD MEMBER HAVE QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS? I HAVE ONE THAT
15 MAYBE MR. HUBBELL CAN ANSWER.

16 YEARS AGO THE LYNCH CANYON LANDFILL WAS
17 PROPOSED TO ACCEPT THE SAN FRANCISCO WASTE, AND THEN
18 THERE WAS AN INITIATIVE PASSED. AND AS I READ THE
19 DOCUMENTS, I THINK THERE'S A LIMITATION OF 95,000 TONS A
20 YEAR THAT COULD BE IMPORTED, BUT I UNDERSTOOD THERE WAS
21 SOME NEGOTIATIONS OR SOMETHING WITH THE B & J SITE AS AN
22 ALTERNATIVE THAT MAYBE WAS APPROVED. I'D JUST LIKE TO
23 KNOW WHAT THE STATUS OF THAT IS IF YOU KNOW ABOUT IT.

24 MR. YOUNG: PERHAPS IT WOULD BE BETTER FOR DAVE TO
25 ADDRESS THIS QUESTION.



1 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: MR. DAVE HUBBELL.

2 MR. HUBBELL: MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD,
3 MY NAME IS DAVID HUBBELL. I'M HERE TODAY REPRESENTING
4 THE COUNTY OF SOLANO ON BEHALF OF OUR SOLID WASTE
5 MANAGEMENT PLAN.

6 WE BELIEVE YOUR STAFF HAS GIVEN A GOOD
7 CHARACTERIZATION OF THE UPDATE OF OUR PLAN. BASICALLY,
8 THE PLAN UPDATE WAS PREPARED JOINTLY BY A TECHNICAL
9 ADVISORY COMMITTEE CONSISTING OF CITIES AND OF THE
10 COLLECTORS OR DISPOSERS. IT'S A FAIRLY NONCONTROVERSIAL
11 PROCESS THIS TIME AND WAS ENDORSED BY ALL THE CITIES.

12 IN RESPONSE TO YOUR QUESTION, MR. BEAUTROW, IN
13 OUR 1984 PLAN UPDATE WE HAD PROPOSED THE ESTABLISHMENT OF
14 THE LYNCH CANYON SITE WHICH WAS TO BE A LONG-TERM
15 DISPOSAL OPTION FOR THE CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO. THERE WAS
16 AN INITIATIVE AND A REFERENDUM THAT OCCURRED IN 1984, ONE
17 OF WHICH REMOVED THE LYNCH CANYON SITE FROM THE COUNTY'S
18 GENERAL PLAN. AND THE SECOND WAS AN INITIATIVE PLACING A
19 LIMITATION OF 95,000 TONS IMPORT ON WASTES ANNUALLY.
20 THAT INITIATIVE STILL ALLOWED B & J TO ACCEPT SAN
21 FRANCISCO WASTES FOR FIVE YEARS.

22 HOWEVER, SINCE THAT TIME --

23 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: THE CLOCK HAS BEEN RUNNING.

24 MR. HUBBELL: -- THERE HAS BEEN SOME INTEREST IN
25 ALLOCATING THE 95,000 TONS, BUT THERE'S NOTHING REALLY,



1 YOU KNOW, CONCRETE AT THIS TIME.

2 THAT'S ALL I HAVE UNLESS YOU HAVE QUESTIONS OF
3 ME.

4 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: DO ANY OF THE OTHER BOARD
5 MEMBERS HAVE QUESTIONS?

6 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: MOVE ADOPTION OF
7 RESOLUTION 88-47.

8 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: SECOND.

9 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED.
10 ANY DISCUSSION AMONG THE BOARD MEMBERS ON THIS? ALL IN
11 FAVOR? OPPOSED? NONE. SO MOVED. THANK YOU, MR.
12 HUBBELL.

13 THE NEXT ONE IS 7, CONSIDERATION OF THE SANTA
14 CLARA COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT.
15 ACTUALLY, 7, 8, AND 9 ARE ALL RELATED TO THREE AMENDMENTS
16 FOR THE SANTA CLARA COUNTY PLAN. I ASSUME THAT WE HAD TO
17 TAKE THESE ONE AT A TIME. THAT'S WHY IT WAS ON THE
18 AGENDA. WE'LL START WITH NO. 7.

19 MR. OLDALL: MIKE YOUNG WILL CONTINUE THIS ITEM,
20 MR. CHAIRMAN.

21 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: I GUESS THIS IS THE FIRST TIME
22 THAT ANY COUNTY HAS SPECIFICALLY ADDRESSED THIS VERY
23 ISSUE ABOUT A MECHANISM, AT LEAST IN MY KNOWLEDGE. AND I
24 UNDERSTAND EVERYBODY IS BESIEGED BY THE ONSLAUGHT OF
25 WASTE, SO THEY WANT TO DEAL WITH THIS. SO THAT'S THE



1 REASON FOR THIS, I SUPPOSE.

2 MR. YOUNG: MR. CHAIRMAN, BOARD MEMBERS, THE
3 CURRENT SANTA CLARA COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN
4 CONTAINS NO PROCEDURES OR CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING
5 OUT-OF-COUNTY REQUESTS FOR WASTE IMPORT. THIS PROPOSED
6 PLAN AMENDMENT WILL ADDRESS THAT PROBLEM.

7 THE COUNTY APPROVED THE PROPOSED PLAN
8 AMENDMENT ON MARCH 29, '88. SUBSEQUENTLY, BOARD STAFF
9 RECEIVED THE LOCALLY APPROVED PLAN AMENDMENT ON JULY 1,
10 1988. THE PLAN AMENDMENT ESTABLISHES A PROCEDURE FOR
11 CONSIDERING REQUESTS FOR OUT-OF-COUNTY WASTE IMPORT.
12 THAT PROCEDURE REQUIRES THAT EACH REQUEST FOR WASTE
13 IMPORT IF NOT ALREADY DISCUSSED IN THE EXISTING COSWMP BE
14 EVALUATED BY THE COUNTY AND INCLUDED IN THE CURRENT
15 COSWMP THROUGH A PLAN AMENDMENT BEFORE THAT PROJECT CAN
16 BE APPROVED AND IMPLEMENTED.

17 IN ADDITION, THE PLAN AMENDMENT SPELLS OUT THE
18 INFORMATION THAT MUST BE INCLUDED IN AN APPLICATION FOR
19 COSWMP AMENDMENT TO IMPORT OUT OF COUNTY WASTE. EACH
20 APPLICATION TO THE COUNTY SOLID WASTE PLANNING PROGRAM
21 FOR A PLAN AMENDMENT TO IMPORT WASTE MUST INCLUDE THE
22 FOLLOWING INFORMATION: THE ORIGIN AND SOURCE OF THE
23 WASTE, THE ULTIMATE DISPOSAL SITE FOR THAT WASTE, THE
24 AMOUNT OF WASTE FOR DISPOSAL, THE COMPOSITION OF THE
25 WASTE, DESCRIPTION OF THE HAZARDOUS WASTE SCREENING



1 METHODS, AND AN EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT ON THE COUNTY
2 SOLID WASTE SYSTEM, A DESCRIPTION OF ALL REQUIRED STATE
3 AND LOCAL PERMITS, A DESCRIPTION OF WASTE REDUCTION
4 EFFORTS AT THE ORIGIN OF THE WASTE, AND, FINALLY, THE
5 APPROPRIATE CEQA DOCUMENT.

6 THE COUNTY HAS DETERMINED THAT THE PLAN
7 AMENDMENT IS NECESSARY IF THE COUNTY IS MAINTAIN ACCURATE
8 DATA ON THE AMOUNT OF WASTE ENTERING THE COUNTY AND IF
9 THE COUNTY IS TO ACCURATELY EVALUATE THE IMPACT OF WASTE
10 IMPORT ON ITS EXISTING SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.

11 THE COUNTY CERTIFIED AND APPROVED A NEGATIVE
12 DECLARATION FOR THE PLAN AMENDMENT. BOARD STAFF REVIEWED
13 THAT DOCUMENT AND DETERMINED THAT IT WAS ADEQUATE FOR THE
14 BOARD'S USE IN EVALUATING THIS PROJECT.

15 IN ADDITION, STAFF HAS REVIEWED THE PROPOSED
16 PLAN AMENDMENT TO DETERMINE IF IT COMPLIES WITH STATE
17 POLICY AND BOARD PLANNING GUIDE -- BOARD PLANNING
18 GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING, REVISING, AND AMENDING COUNTY
19 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANS. AFTER REVIEW, BOARD STAFF
20 HAS FOUND THAT THE PROPOSED PLAN AMENDMENT COMPLIES WITH
21 THOSE REQUIREMENTS AND THAT IT PROMOTES ECONOMIC AND
22 EFFICIENT DISPOSAL OF SOLID WASTE ON A REGIONAL BASIS.

23 BASED ON THESE FINDINGS, BOARD STAFF
24 RECOMMENDS THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE SANTA CLARA COUNTY
25 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT AS SUBMITTED AND



1 ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 88-40.

2 THIS CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION ON THIS ITEM.
3 IF THERE ARE NO QUESTIONS OF ME, MS. SALLY LOGOTHETTI,
4 SANTA CLARA COUNTY SOLID WASTE PROGRAM COORDINATOR, IS
5 HERE TODAY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS THE BOARD MAY HAVE ON
6 THIS.

7 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: MR. BEAUTROW, THIS MAY OR
8 MAY NOT BE RELEVANT TO THIS PARTICULAR AMENDMENT BECAUSE
9 I HAVEN'T SEEN ALL THE ENABLING LEGISLATION THAT'S
10 WRITTEN. ARE ALL OF THESE COUNTIES THAT WE'RE GOING TO
11 BE GETTING COMING DOWN THE LINE, ARE THEY TAKING INTO
12 CONSIDERATION THE NEW JERSEY, CITY OF PHILADELPHIA
13 DECISION ON THE PROHIBITION OF IMPORTED WASTE?

14 IT'S DIFFERENT THAN THE EVERGREEN DECISION.
15 AND ARE THEY WRITING INTO THEIR AMENDMENTS ALL THE
16 REQUIREMENTS THAT THAT PARTICULAR DECISION HAD SO THAT
17 NOBODY CAN TAKE THEM TO COURT AND CANCEL OUT THEIR
18 PROHIBITIONS? I THINK IT OUGHT TO BE VERY CLEARLY
19 INDICATED TO EVERYONE THAT THAT PARTICULAR DECISION TOOK
20 AWAY THE RIGHT OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY TO BAN
21 IMPORTATION OF WASTES.

22 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: MR. CONHEIM, WOULD YOU LIKE TO
23 ADDRESS THAT?

24 ATTORNEY CONHEIM: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN. MS.
25 BREMBERG, THAT CASE WAS BASED ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE



1 GROUND AND ISN'T APPLICABLE IN A SITUATION WHERE WE'RE
2 TALKING ABOUT WHOLLY INTRASTATE EFFECTS. THE CASE THAT I
3 THINK IS SIGNIFICANT IS EVERGREEN BECAUSE IT WAS BASED
4 BOTH ON INTERSTATE ISSUES AS WELL AS INTRASTATE
5 TREATMENT.

6 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: THAT WAS SPECIAL DISTRICTS
7 TOO AND IMPACT ON HEALTH AND SAFETY, WHICH IS WHAT I WAS
8 REFERRING TO IN EXPANDING THEIR AMENDMENTS TO INCLUDE ALL
9 THOSE THINGS.

10 ATTORNEY CONHEIM: I THINK THAT THE ISSUE OF
11 WHETHER THESE CASES -- I DOUBT WHETHER THESE CASES ARE
12 SPECIFICALLY BEING WRITTEN INTO THESE LAWS ALTHOUGH THE
13 LAWYERS THAT ARE ADVISING MOST OF THE COUNTIES INVOLVED
14 IN THESE THINGS ARE AWARE OF THESE CASES.

15 AS THEY MOVE CLOSER TO HOME, I THINK -- AS THE
16 LITIGATION MOVES CLOSER TO HOME, I THINK YOU WILL SEE
17 PLAN AMENDMENTS AND PROCEDURES TAILORED TO CASES THAT MAY
18 BE ON ALL FOURS AND CLEARLY BINDING ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE
19 JURISDICTION.

20 AND PERHAPS THE SANTA CLARA PEOPLE CAN COMMENT
21 SPECIFICALLY ON WHETHER THEY'VE CONSIDERED THESE THINGS.
22 WE'RE ALL ROUGHLY AWARE OF THESE CASES IN TRYING TO DEAL
23 WITH THE ISSUE. WE'RE TRYING TO ADVISE THE LOCAL
24 GOVERNMENTS, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ARE GRAPPLING WITH THE
25 NOTION OF PROTECTING THEIR OWN CAPACITY VERSUS PROVIDING



1 REGIONAL DISPOSAL CAPACITY.

2 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: I KNOW THAT THERE ARE SOME
3 ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS WHO INTEND TO PICK UP ON THE
4 PHILADELPHIA, NEW JERSEY, IGNORING THE INTERSTATE
5 COMMERCE PROVISION AND BRINGING IT CLOSER DOWN AND
6 TIGHTENING THE REFINEMENTS ON IMPORTATION AND
7 EXPORTATION. AND I THINK IT WOULD BEHOOVE EVERYONE TO
8 KIND OF MOVE THAT UP TO THE FRONT OF THE FILE AND CHECK
9 OUT HOW THEY CAN WORD THINGS SO THAT THEY WON'T GET INTO
10 LITIGATION.

11 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: THIS IS SIMPLY A MECHANISM
12 WHERE AN APPLICANT HAS A PROCEDURE TO FOLLOW IF THEY WANT
13 TO IMPORT WASTE, AND THEY'VE GOT TO HAVE THIS LAUNDRY
14 LIST OF INFORMATION. HOWEVER, IT REALLY DOESN'T SAY
15 ANYTHING ABOUT HOW MUCH COULD BE IMPORTED OR WHETHER IT'S
16 A POLICY THAT THEY COULD OR COULD NOT. IT'S JUST A
17 MECHANISM TO GET IT INTO THE PROCESS, AND I GUESS DOWN
18 THE LINE YOU HAVE TO FIGURE OUT FROM A POLICY STANDPOINT
19 IS THE -- LIKE ALAMEDA COUNTY CAME OUT WITH A STATEMENT.

20 YOU ARE THE SANTA CLARA COUNTY REPRESENTATIVE?
21 WOULD YOU IDENTIFY YOURSELF AGAIN?

22 MS. LOGOTHETTI: YES, CERTAINLY. I AM SALLY
23 LOGOTHETTI, AND I'M THE ACTING COORDINATOR FOR THE SOLID
24 WASTE PROGRAM IN SANTA CLARA COUNTY.

25 I REALLY HAVE NOTHING FURTHER TO ADD. WE



1 CONCUR WITH YOUR STAFF'S COMMENTS ON OUR PROPOSAL AND
2 WITH YOURS ALSO, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT THIS IS INDEED
3 INTENDED TO BE A MECHANISM WHICH WILL ALLOW US TO TRACK
4 THE AMOUNT OF IMPORTATION THAT'S BEING PROPOSED.

5 WE ARE CURRENTLY RECEIVING LOTS OF INQUIRIES
6 FROM SURROUNDING JURISDICTIONS, AND WE FEEL THAT WE WILL
7 BE NEEDING TO KEEP TRACK OF HOW MUCH IS COMING INTO OUR
8 COUNTY IN ORDER TO MAKE SURE THAT WE HAVE ADEQUATE
9 DISPOSAL CAPACITY FOR OURSELVES.

10 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY QUESTIONS? WE'RE READY FOR
11 CONSIDERATION OF THIS ITEM, THEN, IF THERE'S NO OTHER
12 COMMENTS.

13 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: MOVE 88-40.

14 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: SECOND.

15 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED.
16 ANY DISCUSSION ON THAT? ALL THOSE IN FAVOR? OPPOSED?
17 NONE. CARRIED. THANK YOU.

18 NEXT ITEM ALSO DEALS WITH SANTA CLARA COUNTY,
19 AND IT'S THE RECYCLERY THAT WE'VE SEEN MANY PRESENTATIONS
20 ON AND MIGHT PROCEED. MR. GAVRICH, GOOD MORNING. SO THE
21 STAFF MAKE A PRESENTATION, PLEASE.

22 MR. YOUNG: MR. CHAIRMAN, BOARD MEMBERS, SANTA
23 CLARA COUNTY IS PROPOSING A PLAN AMENDMENT TO DESIGNATE
24 BROWNING FERRIS INDUSTRIES RECYCLERY PROJECT AS A
25 TRANSFER PROCESSING FACILITY IN THE COUNTY SOLID WASTE



1 MANAGEMENT PLAN.

2 THE PROJECT IS LOCATED ADJACENT TO THE NEWBY
3 ISLAND LANDFILL. THE PROJECT IS DESIGNED TO EXTRACT
4 RECYCLABLES FROM THE INCOMING MIXED WASTE STREAM. THE
5 FACILITY WILL RECOVER PAPER, GLASS, PLASTIC, METAL, WOOD,
6 RUBBER, AND CARDBOARD THROUGH A SERIES OF MANUAL AND
7 MECHANICAL SORTING SYSTEMS. BY SALVAGING RECYCLABLES
8 FROM THE MIXED WASTE STREAM, THE PROJECT WILL HELP THE
9 COUNTY MEET STATE AND LOCAL RECYCLING GOALS AND ALSO HELP
10 TO CONSERVE THE COUNTY'S LANDFILL CAPACITY.

11 THE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVED THE
12 PLAN AMENDMENT ON MARCH 24, 1988. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT
13 WAS SUBSEQUENTLY APPROVED BY ALL THE CITIES IN THE
14 COUNTY. BOARD STAFF RECEIVED THE LOCALLY APPROVED PLAN
15 AMENDMENT JULY 1, 1988. THE COUNTY PREPARED AND
16 CERTIFIED A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE PROJECT.

17 BOARD STAFF HAS REVIEWED THAT DOCUMENT AND
18 DETERMINED IT IS ADEQUATE FOR THE BOARD'S USE IN
19 EVALUATING THIS PROJECT. BOARD STAFF HAS ALSO REVIEWED
20 THE PROPOSED PLAN AMENDMENT TO DETERMINE IF IT COMPLIES
21 WITH STATE POLICY AND BOARD PLANNING GUIDELINES FOR
22 PREPARING, REVISING, AND AMENDING COUNTY SOLID WASTE
23 MANAGEMENT PLANS. STAFF HAS DETERMINED THAT THE PLAN
24 AMENDMENT IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH STATE POLICY AND BOARD
25 PLANNING GUIDELINES.



1 THE AMENDMENT PROMOTES EFFICIENT WASTE
2 HANDLING AND DISPOSAL AND WILL ALSO DIVERT MATERIAL FROM
3 LANDFILLING. THE PROJECT IS EXPECTED TO RECOVER AS MUCH
4 AS 25 PERCENT OF THE INCOMING WASTE. BASED ON THESE
5 FINDINGS, BOARD STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE BOARD APPROVE
6 SANTA CLARA COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT
7 AS SUBMITTED AND ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 88-41.

8 THIS CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION ON THIS ITEM.
9 IF THERE ARE NO QUESTIONS FOR ME, ONCE AGAIN, MS. SALLY
10 LOGOTHETTI IS HERE TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS WHICH THE
11 COUNTY -- WHICH THE BOARD MAY HAVE ON THIS ITEM, AND ALSO
12 MR. DAVE GAVRICH REPRESENTING BROWNING FERRIS INDUSTRIES
13 IS HERE AS WELL.

14 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY BOARD MEMBERS THAT WOULD
15 LIKE TO ASK QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS? I KNOW THAT WE'VE SEEN
16 THE VISUAL PRESENTATION ON A NUMBER OF OCCASIONS AND ALSO
17 IN CONFERENCES. WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO DELAY ACTION
18 UNTIL BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER COMES BACK BECAUSE WE DON'T
19 HAVE A QUORUM. WE'LL -- THERE'S NO -- MR. GAVRICH, WOULD
20 YOU LIKE TO MAKE ANY COMMENTS ON THAT?

21 MR. GAVRICH: JUST ONE VERY QUICK COMMENT. IT'S
22 ACTUALLY A NOTE OF THANKS TO THANK BOTH THE COUNTY OF
23 SANTA CLARA AND THIS SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD FOR
24 BEING VERY SUPPORTIVE ALL ALONG THE WAY IN TERMS OF
25 PLANNING. WE'RE GETTING VERY CLOSE TO GOING TO



1 CONSTRUCTION ON THIS PROJECT, AND IT WILL BE A MODEL
2 PROJECT, NOT JUST FOR THE SAN JOSE AREA, BUT ALSO FOR OUR
3 OTHER LANDFILLS IN CALIFORNIA, AS WELL AS OUR CORPORATE
4 HEADQUARTERS IN HOUSTON IS LOOKING AT IT AS A MODEL FOR
5 OUR OTHER LANDFILLS ACROSS THE COUNTRY, OF WHICH WE HAVE
6 OVER A HUNDRED.

7 THIS REALLY COULD BE THE START OF A TRULY
8 INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM THAT COMBINES
9 COMPOSTING, MATERIALS RECOVERY, PUBLIC BUY-BACK,
10 EDUCATION CENTER, ALL COMBINED WITH AN ENVIRONMENTALLY
11 SOUND LANDFILL. WE'RE REAL EXCITED AND WE THANK THE
12 BOARD FOR THEIR CONTINUED SUPPORT, AND WE'LL BE COMING TO
13 YOU FOR THE FACILITIES PERMIT VERY, VERY SOON.

14 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: THANK YOU.

15 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: DAVE, NOW, WITH YOUR
16 RECYCLERY, IT'S LOCATED IN A CLOSE PROXIMITY TO THE
17 LANDFILL.

18 MR. GAVRICH: RIGHT ADJACENT TO THE LANDFILL ON 11
19 ACRES.

20 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: SO THAT WAY A GREAT AMOUNT OF
21 YOUR RECOVERY IS TAKEN RIGHT OUT OF THE MATERIALS THAT
22 ARE BROUGHT INTO THE LANDFILL; IS THAT CORRECT?

23 MR. GAVRICH: PRECISELY.

24 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: AND YOUR COMPANY ACTUALLY
25 DOES A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT THINGS. DO YOU FIND THIS TO



1 BE A MUCH MORE COST-EFFECTIVE WAY AS OPPOSED TO CURBSIDE
2 RECYCLING?

3 MR. GAVRICH: CURBSIDE RECYCLING IS A RATHER
4 EXPENSIVE WAY OF RECOVERING A RELATIVELY SMALL AMOUNT OF
5 MATERIAL FROM THE RESIDENTIAL WASTE STREAM. THE
6 RECYCLERY ATTACKS THE COMMERCIAL WASTE STREAM WHERE YOU
7 HAVE THE BULKIEST MATERIAL, MATERIAL THAT TAKES UP THE
8 MOST SPACE IN THE LANDFILL.

9 AND WHERE I THINK SAN JOSE IS LOOKING AT
10 SOMETHING IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD OF 50 TO \$90 A TON -- IF
11 THERE'S ANYBODY FROM SAN JOSE, PLEASE CORRECT ME IF I'M
12 WRONG -- IN TERMS OF PER TON DIVERTED FROM THE
13 RESIDENTIAL WASTE STREAM THROUGH CURBSIDE PROGRAMS. THE
14 COMMERCIAL RECYCLERY-TYPE PROGRAM WILL BE SOMEWHERE MORE
15 IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD OF 15 TO \$25 A TON TO PULL THAT
16 MATERIAL OUT OF THE WASTE STREAM. SO IT DOES SEEM TO BE
17 MORE COST-EFFECTIVE. CURBSIDE HAS ITS PLACE IN TERMS OF
18 BRINGING RECYCLING RIGHT INTO THE HOME AND INCREASING THE
19 POLITICAL AWARENESS OF RECYCLING.

20 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: I UNDERSTAND. THE REASON I'M
21 ASKING THIS QUESTION IS FOR THE BENEFIT OF OTHERS THAT
22 MIGHT BE LISTENING BECAUSE, PARTICULARLY FOR THOSE
23 COUNTIES OR AREAS THAT DON'T HAVE A PROGRAM, THEN FROM
24 THE STANDPOINT OF COST-EFFECTIVENESS, THEN THIS IS THE
25 TYPE OF THING THAT THEY WOULD GET THE GREATEST AMOUNT OF



1 BENEFIT FOR THE LEAST AMOUNT OF COST; IS THAT CORRECT?

2 MR. GAVRICH: WE THINK SO, AND WE THINK THE
3 DIVERSION POTENTIAL OF THESE KIND OF PROGRAMS IS
4 SUBSTANTIALLY GREATER THAN CURBSIDE COLLECTION.

5 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: SIGNIFICANTLY GREATER IN
6 VOLUME IN REALLY ACHIEVING THE GOALS OF REMOVING LARGE
7 AMOUNTS FROM THE WASTE STREAM. THAT'S THE POINT I WANTED
8 TO ASK YOU BECAUSE YOU ARE THE ONE THAT'S INVOLVED WITH
9 IT.

10 MR. GAVRICH: WHEN I WAS HERE LAST TIME, I GUESS IT
11 WAS ABOUT EIGHT MONTHS AGO, I GAVE A PRESENTATION ON THE
12 COMPACTION STUDY THAT WE GOT AT NEWBY ISLAND, AND IT'S
13 PROBABLY THE FIRST TIME IT'S EVER BEEN DONE IN THE
14 NATION. IT SHOWS THE COMPACTIBILITY OF VARIOUS DIFFERENT
15 TYPES OF COMMODITIES, AND THE COMMODITIES IN THE
16 COMMERCIAL WASTE STREAM TAKE UP A LOT MORE SPACE ONCE
17 COMPACTED IN THE LANDFILL THAN THE BOTTLES AND THE CANS
18 AND EVEN THE NEWSPRINT DOES THAT COME OUT OF CURBSIDE
19 PROGRAMS. BUT, AGAIN, CURBSIDE PROGRAMS ARE VALUABLE,
20 BUT THEY ARE -- PEOPLE NEED TO KEEP THEM IN PERSPECTIVE.
21 THEY'RE AN EXPENSIVE WAY OF TAKING A RELATIVELY SMALL
22 AMOUNT OF WASTE FROM THE WASTE STREAM.

23 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: OKAY. THAT'S THE POINT THAT
24 I WANT TO MAKE, THAT IF YOU REALLY WANT TO DIVERT A
25 SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT FROM THE LANDFILL CAPACITY, YOU ARE



1 MUCH BETTER OFF APPROACHING IT FROM THIS --

2 MR. GAVRICH: COMMERCIAL STANDPOINT.

3 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: AND, OBVIOUSLY, IF YOU GET TO
4 THE POINT WHERE YOU CAN TAKE EVERYTHING OUT, THAT WOULD
5 BE GREAT; BUT IF YOU HAVE TO CHOOSE, THEN YOU WOULD
6 ACCOMPLISH A GREAT DEAL MORE WITH THIS TYPE OF AN
7 OPERATION. THANK YOU.

8 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: AS A FINAL ASIDE TO THAT, DOES
9 THAT THEN SAY THAT SMALL RURAL COUNTIES THAT HAVE NO
10 COMMERCIALIZATION DO NOT BENEFIT MUCH, IF AT ALL, FROM A
11 RECYCLING PROGRAM?

12 MR. GAVRICH: THAT'S EVEN MORE EXPENSIVE, BY THE
13 WAY, THAN THE CURBSIDE PROGRAM BECAUSE YOUR DENSITIES
14 AREN'T THERE. SAN JOSE ACHIEVES SOME DENSITIES
15 BECAUSE -- THE POPULATION DENSITY AND SO THEY HAVE SOME
16 BETTER ECONOMIES, AND THAT'S WHY THEY CAN KEEP THE COSTS
17 WHERE THEY ARE.

18 AND, AGAIN, SOMEWHERE BETWEEN 50 AND \$90 A TON
19 DIVERTED, BUT RURAL COUNTIES, YOU'VE GOT TO SEND THAT
20 SEPARATE COLLECTION VEHICLE, A SEPARATE COLLECTION TRUCK,
21 PAST MUCH FEWER HOMES. AND SO YOUR PRODUCTIVITY IS LESS
22 AND SO YOUR COSTS ARE GOING TO BE HIGHER. SO IT --
23 AGAIN, IT RAISES THE COST. I THINK IT'S A POLITICAL
24 JUDGMENT CALL AS TO WHETHER THE EFFECTIVENESS IS THERE
25 AND WHETHER THE INCREASED AWARENESS ON THE PART OF



1 PEOPLE, BUT YOU ARE NOT GOING TO BE DIVERTING A HECK OF A
2 LOT OF MATERIAL IN A RURAL CURBSIDE COLLECCTION PROGRAM.

3 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: MY POINT ON THE SUBJECT IS
4 ALWAYS THAT LEGISLATION THAT BLANKETS EVERYONE FOR 20 TO
5 25 PERCENT IS NOT AT ALL IN THE REALM OF POSSIBILITY FOR
6 ALMOST HALF OF THE COUNTIES IN CALIFORNIA.

7 MR. GAVRICH: I THINK THAT'S VERY TRUE.

8 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: I'D LIKE YOU TO ANSWER ONE FOR
9 CLARIFICATION. THE RANGE THAT YOU HAVE IN HERE OF THE
10 MATERIAL FROM 500 TO 2500 TONS PER DAY, THAT'S QUITE A
11 SPREAD. WHEN YOU COME IN WITH A FACILITIES PERMIT, WE'RE
12 NOT ACCUSTOMED TO SEEING SUCH A WIDE RANGE. CAN YOU
13 EXPLAIN WHY YOU ARE NOT MORE SPECIFIC?

14 MR. GAVRICH: SURE. IT'S GOING TO BE A MODULAR
15 FACILITY, AND WE'RE GOING TO BE STARTING OUT, BECAUSE IT
16 IS A MODEL FACILITY -- BECAUSE WE'RE GOING TO BE TESTING
17 EQUIPMENT AND TESTING METHODS, ETC., ETC., WE'RE PROBABLY
18 GOING TO BE STARTING OUT WITH A SIZE BETWEEN 500 AND
19 1,000 TONS IN THE DOOR A DAY. IF WE ARE SUCCESSFUL,
20 WHICH WE THINK WILL BE, WE'RE GOING TO TRY AND DIVERT AS
21 MUCH MATERIAL AS POSSIBLE AND THEREFORE ACCEPT MORE
22 MATERIAL THROUGH THE DOOR AND BE ABLE TO OPERATE ON MORE
23 SHIFTS THAN JUST ONE OR TWO.

24 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: WHAT DOES NEWBY ISLAND TAKE
25 TODAY?



1 MR. GAVRICH: THE TONNAGE THAT THEY TAKE TODAY IS
2 SOMEWHERE BETWEEN 1700 AND 2800 TONS A DAY. ABOUT 1500
3 OF THAT IS THE CITY OF SAN JOSE CONTRACT. SO THAT'S
4 RESIDENTIAL MATERIAL THAT WON'T BE COMING THROUGH THE
5 DOOR, BUT WE HAVE SOME NONCONTRACTED WASTE THAT'S
6 COMMERCIAL. IN FACT, ALL OUR NONCONTRACTED WASTE IS THE
7 COMMERCIAL MATERIAL, AND THAT'S THE STUFF THAT THE
8 RECYCLERY IS GOING TO ATTACK. THAT'S WHY WE ALSO HAVE TO
9 HAVE THAT WIDE RANGE BE BECAUSE WE DON'T KNOW IN THE
10 FUTURE HOW MUCH OF THAT MATERIAL IS GOING TO BE DRAWN TO
11 NEWBY ISLAND.

12 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: THANK YOU. ANY OTHER
13 QUESTIONS?

14 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: MR. CHAIRMAN.

15 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: MS. BREMBERG.

16 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: YOU MENTIONED THAT IT IS
17 YOUR COMPANY'S POLICY TO CONTINUE THIS TYPE OF PLANNING
18 THROUGHOUT. IN YOUR APPLICATIONS, PRESENTLY
19 UNSUCCESSFUL, ON SUNSHINE AND AZUSA WESTERN AND SO FORTH,
20 HAVE YOU INCLUDED THIS PARTICULAR PROPOSAL AND INDICATED
21 TO THE VARIOUS BOARDS THAT YOU ARE PROPOSING, TOO, THAT
22 THIS MIGHT BE PART OF AN EXPANDED ACTION ON SOME OF YOUR
23 OTHER LANDFILLS?

24 MR. GAVRICH: NO. WE'RE WORKING IN LOS ANGELES
25 RIGHT NOW, AND WE WILL PROBABLY BE DOING JUST THAT. I



1 CAN'T SAY AT THIS POINT IN TIME FOR SURE. AGAIN, WE WANT
2 THE RECYCLERY AT NEWBY TO BE OUR FIRST SUCCESS AND TO BE
3 ABLE TO TAKE THAT MODEL, ONCE WE KNOW WHAT IT DOES IN
4 TERMS OF DIVERSION, IN TERMS OF COST-EFFECTIVENESS, IN
5 TERMS OF THE COMPONENTS OF IT THAT ARE MOST EFFECTIVE:
6 COMPOSTING VERSUS WOOD PROCESSING VERSUS MATERIAL
7 RECOVERY, AND BE ABLE TO BUILD A BETTER MOUSETRAP AT THE
8 NEXT ONE.

9 SO ANSWER TO YOUR QUESTION, SUNSHINE AND AZUSA
10 AND THE WHOLE L.A. BASIN HAS A TREMENDOUS NEED BECAUSE
11 BURNING HAS PROVEN NOT TO BE REALLY A VIABLE OPTION DOWN
12 THERE UNTIL THEIR AIR SITUATION IS IMPROVED. AND SO WE
13 HOPE THIS MODEL FROM NEWBY CAN BE USED DOWN THERE IN THE
14 L.A. AREA.

15 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: DON'T YOU THINK IT WILL BE
16 TOO LATE BY THE TIME YOU GET THIS BUILT AND EVALUATED?

17 MR. GAVRICH: NOPE.

18 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS? THANK
19 YOU, MR. GAVRICH.

20 WE'RE READY TO CONSIDER RESOLUTION 88-41.

21 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: SO MOVED.

22 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: SECOND.

23 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED.
24 ALL IN FAVOR? OPPOSED? NO. ANY DISCUSSION ON THIS?
25 MOVED AND SO ORDERED. THANK YOU.



1 NOW, NO. 9, AGAIN SANTA CLARA COUNTY,
2 CONTINUED ACCESS TO THE GUADALUPE LANDFILL, ETC. KIND OF
3 A LONG TITLE.

4 MR. OLDALL: THAT'S ALSO TO INCLUDE THAT REPORTING
5 PROCEDURE FOR THE 25-PERCENT RECYCLING GOAL. MICHAEL,
6 CONTINUE PLEASE.

7 MR. YOUNG: MR. CHAIRMAN, BOARD MEMBERS, THE
8 EXISTING COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN DIVIDES THE
9 COUNTY INTO FOUR SUBREGIONS: THE NORTHWEST AREA, THE
10 SOUTHWEST AREA, THE CENTRAL AREA, AND THE SOUTH COUNTY
11 AREA.

12 ACCORDING TO POLICY CONTAINED IN THE COSWMP,
13 WASTE GENERATED WITHIN EACH SUBREGION IS TO BE DISPOSED
14 OF WITHIN THAT SAME SUBREGION. THE COUNTY IS PROPOSING
15 THIS AMENDMENT BECAUSE THE NORTHWEST AREA LACKS LONG-TERM
16 DISPOSAL CAPACITY. THIS SITUATION HAS NOW BECOME
17 CRITICAL AS A RESULT OF THE IMMINENT CLOSURE OF THE
18 MOUNTAIN VIEW LANDFILL.

19 AFTER THE MOUNTAIN VIEW LANDFILL CLOSES, THE
20 NORTHWEST AREA WILL BE WITHOUT DISPOSAL CAPACITY; AND,
21 THEREFORE, THE NORTHWEST AREA NEEDS TO SEND ITS WASTE TO
22 LANDFILLS LOCATED IN THE CENTRAL AREA, SPECIFICALLY NEWBY
23 ISLAND OR KIRBY CANYON LANDFILL LOCATED IN THE CITY OF
24 SAN JOSE'S JURISDICTION.

25 ANOTHER REASON THE COUNTY IS PROPOSING THE



1 PLAN AMENDMENT IS TO PROVIDE THE SOUTHWEST AREA WITH
2 CONTINUED ACCESS TO THE GUADALUPE MINES LANDFILL. THE
3 CITY OF SAN JOSE'S APPLICATION TO ANNEX THIS LANDFILL.
4 WOULD LEAVE THE SOUTHWEST AREA WITHOUT DISPOSAL CAPACITY.
5 TO ALLOW THE NORTHWEST AREA TO DISPOSE OF ITS WASTE AT
6 LANDFILLS LOCATED IN THE CITY OF SAN JOSE, WHICH IS IN
7 THE CENTRAL AREA, THE AMENDMENT WILL COMBINE THE
8 NORTHWEST AREA AND THE CENTRAL AREA INTO ONE SUBREGION.

9 TO PROVIDE CONTINUED ACCESS TO THE GUADALUPE
10 MINES LANDFILL FROM THE SOUTHWEST AREA, THE PLAN
11 AMENDMENT ACKNOWLEDGES THAT THE CURRENT APPLICATION TO
12 ANNEX THE GUADALUPE MINES LANDFILL INTO THE CITY OF SAN
13 JOSE IS NOT INTENDED TO DEPRIVE THE SOUTHWEST AREA OF
14 CONTINUED USE OF THAT SITE.

15 IN ADDITION, IN ORDER TO CONSERVE LANDFILL
16 CAPACITY AND TO INCREASE RECYCLING, THE PLAN AMENDMENT
17 ESTABLISHES A RECYCLING GOAL OF 25 PERCENT. THE PROPOSED
18 PLAN AMENDMENT WAS APPROVED BY A MAJORITY OF THE CITIES
19 REPRESENTING A MAJORITY OF THE POPULATION IN THE COUNTY.

20 AND THE BOARD RECEIVED THE LOCALLY APPROVED
21 PLAN AMENDMENT ON JULY 1, 1988. THE COUNTY PREPARED AND
22 CERTIFIED A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE PLAN AMENDMENT.

23 BOARD STAFF REVIEWED THAT DOCUMENT AND
24 DETERMINED IT WAS ADEQUATE FOR THE BOARD'S USE IN
25 EVALUATING THE AMENDMENT. STAFF HAS REVIEWED THE



1 PROPOSED PLAN AMENDMENT TO DETERMINE IF IT COMPLIES WITH
2 STATE POLICY AND BOARD PLANNING GUIDELINES.

3 AFTER REVIEWING THE PLAN AMENDMENT, STAFF
4 FOUND THAT THE AMENDMENT CONTAINED NO PROGRAMS FOR
5 IMPLEMENTING THE 25-PERCENT RECYCLING GOAL. INSTEAD, THE
6 AMENDMENT INCLUDED A REPORTING MECHANISM IN WHICH LOCAL
7 JURISDICTIONS WOULD REPORT ON AN ANNUAL BASIS TO THE
8 INTERGOVERNMENTAL COUNCIL DETAILING THEIR PROGRESS
9 TOWARDS ACHIEVING THAT GOAL. IN ADDITION, THE
10 INTERGOVERNMENTAL COUNCIL WILL PREPARE AN ANNUAL REPORT
11 FOR PUBLIC RELEASE DETAILING THE COUNTY'S PROGRESS TOWARD
12 ACHIEVING THE 25-PERCENT GOAL.

13 ALTHOUGH THE PROPOSED PLAN AMENDMENT DID NOT
14 INCLUDE RECYCLING PROGRAMS, THE COUNTY IS CURRENTLY
15 CONDUCTING AN IN-DEPTH RECYCLING STUDY. PROGRAMS
16 RECOMMENDED BY THE STUDY WILL BE USED TO DEVELOP A
17 RECYCLING PROGRAM TO ACHIEVE THE 25-PERCENT RECYCLING
18 GOAL. THE RECYCLING PROGRAM WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE
19 COSWMP DURING THE UPCOMING PLAN REVISION PROCESS.

20 BOARD STAFF ALSO DETERMINED THAT THE AMENDMENT
21 WILL RESOLVE THE NORTHWEST AREA'S DISPOSAL SHORTAGE BY
22 ALLOWING THAT AREA TO DISPOSE OF ITS WASTE AT THE NEWBY
23 ISLAND LANDFILL. SINCE THE PLAN AMENDMENT SOLVES THE
24 NORTHWEST AREA'S DISPOSAL PROBLEM AND SINCE THE COUNTY
25 CAN DEVELOP ADEQUATE RECYCLING PROGRAMS DURING THE



1 UPCOMING PLAN REVISION PROCESS, BOARD STAFF RECOMMENDS
2 THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE SANTA CLARA COUNTY SOLID WASTE
3 MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT AS SUBMITTED AND ADOPT
4 RESOLUTION NO. 88-42.

5 THIS CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION ON THIS. IF
6 THERE ARE NO QUESTIONS FOR ME, MISS DIANE MCKENNA OF
7 SANTA CLARA COUNTY -- MEMBER OF THE SANTA CLARA BOARD OF
8 SUPERVISORS IS HERE TODAY TO ADDRESS THE BOARD ON THE
9 SUBREGIONAL POLICY AMENDMENT.

10 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD ON
11 THIS ITEM?

12 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: MR. CHAIRMAN, I JUST HAVE
13 ONE. WOULDN'T IT MAKE BETTER PUBLIC RELATIONS SENSE FOR
14 THE COUNTY TO COMPLY WITH THE LAW AND HAVE A 20-PERCENT
15 GOAL AND THEN MAYBE GO TO THE 25 OR 30 AND HAVE A BIG
16 WHO-HA INSTEAD OF SETTING 25 AND MAKING 24 OR 23 AND NOT
17 MAKING IT? I DON'T KNOW. MAYBE THEY'RE DIFFERENT THAN
18 EVERYONE ELSE IN THE STATE. THAT'S ENTIRELY POSSIBLE.
19 BUT I DON'T KNOW WHY THEY'RE SETTING A 5-PERCENT GOAL.
20 IS IT, YOU KNOW, TO SHOW OFF FOR THE REST OF THE COUNTIES
21 OR WHAT? I'M QUITE CURIOUS.

22 MR. YOUNG: I BELIEVE SUPERVISOR MCKENNA WILL BE
23 ABLE TO ADDRESS THAT ISSUE FOR YOU.

24 SUPERVISOR MC KENNA: MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF
25 THE BOARD, I THINK -- FIRST OF ALL, I WANT TO THANK THE



1 STAFF WHO'S WORKED WITH US ON THIS ISSUE AND A LOT OF
2 OTHER ISSUES. THEY HAVE BEEN VERY HELPFUL.

3 THEN I'D LIKE TO SAY THAT THIS PROCESS IN
4 DEVELOPING THIS RECOMMENDATION FOR AMENDMENT TO OUR
5 POLICY WAS REALLY A CONSENSUS-BUILDING PROCESS THAT
6 INVOLVED, AS YOU CAN WELL IMAGINE, 15 CITIES, VARIOUS
7 VIEWPOINTS, AND VARIOUS IDEAS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. AND
8 THE REASON THAT 25 PERCENT BECAME THE GOAL WAS REALLY TO
9 GET CONSENSUS AND COOPERATION.

10 I DON'T THINK IT WAS ANY INTENT TO SHOW THE
11 REST OF THE COUNTIES IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, BUT
12 REALLY WAS THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN ALL THE CITIES WHO WOULD
13 HAVE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS PROCESS.

14 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: DID ANY OF THEM HAVE A
15 DESIRE FOR A HIGHER GOAL? IS THIS A COMPROMISE? I'M
16 REALLY QUITE CURIOUS HOW YOU ARRIVED AT THAT.

17 SUPERVISOR MC KENNA: I BELIEVE THAT THE CITY THAT
18 WOULD RECEIVE THE WASTE IS THE CITY OF SAN JOSE; AND I
19 THINK IN ORDER TO CONSERVE THEIR LANDFILL SPACE, THAT
20 THEY FELT IT WOULD BE ADVANTAGEOUS TO THEM AND MOST
21 ACCEPTABLE TO THEM TO HAVE A 25-PERCENT RECYCLING GOAL.

22 MOST OF THE CITIES WHO WOULD BE AFFECTED BY
23 THIS HAVE VERY AGGRESSIVE RECYCLING PROGRAMS OR ARE
24 CONSIDERING THEM, SO THEY THOUGHT THAT THEY COULD
25 INITIATE THIS AS A GOAL.



1 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: THANK YOU.

2 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: SO YOU FEEL IT IS NOT JUST A
3 THEORETICAL FIGURE, BUT IN REALITY SOMETHING THAT YOU
4 WOULD REALLY STRIVE TO ATTAIN AND IT IS REALISTIC. I
5 GUESS WE ALWAYS LOOK AT IT FROM THE BIG PICTURE
6 STANDPOINT OF WHEN YOU DO SOMETHING, WHAT IS X COUNTY
7 GOING TO DO OR WHAT ARE THEY GOING TO SAY ABOUT THIS. WE
8 JUST FINISHED THE DISCUSSION ABOUT HOW 20 PERCENT MIGHT
9 BE IMPOSSIBLE IN ALPINE COUNTY.

10 SUPERVISOR MC KENNA: I THINK THAT YOU ARE RIGHT,
11 AND I THINK WE RECOGNIZE THAT AS PART OF OUR DISCUSSION.
12 OBVIOUSLY, THE COUNTY IS MADE UP OF CITIES WITH ALL
13 DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMPOSITION OF INDUSTRIAL,
14 RESIDENTIAL, AND OTHER TYPES OF COMMUNITIES. SO FOR A
15 SMALLER COMMUNITY, FOR EXAMPLE, SARATOGA MONTE SERENO
16 THAT IS PRIMARILY RESIDENTIAL, A 25-PERCENT RECYCLING
17 GOAL IS GOING TO BE EXTREMELY AGGRESSIVE. FOR A
18 COMMUNITY LIKE MOUNTAIN VIEW OR SUNNYVALE THAT HAS A
19 LARGE INDUSTRIAL BASE, A 25-PERCENT RECYCLING GOAL IS
20 PROBABLY GOING TO BE SOMETHING THAT THEY CAN MEET. SO I
21 THINK THAT WE RECOGNIZE THOSE DIFFERENCES AS PART OF OUR
22 PROCESS.

23 IN THE LANGUAGE WE NOTE THAT THE CITIES ARE
24 GOING TO BE WORKING TOGETHER TO DETERMINE HOW THEY'RE
25 GOING TO CALCULATE REDUCTIONS IN THE WASTE GOING INTO THE



1 LANDFILLS. AND THIS WAS PART OF THE DISCUSSION. THAT'S
2 WHY WE COULDN'T COME BACK WITH A CALCULATION RIGHT NOW
3 BECAUSE WE'RE BEGINNING THAT PROCESS. WE RECOGNIZE THAT
4 PART OF THAT, GOING INTO THE CALCULATIONS AND DECIDING
5 HOW WE'RE GOING TO ACHIEVE 25 PERCENT, IS GOING TO BE
6 DIFFERENT FOR EACH CITY.

7 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: THANK YOU. ANY OTHER QUESTIONS
8 FOR SUPERVISOR MCKENNA, WAS IT?

9 SUPERVISOR MCKENNA: RIGHT.

10 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. READY TO
11 CONSIDER 88-42.

12 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: I WILL MOVE RESOLUTION NO.
13 88-42.

14 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: SECOND.

15 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED.
16 ALL THOSE IN FAVOR? OPPOSED? NONE. ANY DISCUSSION?
17 CARRIED.

18 THANKS A MILLION FOR COMING, SUPERVISOR, AND
19 THE OTHER REPRESENTATIVES. WE ALWAYS COUNT IT A
20 PRIVILEGE TO HAVE INVOLVEMENT OF THE COUNTIES AT THE
21 HIGHER LEVEL AND IT SHOWS YOUR INTEREST, AND WE
22 APPRECIATE IT VERY MUCH.

23 NEXT ONE IS THE STATUS OF THE COSWMP, ITEM 10.

24 MR. OLDALL: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS THE REGULAR ITEM
25 THAT WE BRING UP TO THE BOARD PROVIDING THE LATEST



1600 EAST FOURTH STREET, SUITE 220
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92701
TELEPHONE (714) 953-4447

barristers'
reporting service

1 UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION ON WHERE WE ARE WITH OUR
2 DELINQUENT COSWMP ITEMS. GEORGE LARSON WILL PRESENT THE
3 ITEM.

4 MR. LARSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS, GOOD MORNING.

5 THIS REPORT UPDATES THE CURRENT STATUS OF ALL
6 COSWMPs IN THE STATE. DIRECTING THE BOARD'S ATTENTION TO
7 THE INFORMATION ON THE KEY ISSUES OF COSWMPs, INDICATES
8 51 COSWMPs ARE CURRENT AND COMPLETE TODAY.

9 ALAMEDA COSWMP, WHICH WAS PARTIALLY APPROVED,
10 AS THE BOARD RECALLS, WAS DUE FOR RESUBMITTAL TO THE
11 BOARD ON AUGUST 4TH. BOARD STAFF HAVE NOT RECEIVED THE
12 COMPLETED COSWMP YET. CONVERSATIONS WITH STAFF FROM
13 ALAMEDA COUNTY INDICATE THAT THE COSWMP WITH ITS
14 COMPLETED VERSION IS UNDER CONSIDERATION IN THE CITIES,
15 AND WE EXPECT TO RECEIVE IT BY MID-SEPTEMBER.

16 THE SOLANO COUNTY COSWMP WAS CONSIDERED BY THE
17 BOARD AT THIS MEETING, LEAVING FOUR COSWMPs THAT ARE
18 CURRENTLY DELINQUENT. THOSE ARE CONTRA COSTA, AS WE ALL
19 KNOW, IS EMBROILED IN A VERY COMPLEX SOLID WASTE ISSUE
20 TODAY; HUMBOLT COUNTY, INDICATIONS ARE IT WILL BE
21 SUBMITTED ON OCTOBER 15TH. SACRAMENTO COUNTY COSWMP HAS
22 BEEN RECEIVED BY BOARD STAFF AND WILL BE CIRCULATED TO
23 BOARD MEMBERS FOR REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION AT A FUTURE
24 BOARD MEETING.

25 THE CONSULTANT/CONTRACTOR WHO IS WORKING ON



1 THE KERN COUNTY COSWMP INDICATES THAT OCTOBER 11TH IS
2 STILL THE ANTICIPATED DATE FOR SUBMITTAL OF THAT PLAN.
3 THESE FOUR COSWMPs INCIDENTALLY, TO CLARIFY, HAVE BEEN
4 REFERRED BY BOARD TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE TO
5 FOLLOW UP AND SEEK COMPLIANCE WITH THE SUBMITTAL.

6 DIRECTING THE BOARD'S ATTENTION TO PAGE 259 OF
7 THE PACKET, I'D LIKE TO INFORM THE BOARD OF THE STATUS OF
8 THE COSWMPs THAT ARE DUE IN SOON FOR CONSIDERATION EITHER
9 AS A PLAN REVIEW REPORT OR REVISION.

10 TODAY THE BOARD ACCEPTED THE AMADOR,
11 RIVERSIDE, AND SANTA CRUZ PLAN REVIEW REPORTS IN
12 INITIATING THE 270-DAY CLOCK. THE NEVADA AND SHASTA PLAN
13 REVIEW REPORTS ARE TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE SEPTEMBER
14 BOARD MEETING, AND THE ONE AREA OF CONCERN IS THE EL
15 DORADO PLAN REVIEW REPORT, WHICH WAS NOT SUBMITTED IN A
16 TIMELY MANNER.

17 A LETTER WAS DIRECTED TO THE BOARD OF
18 SUPERVISORS, AND RON DUNCAN OF THE EL DORADO COUNTY STAFF
19 HAS INDICATED THAT THE PLAN REVIEW REPORT WILL BE
20 SUBMITTED IN THE VERY NEAR FUTURE.

21 IN OCTOBER WE SCHEDULED THE CONSIDERATION OF
22 THE VENTURA PLAN REVIEW REPORT.

23 DETAILED INFORMATION ON ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE
24 BOARD ON EACH OF THE DELINQUENT COSWMPs ARE ALSO INCLUDED
25 IN THIS ITEM, WHICH IS PRESENTED FOR INFORMATION. THAT



1 CONCLUDES THE INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED. I'D LIKE TO
2 ENTERTAIN ANY QUESTIONS BY THE BOARD.

3 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY QUESTIONS FOR MR. LARSON?

4 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: JUST -- MR. CHAIRMAN, JUST
5 A TECHNICALITY. SANTA CRUZ IS TOMORROW. SANTA CLARA
6 THAT WAS DONE TODAY.

7 MR. LARSON: THANK YOU. POINT WELL TAKEN. WE DID
8 REQUEST FRIDAY.

9 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS? THANK
10 YOU, MR. LARSON.

11 JUST AN INFORMATION ITEM ON A REGULAR BASIS.
12 AS A MATTER OF PROCEDURE, WE'LL TO GOING TO ITEM 11,
13 WHICH IS THE ABAG ISSUE ABOUT A TECHNICAL ADVISORY
14 COMMITTEE, AND THEN FOLLOWING THAT, WE'D LIKE TO TAKE A
15 TEN-MINUTE BREAK. ITEM 11.

16 MR. OLDALL: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN. THIS PARTICULAR
17 PROPOSAL, THE BOARD MEMBERS MAY REMEMBER, CAME IN A
18 LETTER JUST BEFORE THE JULY BOARD MEETING. AND AT THE
19 JULY MEETING, MR. EOWAN MADE A BRIEF PRESENTATION, AND I
20 THINK IT WAS BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION THAT STAFF INVITE
21 REPRESENTATIVES FROM ABAG TO MAKE A PRESENTATION HERE
22 TODAY FOR YOU AND ALSO TO GIVE STAFF A LITTLE BIT OF TIME
23 TO REVIEW THE DOCUMENT, WHICH THEY HAVE DONE. I THINK
24 JOHN SMITH WOULD LIKE TO GIVE YOU A BRIEF OVERVIEW ON
25 THEM AND THEN WITHOUT FURTHER ADD PROCEED TO THE ABAG



1 REPRESENTATIVES.

2 MR. SMITH: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN AND BOARD MEMBERS.
3 ABAG REPRESENTATIVES ARE HERE TODAY TO DISCUSS IN DETAIL
4 THE PROPOSAL. WHEN WE GOT THE LETTER, THERE WASN'T A LOT
5 OF INFORMATION. SINCE THERE WASN'T A LOT OF INFORMATION,
6 WE HAD A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE COMMITTEE
7 MAKEUP, ITS RESPONSIBILITIES, THE STAFFING, AND ITS ROLE
8 IN REVISING THE PLANNING GUIDELINES. WE HOPE THAT THE
9 REPRESENTATIVES FROM ABAG TODAY CAN ANSWER THOSE
10 QUESTIONS. I THINK THEY SHOULD BE ANSWERED BEFORE THE
11 BOARD FORMALLY CONSIDER A PROPOSAL SUCH AS THIS.

12 TODAY WE HAVE SUPERVISOR TOM TORLECKSON, WHO
13 WOULD LIKE TO LEAD OFF THE PRESENTATION. WE ALSO HAVE ED
14 WYATT, WHO'S THE ABAG SOLID WASTE PROGRAM MANAGER, AND
15 IVONNE ST. JEWELL, CONSULTANT TO ABAG.

16 IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY QUESTIONS OF ME, I WOULD
17 LIKE TO INVITE --

18 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY QUESTIONS OF MR. SMITH?
19 OKAY.

20 MR. SMITH: I'D HAVE SUPERVISOR TOM TORLECKSON.

21 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: MORNING, SUPERVISOR. I'VE BEEN
22 READING ABOUT YOU WITH REGULARITY.

23 MR. TORLECKSON: WE'VE HAD QUITE A BIT OF ACTIVITY,
24 AS YOU ARE AWARE, IN CONTRA COSTA COUNTY. I'M HERE TODAY
25 IN THIS AGENDA ITEM WEARING THE HAT OF AN ABAG EXECUTIVE



1 BOARD MEMBER REPRESENTING ABAG. I'VE BEEN A MEMBER OF
2 THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR OVER TEN YEARS AS A CITY
3 COUNCIL MEMBER AND SUPERVISOR, AND IT'S A PLEASURE TO BE
4 HERE AND TO SHARE THIS CONCEPT WITH YOU AND GET ANY
5 FEEDBACK IN TERMS OF HOW WE MIGHT PROCEED.

6 THE -- BEFORE INTRODUCING THAT, I WANTED TO
7 ALSO MENTION THAT WE ARE WORKING ON A PROGRAM THAT WILL
8 DOVETAIL, WE HOPE, WITH YOUR CLEAN-IN CALIFORNIA PROGRAM,
9 WHICH WE COMMEND YOU FOR AND THINK THAT IT'S AN
10 EXCELLENT, POSITIVE THING THAT PUBLIC RELATIONS AND
11 COMMUNICATION ON THE LITTER CONTROL ASPECT OF THINGS. IN
12 OUR COUNTY WE'RE PULLING TOGETHER CITIES, SUPERINTENDENT
13 OF SCHOOLS, THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY, MUNI COURT JUDGES, THE
14 SHERIFF, AND POLICE CHIEFS, THE SIERRA CLUB PEOPLE FOR
15 OPEN SPACE AND OTHERS TO ADDRESS THAT ISSUE. I JUST
16 WANTED TO TAKE A MOMENT BEFORE STARTING TO SAY THAT WE
17 APPRECIATE WHAT YOU ARE DOING ON A STATEWIDE LEADERSHIP
18 BASIS TO ATTACK THE LITTER AND TRASH PROBLEM.

19 IN TERMS OF THIS PARTICULAR ITEM, LIFE'S
20 GOTTEN MORE COMPLICATED IN THE TEN YEARS I'VE OBSERVED
21 FROM ABAG POSITION AND AGAIN AN ELECTED OFFICIAL AT THE
22 CITY AND COUNTY LEVEL IN TERMS OF SOLID WASTE. AND FOR
23 THAT REASON WE THINK THERE'S MERIT IN THE IDEA OF A SOLID
24 WASTE PLAN TECHNICAL COMMITTEE THAT COULD WORK WITH YOUR
25 BOARD, WORK WITH YOUR STAFF TO ASSIST IN COORDINATION,



1600 EAST FOURTH STREET, SUITE 220
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92701
TELEPHONE (714) 953-4447

barristers'
reporting service

1 COMMUNICATION WITH ALL THE JURISDICTIONS THAT ARE
2 AFFECTED.

3 WE'VE SEEN IN CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, JUST AS AN
4 EXAMPLE, I'M HEADING UP A TASK FORCE ON LEAKING TOXIC
5 WASTE FACILITY, THE GBF FACILITY. WE'VE ALSO HAD THE IT
6 TASK FORCE WHERE WE BROUGHT INTERDEPARTMENTAL,
7 INTERAGENCY REPRESENTATION TOGETHER AND BEEN MUCH BETTER
8 ABLE TO GET THE KIND OF ADVICE WE NEED TO MOVE AHEAD AND
9 ADDRESS THE CRITICAL PROBLEMS WE FACED IN THOSE
10 INSTANCES.

11 IN TERMS OF THE SOLID WASTE PLAN, I'M ALSO A
12 MEMBER OF THE ABAG LEGISLATIVE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE,
13 WE HAD A BIT OF ACTIVITY THIS YEAR TOO IN NEW
14 LEGISLATION. WE THINK THERE'S A ROLE THAT THIS KIND OF A
15 TECHNICAL COMMITTEE TO THE STATE SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT
16 BOARD COULD SERVE IN HELPING ANALYZE HOW THAT VARIOUS
17 PROPOSED LEGISLATION WILL AFFECT REPRESENTATIVE COUNTIES
18 TO DIVERSE COUNTIES WE HAVE IN THIS STATE, RURAL AND
19 URBAN AND METROPOLITAN, AND HOW WE MIGHT ALSO SUPPORT
20 LEGISLATION THAT WOULD ASSIST THE CALIFORNIA STATE SOLID
21 WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD IN ACHIEVING YOUR GOALS.

22 FOR INSTANCE, THE LEGISLATION RECENTLY THAT
23 DELEGATED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION CERTAIN ROLES
24 IN APPROVING OR PERMITTING. ABAG TOOK A POSITION THAT WE
25 THOUGHT THAT WOULD REALLY BE BETTER PLACED IN THE HANDS



1 OF THIS BOARD THAN TO SET UP A SEPARATE KIND OF PROCESS.

2 WE'D LIKE TO WORK WITH YOU; AND WITH THAT
3 BRIEF INTRODUCTION, I'D LIKE TO HAVE IVONNE ST. JEWELL
4 AND ED WYATT INTRODUCE THE DETAILS AND ANSWER QUESTIONS
5 YOU MIGHT HAVE.

6 IVONNE ST. JEWELL HAS WORKED WITH ABAG ON THIS
7 OVER 15 YEARS AND HAS WORKED WITH THE COUNTY STAFF. WE
8 THINK THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WE'D LIKE TO YOU CONSIDER.
9 AND ED WYATT WILL FOLLOW AND HE'S IN THE CURRENT POSITION
10 OF THE PLANNER AND SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR FOR
11 ABAG.

12 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: THANK YOU. IVONNE ST. JEWELL.

13 MS. ST. JEWELL: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD,
14 NICE TO BE BACK AGAIN. WE GAVE -- JOHN, DID YOU
15 DISTRIBUTE THOSE? WE THOUGHT THAT IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO
16 YOU TO HAVE THAT BEFORE YOU AS WE GO THROUGH SOME OF
17 THESE DETAILS.

18 AS BACKGROUND, THE ABAG SOLID WASTE
19 COORDINATING COMMITTEE IS A GROUP THAT WE FORMED BACK IN
20 1973 WHEN JUST AFTER SB 5 WAS PASSED, THE NINE COUNTY
21 SOLID WASTE PLAN MANAGERS BEGAN MEETING AT ABAG TALK
22 ABOUT HOW THEY MIGHT COORDINATE THEIR ACTIVITIES. THE
23 COMMITTEE HAS ALSO ALWAYS HAD A MEMBER FROM THE BAY AREA
24 AIR QUALITY REGIONAL WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
25 AND THE REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD AND YOUR



1 BOARD STAFF.

2 AS THINGS HAVE GOTTEN MORE COMPLICATED OVER
3 THE YEARS, ONE OF THE THINGS THAT ABAG HAS BEEN DOING IS
4 DEVELOPING A REGIONAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN, WHICH
5 BY STATE LAW MUST BE A COMPOSITE OF THE COUNTY SOLID
6 WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANS. AND THERE'S SOME EXHIBITS AFTER
7 THE FIRST THREE PAGES THAT WHEN WE START TO DO A
8 COMPOSITE OF THE NINE BAY AREA COUNTY PLANS, WE FIND THAT
9 THERE'S A GREAT DEAL OF INCONSISTENCY AS TO WHAT THOSE
10 PLANS CONTAIN.

11 AND THERE'S THE FIRST TABLE, FIRST EXHIBIT,
12 THAT LISTS THE TABLE OF CONTENTS OF EACH OF THE NINE
13 COUNTY PLANS, AND THEN THE FINAL COLUMN TALKS ABOUT WHAT
14 NEEDS TO BE INCLUDED IN THOSE PLANS. AND YOU WILL SEE
15 THAT SOME OF THE COUNTIES HAVE SOME THINGS AND SOME OF
16 THEM DON'T. AND THAT WAS THE FIRST DIFFICULTY THAT WE
17 HAVE HAD IN TRYING TO DEVELOP A COMPOSITE COUNTY PLAN.
18 AND I'M SURE THAT YOUR STAFF HAS HAD DIFFICULTIES IN
19 COMPILING A STATEWIDE SUMMARY OF COUNTY PLANS FOR THE
20 SAME REASON, THAT THE PLANS HAVE DIFFERENT FORMATS, THEY
21 CONTAIN DIFFERENT THINGS.

22 THE SECOND ISSUE ON THE FORMAT QUESTION IS THE
23 FACT THAT THE DATABASES IN THE VARIOUS COUNTY PLANS ARE
24 VERY DIFFERENT, AND ED WYATT WHO HAS JOINED THE ABAG
25 STAFF RECENTLY AND HAS BEEN WORKING ON UPDATING THE



1 REGIONAL PLAN IN ORDER TO -- AND HAS BEEN WORKING WITH
2 THE COUNTIES HAS SOME MATERIAL, AND HE'S GOING TO TALK
3 WITH YOU ABOUT THE INCONSISTENCIES AND THE GAPS THAT
4 THERE ARE IN THE COUNTY PLANS AND HOW DIFFICULT IT IS FOR
5 US AT THE REGIONAL LEVEL TO DEVELOP A DATABASE FOR THE
6 REGION, WHICH IS ALSO A PROBLEM AT THE STATE LEVEL
7 BECAUSE THE REQUIREMENTS IN THE COUNTY PLANS AT THE
8 PRESENT TIME ARE NOT CONSISTENT. SO HERE IS ED WYATT.

9 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: MR. WYATT.

10 MR. WYATT: MR. CHAIRMAN, BOARD MEMBERS, I ASK YOU
11 TO TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBITS 3 AND 4. THE FIRST EXHIBIT
12 THAT I MENTIONED, NO. 3, GIVES SORT OF A QUICK OVERVIEW
13 IN TABULAR FORM OF WHAT THE NINE COUNTY -- NINE BAY AREA
14 COUNTIES HAVE AS FAR AS THE DATA AVAILABLE, THE YEAR OF
15 THE DATA AVAILABLE IN THEIR PLAN.

16 YOU CAN SEE THAT IN SOME PARTICULAR
17 INFORMATIONAL CATEGORIES, THERE'S IMPORTANT INFORMATION
18 MISSING. AND THEN YOU CAN SEE, CERTAINLY, DOWN
19 THROUGHOUT EACH ROW THAT MANY OF THE DATES ARE DIFFERENT
20 AND, THEREFORE, DIFFICULT TO COMPARE. IN REVIEWING THE
21 INFORMATION, THEREFORE, IT'S SOMETIMES DIFFICULT TO
22 COMPILE A REGIONAL VIEWPOINT OR EVEN MORE QUANTITATIVELY
23 A REGIONAL DATABASE BASED UPON THE DIFFERENCES IN WHEN
24 THE DATA AVAILABLE -- THE DATA IS AVAILABLE.

25 THEN IN THE NEXT EXHIBIT, EXHIBIT 4, I'VE GOT



1 TWO DIFFERENT TABLES THAT ALSO SHOW SOME OF THE
2 INCONSISTENCIES AND DATA GAPS. IN THE FIRST ONE YOU CAN
3 SEE THAT IN THE CASE OF ALAMEDA AND SONOMA COUNTIES, FOR
4 EXAMPLE, THERE'S NOT REALLY A BREAKDOWN BETWEEN MIXED
5 PAPER, CARDBOARD, AND NEWSPAPER RECYCLING; AND THAT'S
6 SOMETIMES CRITICAL TO TAKE A LOOK AT IN ANY SORT OF
7 EFFORTS IN THE AREA OF RECYCLING.

8 AND THEN, OF COURSE, THERE ARE A FEW PLACES IN
9 WHICH DATA IS MISSING. THE SAME THING CAN BE TRUE AS
10 SEEN IN EXHIBIT 4-B WHERE, ALTHOUGH WE CAN SOMETIMES GET
11 COMPLETE WASTE QUANTITIES, WHEN WE DECIDE TO LOOK AT THE
12 BREAKDOWN AS TO WHAT SECTOR THAT SOME OF THESE WASTES
13 COME FROM, CERTAIN COUNTIES GIVE US A PARTICULAR TYPE OF
14 SECTOR BREAKDOWN AND OTHER COUNTIES DON'T. SO THAT ALSO
15 LIMITS OUR ABILITY TO SEE THE COMPLETE ISSUE.

16 THEREFORE, I THINK THAT IF WE CAN SET UP
17 SOMETHING THAT ALLOWS MORE CONSISTENCY AND ALLOWS EACH
18 COUNTY TO ADDRESS PARTICULAR DATA ISSUES, THAT WE'LL BE
19 ABLE TO HAVE THE SAME TYPE OF DATA AVAILABLE ACROSS THE
20 BOARD.

21 UNLESS THERE'S ANY QUESTIONS AT THIS POINT,
22 I'LL GIVE THE MICROPHONE BACK TO IVONNE, WHO WANTS TO
23 FINISH TALKING ABOUT SOME OF THE OTHER ISSUES --

24 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY QUESTIONS?

25 MR. WYATT: -- REGARDING THE LETTER.



1 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: NO, THANK YOU. I TAKE IT THAT
2 THE MAIN AGENDA ITEM HAS TO DO WITH THE ESTABLISHMENT OF
3 A TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, BUT THE PURPOSE OF THIS
4 PAPER AND THE INFORMATION IS TO INDICATE TO US THAT, EVEN
5 THOUGH EACH ONE OF THE COUNTIES BY THEMSELVES MEET THE
6 REQUIREMENTS, THAT THERE'S INCONSISTENCY AND FURTHER --
7 YOU ARE TRYING TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THERE'S FURTHER NEED
8 TO HAVE A COORDINATED EFFORT, AND YOU FEEL THAT THIS
9 ADVISORY COMMITTEE WOULD BE THE MEANS TO ACCOMPLISH THAT.
10 IS THAT THE GIST?

11 MS. ST. JEWELL: GENERALLY SPEAKING. AN ADVISORY
12 COMMITTEE COULD WORK WITH YOUR BOARD STAFF TO SET UP MORE
13 CONSISTENCY IN WHAT THE CONTENT OF THE PLANS ARE FOR BOTH
14 REGIONAL AND STATE FACILITIES, BUT ALSO TO MAKE IT EASIER
15 FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO COORDINATE WITH EACH OTHER WHEN
16 THEY'VE GOT THE SAME KIND OF A SYSTEM AND THE SAME KIND
17 OF A PLAN FORMAT.

18 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: DID YOU RECEIVE THE STAFF
19 RESPONSE PRIOR TO THIS MEETING, IN OTHER WORDS, THE
20 QUESTIONS THAT THEY ASK?

21 MS. ST. JEWELL: YES.

22 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: SO FAR YOU HAVEN'T ADDRESSED --

23 MS. ST. JEWELL: WE'RE COMING TO THAT. WE WANT TO
24 DEAL FIRST WITH THE NEED -- THE THINGS THAT ARE HAPPENING
25 OUT THERE THAT MAKE IT SOME KIND OF REVISION OF



1 GUIDELINES A GOOD IDEA.

2 THE SECOND PART OF THE THING THAT THE BAY AREA
3 COUNTIES HAVE FELT THERE'S A NEED FOR SOME -- A NEW LOOK
4 AT IS THE INFLEXIBILITY OF THE TIME FRAME FOR APPROVING
5 COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANS. AND THERE ARE A
6 NUMBER OF REASONS FOR THIS. THERE ARE THE VARIOUS
7 POLITICAL CONFIGURATIONS OF THE COUNTIES. IN THE FIRST
8 PLACE, SOME COUNTIES HAVE A GREAT MANY CITIES, SOME DON'T
9 HAVE VERY MANY AT ALL, SOME COUNTIES ARE DENSELY URBAN,
10 OTHERS ARE SUBURBAN, AND OTHERS ARE RURAL. SOME HAVE ONE
11 MAJOR CITY THAT HAS A MAJORITY OF THE POPULATION SO THAT
12 IT ALWAYS HAS TO APPROVE A PLAN OR A PLAN AMENDMENT, AND
13 SO IT SOMETIMES GIVES THAT CITY KIND OF AN UNDUE
14 INFLUENCE OVER THE REST OF THE COUNTY. THESE KINDS OF
15 THINGS THAT PERHAPS NEED TO BE LOOKED AT WITH SOME INPUT
16 FROM THE COUNTIES WHO ARE HAVING THESE DIFFERENT KINDS OF
17 PROBLEMS AT HOME.

18 AND BY IN LARGE, WE FEEL THAT THE COMMITTEE
19 THAT HAD CONSIDERABLE REPRESENTATION FROM COUNTY PLANNERS
20 WHO DEAL WITH THESE PROBLEMS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL COULD
21 PROVIDE THE BOARD WITH SOME INPUT ON HOW THESE THINGS
22 WORK OUT WHEN THEY GET BACK TO THE LOCAL LEVEL AND WHY
23 SOMETIMES IT TAKES A COUNTY A VERY LONG TIME TO GET THE
24 APPROVALS THAT ARE NECESSARY.

25 THE OTHER DIFFICULTY IS THE REQUIREMENT THAT



1 PLANS BE CONSISTENT WITH LOCAL GENERAL PLANS BECAUSE
2 THERE'S -- THERE ARE STATE PLANNING LAW REQUIREMENTS ON
3 GENERAL PLANS THAT YOU MAY HAVE ONLY THREE AMENDMENTS A
4 YEAR. AND SO IF YOU -- AND THAT COVERS A GREAT MANY
5 OTHER PLANNING ISSUES, BESIDES JUST WASTE MANAGEMENT
6 FACILITIES, AND SO THIS SOMETIMES CREATES PROBLEMS AT THE
7 LOCAL LEVEL. THESE KINDS OF THINGS WE THINK THAT LOCAL
8 INPUT WOULD BE USEFUL TO YOU AND WOULD MAKE IT EASIER FOR
9 YOU AND YOUR STAFF TO REVIEW THE COUNTY PLANS.

10 THE SECOND PART, THE QUESTION IS REALLY --
11 THAT YOUR STAFF HAD IN THEIR RESPONSE REALLY DEAL WITH
12 THE COMMITTEE STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONS AND STAFFING. ON
13 THIS MATERIAL I'VE LISTED THE STATE AGENCIES, AND THE
14 REASON THAT I PUT THE OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH IN
15 THERE IS JUST THIS ISSUE I DISCUSSED EARLIER OF THE
16 GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY BECAUSE THEY ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR
17 THE GENERAL PLAN GUIDELINES AND REQUIREMENTS, AND
18 SOMETIMES THESE TWO DON'T MESH VERY WELL.

19 AND THEN A LIST OF THE KINDS OF COUNTIES THAT
20 MAY HAVE FELT OUGHT TO HAVE REPRESENTATION ON THIS
21 COMMITTEE, AND THAT TALKS ABOUT THE URBAN AND SUBURBAN
22 AND THE RURAL COUNTIES AND ALSO THOSE COUNTIES WITH ONLY
23 TWO JURISDICTIONS, HOW YOU DEAL WITH THE MAJORITY KIND OF
24 THING. I KNOW THERE'S HAD TO BE SPECIAL LEGISLATION
25 PASSED FOR BUTTE AND OTHER COUNTIES THAT EACH HAD TWO



1 CITIES AND WERE DOING THEIR PLANNING TOGETHER AND HOW
2 THEY DEALT WITH THE MAJORITY VOTE ISSUE.

3 COUNTIES WITH THOSE KINDS OF PROBLEMS I THINK
4 IT WOULD BE VERY HELPFUL TO HAVE A COMMITTEE OF THIS
5 SORT. I THINK THAT CSAC MIGHT BE ASKED TO APPOINT THOSE
6 COUNTY MEMBERS. THEY MIGHT HAVE TO APPOINT A COMMITTEE
7 OR SOMETHING TO DO THAT.

8 THE FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE, WE WANT TO
9 STRESS THAT THIS WOULD NOT BE ANOTHER LAYER OF REVIEW.
10 REVIEW WOULD NOT BE DELEGATED FROM THE BOARD TO THIS
11 COMMITTEE WHATSOEVER. ITS ROLE WOULD BE TO FACILITATE
12 YOUR REVIEW BY YOUR STAFF AND YOURSELVES.

13 IT WOULD ASSIST THE BOARD STAFF AND STATE
14 AGENCIES IN DEVELOPING GUIDELINES FOR A MORE CONSISTENT
15 COSWMP FORMAT, CONTENT, DATA COLLECTION, AND REPORTING IN
16 A MORE FLEXIBLE TIME FRAME FOR CITY AND PUBLIC REVIEW OF
17 PLAN REVISIONS AND AMENDMENTS. IT WILL PROVIDE INPUT TO
18 BOARD AND STAFF FROM THE LOCAL PERSPECTIVE ON PROPOSED
19 LEGISLATION AFFECTING STATE AND COUNTY SOLID WASTE
20 MANAGEMENT PLANNING, AND COULD ORGANIZE LOCAL SUPPORT FOR
21 LEGISLATION STRENGTHENING THE WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD
22 COUNTY RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY FOR ALL ASPECTS OF
23 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT.

24 AN AWFUL LOT OF LEGISLATION COMING OUT THESE
25 DAYS HAS VERY CONFLICTING SIGNALS ABOUT WHO HAS AUTHORITY



1600 EAST FOURTH STREET, SUITE 220
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92701
TELEPHONE (714) 953-4447

Harristers'
reporting service

1 FOR WHAT, AND I THINK THAT THE COUNTIES COULD -- COUNTIES
2 AND CITIES COULD ORGANIZE SUPPORT FOR THE WASTE
3 MANAGEMENT BOARD BEING THE AGENCY WHO HAS THAT
4 RESPONSIBILITY RATHER THAN FRAGMENTING IT ACROSS THE
5 STATE AGENCIES AND ALSO WOULD SIMPLIFY WHAT THE COUNTIES
6 HAVE TO DO IN ORDER TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF ALL THIS
7 LEGISLATION.

8 FINALLY, WE SUGGEST THAT BESIDES THE WASTE
9 MANAGEMENT BOARD THAT SOMEONE FROM OPR MIGHT BE INVOLVED
10 IN THE STAFFING OF IT JUST BECAUSE OF THE PLANNING LAW
11 COMPLICATIONS THAT WE HAVE COME ACROSS AND WE THINK THAT
12 IT WOULD BE HANDLED, AND YOUR BOARD HAS CREATED OTHER
13 ADVISORY COMMITTEES IN THE PAST. WE THINK THAT THIS WILL
14 BE THE SAME KIND OF A COMMITTEE.

15 AND, AGAIN, FINALLY, IT WOULD MEET ON AN
16 AS-NEEDED BASIS. WE FEEL THAT IT WOULD BE IMPORTANT FOR
17 COMMITTEES SUCH AS THIS TO HAVE SOME INPUT TO THE
18 REVISION OF YOUR PLANNING GUIDELINES THAT YOUR STAFF IS
19 WORKING ON NOW, AND THAT PERIODIC MEETINGS TO REVIEW
20 PROPOSED LEGISLATION WOULD BE USEFUL. AND, ALSO, THAT
21 WHEN BILLS HAVE BEEN PASSED, IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO HAVE A
22 MEETING OF THIS COMMITTEE TO DISCUSS HOW THOSE BILLS ARE
23 GOING TO PLAY OUT AT THE LOCAL LEVEL.

24 AND I THINK I'VE ANSWERED YOUR QUESTIONS SO
25 FAR. IF YOU HAVE MORE, I'LL TRY.

1600 EAST FOURTH STREET, SUITE 220
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92701
TELEPHONE (714) 953-4447

barristers'
reporting service

1 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY QUESTIONS FROM BOARD
2 MEMBERS?

3 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: MR. CHAIRMAN. I READ
4 CAREFULLY YOUR STRUCTURE OF THE COMMITTEE, AND I STILL
5 CAN'T ADD UP AS TO HOW MANY PEOPLE YOU WOULD PROPOSE
6 WOULD BE ON THIS COMMITTEE.

7 MS. ST. JEWELL: WELL, I THINK THAT IT LOOKS FROM
8 HERE AS THOUGH MAYBE IT WOULD BE ABOUT SEVEN OR EIGHT
9 STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCIES AND ABOUT SEVEN COUNTIES.

10 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: I MEANT TO ASK -- EXCUSE MY
11 ABYSMAL IGNORANCE, BUT WHAT IS F & G?

12 MS. ST. JEWELL: FISH AND GAME. IT'S ONE OF THOSE
13 AGENCIES --

14 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: FINANCE AND GRAB BAG.

15 MS. ST. JEWELL: THAT'S PRETTY GOOD. FISH AND GAME
16 FIGURES RATHER STRONGLY IN ANYTHING THAT IS WETLAND OR --

17 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: I UNDERSTAND NOW THAT I
18 KNOW WHAT IT IS.

19 WHAT KIND OF STAFFING WOULD YOU ANTICIPATE
20 THIS COMMITTEE WOULD NEED?

21 MS. ST. JEWELL: WELL, I'M NOT REALLY FAMILIAR WITH
22 HOW THE BOARD HAS STAFFED THE OTHER COMMITTEES SUCH AS
23 THE ONE ON SIGNIFICANT CHANGE OR THE ONE FOR LOCAL
24 ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES AND SO I DON'T KNOW. BUT I DON'T
25 ENVISION IT AS BEING A COMMITTEE THAT MET MONTHLY OR



1 ANYTHING OF THAT NATURE SO THAT I DON'T THINK IT WOULD
2 REQUIRE FULL TIME.

3 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: HOW WOULD YOU ANTICIPATE
4 THAT THIS WOULD BE FINANCED?

5 MS. ST. JEWELL: WELL, AGAIN, I JUST HAVE TO LEAVE
6 IT TO THE FACT THAT THE BOARD HAS HAD COMMITTEES BEFORE
7 ON ISSUES THAT WERE IMPORTANT, AND WE WOULD HOPE THAT
8 THEY WOULD SEE FIT TO DO SOMETHING ALONG THESE LINES.

9 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: AND DO YOU ANTICIPATE OR
10 FEEL THAT ABAG IS QUALIFIED TO MAKE SUCH DECISIONS FOR
11 THE ENTIRE STATE?

12 MS. ST. JEWELL: NO AND WE'RE NOT SAYING THAT.
13 WHAT WE'RE SAYING IS THAT THIS IS A CONSENSUS ON THE PART
14 OF NINE OF THE COUNTIES IN THE STATE, AND WE FEEL THAT
15 THE COUNTIES IN THE BAY AREA ARE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE
16 PROBLEMS THAT EXIST THROUGHOUT THE STATE, AND THAT
17 THESE -- THAT THIS COMMITTEE WOULD BE MADE UP OF COUNTY
18 REPRESENTATIVES FROM ALL OVER CALIFORNIA, NOT JUST THE
19 BAY AREA.

20 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: YOU DON'T FEEL -- YOU
21 INSIST AND UNDERLINE AND YOU REITERATE SEVERAL TIMES THAT
22 IT'S NOT ANOTHER LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT, BUT DON'T YOU FEEL
23 REALISTICALLY THAT IF THIS WERE IMPLEMENTED, THAT IT
24 WOULD BE ANOTHER LAYER OF REVIEW, THAT THE TIME FRAMES
25 INVOLVED WOULD BE PUSHED BACK AND ALLOWED TO SLIDE



1 BECAUSE OF THE INABILITY TO GATHER A QUORUM OF YOUR
2 ADVISORY COMMITTEE, OTHER STAFF FUNCTIONS THAT SEEM TO BE
3 GOING ALONG ON NOTIFICATION AND TIME FRAMES AND SO FORTH?

4 AND I'M NOT AT ALL SURE, JUST AS A MEMBER OF
5 THIS BOARD, THAT DUPLICATION, REPLICATION OF CERTAIN
6 GUIDELINES ARE APPLICABLE TO LOS ANGELES COUNTY AND YOLLO
7 COUNTY, FOR INSTANCE, THAT THOSE FINANCES AND REVENUE
8 SOURCES AND ABILITY AND SO FORTH TO COPE WITH A PROBLEM
9 THAT'S IN YOLLO COUNTY WOULD NOT BE APPLICABLE IN ANY
10 WAY. WHY SET UP A GUIDELINE THAT WOULD WORK FOR LOS
11 ANGELES COUNTY AND IMPOSE IT UPON YOLLO COUNTY? I'M
12 PICKING ON YOLLO BECAUSE WE'RE NOT GOING TO DISCUSS THEM
13 TODAY, AND THEY AREN'T HERE TO DEFEND THEMSELVES.

14 MS. ST. JEWELL: FIRST OFF, IT ISN'T ENVISIONED
15 THAT THIS COMMITTEE WOULD REVIEW ANY PLAN. THAT'S WHAT
16 I'M SAYING, THAT WE WOULD NOT INTERFERE IN ANY WAY OR
17 HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH AN INDIVIDUAL PLAN.

18 WHAT WE'RE SAYING IS THAT IT WOULD BE EASIER
19 FOR YOU AND YOUR STAFF TO REVIEW PLANS IF THEY ALL HAD
20 THE SAME CONTENT, AND IT WOULD BE EASIER FOR YOU AND YOUR
21 STAFF TO DEAL WITH THE DATA SUMMARIZING OF COUNTY PLANS
22 IF THEY ALL HAD A CONSISTENT METHOD OF MEASURING AND ALL
23 HAD CONSISTENT PROJECTION METHODS AND THINGS OF THAT
24 NATURE. IT'S REALLY FOR THE METHODS AND THE FORMAT OF
25 THE COUNTY PLANS, NOT WHAT THE COUNTY PLANS SHOULD DO.



1 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: WHY DO YOU THINK THAT'S
2 IMPORTANT? I'M REALLY AM QUITE CURIOUS. I WOULD HAVE TO
3 BE RETRAINED ON READING PLANS.

4 MS. ST. JEWELL: I DON'T THINK SO. I THINK THAT IF
5 YOU HAD A CHECKLIST THAT SAID THAT THE PLANS OUGHT TO
6 HAVE THIS, THIS, THIS, AND THIS AND YOU GO THROUGH --

7 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: WE DO.

8 MS. ST. JEWELL: -- AND IF THEY'RE MORE OR LESS
9 UNIFORM RATHER THAN RATHER RANDOM AT THE PRESENT TIME, AS
10 THE EXAMPLE OF THE NINE BAY AREA COUNTIES, SOME OF THEM
11 HAVE A SUMMARY, SOME OF THEM DON'T. SOME OF THEM HAVE AN
12 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN, SOME OF THEM DON'T. SOME OF THEM
13 HAVE SEPARATE RESOURCE RECOVERY CHAPTERS, SOME OF THEM
14 DON'T. IT'S JUST THAT IF YOU WANT TO BE ABLE TO JUST
15 CHECK OFF QUICKLY AND THEN CONCENTRATE ON WHETHER THOSE
16 PARTICULAR COMPONENTS OF THE PLAN WERE ADEQUATE, IT SEEMS
17 TO US THAT IT WOULD MAKE IT SIMPLER FOR YOU.

18 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: I DON'T KNOW THAT WE EVER
19 THOUGHT IT WAS COMPLICATED, BUT THANK YOU FOR CONSIDERING
20 US.

21 MS. ST. JEWELL: SOMETIMES IT GETS COMPLICATED AT
22 THE LOCAL LEVEL, WHICH IS THE REASON THIS WAS BROUGHT UP.

23 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: OTHER COMMENTS?

24 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: WELL, I GUESS I SUPPORT
25 GENERALLY THE POSITION THAT MY COLLEAGUE, MS. BREMBERG,



1 HAS STATED. I DON'T SEE ANY REASON, REALLY, WHY, IF YOU
2 ALL WANT TO FORM A COMMITTEE, YOU CAN'T DO IT. YOU DON'T
3 NEED TO COME TO US TO AID AND ABET IT.

4 IF YOU THINK IT WILL BE OF HELP TO YOU, THE
5 COUNTIES THAT ARE INVOLVED, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT YOU GO
6 ON YOUR OWN AND DO IT. NOTWITHSTANDING ALL THE
7 ASSURANCES THAT ARE GIVEN, I LOOK AT ADVISORY COMMITTEES
8 AS BEING CUMBERSOME. I THINK OF THEM AS BEING A
9 DELUTION, REGARDLESS OF WHAT'S BEING SAID, OF OUR
10 AUTHORITY.

11 AND, FRANKLY, WE HAVE SUCH A LIMITED BUDGET
12 WITH REGARDS TO CREATING ANOTHER COMMITTEE, I CAN
13 CERTAINLY VISION GREATER NEEDS TO SPEND OUR MONEY ON THAN
14 ANOTHER COMMITTEE. SO I GUESS MY FEELINGS ARE THAT IF
15 THE COUNTIES OF THE BAY AREA WANT TO FORM A COMMITTEE IN
16 ORDER TO HELP THEM DEVELOP THEIR COSWMPs, GO AHEAD. THEY
17 HAVE TO COME TO US FOR FINAL APPROVAL, BUT THERE ISN'T
18 ANY QUESTION THEN AS TO WHO AND WHERE THE AUTHORITY LIES
19 AND WHO HAS THE RIGHT OF REVIEW. THAT'S ALL I HAVE TO
20 SAY ABOUT IT.

21 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: MR. BROWN.

22 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: FIRST OF ALL, I THINK IT'S
23 IMPORTANT TO RECOGNIZE THE EFFORT THAT'S BEING PUT FORTH
24 HERE. I THINK IT'S BORN OUT OF A REAL CONCERN THAT'S
25 TAKING PLACE AND MAYBE SOMETHING THAT WE'RE NOT ALL VERY



1 COMFORTABLE WITH, AND WE'RE HAVING DIFFICULTY GETTING OUR
2 ARMS AROUND.

3 USING CONTRA COSTA COUNTY AS AN EXAMPLE, IT'S
4 A MISERABLE STALEMATE. I'M NOT SURE WHY OR EVERYBODY
5 THINKS KNOW WHY AND SO ON AND SO FORTH. I HAVE THE
6 UNEASY FEELING, THOUGH, THAT THE COMMITTEE IS REALLY AN
7 OUTGROWTH OF THOSE POLITICAL DIFFICULTIES THAT ARE TAKING
8 PLACE IN THE URBAN AREAS AND THE CRY FOR SOME HELP IN
9 ADDRESSING EITHER NEW REGULATIONS OR ADDRESSING OUR
10 GUIDELINES TO SOMEHOW OR OTHER SOLVE THOSE POLITICAL
11 PROBLEMS THAT HAVE ARISEN, AND CERTAINLY DON'T WANT TO
12 MINIMIZE THOSE POLITICAL PROBLEMS. WE'RE NOT SURE HOW TO
13 WRESTLE WITH THEM EITHER.

14 IF THERE WAS ANY CONTRIBUTION YOUR GROUP COULD
15 MAKE TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, IT WOULD BE CERTAINLY IN
16 ADDRESSING SOME WAY TO GET AROUND THOSE POLITICAL
17 PROBLEMS THROUGH SOME NEW PROCESS OR SOME ADDITION TO THE
18 PROCESS WE ALREADY HAVE. DOES THAT MAKE ANY SENSE TO
19 YOU?

20 MS. ST. JEWELL: YES, I SEE. WELL, AS IT SAYS IN
21 YOUR AGENDA PACKET, THIS IS REALLY FOR YOUR DISCUSSION
22 AND CONSIDERATION. AND WE APPRECIATE YOUR GIVING US THIS
23 TIME TO TALK ABOUT IT AND HOPE YOU WILL GIVE IT SOME
24 FURTHER THOUGHT.

25 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: ONE FURTHER COMMENT. I'D BE



1 MOST INTERESTED IN OUR STAFF'S COMMENTS, EITHER NOW OR AT
2 A LATER DATE WHEN YOU HAVE COMPLETED YOUR GUIDELINE
3 REVIEWS AND SO FORTH BECAUSE I'M SURE THERE ARE SOME
4 CONCERNS HERE THAT YOU COULD CONSTRUCTIVELY USE.

5 MR. EOWAN: ONE THOUGHT THAT WE HAD WAS WE LIKE THE
6 IDEA OF WORKING AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE WITH COUNTIES UP
7 FRONT BEFORE THE TIME FRAMES BEGIN TO BE ENACTED WHEN THE
8 270 DAYS, AND I THINK THE THINGS THAT WE CAN DO TO
9 IMPROVE OUR COMMUNICATION SO THAT COUNTIES KNOW WHAT'S
10 REQUIRED. YOU KNOW, BELIEVE IT OR NOT, WE'RE STILL
11 GETTING CALLS FROM COUNTIES SAYING, "WELL, I DIDN'T KNOW
12 MY PLAN WAS DUE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT'S REQUIRED IN IT."
13 AND SO THINGS THAT WE CAN DO TO IMPROVE THAT, I THINK,
14 ARE HELPFUL TO EVERYBODY.

15 WE DO HAVE, FOR EXAMPLE, IN ANOTHER AREA OF
16 OUR RESPONSIBILITY, THE LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY ADVISORY
17 COUNCIL, WHICH IS A GROUP THAT WAS ESTABLISHED MANY YEARS
18 AGO TO ALLOW ALL OF US TO KEEP UP TO SPEED WITH EACH
19 OTHER ON WHAT THE PROBLEMS ARE IN THE VARIOUS AREAS OF
20 THE STATE IN TERMS OF ENFORCEMENT. AND THAT'S PROVEN TO
21 BE A HELPFUL FORUM FOR DIALOGUE AND A FAIRLY INFORMAL
22 LEVEL ALTHOUGH IT'S A FORMAL COMMITTEE IN ITS OWN WAY.

23 I DON'T KNOW THAT I COULD QUANTIFY WHAT WE
24 ACCOMPLISH IN THE LEA ADVISORY COUNCIL, BUT IT SEEMS THAT
25 EVERYBODY WANTS TO CONTINUE THAT BECAUSE IT IS A GOOD



1 PLACE TO TALK ABOUT THINGS AND KEEP THE LEA'S ADVISED ON
2 A REGULAR BASIS WHAT THE BOARD IS DOING, WHAT POLICIES
3 THE BOARD IS PROMULGATING, ETC. WE DON'T DO THAT ON THAT
4 KIND OF REGULAR FORMAL BASIS IN TERMS OF COUNTY PLANS.

5 I'M NOT SURE THAT THIS PROPOSAL ADDRESSES THAT
6 EXACTLY, BUT IT DOES SPEAK TO A WAY OF TALKING ABOUT WHAT
7 THE BOARD REQUIRES IN TERMS OF COUNTY PLANNING. SO
8 THAT'S SOME OF THE CONVERSATION THAT THE STAFF HAS HAD
9 WITH EACH OTHER ON -- AND NOT -- AND PRIOR TO THIS
10 PROPOSAL, WE'VE BEEN TALKING ABOUT WAYS IN WHICH WE CAN
11 FACILITATE THE COUNTY PLANNING PROCESS.

12 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: TO THAT END, IT WOULD SEEM
13 TO ME, AS OCCURRED YESTERDAY, ENCOURAGING COUNTIES TO
14 TAKE A MORE AGGRESSIVE ROLE IN HELPING US AS WE REVISE
15 OUR GUIDELINES, MAY BE PART OF THE ANSWER TO THE PROBLEM
16 THEY HAVE. YESTERDAY, IF YOU WILL RECALL, WE HAD SOME
17 EXTRAORDINARILY POSITIVE REACTION FROM COUNTY GOVERNMENT
18 ON SOME OF THE THINGS HAVING TO DO WITH IMPLEMENTATION OF
19 2448.

20 I CERTAINLY BELIEVE THAT THAT WAS VERY
21 HELPFUL, AND I WOULD ENCOURAGE ALL THE COUNTIES,
22 REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THEY'RE IN THE BAY AREA OR NOT, TO
23 TAKE THE TIME TO ATTEND THESE GUIDELINE HEARINGS AND TO
24 MAKE COMMENTS AT THAT TIME AND HELP US PROVIDE GUIDELINES
25 WHICH WILL BE WORKABLE, PRACTICAL, MEET THE REQUIREMENTS



1 OF THE LAW, AND HOPEFULLY MEET SOME OF THE OBJECTIVES
2 THAT THIS COMMITTEE WOULD HOPE TO ACHIEVE. I THINK IN
3 THAT WAY THEY CERTAINLY COULD BE VERY HELPFUL TO US, AND
4 I'D LIKE TO BE IN THE RECORD AS ENCOURAGING THAT.

5 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: MR. VARNER.

6 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: MR. CHAIRMAN. I APPRECIATE
7 WHAT JOHN HAS JUST SAID HERE, SOME OF THE THOUGHTS ALSO.
8 WE ALWAYS LOOK FOR INPUT FROM THOSE COUNTIES THAT WE HAVE
9 TO REGULATE AND TO BE ABLE TO HELP US UPHOLD THE LAW AND
10 SO FORTH AND MAKE IT -- NOT TO MAKE IT MORE DIFFICULT.
11 BUT ANOTHER THOUGHT THAT WAS JUST CROSSING THROUGH MY
12 MIND YOU HAVE HERE, WHAT IS IT, NINE COUNTIES. HOW MUCH
13 OF A CONSENSUS DO YOU HAVE AMONG YOURSELVES AS FAR AS THE
14 COUNTIES ARE CONCERNED?

15 BECAUSE IT'S MY EXPERIENCE THAT EACH SEPARATE
16 POLITICAL ENTITY LIKES TO, YOU KNOW, DO ITS OWN THING.
17 SO HOW MUCH REALLY CONSENSUS DO YOU HAVE IN YOUR OWN AREA
18 TO TAKE CARE OF THESE DIFFERENT PROBLEMS? IT SEEMS TO ME
19 THAT YOU COULD -- THAT WOULD BE THE WAY TO DO IT. IF YOU
20 CAN ARRIVE AT CONSENSUS HERE, CERTAINLY WE'RE VERY
21 WILLING TO TAKE ADVICE FOR ANYTHING THAT WOULD MAKE THE
22 WHOLE PROCESS WORK BETTER.

23 MS. ST. JEWELL: WELL, THE COUNTIES DO HAVE
24 CONSENSUS ON THE NEED FOR MORE CONSISTENCY IN THE FORMAT
25 AND CONTENT OF THE PLANS AND THE NEED FOR SOME LOOK AT



1 THE TIME FRAME. IT WAS THE COUNTIES THAT PUT THIS
2 PROPOSAL TOGETHER AND TOOK IT TO THE ABAG EXECUTIVE BOARD
3 FOR ITS APPROVAL. SO WE DO HAVE CONSENSUS ON THE FACT
4 THAT SOME ADJUSTMENTS NEED TO BE MADE TO THE GUIDELINES
5 IN ORDER TO MAKE THIS PROCESS WORK BETTER.

6 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: IT SEEMS TO ME, THEN, IF YOU
7 HAVE CONSENSUS THERE, YOU COULD, AMONG YOURSELVES, CREATE
8 A MODEL PLAN THAT YOU EACH WANT TO ADHERE TO. AS LONG AS
9 IT FIT OUR REQUIREMENTS, WE CERTAINLY WOULDN'T HAVE ANY
10 OBJECTION TO IT THAT I KNOW OF, WOULD WE, GEORGE? IN
11 FACT, THAT MIGHT BE SOMETHING THAT COULD BE USED AS A
12 MODEL, AND THEN WE COULD HOLD THAT UP TO OTHERS AS A
13 MODEL AS TO HOW TO SIMPLIFY OR A BETTER WAY IN WHICH TO
14 STRUCTURE THEIR PLANS. ALTHOUGH I THINK THAT THERE ARE
15 OTHER COUNTIES AND OTHER AREAS THAT HAVE SOME PROBLEMS
16 THAT YOU MAYBE DON'T HAVE.

17 MR. TORLECKSON: I THINK ALL THESE COMMENTS HAVE
18 BEEN VERY HELPFUL, AND I WOULD LIKE TO CARRY BACK TO THE
19 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WHAT YOU SHARED WITH US THIS MORNING.
20 THIS IS OFFERED AS A CONCEPT, AND PERHAPS THE PHRASE
21 "COMMITTEE" MAY HAVE BEEN THE WRONG CONCEPT IMAGE TO
22 GIVE.

23 FEEDBACK PANEL OR ADVISORY FUNCTION OF SOME
24 KIND, MAYBE SHORT DURATION. IN TERMS OF ABAG, WE'RE VERY
25 WILLING AND WOULD PROCEED IF THAT IS THE DESIRE OF THIS



1 BODY, AND I THINK IT IS THE DESIRE OF OUR MEMBER COUNTIES
2 AND CITIES TO PROCEED TO SOME KIND OF A CONSENSUS AMONG
3 OURSELVES, FURTHER CONSENSUS. WE HAVE A CONSENSUS THAT
4 THERE IS A NEED ON A TECHNICAL AND COMMUNICATION LEVEL
5 AND COMPLEXITY OF THE LEGISLATION TO TRY TO PULL TOGETHER
6 SOME THINKING AND HAVE SOME CLEAR GUIDELINES AMONG EACH
7 OF STAFF IN RELATIONSHIP WITH THE STAFF FOR THIS BOARD.

8 THE POINT YOU JUST RAISED, MEMBER, IS THAT THE
9 DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EACH SKAG OR EACH REGION OF THE STATE
10 MAY NOT BE ASSIMILATED IN THIS KIND OF PROCESS, BUT WE
11 WOULD BE GLAD TO GO FORWARD AND TRY TO PRESENT SOME KIND
12 OF A SET OF MODEL SUGGESTIONS. AND I THINK IN THAT
13 CONTEXT, WE'D BE HAPPY TO CONTINUE WORKING WITH YOU.

14 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: I THINK THAT'S GREAT.

15 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: THANK YOU. I BELIEVE THAT
16 THERE'S NO ACTION REQUIRED ON THIS ITEM, BUT YOU
17 CERTAINLY NEED TO GET SOME KIND OF SIGNALS FROM US. AND
18 I GUESS THE SIGNALS ARE IS THAT, FIRST OF ALL, THAT
19 THERE'S NO -- CERTAINLY NO OPPOSITION OR INDICATION THAT
20 YOU ARE NOT FREE TO GO HEAD AND FORM WHATEVER KIND OF
21 COMMITTEES AND THAT WE WOULD ENCOURAGE ANYTHING IN THE
22 PROCESS THAT WOULD HELP OVERALL TO SMOOTH IT, BUT YET
23 THERE'S NO ACTION OR ANYTHING TAKEN ON OUR PART AT THIS
24 TIME FOR FUNDING OR OTHER. IT'S A MATTER OF
25 ENCOURAGEMENT AT THIS TIME TO GO AHEAD, AND I THINK



1 THAT'S ABOUT ALL THE MESSAGE THAT WE COULD WE COULD GIVE,
2 AND WE CERTAINLY APPRECIATE YOU COMING ALL THIS WAY.

3 AND BY THE WAY, TOM, IF WE COULD HAVE THIS
4 COMMITTEE IN PLACE RIGHT NOW, COULD WE CLOSE THAT HOLE
5 WHERE CONTRA COSTA IS? I JUST HAD TO SAY THAT. I'M
6 SORRY.

7 MR. TORLECKSON: THE ISSUES ACTUALLY THAT CAME TO
8 ABAG WERE TECHNICAL RATHER THAN POLITICAL. THE ISSUES OF
9 CONTRA COSTA ARE MORE POLITICAL, AND THE COMMITTEE WOULD
10 NOT HAVE SOLVED THOSE PROBLEMS.

11 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: THANK YOU. THAT CONCLUDES THIS
12 ITEM, AND WE'LL TAKE A TEN-MINUTE BREAK.

13 (A BREAK WAS TAKEN.)

14 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: CAN WE GET THE MEETING STARTED
15 AGAIN PLEASE? THERE WAS A TOM REILLY THAT MADE A REQUEST
16 TO HEAR ITEM -- THIS WAS THE ACME ITEM NO. 25. WE'LL TRY
17 TO DO THAT BEFORE WE BREAK FOR LUNCH SO THAT WE CAN GET
18 THAT OUT OF THE WAY.

19 CONTINUE WITH ITEM 12, STANTON TRANSFER
20 STATION.

21 MR. IWAHIRO: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS A -- COULD I
22 CONFER WITH MY PERSON FOR A MINUTE?

23 THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THIS PARTICULAR ITEM
24 WILL NOT BE HERE UNTIL AFTER LUNCH.

25 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: SO, WE'LL JUST TAKE IT THIS



1 AFTERNOON. THEN ITEM NO. 13.

2 MR. IWAHIRO: ITEM 13 IS CONSIDERATION OF
3 CONCURRENCE FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A SOLID WASTE PERMIT AT
4 HEALDSBURG TRANSFER STATION. THIS IS A NEW TRANSFER
5 STATION THAT WILL TAKE THE PLACE OF A LANDFILL IN THAT
6 AREA AND WILL SERVE ACTUALLY TO MOVE THE WASTE TO THE
7 CENTRAL LANDFILL AT -- IN SONOMA COUNTY. THIS IS GOING
8 TO BE PERMITTED FOR 250 TONS PER DAY. DON DIER OF OUR
9 PERMIT UNIT WILL PRESENT THIS ITEM.

10 MR. DIER: THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING. AS MR.
11 IWAHIRO JUST INDICATED, THIS IS A NEW, LARGE VOLUME
12 TRANSFER STATION. IT IS BEING -- IT HAS BEEN CONSTRUCTED
13 AT THE SITE OF THE HEALDSBURG LANDFILL. THE FACILITY IS
14 LOCATED IN NORTHERN SONOMA COUNTY APPROXIMATELY TWO MILES
15 NORTH OF CENTRAL HEALDSBURG.

16 THE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT RECEIVED A
17 DETERMINATION OF CONFORMANCE EARLIER THIS YEAR AT THE
18 FEBRUARY BOARD MEETING, AND I'D LIKE TO COMMEND THE
19 COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FOR UNDERSTANDING AND
20 ABIDING BY OUR PROCEDURES AND GETTING A CONFORMANCE
21 FINDING, WHICH THEN ALLOWS THEM TO CONSTRUCT THE
22 FACILITY.

23 AND NOW THEY'RE BEFORE US TODAY TO GET THE
24 FACILITIES PERMIT TO ALLOW THEM TO OPERATE THE FACILITY.
25 BECAUSE THE CONFORMANCE FINDING WAS FOUND IN FEBRUARY,



1 THEY DID CONSTRUCT A FACILITY. IT IS CAPABLE OF HANDLING
2 UP TO ABOUT 320 TONS ON ANY PEAK DAY. THE PERMIT
3 CONTAINS A LIMITATION OF PERMITTED CAPACITY OF 250 TONS
4 PER DAY, WHICH STAFF FINDS ACCEPTABLE. THAT'S ABOUT THE
5 DESIGN CAPACITY.

6 THE TYPICAL TONNAGE THAT'S BEEN RECEIVED AT
7 THE HEALDSBURG LANDFILL, IN 1987 THE LANDFILL RECEIVED AN
8 AVERAGE OF ABOUT 175 TONS PER DAY. THIS AMOUNT OF WASTE,
9 THEN, WOULD BE EXPECTED TO BE TRANSFERRED THROUGH THE
10 FACILITY.

11 THE FACILITY WILL BE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FROM 8
12 A.M. TO 5 A.M. SEVEN DAYS A WEEK. AND STAFF HAS REVIEWED
13 THE DESIGN OF THE FACILITY AND FINDS THAT IT'S VERY WELL
14 THOUGHT OUT DESIGN FOR THE LEVEL OF WASTE THAT THEY'LL BE
15 RECEIVING.

16 THE PERMIT WAS RECEIVED ON JULY 7TH, AND OUR
17 40-DAY REQUIREMENT WOULD PUT THIS MATTER BEFORE THE BOARD
18 TODAY. THE 40 DAYS WOULD EXPIRE ON AUGUST 16TH SO THAT
19 IS WHY WE HAVE IT SCHEDULED FOR TODAY'S CONSIDERATION.

20 WE HAVE REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE PUBLIC WORKS
21 DEPARTMENT HERE TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE, AND
22 STAFF IS IN A POSITION TO RECOMMEND CONCURRING WITH THE
23 PERMIT BY ADOPTING PERMIT DECISION NO. 88-43.

24 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: IS THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM
25 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?



1 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: IT'S JUST A MATTER OF
2 CURIOSITY. HOW MUCH -- WHAT IS THE CHARGE ON THIS TYPE
3 OF A FACILITY WHICH OBVIOUSLY HAS GOOD PLANNING WITH THE
4 TYPE OF EQUIPMENT THAT'S PROPOSED TO BE USED AND SO
5 FORTH? THERE MUST BE A CONSIDERABLE CAPITAL INVESTMENT.
6 IT'S JUST A MATTER OF CURIOSITY. IT HAS NOTHING TO DO
7 WITH MY VOTE, WHICH IS IN FAVOR OF THIS TYPE OF THING.
8 IT'S JUST THAT I'D LIKE TO KNOW.

9 MR. DIER: I'D LIKE TO INTRODUCE ALEX SABASTIAN.

10 MR. HASKINS: MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD,
11 MY NAME IS ED HASKINS. I'M THE SOLID WASTE DIVISION
12 MANAGER.

13 COSTS ARE CERTAINLY GOING UP, BUT CONSTRUCTION
14 COSTS AT THIS FACILITY, INCLUDING A NICE RECYCLING AREA,
15 WILL BE APPROXIMATELY \$2 MILLION. THAT'S JUST
16 CONSTRUCTION COSTS, DOESN'T INCLUDE ENGINEERING AND EIR'S
17 AND PERMITS AND THOSE THINGS.

18 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: WHICH WOULD ACTUALLY TAKE
19 IT UP APPROXIMATELY THREE MILLION WITH CAPITAL
20 INVESTMENT?

21 MR. HASKINS: WELL, I'D SAY APPROXIMATELY TWO AND A
22 HALF MILLION, TOTAL WORK TO GET SOMETHING CONSTRUCTED
23 LIKE THAT.

24 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

25 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS?



1 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: I JUST WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A
2 COMMENT. I CERTAINLY APPRECIATE THE FACT THAT WE HAVE
3 SOMEONE HERE THAT COMES IN AND DOES ALL THE THINGS PRIOR
4 TO OPENING UP ONE AS OPPOSED TO OUR LAST MEETING WHERE WE
5 HAD TO TAKE ACTION AGAINST SOMEBODY THAT OPENED THEM UP
6 ILLEGALLY AND THEN COMPLAINED ABOUT THE BUREAUCRATIC RED
7 TAPE. SO I COMMEND YOU IN THAT.

8 MR. HASKINS: I CAN'T TAKE COMPLETE SUPPORT OF
9 THAT. YOUR STAFF AND BOARD ARE CERTAINLY SUPPORTIVE OF
10 ALL OUR --

11 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: IS THIS GOING TO BE COUNTY
12 CONSTRUCTED, AND THEN YOU ARE GOING TO SOLICIT RRP'S FOR
13 PRIVATE OPERATION, OR IS THE COUNTY GOING TO OPERATE? I
14 CAN'T REMEMBER WHAT YOUR PROCEDURE IS.

15 MR. HASKINS: THE WAY WE'VE BEEN GOING IN OUR
16 COUNTY IS IT WILL BE CONSTRUCTED BY THE COUNTY OF SONOMA,
17 WE'LL SEND OUT FOR PROPOSALS FOR THE OPERATION TO PRIVATE
18 CONTRACTORS TO OPERATE THE TRANSFER STATION FACILITY AND
19 CONTRACT TO OPERATE THE RECYCLING AREA FOR THE PRIVATE.

20 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: WILL YOU CONTROL THE GATE WITH
21 THE COUNTY PERSON SO THAT A COUNTY PERSON WILL BE
22 COLLECTING THE FEES AND SO FORTH?

23 MR. HASKINS: THAT'S CORRECT. OUR AUDITORS
24 RECOMMENDED THAT WE BASICALLY HANDLE THE MONEY.

25 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS



1 ITEM? WE'RE READY FOR CONSIDERATION OF 88-43.

2 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: I WOULD MOVE 88-43.

3 BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN: SECOND.

4 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED.

5 ANY OPPOSITION? ANY DISCUSSION ON THIS? CARRIED.

6 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: MR. ARAKALIAN WANTS TO BE
7 NOTICED. YOU RAISED YOUR HAND. IT'S BEEN MOVED AND
8 CARRIED AND PASSED AND THANK YOU.

9 NO. 14 IS GOING TO BE, AS I UNDERSTAND, IN THE
10 P.M. RIGHT AFTER LUNCH.

11 MR. IWAHIRO: THAT'S CORRECT. WE'D BE READY TO GO
12 TO 15.

13 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ON THESE OTHER ITEMS, ARE THESE
14 JUST PRESENTATIONS WITHOUT ANY PERSONS BEING HERE?

15 MR. IWAHIRO: NO. THERE ARE SOME OUTSIDE PEOPLE,
16 SO TO SPEAK.

17 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ALL RIGHT. NO. 15.

18 MR. IWAHIRO: 15, YES. THIS IS REMOVAL OF A
19 LANDFILL FROM OUR OPEN DUMP LIST. THERE ARE JUST SEVERAL
20 SITES THAT ARE ON OUR OPEN DUMP LIST, AND WE'RE TRYING TO
21 REMOVE THEM AS EXPEDITIOUSLY AS POSSIBLE. SO YOU WILL
22 SEE THESE COMING BEFORE YOU EVERY NOW AND THEN.

23 OUR SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA OFFICE IS HANDLING
24 THIS, AND GARY KING, OUR MANAGER DOWN THERE, WILL BE
25 PRESENTING THIS ITEM.

1 MR. KING: MR. CHAIRMAN, BOARD MEMBERS, MY NAME IS
2 GARY KING. I'M WITH THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA OFFICE.
3 THIS IS A SHORT ITEM TODAY. THE REASON WE'RE BRINGING IT
4 IS TO HAVE THE PENROSE PIT LOCATED IN NORTHERN LOS
5 ANGELES COUNTY IN THE SAN FERNANDO VALLEY REMOVED FROM
6 THE RCRA OPEN DUMP INVENTORY. WE HAVE LISA DERNBACH HERE
7 FROM OUR OFFICE, AND SHE'S GOING TO MAKE THIS
8 PRESENTATION.

9 MS. DERNBACH: MR. CHAIRMAN, BOARD MEMBERS, IN 1980
10 THE BOARD CONDUCTED INSPECTIONS OF LANDFILLS THROUGHOUT
11 THE STATE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FEDERAL RESOURCE
12 CONSERVATION AND RECOVERY ACT. THE RESULT OF THOSE
13 INSPECTIONS FOR SITES FOUND IN VIOLATION OF THE RCRA
14 STANDARDS WAS INCLUSION UPON THE RCRA OPEN DUMP
15 INVENTORY.

16 TO DATE 23 SITES WITHIN THE STATE STILL REMAIN
17 ON THE RCRA INVENTORY LIST. THE PENROSE PIT LANDFILL WAS
18 INCLUDED ON THE RCRA OPEN DUMP INVENTORY BY THE BOARD ON
19 SEPTEMBER 4, 1981, FOR VIOLATION OF THE RCRA SAFETY GAS
20 CRITERION.

21 THE LANDFILL IN THE SUN VALLEY AREA OF LOS
22 ANGELES DEPOSITED APPROXIMATELY 12 MILLION CUBIC YARDS OF
23 WASTE BEFORE CLOSING OPERATIONS IN MARCH 1985. IN THAT
24 SAME YEAR THE LOS ANGELES BY-PRODUCTS COMPANY, OWNER OF
25 THE PENROSE PIT LANDFILL, LEASED ALL LANDFILL GAS RIGHTS



1 TO PACIFIC LIGHTING ENERGY SYSTEMS. PACIFIC LIGHTING
2 ADDED TO AND IMPROVED THE SITE'S LANDFILL GAS MONITORING
3 SYSTEM, AN EXTRACTION SYSTEM, AND, AS WELL, BUILT A
4 GAS-TO-ENERGY GENERATION PLANT.

5 PENROSE PIT IS BORDERED TO THE SOUTH BY
6 STRATHERN STREET, TO THE EAST BY TUJUNGA AVENUE, TO THE
7 NORTH BY INDUSTRIES, TO THE WEST BY BOTH MOBILE HOMES,
8 THE FENCE IS THE LANDFILL BOUNDARY, AND ALSO THE WALL
9 INDICATES THE BOUNDARY TO RESIDENCES.

10 BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN: OBVIOUSLY, WITHOUT ANY
11 WRITING, WE DON'T KNOW IF THAT WALL IS ON THE LEFT OR THE
12 RIGHT.

13 MS. DERNBACH: THIS ONE IS CORRECT. ON JULY 5TH OF
14 THIS YEAR BOARD STAFF, ALONG WITH THE LEA, CITY OF LOS
15 ANGELES, CONDUCTED INSPECTIONS OF THE 27 ON-SITE
16 MONITORING PROBES. AND ALL THE PROBES HAD READINGS OF
17 ZERO GAS WITH THE EXCEPTION OF TWO PROBES ON THE EASTERN
18 SITE BOUNDARY THAT HAD READINGS OF METHANE LESS THAN
19 ONE-HALF OF 1 PERCENT.

20 BOARD STAFF THEN PROCEEDED TO MONITOR ALL OF
21 THE EIGHT OFFSITE PROBES. THIS IS ALONG TUJUNGA AVENUE.
22 AND OF THE EIGHT OFFSITE PROBES, AGAIN, ONE PROBE DID
23 HAVE A READING OF 5 PERCENT METHANE. AND THIS PROBE,
24 PROBE B, IS ALONG THE EASTERN SITE BOUNDARY AGAIN ALONG
25 TUJUNGA AVENUE, AND DIRECTLY ACROSS THE STREET FROM IT IS



1600 EAST FOURTH STREET, SUITE 220
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92701
TELEPHONE (714) 953-4447

barristers'
reporting service

1 THE STRATHERN GRAVEL PIT, APPROXIMATELY 150 FEET DEEP.
2 THERE ARE NO BUILDINGS ON SITE, AND THE OWNER OF THE
3 GRAVEL PIT IS ALSO THE LOS ANGELES BY-PRODUCTS COMPANY,
4 AND THEY PLAN TO LANDFILL IN THE PIT ONCE GRAVEL
5 OPERATIONS HAVE CEASED.

6 IN CONCLUSION, BASED ON THE INFORMATION FROM
7 THE GAS MONITORING OF THE PROBES ON AND OFF SITE AT THE
8 PENROSE PIT LANDFILL, STAFF BELIEVED THAT ALL THE RCRA
9 STANDARDS HAVE BEEN COMPLIED WITH ALTHOUGH A GAS READING
10 OF 5 PERCENT WAS FOUND AT ONE OF THE OFF-SITE PROBES. IT
11 IS BELIEVED THAT GAS MIGRATION FROM THE SITE DOES NOT
12 POSE A THREAT TO THE ENVIRONMENT OR TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH
13 AND SAFETY AT THIS POINT.

14 AT THIS TIME STAFF WOULD LIKE TO RECOMMEND
15 THAT THE BOARD CHOOSE OPTION NO. 1 INSIDE YOUR AGENDA
16 PACKET AND ALSO ADOPT RESOLUTION 88-48, WHICH IS REMOVAL
17 OF THE PENROSE PIT LANDFILL FROM THE RCRA OPEN DUMP
18 INVENTORY AND CONTINUE MONITORING THE SITE FOR COMPLIANCE
19 WITH THE STATE MINIMUM STANDARDS.

20 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: MS. BREMBERG.

21 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN. AS I
22 READ THIS, FIRST THING THAT CROSSED MY MIND WAS SB 151
23 AND THE NEW SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT'S
24 REGULATIONS. WHEN I SAW THAT THEY PLANNED A NINE-HOLE
25 GOLF COURSE ON THIS AS PART OF THEIR POSTCLOSURE PLAN, I



1 WOULD HOPE THAT IF THIS IS REMOVED FROM THE -- IF WE TAKE
2 YOUR RECOMMENDATION NO. 1, THAT WE INFORM THEM THAT WE
3 SHALL NOT ONLY BE MONITORING FOR STATE MINIMUM STANDARDS,
4 BUT THAT THEY HAD BETTER GET BUSY VERY QUICKLY ON THE
5 SB 151 REQUIREMENTS BECAUSE THEY ARE INCREDIBLY -- WELL,
6 THEY'RE A THOUSAND TIMES STRICTER THAN OUR STATE MINIMUM
7 STANDARDS.

8 AND I DON'T WANT US TO GET -- GIVE THEM THE
9 IDEA THAT THEY CAN JUST PROCEED IN A NEAT AND ORDERLY
10 FASHION ON A NINE-HOLE GOLF COURSE THAT WE AREN'T
11 RECOGNIZING THAT THEY ARE NOT IN COMPLIANCE. I THINK
12 THAT THEY SHOULD BE INFORMED OF THAT, THAT THIS IS NOT A
13 BLANKET THING THAT WE'RE GOING TO SIDESTEP THOSE
14 REQUIREMENTS OR ALLOW THEM TO I MEAN.

15 MS. DERNBACH: MS. BREMBERG, AFTER THE CONCLUSION
16 OF OUR GAS MONITORING AT THE SITE, PACIFIC LIGHTING
17 ENERGY SYSTEMS HAVE DONE THEIR OWN MONITORING OF THE
18 PROBES WITH MORE FINE TUNING OF THEIR EXTRACTION SYSTEM.
19 THEY NOW CLAIM THAT THERE IS NO GAS GOING OFF THE SITE,
20 AND ALL GAS READINGS, IF ANY WERE FOUND, WAS LESS THAN
21 THAT 1 PERCENT.

22 IN ADDITION, A CLOSURE PLAN FOR THE SITE WAS
23 SUBMITTED ORIGINALLY BACK IN 1986, AND THE LOS ANGELES
24 BY-PRODUCTS COMPANY HAVE ASSURED ME THAT THIS MONTH
25 THEY'RE GOING TO BE SUBMITTING THAT REVISED CLOSURE PLAN



1 TO THE WATER BOARD.

2 MR. KING: IN ADDITION TO THAT, WE'VE HAD
3 DISCUSSIONS WITH THE LEA OUT THERE. WE FEEL THAT THEY'RE
4 KEEPING UP A VERY STRONG VIGILANCE IN MONITORING THIS
5 SITE AS IT IS. WE FEEL THAT RCRA LIST ITSELF JUST POSES
6 AN ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEM TO THEM RIGHT NOW, AND THE ONE
7 PROBE -- I WANT TO STRESS IT'S JUST THE ONE PROBE -- IS
8 MIGRATING ONTO A GRAVEL PIT, WHICH WE FEEL POSES NO
9 PROBLEM WITH OUR REGULATION. SO WE THINK THERE'S ENOUGH
10 INTEGRITY OUT HERE TO KEEP THEM ON IT. WE DEFINITELY --

11 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: I UNDERSTAND THAT. YOU
12 KNOW THE IMPLICATIONS DOWN THE LINE. I DON'T WANT THEM
13 TO FEEL THAT WE'VE GIVEN THEM A BLANKET GO-AHEAD TO PLAY
14 GAMES WITH THE REGULATIONS AND MAYBE THEY NEED MORE
15 MONITORING EQUIPMENT. AND IF THEY PLAN TO USE THAT
16 GRAVEL PIT FOR A LANDFILL, THEN WE DO COME BACK INTO THE
17 PICTURE. AND I DON'T THINK THERE SHOULD BE A GAP IN THE
18 CONTINUITY OF THEIR PLANNING.

19 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS? READY FOR
20 CONSIDERATION OF 88-48.

21 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: SO MOVED.

22 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: SECOND.

23 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED.
24 ANY OPPOSITION? ANY DISCUSSION? OKAY. IT'S APPROVED,
25 THEN, RESOLUTION 88-48. THANK YOU.



1 MR. IWAHIRO: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK WE'RE READY TO
2 MOVE TO 21. OTHER THAN THAT, MOST OF THE OTHER ITEMS IN
3 BETWEEN REQUIRE SOME OUTSIDE PRESENTATIONS.

4 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: WE'RE GOING TO SIDESTEP 16 AND
5 17?

6 MR. IWAHIRO: THAT'S CORRECT.

7 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: AND 18, SOMEBODY FROM THE L.A.
8 SAN DISTRICT IS GOING TO COME ON THAT?

9 MR. IWAHIRO: YES.

10 MR. OLDALL: 18, 19 WAS REQUESTED FOR FRIDAY, 20 WE
11 NEED MR. RELLIS HERE THIS AFTERNOON.

12 WE ARE READY WITH 21 IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO GO
13 AHEAD, MR. CHAIRMAN.

14 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: WHY DON'T WE GO TO 25 SINCE
15 THERE'S REPRESENTATIVES HERE ON THAT. LET'S TAKE 25
16 FIRST.

17 MR. IWAHIRO: MR. CHAIRMAN, ACME FILL CORPORATION
18 HAS WRITTEN MR. EOWAN A LETTER REQUESTING THAT THEY BE
19 PUT ON THE AGENDA. AS YOU PROBABLY KNOW, ACME FILL HAS A
20 1500 TON PER DAY LANDFILL IN MARTINEZ AND IT'S REACHING
21 CAPACITY.

22 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: EXCUSE ME, BUT THERE'S NOTHING
23 IN OUR PACKET ON THIS, SO IT'S STRICTLY AN INFORMATION
24 PRESENTATION ITEM AND NO ACTION.

25 MR. IWAHIRO: THAT'S CORRECT, YES.



1 THEY HAVE A SITE AND THEY'RE UP TO CAPACITY OR
2 PRETTY CLOSE TO IT, AND THEY ARE PROPOSING CERTAIN THINGS
3 LIKE WASTE RECOVERY, RECYCLING, AND TRANSFER STATION, AND
4 EXPANSION OF THE LANDFILL. AND WHAT THEY WANTED TO DO IS
5 LET US KNOW WHAT THEIR PLANS ARE, AND THAT'S WHY ON THE
6 AGENDA. MR. TOM REILLY OF ACME FILL CORPORATION, WHO IS
7 THE DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS THERE, IS READY TO MAKE THE
8 PRESENTATION.

9 MR. REILLY: MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD
10 AND STAFF, MY NAME IS TOM REILLY. I'M THE DIRECTOR OF
11 OPERATIONS FOR ACME FILL CORPORATION, AND I'M ALSO THE
12 PROJECT MANAGER FOR THE PROPOSED WASTE RECOVERY AND
13 TRANSFER STATION.

14 FOR YOUR INFORMATION, THE PRESIDENT OF ACME
15 FILL CORPORATION IS MR. BOYD OLNEY, JR., THE VICE
16 PRESIDENT IS BART BISIO, THE SECRETARY TREASURER IS
17 GEORGE NAVONE. WE EMPLOY APPROXIMATELY 30 PEOPLE AND
18 OPERATE A LANDFILL IN MARTINEZ, WHICH SERVES
19 APPROXIMATELY 400,000 PEOPLE IN CENTRAL CONTRA COSTA
20 COUNTY. THE LANDFILL RECEIVES APPROXIMATELY 1500 TONS A
21 DAY.

22 BEFORE I BEGIN MY PRESENTATION, I'D LIKE TO
23 ACKNOWLEDGE THE PRESENCE OF MR. JIM BLAKE IN THE
24 AUDIENCE. HE'S WITH THE CONTRA COSTA COUNTY HEALTH
25 DEPARTMENT, WHICH ACTS AS THE LEA FOR SOLID WASTE RELATED



1 MATTERS.

2 THE PURPOSE OF MY PRESENTATION TODAY IS TO
3 PROVIDE A PROJECT OVERVIEW AND STATUS REPORT OF THE WASTE
4 RECOVERY AND TRANSFER STATION. WE PLAN TO BE BACK BEFORE
5 THE BOARD NEXT MONTH WITH OUR APPLICATION FOR A STATE
6 FACILITIES PERMIT.

7 WITH THE PENDING CLOSURE OF OUR LANDFILL, ACME
8 HAS PLANNED TO DEVELOP A WASTE RECOVERY AND TRANSFER
9 STATION. THIS IS AN ARTIST RENDERING OF THE PROJECT.
10 AND IT HAS BEEN DESIGNED TO CONVENIENTLY AND EFFICIENTLY
11 TRANSFER WASTE FROM SMALL VEHICLES TO THE LARGE TRANSFER
12 VANS TO KEEP PACE WITH COMMUNITY GROWTH AND TO PERMIT THE
13 SALVAGE OF A NUMBER OF RECOVERABLE MATERIALS AND ALSO TO
14 PROVIDE THE OPTION OF MOVING INTO A MORE AGGRESSIVE
15 RESOURCE RECOVERY PROGRAM IN THE FUTURE.

16 THE PROJECT INCLUDES A MAIN TRANSFER STATION
17 BUILDING HERE WHERE THERE IS A SEPARATELY -- A SEPARATE
18 ENCLOSED FACILITY FOR THE GENERAL PUBLIC TO DROP OFF.
19 THERE IS A SEPARATE FACILITY FOR GARBAGE TRUCKS AND THEN
20 AN AREA FOR THE TRANSFER VANS TO BE LOADED. THERE IS A
21 VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF
22 ON-SITE EQUIPMENT AND TRANSFER VANS. THERE'S AN
23 ADMINISTRATION AREA HERE. IN THE BACK SIDE, WHICH YOU
24 CANNOT SEE, IS THE MATERIAL PROCESSING FACILITY, AND ALSO
25 IF WE RECEIVE FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES A



1 HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE DROPOFF FACILITY.

2 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: MR. ARAKALIAN HAD A QUESTION.

3 BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN: JUST FOR THE MOMENT. YOU
4 HAVE A RENDERING OF THE OUTSIDE OF THE THING. ARE YOU
5 PEOPLE FAR ALONG YET THAT YOU KNOW THE MEANS YOU ARE
6 GOING TO USE IN HERE? ARE YOU GOING TO USE THE PIT-TYPE
7 METHOD OR THE MORE RECENT COMPRESSED-TYPE THING?

8 MR. REILLY: I HAVE A COUPLE SLIDES FOR YOU THAT
9 WILL SHOW YOU, BUT WE'LL HAVE A COMBINATION --- PUBLIC
10 DUMP HAVE A TIPPING FLOOR AND WHERE THE GARBAGE TRUCKS
11 STORAGE BED. WE'LL HAVE A COMBINATION, AND I'LL SHOW YOU
12 A COUPLE OF SLIDES.

13 THE PUBLIC OR USERS OF THE FACILITY WILL FIRST
14 HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO PASS A RECYCLING CENTER FOR
15 NEWSPAPER, GLASS, AND CANS. THEY'LL THEN PROCEED TO A
16 SCALE FACILITY WHERE THEY'LL PAY. THE PUBLIC WILL
17 PROCEED TO, AS I JUST MENTIONED, A CONCRETE TIPPING FLOOR
18 IN AN ENCLOSED BUILDING. THE WASTE HERE WILL BE DROPPED
19 OFF. THERE WILL BE SOME SALVAGING HERE AND ALSO THE
20 ABILITY TO LAY OUT AND LOOK FOR HAZARDOUS WASTES THAT
21 MIGHT HAVE BEEN PART OF THE STREAM.

22 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: WHAT FACILITY IS THAT ONE?

23 MR. REILLY: THIS IS SAN CARLOS.

24 THE GARBAGE TRUCKS WILL DUMP FROM AN ELEVATED
25 AREA SIMILAR TO WHERE THIS VEHICLE IS HERE INTO A STORAGE



1 PIT. THE MATERIAL HERE WILL BE SOMEWHAT PRECOMPACTED AND
2 THEN PUSHED TO THE ONE END OF THE BUILDING WHERE THEY'LL
3 BE LOADED INTO OPEN-TOP VEHICLES. THE FACILITY WILL HAVE
4 THE CAPABILITY OF LOADING TWO TRAILERS AND WILL ALSO
5 UTILIZE SCREENS ON TOP OF THE TRAILERS TO REDUCE OR
6 ELIMINATE LITTER ON THE WAY TO THE LANDFILL.

7 WE WILL BE IMPLEMENTING CERTAIN RECOVERY
8 PROGRAMS SIMILAR TO WHAT'S AT THE MARIN RESOURCE RECOVERY
9 CENTER HERE, AND IN OUR FACILITY WE WILL BE LOOKING TO
10 CHIP WOOD AND BRUSH MATERIAL. MATERIAL IS CONVEYED UP TO
11 A CHIPPER, IT'S CHIPPED, AND THEN STORED, AND THE
12 MATERIAL IS SHIPPED TO LOUISIANA PACIFIC'S FACILITY AS A
13 BOILER FUEL.

14 WE'LL BE ABLE TO BALE PAPER PRODUCTS, AND
15 METAL PRODUCTS WILL BE SALVAGED AND THEN STORED OUTSIDE
16 THE BUILDINGS IN DEBRIS BOXES.

17 IN DESIGNING THIS FACILITY OR AT LEAST
18 CONCEPTUALIZING TO DATE, WE CONSIDERED A NUMBER OF KEY
19 FACTORS. ONE WAS THE SITE CHARACTERISTICS, TRAFFIC AND
20 TONNAGE CHARACTERISTICS, RECYCLING OBJECTIVES, AND ALSO
21 POTENTIAL LANDFILL CONSTRAINTS. THE SITE IS
22 APPROXIMATELY 22 ACRES. IT'S ZONED HEAVY INDUSTRIAL, AND
23 IT'S A FORMER BARROW AREA FOR COVER MATERIAL FOR OUR
24 LANDFILL.

25 IT IS BORDERED ON THE EAST BY A MARTINEZ GUN



1 CLUB, ACME PROPERTY TO THE SOUTH, A VINE HILL RESIDENTIAL
2 NEIGHBORHOOD TO THE WEST, AND OPEN PROPERTY TO THE NORTH.
3 THIS IS THE OLD ENTRANCE TO THE LANDFILL, AND THIS IS OUR
4 METHANE RECOVERY FACILITY. THE GAS FROM THE LANDFILL IS
5 COLLECTED, PROCESSED HERE BY GETTY SYNTHETIC FUELS, AND
6 THEN PIPED OVER TO A WASTE WATER TREATMENT FACILITY WHERE
7 IT IS BURNED AS A SUPPLEMENT TO NATURAL GAS IN THE
8 COMBUSTION OF SEWAGE SLUDGE.

9 OUR PROJECT PARAMETERS WITH RESPECT TO TONNAGE
10 AND TRAFFIC WERE AVERAGING IN 1987 ON A WEEKDAY ABOUT
11 1385 TONS A DAY, BUT WE ALSO HAVE SIGNIFICANT PEAKING
12 REQUIREMENTS. AND THESE PEAKS COME IN APRIL AND MAY, AND
13 A LOT OF IT IS ATTRIBUTED TO THE SPRING CLEANUPS THAT THE
14 HAULERS OFFER IN THE AREA. OUR TRAFFIC ALSO HAS A
15 SIGNIFICANT PEAKING FACTOR, AND MOST OF THE TRAFFIC OR
16 THE HEAVIEST TRAFFIC IS ON THE WEEKENDS WITH AVERAGES OF
17 ABOUT 1015 A DAY, PEAKING AT ABOUT 1385. AND, AGAIN,
18 WE'VE TAKEN THESE TYPES OF PARAMETERS INTO ACCOUNT IN OUR
19 CONCEPTUALIZATION.

20 WE HAVE BROKEN OUR TRAFFIC AND TONNAGE INTO
21 THREE CATEGORIES: RED BEING OUR FRANCHISE HAULERS,
22 YELLOW OUR MONTHLY CHARGE ACCOUNTS, WHICH IS OUR LAWN
23 SERVICES AND SMALL COMPANIES SUCH AS THAT, AND THE
24 GENERAL PUBLIC. YOU CAN SEE THAT THE GENERAL PUBLIC
25 GENERATES THE MAJORITY OR 60 PERCENT OF THE TRAFFIC, BUT



1 IT ONLY CONTRIBUTES 10 PERCENT OF OUR TONNAGE. JUST THE
2 REVERSE, THE GARBAGE FRANCHISE HAULERS CONTRIBUTE 26
3 PERCENT OF THE TRAFFIC AND OVER 84 PERCENT OF THE
4 TONNAGE.

5 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: QUESTION AT THAT POINT.
6 CAN YOU IDENTIFY THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CHARGE ACCOUNTS,
7 FRANCHISE HAULERS? WHAT DO YOU MEAN?

8 MR. REILLY: THE FRANCHISE HAULERS ARE THE LOCAL
9 COLLECTION COMPANIES, AND THE MONTHLY CHARGE ACCOUNTS ARE
10 ANYBODY THAT HAS ESTABLISHED A MONTHLY CHARGE ACCOUNT
11 WITH US. IT'S LIKE J & B'S, LET'S SAY, LAWN SERVICE.
12 IT'S SOME TYPE OF SMALL COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISE THAT DOES
13 LAWN CLIPPINGS OR LANDSCAPING OR THAT TYPE OF ACTIVITY OR
14 ROOFING OR SUCH.

15 WE'RE PROPOSING TO PURSUE A THREE-PHASE
16 RESOURCE RECOVERY PROGRAM AS PART OF THE PROJECT; AND THE
17 FIRST PHASE, WHICH WOULD BE WHEN THE PROJECT STARTS UP,
18 WE WOULD PROVIDE A DROPOFF RECYCLING CENTER FOR NEWS,
19 GLASS, AND CANS. WE WILL CHIP WOOD AND BRUSH DEBRIS,
20 BALE CARDBOARD, AND SALVAGE MISCELLANEOUS METALS.

21 WE HOPE IN PHASE 1 TO REDUCE THE AMOUNT OF
22 WASTE HAVING TO BE LANDFILLED BY APPROXIMATELY 20
23 PERCENT. IN PHASE 2, WE WOULD CONVERT THE DROPOFF
24 RECYCLING CENTER TO A BUY-BACK CENTER AND ALSO EXPAND THE
25 LIST OF MATERIALS THAT WE'RE SALVAGING IN PHASE 1.



1 HOPEFULLY, WE CAN GET INTO SMALL LOADS OF DEMOLITION AND
2 CONSTRUCTION DEBRIS.

3 IN PHASE 3 WE HOPE TO PURSUE A MORE
4 COMPREHENSIVE RESOURCE RECOVERY PROGRAM, AND OUR LATEST
5 THINKING ON THIS, BECAUSE OF OUR PROXIMITY TO A LOUISIANA
6 PACIFIC FACILITY IN ANTIOCH AND THEIR DESIRE TO TAKE MORE
7 URBAN WOOD WASTE, IS TO PROCESS THE REMAINING OR THE BULK
8 OF THEIR REMAINING FLOW INTO REFUSE PELLETS AND THEN TO
9 SHIP THEM TO LP AS A SUPPLEMENT TO THEIR WOOD WASTE IN
10 THEIR BOILERS. THAT WOULD TAKE A MODIFICATION IN THEIR
11 AIR PERMIT. AND WE HOPE TO BE ABLE TO IMPLEMENT PHASE 3
12 IN EIGHT TO TEN YEARS AFTER WE START OPERATION OF THE
13 PROJECT.

14 BECAUSE THERE ARE TIMING CONSTRAINTS BETWEEN
15 WHEN OUR EXISTING LANDFILL REACHES CAPACITY AND WHEN WE
16 CAN PUT THIS PERMANENT STATION ON LINE, THERE'S A NEED
17 FOR AN INTERIM SOLUTION. AND ACME'S PROPOSAL IS TO
18 PROVIDE AN INTERIM TRANSFER STATION ON ONE OF OUR
19 EXISTING LANDFILL AREAS. AND THIS FACILITY WOULD CONSIST
20 OF AN OPEN AIR CONCRETE PAD WHERE THE MATERIAL WILL BE
21 DUMPED, RUBBER-TIRED VEHICLES WILL THEN PUSH THE MATERIAL
22 INTO ENCLOSED DUST ENCLOSURES WHERE THE MATERIAL WILL BE
23 LOADED INTO OPEN-TOP VEHICLES. THESE DUST ENCLOSURES
24 WILL INCORPORATE A DUST MISTING SYSTEM TO HELP REDUCE THE
25 DUST THAT IS GENERATED OR THE PLUME OF DUST THAT'S



1 GENERATED WHEN THE WASTE HITS THE BOTTOM OF THE TRUCK AND
2 THEN COMES BACK UP.

3 ITS LOCATION AND RELATIONSHIP TO THE PERMANENT
4 STATION IS PROCEEDING WHERE THE PERMANENT STATION IS.
5 AGAIN, THIS IS THE 22-ACRE PIECE THAT I SHOWED YOU.
6 HERE'S THE INTERIM TRANSFER STATION. WE HOPE WHEN THE --
7 OR PLAN THAT WHEN THE PERMANENT STATION COMES ON LINE TO
8 CONVERT THE INTERIM STATION TO A PERMANENT PUBLIC
9 RECYCLING CENTER TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE IMPROVEMENTS
10 THAT WE'RE PROPOSING IN THAT AREA, AND THAT'S WHY THE
11 INTERIM STATION HAS BEEN LOCATED STRATEGICALLY IN THAT
12 AREA.

13 NOW, WE WILL BE -- THE PERMANENT STATION WILL
14 BE FINANCED USING TAX EXEMPT BONDS ISSUED BY THE
15 CALIFORNIA POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY. WE
16 HAVE INITIAL INDUCEMENT RESOLUTION FROM THE AUTHORITY;
17 BUT BECAUSE THESE ARE PROJECT BONDS, THEY'RE ALL SECURED
18 BY AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE PARTIES AND A BANK, THIRD PARTY
19 BANK LETTER OF CREDIT. THE HAULERS -- ACME WILL PROCEED
20 TO HAVE AGREEMENTS WITH THE HAULERS AND ALSO GET
21 COMMITMENTS FROM THE FRANCHISING AGENCIES FOR ADOPTION OR
22 MODIFICATION OF ANY LOCAL ORDINANCES THAT WOULD THEN
23 DIRECT THE WASTE TO THE PROJECT.

24 I WANT TO JUST BRIEFLY GO THROUGH WITH YOU
25 SOME OF THE WORK THAT WE HAVE DONE IN TWO AND A HALF



1 YEARS IN PURSUING THIS PROJECT. IT ALL STARTED IN 1986
2 WHEN WE FILED THREE BASIC -- APPLICATIONS FOR THREE BASIC
3 PERMITS, OUR AIR PERMIT, A WASTE DISCHARGE, AND A LAND
4 USE WITH THE COUNTY. IN SEPTEMBER OF THAT YEAR THE
5 REGIONAL BOARD DECIDED THAT INSTEAD OF PROVIDING SEPARATE
6 WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PROJECT, IT WOULD
7 HANDLE THE WASTE DISCHARGE OR ANY DISCHARGE THEY FELT
8 WERE NECESSARY AS PART OF THE LANDFILL CLOSURE PLANS.

9 IN OCTOBER THE BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT
10 DISTRICT ISSUED THE AUTHORITY TO CONSTRUCT FOR THE
11 STATION, AND THAT'S THE PERMANENT STATION. IN NOVEMBER
12 THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT WAS -- THE CONTRACT WAS
13 LET, WHICH WAS FUNDED BY ACME FILL CORPORATION. WE FILED
14 FOR AMENDMENT TO THE GENERAL PLAN AND ALSO AMENDMENT TO
15 THE COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN.

16 IN DECEMBER WE FILED OUR REPORT OF STATION
17 INFORMATION WITH THE LOCAL LEA AND ALSO THE SOLID WASTE
18 MANAGEMENT BOARD, AND ALSO THE TIME THAT WE FILED FOR OUR
19 FINANCING WITH CBCFA.

20 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: I'D LIKE TO COMMENT HERE. WE
21 HAVE GOT A BASIC PROBLEM IN THAT CONTRA COSTA HAS NO
22 COSWMP. SO WHEN IT COMES TIME TO APPLY FOR A FACILITY
23 PERMIT, WE DON'T KNOW WHAT TO DO, QUITE HONESTLY, AND YOU
24 HAVEN'T MENTIONED THAT YET, BUT IT'S A REAL DILEMMA.

25 MR. REILLY: I UNDERSTAND THAT DILEMMA.



1 IN '87, FEBRUARY OF THAT YEAR, WE RECEIVED THE
2 INITIAL INDUCEMENT RESOLUTION FROM CALIFORNIA POLLUTION
3 CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY.

4 IN JUNE THE SUPERVISORS APPROVED THE REVISED
5 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN, AND THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL
6 IMPACT REPORT WAS PUBLISHED AND CIRCULATED.

7 IN AUGUST WE STARTED OUR HEARINGS WITH THE
8 PLANNING COMMISSION, COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION, WHO
9 HEARD THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT IN SEPTEMBER.
10 THERE WERE CONTINUING HEARINGS ON THE LAND USE PERMIT,
11 AND ALSO THE CITIES AT THAT TIME APPROVED THE REVISED
12 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN.

13 IN THE REVISED PLAN AND ALSO IN THE PLAN THAT
14 EXISTS, THE '82 PLAN, THE TRANSFER STATION IS MENTIONED
15 AND CAN BE FOUND IN CONFORMANCE TO THOSE PLANS.

16 IN OCTOBER THE PLANNING COMMISSION CERTIFIED
17 THE FINAL EIR AND APPROVED THE GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND
18 LAND USE PERMIT, WHICH WAS FOLLOWED IN DECEMBER BY THE
19 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ACTIONS.

20 IN 1988 WE FILED FOR AUTHORIZATION WITH THE
21 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES AND EPA TO PLACE THE
22 INTERIM TRANSFER STATION ON WHAT WE CALL OUR NORTH
23 PARCEL. BECAUSE THE FACILITY HAS RECEIVED ANYWHERE FROM
24 4 TO 7 PERCENT HAZARDOUS WASTE, IT'S CONSIDERED A
25 FACILITY UNDER THEIR JURISDICTION. WE'VE FORWARDED A



1 DRAFT WASTE SUPPLY AGREEMENT TO THE LOCAL COLLECTORS. IN
2 MAY WE FILED FOR ANNEXATION TO THE LOCAL SANITARY
3 DISTRICT FOR SERVICE WITH THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION
4 COMMISSION.

5 WE FILED AN AIR PERMIT FOR THE INTERIM
6 TRANSFER STATION WITH THE AIR DISTRICT. IN JUNE WE HAD A
7 PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES
8 AND EPA ON THE INTERIM TRANSFER STATION, AND IN JULY WE
9 RECEIVED OUR AUTHORITY TO CONSTRUCT THE INTERIM TRANSFER
10 STATION FROM THE AIR DISTRICT.

11 NOW, IN AUGUST WE JUST, AS A MATTER OF FACT,
12 YESTERDAY RECEIVED APPROVAL TO ANNEX TO THE SANITARY
13 DISTRICT, AND THIS MORNING WE DROPPED OFF A DRAFT
14 FACILITIES PERMIT WITH YOUR STAFF FOR THEIR REVIEW.
15 TOMORROW MORNING WE HAVE A MEETING WITH YOUR STAFF AT
16 8:30 TO REVIEW THAT DRAFT, AND HOPEFULLY MONDAY OR
17 TUESDAY OF NEXT WEEK WE CAN SUBMIT THE FULL APPLICATION.

18 THAT CONCLUDES MY FORMAL REMARKS, AND I'D BE
19 HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS THAT YOU MAY HAVE.

20 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: I HAVE A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS.
21 I'M SURE THE OTHER BOARD MEMBERS ALSO. THE OUTSTANDING
22 ONE IS WHERE IS THE WASTE GOING TO GO? I MEAN,
23 EVERYTHING SEEMS TO BE UP IN THE AIR. I KNOW THAT YOU
24 SAY 1990 AND THERE'S GOING TO BE AN INTERIM TRANSFER
25 STATION; BUT IN THE INTERIM, NUMBER ONE, WHERE IS THE



1 WASTE GOING TO GO? AND I KNOW ACME HAS AN APPLICATION TO
2 EXTEND THE LIFE OF THE LANDFILL, WHICH HAS BEEN DEFERRED
3 FOR 30 DAYS TO THE WATER BOARD. CAN YOU GIVE US AN
4 UPDATE ON THAT? AND, ALSO, WHERE IS THE WASTE GOING TO
5 GO?

6 MR. REILLY: I'LL ANSWER YOUR SECOND ONE FIRST.
7 WE'RE BACK IN FRONT OF THE REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL
8 BOARD NEXT WEDNESDAY FOR OUR HEARING ON THE EXPANSION.

9 WITH RESPECT TO WHERE THE WASTE IS GOING TO
10 GO, WE'RE NOT QUITE SURE. BUT WE DO KNOW THAT EVERY
11 SCENARIO THAT WE'VE LOOKED AT AND EVERY SCENARIO THAT THE
12 COUNTY HAS LOOKED AT INCORPORATES A TRANSFER STATION AND
13 NEEDS A TRANSFER STATION.

14 THE COUNTY AND THE -- THERE'S A MAYOR'S --
15 SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COUNTY MAYOR'S CONFERENCE THAT HAS
16 BEEN ESTABLISHED TO NEGOTIATE WITH ALAMEDA COUNTY FOR AN
17 EXPORT AGREEMENT, AND SO THERE'S THOSE TYPES OF
18 ACTIVITIES PROCEEDING AND WE HOPE THEY ARE SUCCESSFUL.

19 ACME DOES NOT HAVE THE ANSWER OF WHERE THE
20 WASTE IS GOING TO GO. AGAIN, WE FEEL AND THE COUNTY
21 FEELS THAT A TRANSFER STATION IS AN INTEGRAL PART OF
22 WHERE AND HOW THE WASTE GETS THERE, WHEREVER IT'S GOING.

23 BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN: I'M RATHER SURPRISED, WITH
24 THE PICTURES YOU WERE SHOWING, NOT YOUR TRANSFER STATION,
25 BUT I GUESS THE BFI ONE, THAT IT SEEMS TO ME FROM WHAT I



1600 EAST FOURTH STREET, SUITE 220
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92701
TELEPHONE (714) 953-4447

Harristers
reporting service

1 CAN UNDERSTAND THAT THAT'S THE TYPE YOU INTEND TO DO.
2 OTHERWISE, WHY WOULD YOU SHOW US THOSE PICTURES? I'M
3 SURPRISED AT THAT. FROM WHAT I CAN GATHER TALKING TO
4 PEOPLE IN GENERAL, THAT'S GETTING TO BE ALMOST AN
5 OBSOLETE METHOD. AND FOR SOMEBODY PUTTING IN A NEW ONE
6 WOULD USE THAT WHEN THERE ARE SO MANY ADVANTAGES THAT
7 I'VE BEEN MADE AWARE OF ON THE TYPES NOW THEY'RE USING
8 WITH THE COMPRESSED METHODS.

9 ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THOSE? AND THE
10 ADVANTAGES, AS A MEMBER OF THE BOARD, THAT I WOULD SEE TO
11 THAT THEY ARE -- THEY HAVE MANY OTHER ADVANTAGES FOR A
12 LOT OF OTHER REASONS THAT WOULDN'T CONCERN ME POSSIBLY,
13 ONE OF THEM BEING ECONOMICS. I THINK IT'S MUCH CHEAPER
14 AND, MORE IMPORTANTLY, THAT IT'S MORE CONDUCTIVE TO SOURCE
15 SEPARATION BECAUSE IN TRANSFERRING BY CONVEYOR TO YOUR
16 PACKER, YOU ALREADY ARE CONVEYING THIS STUFF ON THE
17 SPREAD METHOD, WHICH MAKES IT REALLY SIMPLE AND ALMOST
18 ENCOURAGES BETTER SOURCE SEPARATION BECAUSE HERE
19 EVERYTHING ISN'T DUMPED INTO A PIT, BUT IT FLOWS BY ON
20 CONVEYOR AND IT'S SO EASY TO INCORPORATE THAT WITH
21 RECYCLING. WHERE THE OTHER WAY, YOU ARE GOING HAVE TWO
22 SEPARATE OPERATIONS, ONE IN THE SEPARATION EITHER AFTER
23 IT'S INTO A PIT OR SEPARATING CERTAIN LOADS. MY GOSH,
24 THE OTHER WAY IS SO SIMPLE. EVERYTHING GOES ON A
25 CONVEYOR. I'M JUST WONDERING WHY YOU PEOPLE WOULD TAKE



1 SOMETHING THAT'S SORT OF PASSE AS FAR AS
2 STATE-OF-THE-ART.

3 MR. REILLY: WELL, I HAVE A COUPLE OF COMMENTS WITH
4 RESPECT TO THE ISSUES THAT YOU ARE RAISING. THIS PAST
5 SPRING ACME HAD SOME SPECIAL STUDIES DONE BY OUR
6 ENGINEERING -- SOME ENGINEERING FIRMS, AND WE DID LOOK AT
7 AND ARE STILL CONSIDERING THE NEW TYPE OF COMPACTORS THAT
8 ARE ON THE MARKET. THERE'S A NUMBER OF ADVANTAGES. ONE,
9 THEY PRODUCE A SOMEWHAT STANDARD CUBE THAT IS SLID INTO
10 THE BACK OF THE TRAILERS.

11 BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN: BIGGER PAYLOADS.

12 MR. REILLY: RIGHT. THESE ARE CONCEPTUALIZATIONS
13 OF WHAT WE'VE BEEN WORKING ON, BUT WE HAVEN'T FINALIZED
14 THE EXACT CONFIGURATION OF WHETHER WE'RE GOING TO USE THE
15 COMPACTORS OR GO WITH THE SYSTEM HERE. WE'RE STILL
16 EVALUATING THEM, BUT WE ARE CONSIDERING THEM, AND WE KNOW
17 THEY HAVE A NUMBER OF ADVANTAGES.

18 WITH RESPECT TO, YOU KNOW, THE ISSUES -- WE
19 STILL -- THE REASON WE ARE CONSIDERING A STORAGE PIT
20 CONCEPT, WHILE IT HAS SOME DRAWBACKS, IT ALSO HAS SOME
21 ADVANTAGES. WE NEED TO HAVE THE FLEXIBILITY TO STORE
22 SOME WASTE FOR, ONE, TO AVOID COMMUTE HOURS AND THE
23 TRAFFIC IN THE AREA AND ALSO TO MEET ANY LANDFILL
24 CONSTRAINTS THAT WE MIGHT COME UP AGAINST.

25 BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN: THAT DOESN'T ELIMINATE THE



1 OTHER TYPE BY ANY MEANS. IT'S A COMBINATION OF.

2 MR. REILLY: WE FEEL THAT WHAT WE'LL HAVE IS IN
3 THE FIRST PHASE THAT WHERE THE PUBLIC IS DISPOSING, ALSO
4 THAT MATERIAL WILL BE SALVAGED OUT. WE'LL HAVE A
5 MATERIAL PROCESSING BUILDING WHERE WE'LL HAVE BALING AND
6 WOOD SHREDDER WHERE WE'LL DIVERT WASTE IN THAT DIRECTION.

7 OUR THIRD PHASE WHERE WE'LL ATTACK THE STUFF
8 THAT'S COMING OUT OF THE PACKER TRUCKS WHICH IS SO
9 COMINGLED AND DIFFICULT TO SEPARATE IN A RELATIVELY CLEAN
10 FASHION, WE'LL TRY TO PROCESS THAT INTO PELLETS AND SEND
11 THAT TO LOUISIANA PACIFIC. THAT'S OUR PLAN. MATERIAL
12 THAT IS RELATIVELY CLEAN, KEEP IT SEPARATE, PROCESS IT.
13 THE STUFF THAT'S ALREADY PACKED AND CONTAMINATED IS
14 PROCESS THAT INTO PELLETS. THAT'S OUR CONCEPT.

15 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS?

16 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T HAVE
17 A QUESTION, BUT I HAVE A COMMENT. NOTWITHSTANDING ALL OF
18 THE THINGS THAT HAVE BEEN SAID HERE, I THINK THIS IS THE
19 SECOND OCCASION THIS MORNING WHERE WE HAVE FOUND SOMEONE
20 WHO IS TRYING TO DO THEIR HOMEWORK AND TRYING TO GET
21 EVERYTHING IN ORDER BEFORE THEY ARE BEFORE US ASKING FOR
22 APPROVAL OF A PERMIT.

23 I CONGRATULATE YOU ON THAT. I THINK IT'S
24 UNFORTUNATE THAT YOU ARE KIND OF BETWEEN A ROCK AND A
25 HARD SPOT BECAUSE YOU ARE APPARENTLY ALMOST UP TO THE



1 POINT WHERE YOU WANT TO GET A PERMIT; AND IF YOU COME
2 BEFORE US, WE HAVE TO DENY IT. HAVING SAID THAT, LET ME
3 AGAIN CONGRATULATE YOU. YOUR COMPANY IS GOING FORWARD
4 AND DOING THEIR HOMEWORK AND DOING THEIR PLANNING. I
5 THINK IF YOU DO THAT, IT MAKES IT OH SO MUCH EASIER, ALL
6 THINGS BE EQUAL, WHEN YOU COME BEFORE THIS BOARD FOR A
7 PERMIT.

8 MR. REILLY: THANK YOU.

9 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: I'M JUST CURIOUS. HOW IS
10 SOME OF THE OTHER INTERNAL PROBLEMS WITHIN CONTRA COSTA
11 COUNTY OR DOES IT LOOK LIKE SOME RESOLUTION OF SOME OF
12 THOSE PROBLEMS FROM YOUR PERSPECTIVE?

13 MR. REILLY: MAY I ASK WHAT PROBLEMS ARE YOU
14 REFERRING TO SPECIFICALLY? THERE ARE A NUMBER OF THEM.
15 I JUST DON'T KNOW WHICH ONE TO COMMENT ON.

16 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: GENERALLY SPEAKING, THAT WAS
17 A GENERAL COMMENT.

18 MR. REILLY: I'M ALWAYS LOOKING UP, NOT DOWN, AND
19 ALWAYS TRYING TO PROCEED. WE DO HAVE PROBLEMS IN CONTRA
20 COSTA COUNTY. THE MAIN ONE, WE DON'T HAVE EIGHT YEARS
21 WORTH OF CAPACITY; HOWEVER, WE ALSO HAVE A SITUATION
22 WHERE THE LANDFILLS, AT LEAST THE ONE WE OPERATE, IS
23 REACHING CAPACITY. WE NEED TO PUT SOMETHING ELSE IN
24 PLACE. AND WE KNOW THAT ANY LANDFILL IS GOING TO BE
25 REMOTE. A TRANSFER STATION IS GOING TO BE NEEDED NO



1 MATTER WHAT SCENARIO WE LOOK AT.

2 WHILE IT DOESN'T ANSWER YOUR QUESTION
3 SPECIFICALLY, I BELIEVE THAT THE ACME PROPOSAL IS PART OF
4 THE SOLUTION, NOT PART OF THE PROBLEM, AND WE HOPE TO GO
5 FORWARD WITH THE PROJECT.

6 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: THANK YOU. WELL, I REALLY
7 DIDN'T EXPECT A DIRECT QUESTION BECAUSE IT'S STILL UP IN
8 THE AIR. I, LIKE JOHN, WANT TO CONGRATULATE YOU. WASTE
9 IS GOING TO HAVE TO GO SOMEWHERE, AND YOU GUYS ARE MAKING
10 AN EFFORT AND LOOKING FORWARD. AND I TAKE IT, TOO, YOU
11 ARE LEAVING YOUR OPTIONS OPEN ENOUGH SO THAT YOU CAN
12 MODIFY AS THEY COME ALONG. THAT'S THE KIND OF THING THAT
13 WE NEED TO SOLVE THESE WASTE CRISES.

14 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: THANK YOU, MR. REILLY. I HAVE
15 ONE ADDITIONAL THING I WANT TO ASK MR. CONHEIM. YOU
16 MENTION YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE A MEETING WITH THE STAFF,
17 AND YOU ARE GOING TO START THE BALL ROLLING ON THE
18 APPLICATION FOR THE FACILITIES PERMIT. AND, YET, WHAT'S
19 THE RECOURSE? IN OTHER WORDS, WE DON'T WANT TO BE IN A
20 POSITION TO START A CLOCK TICKING AND THEN HAVE TO DENY
21 IT BECAUSE THE COUNTY -- CAN YOU TELL US AGAIN WHAT THE
22 PROCEDURE ON THESE PERMITS IS? THIS DOESN'T HAPPEN VERY
23 OFTEN OBVIOUSLY, BUT WHAT DO WE DO NEXT?

24 ATTORNEY CONHEIM: AS A THRESHOLD MATTER, I NEED TO
25 ADVISE YOU THAT ANY SPECIFIC DISCUSSION ABOUT ANYTHING TO



1 DO WITH CONTRA COSTA COUNTY IS SO INTIMATELY RELATED TO
2 POTENTIAL LITIGATION THAT I FEEL VERY UNCOMFORTABLE
3 DISCUSSING ANY OF IT OUTSIDE OF A CLOSED SESSION, AND I
4 WOULD ADVISE YOU NOT TO.

5 WITH REGARD TO THE GENERALIZED PROCEDURE FOR
6 NOT STARTING THE CLOCK TICKING OR FOR STOPPING, THERE'RE
7 A NUMBER OF WAYS TO DO IT. YOU CAN START IT TICKING. IF
8 YOU START TO RUN OUT OF TIME, YOU CAN -- WE CAN GET A
9 WAIVER FROM BOTH THE LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY AND THE
10 PROJECT PROPONENT.

11 IN A CASE WHERE YOU ARE CONCERNED ABOUT A
12 PROBLEM THAT PROBABLY WON'T GO AWAY BEFORE THE TIME RUNS
13 OUT, THE OPERATOR CAN MAKE A DECISION NOT TO START THE
14 CLOCK TICKING.

15 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: THERE'S VARIOUS MECHANISMS.

16 ATTORNEY CONHEIM: THERE'S VARIOUS MECHANISMS
17 AVAILABLE. IF WE WANT TO GO BEYOND THAT DISCUSSION; THAT
18 IS, THE HYPOTHETICAL IF CLOCK CONTINUES TO TICK RIGHT
19 DOWN TO D-DAY, MAY I ADVISE YOU THAT I THINK THAT
20 DISCUSSION SHOULD TAKE PLACE IN CLOSED SESSION WITH
21 REGARD TO THE BOARD'S REFERRAL OF CONTRA COSTA COUNTY TO
22 THE ATTORNEY GENERAL SEVERAL WEEKS AGO CONCERNING THEIR
23 DELINQUENT PLAN.

24 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ENOUGH SAID, I GUESS. ANY
25 OTHER DISCUSSION ON THIS? THANKS A LOT, MR. REILLY, FOR



1 COMING AND PRESENTING THIS, AND WE REALLY DO APPRECIATE
2 YOUR ANTICIPATING ACTIONS AND INFORMING US.

3 THE QUESTION THEN NOW IT'S 12 O'CLOCK, AND DO
4 WE HAVE SOME SANDWICHES ALREADY READY OR WHAT'S THE
5 STORY?

6 MR. OLDALL: I THINK CONNIE WENT OUT TO GET THEM.

7 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: WE'VE GOT TIME FOR ANOTHER --

8 MR. OLDALL: WE CAN DO ITEM 21 IF YOU WANT.

9 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: 21.

10 MR. OLDALL: THIS IS THAT QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE
11 CALIFORNIA RECYCLING MARKETS FOR THE QUARTER APRIL
12 THROUGH JUNE 1988. IT STARTS ON PAGE 380 IN YOUR PACKET,
13 3-8-0. AND, AGAIN, WE'LL BE COVERING ALUMINUM, GLASS,
14 PLASTIC, THE OLD NEWSPAPER, CORROGATED CONTAINERS, AND
15 THE OLD FAMILIAR USED MOTOR OIL. BRIAN FORAN WILL
16 PRESENT THE ITEM.

17 MR. FORAN: MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD,
18 I'M HERE TODAY TO PRESENT STAFF'S QUARTERLY REVIEW OF
19 CALIFORNIA'S RECYCLING MARKETS FOR THE THREE MONTHS OF
20 APRIL THROUGH JUNE OF THIS YEAR. AS MR. OLDALL
21 MENTIONED, MARKETS REVIEWED ARE FOR ALUMINUM AND PET
22 PLASTIC BEVERAGE CONTAINERS, GLASS CONTAINERS, OLD
23 NEWSPAPER, OLD CORROGATED CONTAINERS, AND USED MOTOR OIL.

24 THE ITEM BEFORE YOU WAS PREPARED THROUGH
25 INTERVIEWS WITH RECYCLING BROKERS AND COLLECTORS THROUGH



1 THE STATE.

2 I WILL FIRST REVIEW THE IMPACT THAT AB 2020
3 HAS HAD ON THE MARKETS FOR BEVERAGE CONTAINERS IN
4 CALIFORNIA AND WILL THEN INDIVIDUALLY REVIEW THE MARKET
5 STATUS OF THE SIX RECYCLABLE COMMODITIES COVERED IN THE
6 REPORT.

7 THE REDEMPTION VALUE FOR BEVERAGE CONTAINERS
8 COVERED UNDER AB 2020 REMAINED AT 1 CENT PER CONTAINER.
9 THIS IS THE MINIMUM REDEMPTION VALUE MANDATED BY AB 2020
10 AND WILL REMAIN AT THAT LEVEL AT LEAST UNTIL DECEMBER 31,
11 1989, UNLESS CHANGED BY LEGISLATION.

12 THE CONTAINER PER POUND RATES BASED ON THE
13 1-CENT REDEMPTION VALUE ARE LISTED IN THE FIRST GROUP OF
14 FIGURES ON PAGE 381 OF YOUR AGENDA PACKET. AS OF APRIL
15 1ST OF THIS YEAR, A REDEMPTION BONUS OF FOUR-TENTHS OF A
16 CENT PER CONTAINER WAS ADDED TO ALL BEVERAGE CONTAINERS
17 COVERED UNDER AB 2020.

18 THE REDEMPTION BONUS INCREASED THE CONTAINER
19 PER POUND RATES TO THE LEVELS INDICATED IN THE SECOND
20 GROUP OF FIGURES ON PAGE 381 OF YOUR PACKET. THE
21 REDEMPTION BONUS RESULTS FROM THE REDEMPTION VALUE MONIES
22 PAID INTO THE CALIFORNIA RECYCLING FUND BY THE BEVERAGE
23 DISTRIBUTORS THAT ARE NOT REDEEMED BY THE PUBLIC.

24 AS OF JULY 1ST OF THIS YEAR, AN ADDITIONAL
25 REDEMPTION BONUS OF TWO-TENTHS OF A CENT PER CONTAINER



1 WAS ADDED TO THE COVERED CONTAINERS. FOR THE RECORD, IT
2 WAS INCORRECTLY STATED IN THE ITEM THAT THE REDEMPTION
3 BONUS WAS INCREASED AN ADDITIONAL SIX-TENTHS OF A CENT
4 PER CONTAINER. ACTUALLY, THE TOTAL REDEMPTION BONUS NOW
5 STANDS AT SIX-TENTHS OF A CONTAINER; AND, AGAIN, THAT
6 INCREASE WAS TWO-TENTHS AS OF JULY 1ST.

7 THE NEW REDEMPTION BONUS HAS FURTHER INCREASED
8 THE CONTAINER PER POUND RATES TO THE LEVEL INDICATED IN
9 THE THIRD GROUP OF FIGURES ON PAGE 381 OF YOUR PACKET.
10 WHILE THE ADDITION OF THE REDEMPTION BONUSES TO THE
11 REDEMPTION VALUE HAS RESULTED IN OVERALL INCREASED PRICES
12 PAID TO BOTH COLLECTORS AND THE PUBLIC FOR BEVERAGE
13 CONTAINERS, IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT ONLY COLLECTORS WHO
14 ARE CERTIFIED WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION ARE
15 REQUIRED TO PAY THIS BONUS TO THE PUBLIC, AND EVEN SOME
16 OF THESE COLLECTORS ARE ELIGIBLE TO RETAIN THE REDEMPTION
17 BONUS RATHER THAN PAY IT TO THE PUBLIC.

18 IF I CAN DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION TO THE SCREEN,
19 I WILL BEGIN REVIEW OF THE INDIVIDUAL RECYCLABLE
20 COMMODITIES. FOR ALUMINUM BEVERAGE CONTAINERS, PRICES
21 PAID TO COLLECTORS AVERAGED 98 CENTS PER POUND, AN
22 INCREASE OF 23 CENTS PER POUND FROM THE PREVIOUS QUARTER.
23 THE INCREASE WAS A RESULT OF BOTH THE 10-CENT PER POUND
24 REDEMPTION BONUS AND AN INCREASE IN THE VALUE OF SCRAP
25 VALUE OF ALUMINUM DURING THE QUARTER.



1 PRICES PAID TO THE PUBLIC AVERAGED 72 CENTS
2 PER POUND, AN INCREASE OF 7 CENTS PER POUND. THE FIGURES
3 FOR THE PUBLIC ARE THE RED LINE UNDERNEATH THE BLUE LINE
4 FOR COLLECTORS.

5 IT WAS INTERESTING TO NOTE THAT THE RANGE OF
6 PRICES OFFERED TO THE PUBLIC WAS FROM A LOW OF 25 CENTS
7 PER POUND; THAT IS, NO SCRAP VALUE ADDED, UP TO NEARLY 90
8 CENTS PER POUND.

9 THE FORECAST FOR PRIMARY ALUMINUM INCREASED
10 SIGNIFICANTLY DURING THE SECOND QUARTER AND WILL LIKELY
11 REMAIN STEADY OR CONTINUE TO INCREASE DURING THE THIRD
12 QUARTER. SINCE ALUMINUM BEVERAGE CONTAINERS ARE CONSUMED
13 PRIMARILY BY THE PRIMARY ALUMINUM INDUSTRY, THE SCRAP
14 VALUE OF ALUMINUM BEVERAGE CONTAINERS WILL LIKELY REMAIN
15 HIGH AS WELL. EVEN IF THERE IS NO INCREASE IN SCRAP
16 VALUE, THE PRICE PAID TO BOTH COLLECTORS AND THE PUBLIC
17 SHOULD INCREASE SOMEWHAT DUE TO THE ADDITIONAL 5 CENTS
18 PER POUND REDEMPTION BONUS.

19 PRICES PAID TO COLLECTORS AVERAGED -- FOR
20 GLASS CONTAINERS, PRICES PAID TO COLLECTORS AVERAGED 5.3
21 CENTS PER POUND OR \$106 PER TON, AN INCREASE OF 1.3 CENTS
22 PER POUND OR \$26 PER TON FROM THE PREVIOUS QUARTER.

23 ALTHOUGH THE PRICE INCREASE WAS LIKELY DUE
24 PRIMARILY TO THE EIGHT-TENTHS OF A CENT PER POUND
25 REDEMPTION BONUS, THERE WAS ALSO SOME INCREASED SCRAP



1 VALUE BEING PAID BY THE LARGER GLASS CONTAINER
2 MANUFACTURERS.

3 PRICES PAID TO THE PUBLIC AVERAGED 3.5 CENTS
4 PER POUND, AN INCREASE OF 1.5 CENTS PER POUND. STAFF
5 BELIEVES THE MAIN REASON FOR THE INCREASE WAS THAT SOME
6 OF THE SCRAP VALUE FOR GLASS RECEIVED BY COLLECTORS WAS
7 FINALLY BEING PASSED ON TO THE PUBLIC. THE PRICE FOR
8 GLASS HAD REMAINED AT 2 CENTS PER POUND, WHICH WAS
9 STRICTLY DUE TO THE REDEMPTION VALUE SINCE THE
10 IMPLEMENTATION OF AB 2020.

11 IT IS SPECULATIVE WHETHER THE DEMAND WILL FOR
12 GLASS INCREASE DURING THE THIRD QUARTER; BUT, REGARDLESS,
13 THE ADDITIONAL FOUR-TENTHS OF A CENT PER POUND REDEMPTION
14 BONUS WILL LIKELY INCREASE THE PRICES SOMEWHAT.

15 FOR PET PLASTIC BEVERAGE CONTAINERS, THE
16 PRICES TO COLLECTORS, WHICH IS THE UPPER LINE THERE,
17 AVERAGED 25 CENTS PER POUND AND INCREASED TO 4 CENTS PER
18 POUND FROM THE PREVIOUS QUARTER. MOST OF THIS INCREASE
19 WAS DUE TO THE 2.4 CENTS PER POUND REDEMPTION BONUS.

20 WHILE THERE WAS NO INCREASE IN THE SCRAP VALUE
21 OF PET BEVERAGE CONTAINERS PAID TO COLLECTORS, SOME
22 BROKERS WERE APPARENTLY OFFERING HIGHER PRICES TO
23 COLLECTORS IN EXCHANGE FOR ASSURED DELIVERIES OF OTHER
24 RECYCLABLE COMMODITIES. PRICES TO THE PUBLIC AVERAGED 8
25 CENTS PER POUND, AN INCREASE OF 2 CENTS PER POUND. THIS



1 INCREASE WAS STRICTLY DUE TO THE 2 CENTS PER POUND
2 REDEMPTION BONUS.

3 THE FORECAST FOR THE THIRD QUARTER HAS THE
4 SCRAP VALUE FOR PET BEVERAGE CONTAINERS BEING
5 ESSENTIALLY -- SCRAP VALUE BEING ESSENTIALLY DETERMINED
6 BY AB 2020. NO INCREASE IS ANTICIPATED IN THAT SCRAP
7 VALUE FOR THE THIRD QUARTER. HOWEVER, THE ADDITIONAL 1.2
8 CENTS PER POUND REDEMPTION BONUS WILL LIKELY INCREASE THE
9 POUNDS PER RATE PAID TO BOTH COLLECTORS AND THE PUBLIC.

10 WHILE MOST COLLECTORS HAVE CHOSEN NOT TO PASS
11 ON ANY OF THE 15 CENTS PER POUND SCRAP VALUE THAT THEY
12 RECEIVED TO THE PUBLIC, APPARENTLY SOME COLLECTORS HAVE
13 PAID AS MUCH AS 6.5 CENTS PER POUND OVER THE REDEMPTION
14 VALUE IN BONUSES. THIS IS LIKELY A RESPONSE TO LOCAL
15 COMPETITION AMONGST COLLECTORS FOR BUSINESS. IT IS
16 UNLIKELY, HOWEVER, THE PAYMENT OF SCRAP VALUE FOR PET
17 BEVERAGE CONTAINERS TO THE PUBLIC WILL BECOME COMMONPLACE
18 DURING THE THIRD QUARTER.

19 THE MARKET FOR OLD NEWSPAPER SUFFERED
20 CONSIDERABLY DURING THE QUARTER. PRICES PAID TO
21 COLLECTORS VIA DOMESTIC MARKETS, WHICH IS THE RED LINE IN
22 THE MIDDLE OF GRAPH, DROPPED \$22 PER TON TO AN AVERAGE TO
23 \$69 PER TON. PRICES PAID TO COLLECTORS VIA FOREIGN
24 MARKETS, THE UPPERMOST LINE, DROPPED \$31 PER TON TO AN
25 AVERAGE OF \$68 PER TON.



1 PRICES TO THE PUBLIC ALSO DECREASED
2 SIGNIFICANTLY FROM AN AVERAGE OF \$50 PER TON TO AN
3 AVERAGE OF \$41 PER TON. THERE WERE TWO PRIMARY REASONS
4 FOR THE DECREASE IN FOREIGN PRICES FOR OLD NEWSPAPER:
5 HIGHER SHIPPING RATES AND DECLINE OVERSEAS PAPER
6 CONSUMPTION.

7 APPARENTLY THE HIGHER SHIPPING RATES HAVE
8 TAKEN PLACE WITHOUT A MAJOR DECLINE IN EMPTY SHIPPING
9 CONTAINERS, WHICH WAS SOMETHING WHICH THE BROKERS HAD
10 SPECULATED WOULD TAKE PLACE AS A TURN-AROUND IN THE TRADE
11 DEFICIT MIGHT CREATE IF WE START SHIPPING MORE THINGS
12 OUT, THOSE CONTAINERS WOULD BE FILLED UP AND THE SHIPPING
13 RATES WOULD INCREASE. APPARENTLY THIS HAPPENED WITHOUT
14 SUCH A CHANGE IN THE TRADE BALANCE.

15 THE DECLINE IN OVERSEAS CONSUMPTION WAS
16 PRIMARILY DUE TO A MAJOR JAPANESE DEINKING MILL THAT
17 BEGAN TO CONSUME A LARGE VOLUME OF ITS INVENTORY. THE
18 REDUCED DEMAND FOR OLD NEWSPAPER ENABLED THE MILL TO
19 LOWER ITS PRICE PAID FOR OLD NEWSPAPER AND REROUTED MUCH
20 OF THE PAPER TO BOARDPACK MILLS, WHICH DO NOT PAY AS MUCH
21 AS THE DEINKING MILLS.

22 BECAUSE THE EXPORT MARKET FOR ONP DECLINED SO
23 STRONGLY DURING THE SECOND QUARTER, DOMESTIC MILLS WERE
24 ABLE TO LOWER THEIR PRICES AS WELL, WHICH EXPLAINS THE
25 DROP IN DOMESTIC PRICES INDICATED BY THE RED LINE.



1 THE SHORT-TERM OUTLOOK FOR THE THIRD QUARTER
2 FOR OLD NEWSPAPER IS NOT BRIGHT. EMPLOYEES AT THE
3 JEFFERSON SMURFITT DEINKING MILL IN PORTLAND, OREGON, ONE
4 OF THE LARGE CONSUMERS OF ONP IN THE WESTERN UNITED
5 STATES, WENT ON STRIKE IN EARLY JULY, IMMEDIATELY
6 LOWERING DOMESTIC DEMAND FOR OLD NEWSPRINT.

7 IN ADDITION, THE JEFFERSON SMURFITT MILL
8 EXPORTED LARGE VOLUMES OF THEIR INVENTORY IN RESPONSE TO
9 THE STRIKE, FURTHER WEAKENING THE OVERSEAS MARKET. AS OF
10 JULY 15TH, FOREIGN PRICES FOR ONP HAD ALREADY DROPPED \$10
11 FROM THEIR PRICES A MONTH PREVIOUS.

12 FOR OLD CORROGATED CONTAINERS, PRICES PAID TO
13 COLLECTORS VIA DOMESTIC MARKETS, THE RED LINE IN THE
14 MIDDLE, DROPPED ONLY A DOLLAR FIFTY PER TON FROM THE
15 PREVIOUS QUARTER, AVERAGING ABOUT 81.50 PER TON; HOWEVER,
16 FOREIGN MARKET PRICES, WHICH HAD BEEN SO STRONG
17 THROUGHOUT THE PAST 12 MONTHS, DROPPED AN AVERAGE OF \$15
18 PER TON TO \$85 PER TON.

19 INDUSTRY SOURCES ATTRIBUTED THE PRICE DROP TO
20 THE SAME TWO FACTORS THAT ADVERSELY AFFECTED THE ONP
21 EXPORT MARKET: INCREASED SHIPPING RATES AND A DROP IN
22 OVERSEAS MILL CONSUMPTION.

23 YOUR ITEM SAYS PRODUCTION. IN FACT, WHAT I
24 MEANT WHEN I WROTE THE ITEM IS CONSUMPTION. I DON'T HAVE
25 IT VERIFIED THAT THE PRODUCTION OF THE COMMODITY ACTUALLY



1 DECLINED. IT WAS THEIR CONSUMPTION OF THE OLD MATERIAL
2 THAT WAS BEING EXPORTED.

3 PRICES PAID TO THE PUBLIC ALSO DECREASED,
4 FALLING FROM AN AVERAGE \$59 PER TON TO \$51 PER TON. MOST
5 OF THE COLLECTORS AND BROKERS INTERVIEWED FELT THAT THE
6 FOREIGN MARKET FOR OCC WOULD CONTINUE TO SOFTEN DURING
7 THE THIRD QUARTER FOR THE SAME REASONS THAT IT WAS WEAK
8 DURING THE SECOND QUARTER.

9 DOMESTIC DEMAND FOR OCC COULD ALSO DROP OFF IF
10 THE RECENT PRIME RATE INCREASE SLOWS DOWN LARGE PRODUCT
11 MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES WHICH CONSUME LARGE QUANTITIES
12 OF CORROGATED CARDBOARD AND WHICH, IN TURN, CREATES A
13 DEMAND FOR THE OLD CORROGATED.

14 FOR USED MOTOR OIL, THE PRICES RECEIVED BY
15 USED OIL HAULERS FROM REPROCESSING AND REREFINING
16 FACILITIES CONTINUED TO BE VERY LOW. THIS IS THE RED
17 LINE ON YOUR GRAPH. ALTHOUGH THE AVERAGE PRICE DID
18 INCREASE BY ABOUT 1 CENT PER GALLON FROM THE PREVIOUS
19 QUARTER, THE AVERAGE PRICE IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, TWO
20 USED OIL HAULERS FROM THE REPROCESSORS AND REREFINERS WAS
21 10.5 CENTS PER GALLON AND 11 CENTS PER GALLON IN SOUTHERN
22 CALIFORNIA.

23 AS WITH THE PREVIOUS QUARTER, MOST SERVICE
24 STATIONS AND AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR SHOPS THAT GENERATE
25 MODERATE QUANTITIES OF USED MOTOR OIL HAD TO PAY USED OIL



1 HAULERS TO COLLECT THE OIL. THIS IS INDICATED BY THE
2 LITTLE SEGMENT OF THE RED LINE AT THE VERY END. THIS IS
3 DATA THAT WE'RE JUST NOW STARTING TO RECORD IN OUR
4 MARKETS REVIEW, AND WE'LL SEE THAT LINE EXTEND OUT IN
5 SUBSEQUENT QUARTERLY REVIEWS.

6 THE AVERAGE PRICE THAT THE SERVICE STATIONS
7 HAD TO PAY TO THE USED OIL HAULERS WAS 16 CENTS PER
8 GALLON IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA AND 12.5 CENTS PER GALLON
9 IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA.

10 MANY SERVICE STATIONS AND AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR
11 SHOPS CONTINUE TO PASS ON THEIR COST OF OIL COLLECTION BY
12 CHARGING THE PUBLIC TO DISPOSE OF USED MOTOR OIL AT THEIR
13 FACILITIES. FEES CHARGED BY SERVICE STATIONS AND REPAIR
14 SHOPS AGAIN RANGE FROM 10 CENTS PER GALLON UP TO A DOLLAR
15 PER GALLON. ALTHOUGH STAFF HAS HEARD CONSISTENT REPORTS
16 OF CHARGES IN THE DOLLAR FIFTY RANGE NOW SINCE THE REPORT
17 WAS WRITTEN. THE MOST COMMON CHARGE RANGED BETWEEN 35 TO
18 50 CENTS PER GALLON.

19 DISPOSAL CHARGES TENDED TO BE SLIGHTLY HIGHER
20 IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA THAN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. THE TWO
21 INDUSTRY SOURCES INTERVIEWED BOTH FEEL THE USED OIL
22 MARKET WILL CONTINUE TO WEAKEN DURING THE THIRD QUARTER.
23 THE DEMAND FOR USED OIL IS GENERALLY NOT HIGH AT THIS
24 TIME OF YEAR SO END MARKET PRICES MAY DROP. FURTHERMORE,
25 OPERATION COSTS ARE INCREASING FOR THE USED OIL HAULERS



1 SO THE FEES THAT THEY CHARGE COLLECTION FACILITIES WILL
2 LIKELY INCREASE. IN TURN, COLLECTION FACILITIES WILL
3 PROBABLY INCREASE THE RATES CHARGED TO ACCEPT USED OIL
4 FROM THE PUBLIC.

5 MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, THIS
6 CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION OF STAFF'S QUARTERLY REVIEW OF
7 CALIFORNIA'S RECYCLING MARKETS. I'LL BE GLAD TO ANSWER
8 ANY QUESTIONS YOU HAVE AT THIS TIME.

9 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: I REALLY DON'T HAVE A
10 QUESTION, BUT I WONDER IF YOU CAUGHT THE ASSOCIATED PRESS
11 RELEASE THIS MORNING THAT ALUMINUM BEVERAGE CANS ACHIEVED
12 A 67-PERCENT RECYCLING RATE THROUGH THE SECOND QUARTER,
13 WHICH PUTS IT ABOVE WHAT'S DEMANDED IN THE LAW OF 65
14 PERCENT?

15 I THINK THIS MAY HAVE SOME IMPACT ON WHERE THE
16 PRICE GOES. I WOULD SAY YOUR REPORT THERE PRETTY CLEARLY
17 SHOWS ONE OF THE REASONS WHY THERE IS SO MUCH DIFFICULTY
18 WITH THE RECYCLING CENTERS OR REDEMPTION CENTERS THAT ARE
19 IN THE PARKING LOTS AND AROUND THROUGH THE GROCERY
20 STORES. ANY SERIOUS RECYCLER OF ALUMINUM, LOOKING UP
21 THERE AND SEEING A MARKET SOME 80 CENTS A POUND FOR USED
22 CANS, IS CERTAINLY NOT GOING TO GO TO SOME REVERSE
23 VENDING MACHINE OR SIT IN SOME PARKING LOT TO GET 25
24 CENTS A POUND.

25 IF THEY'RE A LARGE USER OF ALUMINUM BEVERAGE



1 CONTAINERS AND THERE ARE A NUMBER OF RECYCLING CENTERS IN
2 THE MAJOR METROPOLITAN AREAS AT LEAST, THEY CAN GO THERE
3 AND GET 75 CENTS A POUND FOR THEM, WHY IN THE HELL WOULD
4 THEY WANT TO GET 25 CENTS AT A CERTIFIED REDEMPTION
5 CENTER?

6 AND THAT'S PART OF THE REASON -- AS A MATTER
7 OF FACT, I PERSONALLY THINK IT'S A LARGE PART OF THE
8 REASON THAT MANY OF THESE REDEMPTION CENTERS ARE GOING
9 BELLY UP. IF THAT PRICE DIFFERENCE WAS TO COME DOWN,
10 THAT MIGHT HAVE SOME IMPACT ON IT; BUT RIGHT NOW ALUMINUM
11 IS SITTING OUT THERE FEELING VERY, VERY GOOD ABOUT
12 THEMSELVES WITH A 67-PERCENT RATE AND RISING BECAUSE, AS
13 I INDICATED TO ALL OF YOU, I THINK, AT THE LAST MEETING,
14 THE REALLY BIG QUARTER IN THE BEVERAGE INDUSTRY IS THE
15 THIRD QUARTER.

16 AND THIS IS ONE OF THE ARGUMENTS THAT I'VE
17 ALWAYS PRESENTED, THAT YOU NEED TO GO THE FULL YEAR
18 BEFORE YOU START EVALUATING WHAT THE PERCENT OF RECYCLING
19 REALLY IS.

20 MY FEELINGS ARE THAT YOU ARE PROBABLY GOING TO
21 GET AT THE END OF THE THIRD QUARTER SOMEWHERE UP AROUND
22 70 PERCENT. WHEN YOU GET UP TO THAT, YOU'RE GETTING UP
23 TO ALMOST THE MAXIMUM THAT YOU ARE PROBABLY EVER GOING TO
24 GET. AND I GUESS THEY'RE FEELING PRETTY GOOD ABOUT
25 THEMSELVES. IT WAS INTERESTING. IT WAS AN AP RELEASE



1 THIS MORNING. SO IT'S ON THE NATIONAL WIRE, AND THAT'S
2 GOING TO HAVE SOME IMPACT NATIONALLY I IMAGINE.

3 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: MS. BREMBERG.

4 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.

5 WOULD YOU GO BACK TO PAGE 381 IN OUR PACKET
6 AND THE PARAGRAPH "REDEMPTION BONUSES ABOVE ARE NOT
7 ALWAYS PASSED ON TO THE PUBLIC. PAYMENT OF BONUS IS NOT
8 REQUIRED FOR TRANSACTIONS INVOLVING 50 CONTAINERS OR
9 LESS." WHAT I'M INTERESTED IN IS THE NEXT SENTENCE: THE
10 DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION HAS DECLARED CERTAIN TYPES OF
11 RECYCLING OPERATIONS AS ELIGIBLE TO RETAIN THE REDEMPTION
12 BONUS RATHER THAN PAY IT TO ITS CUSTOMERS.

13 A, WHAT CRITERIA DO THEY USE FOR ELIGIBILITY?
14 AND, B, DO YOU HAVE A FEW EXAMPLES OF SOLE CERTIFIED --
15 WHAT DO THEY CALL THEM -- OPERATIONS THAT ARE, BY THE
16 CONSERVATION DEFINITION, ALLOWED TO KEEP THE BONUSES?

17 MR. FORAN: MS. BREMBERG, I'M NOT PRECISELY SURE OF
18 THAT CRITERIA. I READ IT IN ONE OF THE TECHNICAL
19 BULLETINS THAT IS ROUTINELY SENT TO US BY THE DEPARTMENT
20 OF CONSERVATION. I'D BE GLAD TO PROVIDE YOU WITH THAT
21 CRITERIA WHEN I GO BACK AND LOOK AT THAT BULLETIN.

22 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: NAME A SPECIFIC LIKE BOY
23 SCOUTS OF AMERICA, THE HOTTENTOTS FOR BETTER CANS, OR
24 WHATEVER. I MEAN AN ACTUAL ORGANIZATION THAT'S GOTTEN
25 THAT CERTIFICATION.



1 MR. FORAN: I BELIEVE ONE OF THE CRITERIA FOR BEING
2 ABLE TO RETAIN THAT REDEMPTION BONUS IS BEING A PRIVATE,
3 NONPROFIT-TYPE RECYCLING OPERATION, BUT I COULDN'T NAME
4 YOU A SPECIFIC FACILITY.

5 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: ANY WAY YOU CAN FIND OUT?

6 MR. FORAN: OH, YES, SURE. I'D BE GLAD TO GET THAT
7 INFORMATION.

8 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: I WAS JUST A LITTLE CURIOUS
9 AS TO THIS BECAUSE THERE MUST BE SEVERAL ORGANIZATIONS
10 WITHIN VARIOUS COMMUNITIES THAT DON'T HAVE THE VAGUEST
11 IDEA. THEY DON'T READ THE TECHNICAL BULLETINS, AND THEY
12 MAY BE MISSING A CHANCE, THE ONES THAT HAVE BEEN KIND OF
13 LEFT OUT IN THE COLD AFTER 2020 WENT IN. AND IF THERE'S
14 AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THEM TO RECEIVE SAID CERTIFICATION AND
15 KEEP THESE BONUSES, MAYBE THEY GET BACK INTO BUSINESS,
16 SOME OF THE SENIOR CITIZEN ORGANIZATIONS DID IN THE PAST.

17 MR. FORAN: THE ONLY OPERATIONS THAT WOULD EVEN BE
18 ELIGIBLE TO RETAIN THIS BONUS ARE THOSE THAT ARE
19 REQUIRED TO PAY IT IN THE FIRST PLACE, AND THOSE ARE THE
20 OPERATIONS CERTIFIED WITH THE DEPARTMENT. AND I BELIEVE
21 ALL THOSE OPERATIONS ARE ON THE MAILING LIST FOR THOSE
22 TECHNICAL BULLETINS.

23 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: CAN YOU BELIEVE THAT A BOY
24 SCOUT TROOP IS GOING TO READ A TECHNICAL BULLETIN? I
25 DON'T BELIEVE THEY WOULD.



1 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS OR
2 DISCUSSION? THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR THE REPORT.
3 EXCELLENT JOB AS USUAL.

4 THE BOARD IS GOING TO TAKE A LUNCH BREAK TILL
5 1:15, AND WE'RE GOING TO EAT OUR LUNCH IN HERE, ALL OF
6 THE BOARD MEMBERS; BUT A COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD IS GOING
7 TO DISCUSS A COUPLE OF BUDGET ITEMS HERE, SO IT'S NOT A
8 CLOSED SESSION. WE CANNOT EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC, BUT WE'RE
9 NOT GOING TO BE TAKING ANY ACTION EITHER. SO WE'RE JUST
10 GOING TO GO DOWN TO THE LOWER TABLE AND EAT OUR LUNCH.

11 THANK YOU. THE REGULAR FORMAL MEETING WILL
12 CONVENE AT 1:30.

13
14 (A LUNCH BREAK WAS TAKEN.)
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

///



1 AFTERNOON SESSION, AUGUST 11, 1988

2
3 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: WE'LL CONTINUE WITH THE
4 AFTERNOON PART OF THE BOARD AGENDA, AND WE'LL BACK UP TO
5 SOME OF THE ITEMS THAT WE DEFERRED UNTIL THIS AFTERNOON.

6 NO. 12, DETERMINATION OF CONFORMANCE FOR THE
7 STANTON TRANSFER STATION.

8 MR. IWAHIRO: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS THE
9 DETERMINATION OF CONFORMANCE, AS WELL AS THE CONCURRENCE
10 WITH THE PERMIT FOR THE STANTON TRANSFER STATION, WHICH
11 IS IN ORANGE COUNTY. THIS IS A FACILITY THAT'S BEING
12 ENLARGED AND ENCLOSED, SO IT WILL INCREASE ITS CAPACITY
13 AND UPGRADE THE FACILITY.

14 WE HAVE JEAN BLAKESLY OF THE PLANNING DIVISION
15 AND DON DIER OF OUR PERMITS TO PRESENT THIS ITEM.

16 MS. BLAKESLY: GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. CHAIRMAN AND
17 BOARD MEMBERS. FIRST, I'LL GIVE A BRIEF DESCRIPTION ON
18 THE PROJECT AND DISCUSS THE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT, AND
19 THEN I'LL DISCUSS THE DETERMINATION OF CONFORMANCE.

20 AFTER THAT DON DIER WILL PRESENT THE SECTION
21 ON PERMITTING.

22 THE PROJECT IS AN EXPANSION OF AN EXISTING
23 LARGE VOLUME TRANSFER STATION. IT'S OPERATED BY CR
24 TRANSFER. IT HAS A DAILY THROUGHPUT OF 500 TO 600 TONS
25 PER DAY. TRANSFER STATION MODIFICATIONS ENABLE AN



1 INCREASED DAILY CAPACITY OF 1800 TONS PER DAY.

2 THE OPERATOR PROPOSES A FUTURE RECYCLING
3 CAPACITY OF 10 PERCENT BY VOLUME. AN ENVIRONMENTAL
4 IMPACT REPORT WAS PREPARED FOR THIS PROJECT.

5 IMPACTS, MITIGATIONS, AND ALTERNATIVES HAVE
6 BEEN ADDRESSED. IMPACTS INCLUDE: DUST, AIR EMISSIONS,
7 ODORS, UNAUTHORIZED ACCEPTANCE OF WASTE ENTERING THE
8 TRANSFER STATION AREA, LITTER, AND METHANE GAS FORMATION.

9 THE COMPREHENSIVE MITIGATIONS INCLUDE: A
10 WATER MISTING SYSTEM TO KEEP THE DUST DOWN; IMMEDIATE
11 TRANSFER OF PUTRESCIBLE AND ORGANIC WASTES, NO
12 UNAUTHORIZED WASTES WILL BE ACCEPTED, THE TRUCKLOADS WILL
13 BE SCREENED AND MONITORED FOR THAT, NO SLUDGES, LIQUIDS,
14 SPECIAL WASTE ACCEPTED INTO THE AREA, LITTER WILL BE
15 CONTROLLED BECAUSE THE FACILITY IS NOW ENCLOSED, TRANSFER
16 VEHICLES ARE TO BE CLEANED OUT AFTER EACH LOAD,
17 MONITORING FOR METHANE GAS WILL OCCUR MONTHLY, THE
18 IMPACTS WILL BE REDUCED TO A LEVEL OF INSIGNIFICANCE.

19 IN CONCLUSION, THE STAFF AT THE BOARD HAS
20 DETERMINED THAT THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT IS
21 ADEQUATE AND APPROPRIATE FOR THE BOARD'S USE AND THAT THE
22 EXPANSION INCLUDES NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.

23 NOW, TURNING TO THE DETERMINATION OF
24 CONFORMANCE, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BOARD'S PROCEDURES
25 FOR OBTAINING A DETERMINATION OF CONFORMANCE, THE



1 OPERATOR HAS FILED A NOTICE OF PROPOSED FACILITIES TO
2 EXPAND THE FACILITY. ORANGE COUNTY GENERAL SERVICE
3 AGENCY HAS MADE THE NECESSARY LOCAL FINDINGS OF
4 CONFORMANCE AND HAS FOUND THE PROJECT TO BE IN
5 CONFORMANCE WITH THE COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN.

6 SINCE THE LOCAL APPROVALS HAVE BEEN OBTAINED,
7 IT'S APPROPRIATE AT THIS TIME FOR THE BOARD TO CONSIDER
8 THE DETERMINATION OF CONFORMANCE FOR THIS PROJECT. THE
9 BOARD EVALUATES THE DETERMINATION OF CONFORMANCE BASED ON
10 THE FOUR ESTABLISHED BOARD CRITERIA: THE STATE POLICY,
11 THE CONSISTENCY WITH THE POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE
12 COSWMP, IT'S CONSIST WITH THE SHORT, MEDIUM, AND
13 LONG-TERM FACILITIES ELEMENT OF THE COSWMP, AND IT'S
14 CONSISTENT WITH THE LOCAL ISSUES AND PLANNING.

15 THE STAFF HAS FOUND THE PROJECT TO BE IN
16 CONFORMANCE AND WITH ALL THESE FOUR CRITERIA.

17 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: MR. CHAIRMAN.

18 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: MS. BREMBERG.

19 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: I WOULD LIKE TO GO BACK TO
20 A STATEMENT THAT YOU MADE THAT THERE WOULD BE NO
21 ADDITIONAL IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT, AND I FIND THAT
22 EXTRAORDINARILY DIFFICULT TO BELIEVE IF IT'S GOING TO GO
23 FROM 842 OR 500 TONS PER DAY TO 1800 TONS PER DAY. I'M
24 THINKING OF TRAFFIC, NOISE OF TRAFFIC, AIR POLLUTION FROM
25 THE INCREASED TRAFFIC, AND SO FORTH.



1 SHOULDN'T THERE BE SOME KIND OF A SUPPLEMENTAL
2 BIT OF INFORMATION WITH POSSIBLE MITIGATION MEASURES OR
3 SOMETHING? THIS IS CERTAINLY NOT A NO IMPACT. I THINK
4 THAT WAS A VERY, IF I MAY, RECKLESS STATEMENT TO MAKE
5 BECAUSE YOU CANNOT INCREASE THAT MUCH TONNAGE AND THAT
6 MUCH TRAFFIC WITHOUT AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT IN A
7 METROPOLITAN AREA, PARTICULARLY UNDER THE NEW SOUTH COAST
8 AIR QUALITY DISTRICT STANDARDS.

9 MR. SMITH: MRS. BREMBERG, THEY DID DO AN EIR FOR
10 THIS PROJECT. IN THAT PROJECT THEY DID LOOK AT THE
11 IMPACTS, AND THEY HAVE DEVELOPED WHAT WE FEEL ARE
12 COMPREHENSIVE MITIGATION MEASURES, BUT THOSE WERE
13 CAREFULLY LOOKED AT.

14 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND THAT
15 FROM WHAT JEAN SAID.

16 MR. SMITH: THAT WAS THE SIZE OF THE PROJECT.

17 MS. BLAKESLY: IT WAS PERMITTED IN THE FIRST PLACE
18 FOR 1800 TONS PER DAY.

19 MR. SMITH: IT WAS COVERED IN THAT PROJECT.

20 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: THANK YOU.

21 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANYBODY ELSE? I HAD ONE
22 QUESTION ON THE QUANTITIES. I NOTICE THAT -- WE HAVEN'T
23 GOT TO THE PERMIT SECTION YET, BUT I MADE A STATEMENT ON
24 SEVERAL OCCASIONS HAVING TO DO WITH WHEN YOU ARE TALKING
25 ABOUT TRANSFER STATIONS, ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT A FIVE-DAY



1 AVERAGE OR ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT A SEVEN-DAY AVERAGE OR
2 ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT WHAT? WHAT ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT?
3 I SEE IT'S AN AVERAGE PERMITTED TONNAGE OF 1800 TONS A
4 DAY. THEN I READ FURTHER DOWN IT OPERATES SEVEN DAYS A
5 WEEK; BUT DO THEY REALLY MEAN WHAT THEY'RE SAYING?

6 AND, ALSO, WE HEARD THIS MORNING ABOUT THE
7 ACME TRANSFER STATION WHERE THEY HAD PEAK LOADING. YOU
8 MIGHT GET 3,000 TONS A DAY PEAK ON SOMETHING LIKE THIS
9 BECAUSE OF THE VARIATION. I JUST DON'T WANT ANYBODY PUT
10 IN A BOX, AND I THINK THAT WE ALL OUGHT TO BE TALKING
11 ABOUT THE SAME THING THROUGHOUT THE INDUSTRY.

12 IS THERE ANY COMMENTS ON THAT ASPECT?

13 MR. DIER: I WOULD LIKE TO RESPOND SORT OF
14 PREMATURELY BEFORE WE GET INTO THE PERMITTING. IT'S TRUE
15 THE PERMIT FOR THIS PROJECT STATES A DAILY AVERAGE OF
16 1800 TONS PER DAY. THIS IS SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT THAN WHAT
17 STAFF HAS BEEN RECOMMENDING TO LEA'S FOR WELL NIGH ONTO
18 OVER THREE YEARS NOW, AND THAT IS TO WHEN THEY WRITE
19 PERMITS, TO TRY AND SPECIFY A PERMITTED DAILY CAPACITY.

20 THE DIRECTION WE GIVE THEM IS TO GIVE IT ON
21 ANY OPERATING DAY RATHER THAN SPECIFYING AN AVERAGE
22 BECAUSE WHENEVER YOU SAY AVERAGE, IT'S JUST THE POINT YOU
23 ARE MAKING, MR. BEAUTROW, ON WHAT BASIS? IS IT ON A
24 FIVE-DAY BASIS? AN ANNUAL BASIS? IF IT'S ON AN ANNUAL
25 BASIS, THEN HOW DO YOU ENFORCE THE PERMIT? YOU HAVE TO



1 WAIT A YEAR AND FIND OUT IF YOU VIOLATED THE PERMIT SO
2 YOU CAN AVERAGE.

3 SO OUR DIRECTION TO LEA'S HAS BEEN -- WE
4 HAVEN'T REQUIRED IT, BUT WE STRONGLY SUGGESTED INCLUDING
5 LANGUAGE TO HAVE A PERMITTED CAPACITY PER OPERATING DAY
6 SO THAT AS A FACILITY'S OPERATIONS START APPROACHING THAT
7 NUMBER ON ANY PARTICULAR DAY, THEN IT STARTS TRIGGERING
8 IN THE OPERATOR'S MIND AND THE LEA'S MIND THAT PERHAPS
9 THEY NEED TO START LOOKING AT REVISING OR MODIFYING THAT
10 PERMIT.

11 AND WE DON'T -- ALONG WITH THAT GUIDANCE, WE
12 DON'T WANT TO LIMIT THEM TO A LEVEL THAT IS GOING TO
13 CAUSE THEM SOME PROBLEMS REAL QUICK. WE WANT THEM TO
14 THINK IT THROUGH AND LOOK AT THE DESIGN CAPACITY OF THE
15 FACILITY AND SPECIFY THAT AS THE PERMITTED CAPACITY
16 BECAUSE IT ALLOWS SOME ROOM FOR GROWTH WITHOUT HAVING TO
17 COME BACK AND MAKE PERMIT MODIFICATIONS.

18 IF THERE ARE OTHER DOCUMENTS, SUCH AS THE USE
19 PERMIT, EIR, OR SOME OTHER THING THAT LIMITS THEM TO SOME
20 LEVEL LESS THAN DESIGN CAPACITY, THEN WE LIMIT TO THAT
21 NUMBER. ABSENT THOSE RESTRICTIONS, WE'RE ENCOURAGING
22 LEA'S TO PUT IN DESIGN CAPACITY AS THE PERMIT CAPACITY.

23 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: DID THIS SLIP THROUGH THE
24 CRACK?

25 MR. DIER: THIS ONE, YES, IT DID. WE HAVE A LOT OF



1 LEA'S OUT THERE WHO HAVE THEIR OWN WAY OF DOING THINGS.
2 IT'S A SLOW PROCESS TRYING TO HAVE OUR IDEAS GET OUT TO
3 ALL OF THEM.

4 I'D LIKE TO BRIEFLY TALK ABOUT THE PERMIT. AS
5 JEANIE MENTIONED, THIS PROJECT IS A REVISED PERMIT
6 REPRESENTING THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE STANTON TRANSFER
7 STATION. BEFORE THE SITE WAS RECONSTRUCTED, IT OPERATED
8 AS AN OPEN AIR TRANSFER STATION AT VARIOUS TIMES DUMPING
9 DIRECTLY INTO THE TRANSFER VEHICLES.

10 AS A RESULT OF THE RECONSTRUCTION, THE
11 FACILITY NOW IS ENCLOSED AND UTILIZING ONE OF THE
12 PREVIOUS PITS FOR THE TRANSFER OPERATION. THE FACILITY
13 NOW HAS A SINGLE POINT OF ENTRY AND EXIT FOR THE WASTE
14 VEHICLES ENTERING THE FACILITY. IMPROVEMENTS OF THE SITE
15 ARE TREMENDOUS OVER THE PRIOR OPERATION.

16 STAFF HAS LOOKED AT THE EXISTING FACILITY NOW
17 AS IT'S RECONSTRUCTED AND TRULY BELIEVES THAT THEY CAN
18 AND ARE OPERATING IN COMPLIANCE WITH OUR MINIMUM
19 STANDARDS.

20 AS MENTIONED, THE FACILITY PERMIT NOW DOES
21 CONTAIN A LIMITED CAPACITY OF 1800 TONS PER DAY ON AN
22 AVERAGE BASIS. I WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT THAT IN 1984
23 THE GENERAL PLAN WAS AMENDED TO SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFY
24 THIS FACILITY. SO WITH ALL OF THESE ACTIVITIES BETWEEN
25 THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND THE COUNTY SOLID



1 WASTE PLAN AND THE GENERAL PLAN, STAFF IS QUITE
2 COMFORTABLE WITH THE RECOMMENDATION TO YOU THIS MORNING
3 OR THIS AFTERNOON TO CONCUR IN THE FACILITIES PERMIT.

4 SO ON THAT BASIS, WE'RE ABLE TO RECOMMEND THAT
5 YOU ADOPT DETERMINATION OF CONFORMANCE NO. 88-8 AND
6 PERMIT DECISION NO. 88-44.

7 WE DO HAVE MIKE SILVA HERE, PRESIDENT OF CR
8 TRANSFER, WHO, I BELIEVE, WOULD BE ABLE TO ANSWER ANY
9 QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE. HE DOESN'T HAVE A PRESENTATION;
10 BUT IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS OF HIM ABOUT THIS
11 OPERATION, HE'D BE MORE THAN HAPPY TO ANSWER THEM.

12 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: BOARD MEMBERS HAVE ANY
13 QUESTIONS? MR. SILVA, COULD YOU COME UP, PLEASE?

14 WOULD YOU BE ABLE TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION
15 ABOUT THE AVERAGE AND WHAT KIND OF AN AVERAGE IT IS, THE
16 1800 TONS A DAY?

17 MR. SILVA: THAT DEFINITELY WOULD BE THE PEAK
18 LOADING FOR OUR TRANSFER STATION ON A DAILY AVERAGE, 1800
19 A DAY.

20 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: THAT'S THE MAXIMUM THAT YOU
21 WOULD PUSH THROUGH THERE A DAY, PERIOD, RATHER THAN EVEN
22 ON AN AVERAGE? IN OTHER WORDS, THEN THE AVERAGE WOULD BE
23 MUCH LOWER THAN THAT, SO YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT THE PEAK
24 YOU CAN HANDLE THROUGH THERE WOULD BE 1800 TONS ON ANY
25 GIVEN DAY.



1 MR. SILVA: NOT BY FACILITY DESIGN, BY EIR
2 RESTRICTIONS, COUNTY RESTRICTIONS, THINGS LIKE THAT.
3 FACILITY, 4,000 TONS, NO PROBLEM, BUT THAT'S A DIFFERENT
4 STORY.

5 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: OKAY. ANYBODY ELSE HAVE ANY
6 QUESTIONS?

7 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: MR. CHAIRMAN, SHOULDN'T
8 THEN AVERAGE BE ELIMINATED AND PUT IN 1800 MAXIMUM?

9 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: DON, CAN YOU ANSWER THAT?

10 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: BECAUSE IF YOU'RE GOING BY
11 AN AVERAGE, IT WOULD BE 3600 OR ZERO.

12 MR. DIER: I CAN GIVE YOU MY OPINION, BUT I MIGHT
13 WANT TO DEFER TO COUNSEL ON THIS. IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING
14 THAT THE BOARD CAN EITHER OBJECT OR CONCUR TO A PERMIT AS
15 SUBMITTED BY THE LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.

16 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: MR. CONHEIM, DO YOU WANT TO
17 COMMENT?

18 ATTORNEY CONHEIM: THAT'S THE SHORT ANSWER. THE
19 LONGER ANSWER, THE MORE PRACTICAL ONE, IS THAT WHILE YOUR
20 STATUTORY AUTHORITY IS LIMITED, IF YOU HAD EVERYBODY HERE
21 IN THE ROOM, WE COULD MAKE THAT CHANGE HERE TODAY.
22 WITHOUT THE LEA, WE WOULD NEED INITIALLY A PHONE CALL TO
23 ACT TODAY AND FOLLOWED UP BY A FAX AND/OR A WRITTEN
24 CONFIRMATION OF THE LEA'S AGREEMENT, ASSUMING THAT THE
25 OWNER/OPERATOR ALSO AGREED.



1 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: WELL, I GUESS WE'VE GONE
2 THROUGH THIS BEFORE, AND IT'S VERY CUMBERSOME TO TRY
3 TO -- IN OTHER WORDS, WE DON'T WANT TO THROW OUT THE BABY
4 WITH THE BATH WATER RIGHT NOW.

5 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: I DON'T UNDERSTAND USING
6 AVERAGE.

7 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: IT'S NOT CORRECT.

8 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: DON, IN THE FUTURE DO WE HAVE
9 SOME AUTHORITY HERE TO SEE THAT THIS SORT OF A THING IS
10 CLARIFIED? IT WAS ALWAYS MY UNDERSTANDING AND MR. SILVA
11 SEEMS TO UNDERSTAND THE SAME THING WHEN HE SAYS 1800 PER
12 DAY, THAT'S THE MAXIMUM. SO WHY DON'T WE MAKE OUR RULES
13 CONSISTENT WITH WHAT WE INTEND FOR IT TO BE DONE? IS
14 THAT POSSIBLE FOR YOU TO TAKE CARE OF THAT?

15 MR. DIER: IT IS AND WE'RE DOING THAT AT TWO
16 DIFFERENT LEVELS. IN THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE, IN THE
17 SEPTEMBER MEETING, WE'RE GOING TO BE PRESENTING TO YOU
18 FOR YOUR REVIEW AND AUTHORIZATION TO DISTRIBUTE SOME
19 GUIDELINE DOCUMENTS FOR THE PERMIT PROGRAM. AND THESE
20 GUIDELINE DOCUMENTS WILL INCLUDE THESE TYPES OF
21 REQUIREMENTS. AND THE SECOND LEVEL WILL BE LATER ON AS
22 PART OF THE WHOLE REGULATION PROCESS. WE'RE GOING TO TRY
23 AN ADDRESS THIS AS A PART OF OUR REGULATION PROCESS.

24 BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN: MR. CHAIRMAN.

25 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: MR. ARAKALIAN.



1 BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN: WHY WOULD THE AVERAGE MAKE
2 A DIFFERENCE TO US WHEN IF THEY HAVE A MAXIMUM, WELL,
3 OBVIOUSLY THEY CAN DO ANYTHING UP TO THAT MAXIMUM? THEN
4 WHAT WOULD WE CARE WHAT THE AVERAGE WAS?

5 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: BECAUSE IT'S CONFUSING, SAM,
6 THE WAY THEY'VE GOT IT DONE. AS THE GENTLEMAN SAYS, HE
7 COULD RUN 4,000 TONS THROUGH THERE A DAY NOW. YOU CAN'T
8 REALLY REGULATE IT UNDER THOSE KIND OF CONDITIONS, SO
9 THERE SHOULD BE A MAXIMUM DAILY THING, WHICH IS 1800.

10 BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN: SO THAT'S WHAT WE'RE
11 SAYING. THE 18 IS A MAXIMUM DAILY.

12 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: IT ISN'T THE WAY IT'S
13 WRITTEN.

14 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: OKAY. TO SUMMARIZE, YOU ARE
15 STILL COVERED BECAUSE IT'S THE -- IF YOU SAYING THE
16 MAXIMUM IS 1800 TONS A DAY AND WE'RE SAYING -- AND THE
17 WAY IT'S WRITTEN IN THE AVERAGE, I MEAN IT'S OBVIOUSLY
18 THAT YOU COULD -- YOU CAN ACCOMMODATE THAT. SO I BELIEVE
19 THAT THE STAFF HAS TO LOOK THESE THINGS OVER MORE
20 CAREFULLY BEFORE THEY EVER GET TO THE STATE THAT THEY'RE
21 TO US AND THAT WE MAKE SURE THAT THESE KIND OF THINGS ARE
22 IRONED OUT IN THE FUTURE. WOULD YOU ALL AGREE WITH THAT?

23 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: YES.

24 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY OTHER FURTHER COMMENTS ON
25 THIS? I GUESS WE'RE READY -- THANK YOU, MR. SILVA -- TO



1 CONSIDER 88-44.

2 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: MOVED.

3 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: SECOND.

4 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ALL THOSE IN FAVOR? OPPOSED?
5 NONE. ANY DISCUSSION?

6 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: ABSTAIN.

7 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: SHOW THAT MR. GALLAGHER
8 ABSTAINED AND THAT MOTION PASSES. THANK YOU.

9 ATTORNEY CONHEIM: MR. CHAIRMAN, PARDON ME IF I
10 MISSED SOMETHING. I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT YOU
11 VOTED ON BOTH NUMBERED --

12 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: WE DIDN'T.

13 ATTORNEY CONHEIM: BOTH NUMBERED DOCUMENTS.

14 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I'LL MOVE ON 88-8.

15 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: I'M SORRY, YEAH. THE MOTION
16 HAS BEEN MADE ON 88-8, WHICH IS THE DETERMINATION OF
17 CONFORMANCE.

18 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: RIGHT.

19 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: IS THERE A SECOND ON THAT?

20 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: SECOND.

21 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: SECOND BY MR. VARNER. ANY --
22 EXCUSE ME. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR? YOU GOING TO ABSTAIN
23 AGAIN?

24 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: I HAVE TO ABSTAIN. IT'S
25 AN ORANGE COUNTY PROBLEM.



1 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION? IT'S
2 BEEN MOVED, APPROVED.

3 ITEM NO. 14, DETERMINATION OF CONFORMANCE AND
4 CONCURRENCE IN FACILITY PERMIT FOR THE EXPANSION OF THE
5 EASTERN REGIONAL LANDFILL PLACER COUNTY.

6 MR. IWAHIRO: THIS IS THE SAME TYPE OF ACTION FOR
7 AN EXPANSION OF THE LANDFILL IN THE NORTH TAHOE TRUCKEE
8 AREA. CY ARMSTRONG FROM PLANNING AND DON DIER FROM
9 PERMITS WILL TAKE THIS ITEM.

10 MR. ARMSTRONG: GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. CHAIRMAN, BOARD
11 MEMBERS.

12 AGAIN, THIS IS A TWOFOLD ITEM, THE FINDING OF
13 CONFORMANCE AND THE CONCURRENCE WITH THE PERMIT. THE
14 PRESENT LANDFILL IS NEARING CAPACITY. EXPANSION WILL
15 PROVIDE FOR 20 YEARS OF ADDITIONAL DISPOSAL CAPACITY, AND
16 THE FACILITY WILL SERVE, AS IT IS NOW, THE NORTH
17 TAHOE/TRUCKEE AREA OF THE COMBINED PLACER AND NEVADA
18 COUNTY AREA.

19 TURNING TO THE FIRST ITEM, WHICH WOULD BE THE
20 ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, THE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS
21 DEPARTMENT HAS PREPARED AND CIRCULATED AN ENVIRONMENTAL
22 IMPACT REPORT IN COMPLIANCE WITH CEQA AND FILED THE
23 PROPER NOTICE OF DETERMINE WITH THE STATE CLEARING HOUSE
24 ON THE PROJECT.

25 THE COUNTY HAS FOUND THE PROJECT WITH



1 MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT
2 IMPACT. ON PAGE 304 OF YOUR BOARD PACKET, THERE ARE A
3 NUMBER OF MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED, WHICH ARE
4 INCLUDED IN THE PROJECT. A LEACHATE CONTROL SYSTEM WITH
5 DOUBLE PUMPS FOR THE SYSTEM HAS BEEN INSTALLED. A
6 BACK-UP GENERATOR IN CASE OF A ELECTRICAL POWER OUTAGE IS
7 IN PLACE. CUT-OFF TRENCHES TO DIVERT RUNOFF WATER HAVE
8 BEEN CONSTRUCTED AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS, AND A SERIES OF
9 TEST WELLS TO ENSURE WATER QUALITY HAS BEEN CONSTRUCTED
10 AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS THROUGHOUT THE FACILITY FOR
11 MONITORING.

12 TURNING TO THE BOARD ACTION ON DETERMINATION
13 OF CONFORMANCE, THE PROJECT PROPONENT HAS FILED A NOTICE
14 OF INTENT OF PROPOSED FACILITIES ON THE PROJECT. THE
15 COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT HAS FOUND THE PROJECT TO
16 BE IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT
17 PLAN.

18 STAFF FINDS THAT ALL LOCAL ACTIONS HAVE BEEN
19 COMPLETED, AND IT IS APPROPRIATE FOR THE BOARD TO
20 CONSIDER THE REQUEST FOR DETERMINATION OF CONFORMANCE.
21 THIS IS BASED ON FOUR CRITERIA: THE PROJECT IS
22 CONSISTENT WITH STATE POLICY, IS CONSISTENT WITH THE
23 POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE COUNTY SOLID WASTE
24 MANAGEMENT PLAN, IS CONSISTENT WITH THE SHORT, MEDIUM,
25 LONG-TERM FACILITIES ELEMENT OF THE COUNTY SOLID WASTE



1 MANAGEMENT PLAN, AND LOCAL ISSUES AND PLANNING ACTIVITIES
2 HAVE BEEN COMPLETED.

3 BOARD STAFF ALSO FEELS THAT THE ENVIRONMENTAL
4 IMPACT REPORT HAS BEEN DONE PROPERLY AND THE PROPER
5 DOCUMENT HAS BEEN FILED.

6 TO COMPLETE THE REST OF THE ITEM, MR. DON DIER
7 WILL TAKE OVER NOW.

8 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: MS. BREMBERG HAS A QUESTION.

9 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: MR. ARMSTRONG, NO. 1 OF THE
10 MITIGATING MEASURES ON PAGE 304, LEACHATE CONTROL SYSTEM
11 WITH DOUBLE PUMPS, MAY I ASK WHAT'S DONE AFTER IT'S
12 DOUBLE PUMPED BECAUSE OF THE NEW RULES AND REGULATIONS
13 THAT ARE COMING DOWN ABOUT RETURNING THE LEACHATE TO THE
14 LANDFILL? I'M JUST VERY CURIOUS AS TO WHAT THEY PLAN TO
15 DO WITH IT AFTER THEY'VE GOT IT DOUBLE PUMPED.

16 MR. ARMSTRONG: MS. BREMBERG, I HAVE SEEN THE
17 SYSTEM IN PLACE; HOWEVER, I'D LIKE TO DETER. WE HAVE A
18 LARGE CONTINGENT FROM THE COUNTY BECAUSE I DON'T QUITE
19 UNDERSTAND WHERE ALL THAT DOES GO. WE HAVE THREE OR FOUR
20 PEOPLE FROM THE COUNTY TO ANSWER THAT.

21 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: WE'LL DEFER ON THAT. DON.

22 MR. DIER: AS CY INDICATED, THIS ACTION IS AN
23 EXPANSION OF THE EASTERN REGIONAL LANDFILL. WITH THE
24 ADDITION OF ACREAGE, THE TOTAL SITE WILL COME TO A LITTLE
25 OVER 101 ACRES. THE PERMITTED CAPACITY, AS SPECIFIED IN



1 THE PERMIT AS A 105 TONS PER DAY, INCLUDING 30 CUBIC
2 YARDS PER WEEK OF SEWAGE SLUDGE.

3 THE BOARD RECEIVED THIS PERMIT ON APRIL 1,
4 1988; HOWEVER, BECAUSE OF SOME OUTSTANDING ISSUES, THE
5 LEA AND THE OPERATOR WAIVED THE TIME REQUIREMENT IN ORDER
6 TO RESOLVE THOSE ISSUES.

7 ON JULY 20TH, I BELIEVE IT WAS -- JULY 12TH AN
8 ENGINEER'S REPORT AND UPDATED DISPOSAL SITE INFORMATION
9 WAS SUBMITTED, AND STAFF HAS REVIEWED THIS MATERIAL AND
10 FOUND TO MEET OUR REQUIREMENTS, AND SO WE ARE IN A
11 POSITION TODAY TO BE ABLE TO RECOMMEND TO YOU THAT
12 EVERYTHING APPEARS TO BE IN ORDER.

13 THE PERMIT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE COUNTY PLAN
14 AND THAT THE PERMIT IS CONSISTENT WITH STATE MINIMUM
15 STANDARDS. SO STAFF IS ABLE TO RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD
16 ADOPT DETERMINATION OF CONFORMANCE 88-3 AND PERMIT
17 DECISION NO. 88-25.

18 AS CY INDICATED, WE DO HAVE SIZABLE CONTINGENT
19 HERE TO ANSWER YOUR SPECIFIC QUESTION AND ALSO TO ANSWER
20 ANY OTHER QUESTIONS.

21 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ARE THERE ANY OTHER SPECIFIC
22 QUESTIONS FROM BOARD MEMBERS THAT WE CAN LEAD INTO?
23 OKAY. WOULD SOMEONE PLEASE COME EITHER REPRESENTING THE
24 COUNTY OR THE OPERATOR, WHATEVER, AND MAYBE YOU CAN
25 EXPLAIN THE LEACHATE CONTROL THING A LITTLE BETTER.



1 MR. SCRIBNER: YES, THANKS, MR. CHAIRMAN. I'M JIM
2 SCRIBNER WITH PLACER COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT.

3 THE LEACHATE CAPTURE SYSTEM FOR THE EXISTING
4 32-ACRE SITE IS PLACED BELOW. IT WAS PUT IN PLACE IN
5 1976. I BELIEVE MR. BEAUTROW WAS UP AT THE SITE. I
6 THINK YOU WERE ON THE BOARD THEN, WEREN'T YOU? SO YOU
7 KNOW WHAT I'M TALKING ABOUT.

8 THAT PRESENT OPERATION HAS A DOUBLE PUMPING
9 SYSTEM. IF ANY LEACHATE IS PRODUCED -- WE HAVEN'T HAD
10 ANY LEACHATE SINCE ABOUT 1979 OR 80 BECAUSE WE HAVE A
11 SUCH ELABORATE CUT-OFF TRENCHES -- WOULD BE SPRAYED BACK
12 ON THE LANDFILL.

13 IN THE EXPANSION AREA, WE HAVE LEACHATE
14 CAPTURE TRENCH IN PLACE GOING IN THE BOTTOM OF THE
15 TRENCH. AND WITH THE CUT-OFF TRENCHES, WE DON'T
16 ANTICIPATE A PROBLEM; BUT IF WE DO HAVE, IT WOULD GO TO
17 AN EVAPORATION POND.

18 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: IT WOULD GO TO AN
19 EVAPORATION POND, NOT BACK ON THE LANDFILL?

20 MR. SCRIBNER: RIGHT. WE'RE HOPEFUL THAT WE'RE NOT
21 GOING TO PRODUCE ANY LEACHATE. THAT'S WHY WE HAVE THIS
22 ELABORATE CUT-OFF TRENCH SYSTEM THAT WE'RE PUTTING IN TO
23 INTERCEPT ANYTHING.

24 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: I WOULD SUGGEST IF YOU GET
25 ANY, THT YOU MOVE IT OVER TO YOUR EVAPORATION POND



1 BECAUSE OF THE NEW RULES. THANK YOU.

2 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS? WE WON'T
3 BELABOR THE REST OF THE CONTINGENT IF THERE'S NO FURTHER
4 QUESTIONS.

5 ANY OTHER DISCUSSION BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
6 THEN WE'RE READY FOR CONSIDERATION, AND IT WOULD BE THE
7 TWO ITEMS, THEN, THE DETERMINATION OF CONFORMANCE AND THE
8 FACILITY PERMIT DECISION ON PAGE 322.

9 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: SO MOVED.

10 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: MR. VARNER MOVED IT.

11 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: SECOND.

12 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ALL THOSE IN FAVOR? OPPOSED?
13 NONE. ANY DISCUSSION? SO ORDERED.

14 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD MOVE
15 88-3 AND WE HAVE TWO.

16 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: I THOUGHT WE DID THEM BOTH
17 TOGETHER.

18 THANK YOU ALL FOR COMING AND IT'S BEEN
19 APPROVED.

20 GEORGE, AS FAR AS THE REST OF THE AGENDA NOW,
21 WE'RE GOING TO DEFER 15 AND 16 UNTIL TOMORROW.

22 MR. IWAHIRO: 16 AND 17. SO THE NEXT ONE WOULD BE
23 THE WASTE DISPOSAL REGION, BUT WE WERE WAITING FOR
24 SOMEBODY FROM LOS ANGELES COUNTY TO COME ON THAT.

25 MR. EOWAN: WE COULD GO TO ITEM NO. 23 IF YOU LIKE.



1 I THINK WE'RE PREPARED TO DO THAT ONE.

2 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ITEM 23 THEN.

3 MR. IWAHRO: MR. CHAIRMAN, ITEM 23 IS WITH REGARD
4 TO OUR HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE PROGRAM. AS YOU KNOW,
5 IN THE PAST YEAR WE HAVE BEEN WORKING WITH AN ADVISORY
6 COMMITTEE TO DEVELOP THE PROGRAM. THEY HAVE GIVEN US A
7 REPORT, AND IN THE RECENT PAST YOU HAVE GIVEN US
8 DIRECTION TO GO AHEAD WITH THIS PROGRAM AND YOU'VE
9 INCREASED THE STAFF. AND SO WE HAVE NOW EMBARKED ON THAT
10 PROGRAM. WHAT WE'RE GOING TO BE DOING TODAY IS GIVE YOU
11 A PLAN OF ACTION THAT WE HAVE DEVELOPED FOR YOUR
12 CONSIDERATION.

13 WE ARE ENVISIONING A KIND OF FOUR-PRONG OR
14 FOUR-COMPONENT PROGRAM. AS YOU WILL NOTICE, IN OUR -- ON
15 PAGE 397 IN THE KEY ISSUES, PUBLIC INFORMATION PROGRAM,
16 COMMUNITY OUTREACH, AND THE GRANT PROGRAM, AS WELL AS THE
17 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ELEMENT.

18 WE ALSO, AS YOU RECALL, HAVE GIVEN A CONTRACT
19 TO CALIFORNIA PARTNERSHIPS TO WORK WITH THREE COUNTIES
20 TO -- IN THREE COUNTIES TO DEVELOP A COLLECTION PROGRAM
21 AND TO ASSIST IN THOSE PROGRAMS. SO DAVE STRICKLER, WHO
22 IS OUR PROGRAM PERSON IN THIS AREA, WILL GIVE US AN
23 OVERVIEW OF THE PLAN OF ACTION, AND I BELIEVE MR. JIM
24 CAMPBELL IS HERE TO GIVE US A RUNDOWN ON HIS CONTRACT,
25 THE CURRENT STATUS OF IT. DAVE STRICKLER.



1 MR. STRICKLER: THANK YOU, HERB.

2 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: BEFORE YOU BEGIN, THAT'S REAL
3 SMALL, AND I'M SURE THE PEOPLE IN THE AUDIENCE CAN'T SEE
4 IT. MAYBE YOU CAN JUST EXPLAIN IT AS YOU GO.

5 MR. STRICKLER: THAT'S MY HOPE WAS -- FOR THE
6 PEOPLE THAT ARE INTERESTED AND HAVE AN AGENDA, I'VE GOT A
7 PAGE NUMBER ON THE BOTTOM OF EACH OF THESE, AND THEY
8 REALLY ARE A DUPLICATION WHAT'S IN YOUR AGENDA ITEM. AS
9 I MOVE THROUGH THIS WHOLE THING, I'M JUST GOING TO REALLY
10 SUMMARIZE THE AGENDA ITEM ITEM BY ITEM BRIEFLY. AND AS I
11 PUT THESE CHARTS UP, IF YOU CAN JUST GANDER AT THEM, YOU
12 CAN FIND THEM ON ONE OF THE PAGES. IF NOT, I'LL BE HAPPY
13 TO GIVE YOU THE PAGE NUMBER.

14 AS HERB INDICATED, MOST OF FISCAL '87 AND '88
15 WAS SPENT WITH HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE IN A
16 DEVELOPMENTAL PROCESS, THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE, THEIR
17 REPORTS, THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS.

18 LET ME REFOCUS REAL QUICK ON THIS. THE '87/88
19 WAS ADDRESSING THE DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS
20 WASTE PROGRAMS, SORT OF SETTING DIRECTIONS, LOOKING AT
21 ISSUES. THE PLAN OF ACTION THAT WE PROPOSE TODAY IS THE
22 '88-89; AND, AS YOU CAN SEE, ITS COMPONENTS AND ITS
23 TIMELINES, AND I TRIED TO BE AS SPECIFIC AS POSSIBLE IN
24 PUTTING THAT TOGETHER SO THAT WE ALL KNOW WHAT WOULD BE
25 EXPECTED OF ME, FOR INSTANCE, IN THE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS



1 WASTE PROGRAM AND THE DIRECTION THAT WE'D BE HEADING.

2 SO THOSE PROGRAMS AND COMPONENTS CONSIST OF --
3 WELL, LET ME CHANGE SLIDES HERE. JUST A MOMENT. LET ME
4 JUST BRIEFLY COVER THE GOALS FOR THE PROGRAM THEN OVER
5 THIS NEXT YEAR, SOME LONG-TERM AND SOME JUST WITHIN THIS
6 NEXT YEAR.

7 FIRST IS TO PROVIDE A CONSISTENT RESPONSE TO
8 THE PUBLIC AND TO THE CITIES AND COUNTIES ON HOUSEHOLD
9 HAZARDOUS WASTE ISSUES AND DISPOSAL STORAGE TREATMENT,
10 WHATEVER, BUT TO MAKE THOSE ANSWERS THE SAME EVERY TIME
11 SOMEONE CALLS OR CONTACTS US. I THINK THAT'S REAL
12 IMPORTANT IN A PROGRAM LIKE THIS, SO WE'RE GOING TO
13 EMPHASIZE THAT.

14 SECOND ITEM WOULD BE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE. BY
15 THAT I MEAN RIGHT AT CITIES AND COUNTIES WHO ARE, UNDER
16 THE TANNER PLAN, GETTING INVOLVED IN HAZARDOUS WASTE
17 MATERIALS AND HAVE AN ELEMENT OF HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS
18 WASTE MATERIALS AND REALLY LOOKING TO LEARN FROM OTHER
19 CITIES AND COUNTIES THAT MAY HAVE ALREADY DONE SOMETHING,
20 AND WE PLAN TO BE A CONDUIT, A TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ARM,
21 IF YOU WILL, TO TRANSFER ANY INFORMATION THAT'S VIABLE
22 FROM REGION TO REGION WITHIN CALIFORNIA.

23 THE NEXT ITEM WOULD BE TO FORMALIZE AND
24 DISTRIBUTE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE GUIDELINES TO THE
25 CITIES AND COUNTIES SO THAT AS THEY PUT THEIR PROGRAMS



1 TOGETHER AND AS THEY ADDRESS HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE IN
2 THE COSWMPs, THERE WILL BE SOME CONTINUITY BETWEEN THOSE
3 THINGS.

4 IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING NOW THAT WE CAN GET ONE
5 PLAN FROM ONE AREA AND ANOTHER PLAN FROM ANOTHER. I
6 REALLY SEE SOME SORT OF CONSISTENCY IN PLANING THESE
7 AREAS TO BE HELPFUL TO THE CITIES AND COUNTIES IN
8 CALIFORNIA.

9 AND THEN THE LAST ITEM ON MY PARTICULAR AGENDA
10 IS TO DEVELOP THE CRITERIA AND THE GUIDELINES FOR THE
11 GRANTS PROGRAM UNDER AB 2448, WHICH IS NOT COMPLETELY
12 SEPARATE FROM THE MISSION OF 1809, BUT FOR THE NEXT YEAR
13 OR SO WILL BE SORT OF A SEPARATE ENTITY. SO THAT'S A
14 VERY IMPORTANT GOAL.

15 THE OBJECTIVES AND I WOULD -- I WILL, IF YOU
16 DON'T MIND, JUST BRIEFLY SUMMARIZE WHAT THE OBJECTIVES
17 ARE AND THE ITEMS UNDER THE TASKS UNDER EACH OBJECTIVE.

18 THE OBJECTIVE IS TO DEVELOP A PUBLIC
19 INFORMATION PROGRAM. IT WOULD HAVE TWO COMPONENTS OR TWO
20 TASKS. THIS IS ON PAGE 398 OF THE AGENDA ITEM. ONE IS
21 TO PREPARE A HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE INFORMATION
22 BROCHURE. THIS IS ONE OF THESE SMALL BILL INSERT-TYPE OF
23 BROCHURES THAT GIVES THE GENERAL PUBLIC, THROUGH THE
24 PROCESS OF RECEIVING VARIOUS UTILITY BILLS, SOME IDEA OF
25 THE COMPLEXITY OF THE SOLID WASTE ISSUES IN CALIFORNIA TO



1600 EAST FOURTH STREET, SUITE 220
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92701
TELEPHONE (714) 953-4447

barristers'
reporting service

1 DATE, TO GIVE THEM A LITTLE PANORAMA OF WHY LOOKING AT
2 THEIR HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE IS CONNECTED TO SITING
3 AND INCINERATION AND SORT OF TO FOCUS ON THOSE ISSUES.

4 WE WOULD PRODUCE THAT AND SUPPLY THAT TO
5 CITIES AND COUNTIES WHO WOULD REPRODUCE IT AT THEIR COST
6 AND INSERT IN FLIERS. WE THINK THAT THAT WOULD BE A VERY
7 APPROPRIATE WAY TO HAVE THAT INFORMATION DISSEMINATED.

8 ADDITIONALLY, WE'D LIKE TO ORGANIZE AN
9 IN-HOUSE SPEAKERS BUREAU. I KNOW THAT THERE'S BEEN A LOT
10 OF TALK ABOUT THAT, BUT I THINK THAT THERE ARE A NUMBER
11 OF PLAYERS IN THE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE GAME AND THAT
12 WE NEED TO BE OUT TALKING WHENEVER POSSIBLE, ESPECIALLY
13 WHEN WE KNOW WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT, AND PARTICIPATING
14 IN ADVISORY COMMITTEES OR WITH CITIES THAT HAVE QUESTIONS
15 OR COUNTIES THAT HAVE QUESTIONS OR A LONE PUBLIC CALLER.
16 SOMEBODY WHO WANTS TO KNOW WHAT'S GOING ON IN ONE OF THE
17 COUNTIES, THEN WE SHOULD HAVE THAT INFORMATION AND GIVE
18 THAT PERSON A CONTACT PERSON AND SORT OF EVEN TELL THEM
19 WHEN THE NEXT COLLECTION DAY IS IN FRESNO, FOR INSTANCE.
20 THAT'S PART OF THAT SPEAKERS BUREAU.

21 THERE'S A LITTLE BIT OF OVERLAP BETWEEN THE
22 OBJECTIVE NO. 2, WHICH IS A COMMUNITY OUTREACH PROGRAM,
23 AND I GUESS THAT OVERLAP IS REALLY SEEN THERE IN ITEM NO.
24 3, THE TASK NO. 3, DEVELOP A TARGET PUBLIC AWARENESS
25 CAMPAIGN. THAT'S PRETTY MUCH A PUBLIC AWARENESS



1 CAMPAIGN, AND WHAT I'M PROPOSING THAT WE DO IS THAT WE
2 ENLIST THE AID OF CITIES AND COUNTIES THAT ARE HOLDING
3 HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ROUNDUPS AND TOXIC AWARENESS
4 WEEKS AND COLLECTION DAYS IS TO BECOME INVOLVED WITH THEM
5 SORT OF LIKE CALIFORNIA CLEAN-IN DOES. JUST SORT OF GET
6 IN THERE, MIX IT UP WITH THEM, LET THEM KNOW WE'RE HERE,
7 WHAT OUR SERVICES CAN AND CANNOT BE, AND SORT OF SHARE
8 SOME OF THAT INFORMATION WITH OTHER COUNTIES AS THEY COME
9 ON-LINE TO DO THAT IN OTHER CITIES.

10 WITH THAT PART OF THE PROGRAM TODAY AND TO
11 CONCLUDE MY PART OF IT, WE HAVE A CONTRACT, AS THE BOARD
12 WELL KNOWS, WITH CALIFORNIA PARTNERSHIPS INC. THE
13 PRESIDENT IS HERE TODAY, AND THEY'RE WORKING WITH SEVERAL
14 COUNTIES DOWN THERE, AND HE WOULD LIKE TO UPDATE YOU ON
15 THAT PARTICULAR ISSUE, BUT THAT WILL BE AT THE CONCLUSION
16 OF MY PRESENTATION. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS AT THAT
17 TIME TAKE THEM.

18 PART OF THE COMMUNITY OUTREACH WOULD BE
19 DEVELOPMENT OF A RESOURCE LIBRARY AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF
20 A COMPUTER DATABASE. I THINK I'LL USE A LITTLE JARGON
21 HERE. NETWORKING IS THE WAY TO GO IN THIS PARTICULAR
22 ISSUE. NETWORKING WITH INDUSTRY, WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT,
23 WITH STATE GOVERNMENT, WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, WHENEVER
24 THE POSSIBILITIES ARISE. TO DO THAT, WE NEED TO BECOME
25 PART OF THEIR INFORMATION NETWORK AND VICE-VERSA. WE



1600 EAST FOURTH STREET, SUITE 220
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92701
TELEPHONE (714) 953-4447

barristers'
reporting service

1 NEED TO BE ABLE TO GET INFORMATION FROM THEM, STORE IT,
2 AND BE ABLE TO USE IT WITH OTHER AGENCIES AND ENTITIES.
3 SO THEY LOOK A LITTLE DRY, BUT I THINK THEY'RE REAL
4 IMPORTANT COMPONENTS ON THE COMMUNITY OUTREACH PROGRAM.

5 THE NEXT OBJECTIVE -- LET ME JUST SKIP OVER
6 THE ONE THAT LISTING IN THE AGENDA ITEM, WHICH IS THE
7 2448, AND I'LL ADDRESS THAT SEPARATELY.

8 NEXT OBJECTIVE FOR 1809 WOULD BE TO DEVELOP A
9 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, AND THAT WOULD FOCUS ON
10 WASTE REDUCTION, TREATMENT TECHNOLOGY, SITING OF
11 PERMANENT FACILITIES, POSSIBLY THE COMBINATION OF SMALL
12 GENERATORS AND HOUSEHOLDS IN COUNTIES; AND JUST TO SORT
13 OF GET OUT THERE AND REALLY TALK ABOUT SOME OF THE
14 ENGINEERING, SOME OF THE TECHNOLOGY INVOLVED. THAT WOULD
15 PROBABLY ALSO REQUIRE THAT WE MAKE SOME OUTREACH WITH
16 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES AND SORT OF PICK THEIR
17 BRAINS A LITTLE BIT AND HELP WHEREVER WE COULD.

18 THERE ARE A NUMBER OF COUNTIES WHO ARE
19 CONSIDERING -- SERIOUSLY CONSIDERING SITING OF PERMANENT
20 HAZARDOUS WASTE COLLECTION FACILITY IN THEIR COUNTY, AND
21 THAT'S TO GO AFTER THE SMALL QUANTITY AND THE HOUSEHOLD
22 GENERATOR. WE NEED TO BE OUT THERE, I THINK,
23 UNDERSTANDING THAT PROCESS AND ASSISTING WHEREVER WE CAN.
24 I THINK THERE IS A TIME BETWEEN THAT AND THE 2448 PROGRAM
25 TOWN DOWN THE ROAD.



1 THE TASK WOULD BE TO FORMALIZE AND DISTRIBUTE
2 A MODEL OPERATIONS PLAN. THAT'S ALONG THE SITING
3 GUIDELINES SO THAT YOU COULD SITE YOUR FACILITY. DEVELOP
4 AND DISTRIBUTE A REFUSE WORKER'S SAFETY PACKET. IF WE
5 GET INTO THE BUSINESS OF COLLECTING FROM CURBSIDES IN
6 CERTAIN PROGRAMS, THAT INFORMATION IS ALREADY DEVELOPED.
7 WE JUST NEED TO DISSEMINATE IT TO PEOPLE WHO MIGHT BE
8 INTERESTED IN WORKER'S SAFETY FROM THE CURBSIDE.

9 WITH THAT IS PUBLIC SAFETY, SO THERE'S A
10 LITTLE ELEMENT THERE AND WE CAN MAYBE WORK INTO THE OTHER
11 PARTS OF PUBLIC INFORMATION THAT IS VERY IMPORTANT FROM
12 THE INDUSTRY STANDPOINT AND FROM CITIES AND COUNTIES WHO
13 MAINTAIN THEIR OWN COLLECTION SERVICES.

14 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: I THINK WE'VE GOT A COUPLE OF
15 QUESTIONS.

16 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: I WAS JUST GOING TO SAY
17 UNDER YOUR THE RESOURCE LIBRARY I'M ALL IN FAVOR OF THAT,
18 BUT WOULD IT BE A LIBRARY FOR COMPUTER INFORMATION
19 SHARING? WOULD IT BE A LIBRARY ON THE WALL WHERE PEOPLE
20 DROP IN AND CHECK OUT BOOKS? WOULD IT BE A LIBRARY WHERE
21 PEOPLE COULD CALL IN SAY, "WHAT DO YOU HAVE IN REFERENCE
22 TO?" AND YOU CAN SEND JUST THAT PACKET OF INFORMATION.
23 I THINK THIS WHOLE THING IS REALLY GREAT, BUT YOU SAY
24 LENDING AND RECOVERY, I'M JUST WONDERING IF IT WOULD BE
25 LIKE THE ELECTRONIC BILL TRACKING OR CITY LINKS.



1 MR. STRICKLER: IT MIGHT GET THERE EVENTUALLY.
2 INITIALLY, IT WOULD BE A STAFF MEMBER XEROXING AN ARTICLE
3 AND SHIPPING IT TO SOMEBODY. OR IF WE HAD A TRUST
4 RELATIONSHIP WITH SOMEBODY, WE'D SEND THEM THE BOOK AND
5 WE'D GET THE BOOK BACK. I'VE MANAGED A LENDING LIBRARY
6 ALONG THOSE LINES, BUT IT'S A LITTLE BIT TIME CONSUMING.
7 I WOULD LIKE TO DEVELOP A LITTLE MORE TECHNOLOGY IN THE
8 VEIN OF VIDEO TAPES OR SLIDE TAPE PRESENTATIONS WHERE WE
9 COULD GO ON THE ROAD AND DO THAT KIND OF STUFF. MAYBE I
10 SHOULD HAVE BEEN A LITTLE CLEARER ABOUT THAT. BUT IT
11 WOULD BE A LENDING LIBRARY FROM A TECHNICAL STANDPOINT.

12 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: HOW DO WE LET PEOPLE KNOW
13 WE HAVE IT?

14 MR. STRICKLER: THAT IS A FUNCTION OF ONCE WE
15 DECIDE WE'RE GOING TO HAVE ONE AND WE PUT IN PLACE, THAT
16 GOES IN OUR DOG AND PONY SHOW AS WE GO ON THE ROAD AND
17 SELL WHAT WE DO, OUR SERVICE TO THE CITIES AND COUNTIES.
18 THAT'S WHERE WE WILL FOCUS. I THINK THAT THERE'S A LOT
19 OF NEED RIGHT THERE TO GET THIS TECHNICAL INFORMATION TO
20 THEM. WHAT DO YOU WHEN YOU CAPTURE A MATERIAL THAT'S TOO
21 TOXIC TO REALLY DEAL WITH OR SPECIAL WASTE?

22 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: YOU PLAN TO DEAL WITH ALL
23 50 COUNTIES?

24 MR. STRICKLER: I BELIEVE SO, YES. UNDER 2448,
25 WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO DEALL WITH ALL THE COUNTIES AND



1 ALL THE CITIES, AND I THINK THAT'S GOING TO BE A
2 MONUMENTAL TASK, BUT IT'S A TASK WE HAVE TO TAKE ON. THE
3 PLAN OF ACTION YOU SEE TODAY IS SORT OF LENDING ITSELF TO
4 GO OUT AND SELL TO THOSE PEOPLE IN THE NEXT SIX MONTHS
5 THAT WE DO HAVE SOME FORMALIZED PLAN FOR THEIR
6 PARTICIPATION AND OUR PARTICIPATION.

7 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: I DON'T KNOW THAT YOU KNOW
8 OR AND I CERTAINLY DON'T KNOW THE DETAILS, BUT IT SEEMS
9 TO ME IT WOULD BEHOVE US TO BE ON TOP OF IT AND WATCHING
10 IT. I UNDERSTAND THAT YESTERDAY A FEDERAL JUDGE MADE A
11 LANDMARK DECISION CLEARING THE WAY FOR OGDEN MARTIN, I
12 BELIEVE IT WAS, TO INCINERATE HAZARDOUS WASTE IN SAN
13 DIEGO COUNTY, I BELIEVE.

14 MR. STRICKLER: I'M NOT AWARE OF THAT, NO.

15 BOARD MEMBER GALLAGHER: I DON'T KNOW WHETHER THAT
16 INCLUDED HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE OR WHETHER IT WAS
17 SEWAGE SLUDGE OR WHATEVER IT WAS, BUT IT SEEMS TO ME WE
18 OUGHT TO BE UP-TO-DATE ON THAT, AND THIS MAY BE AN
19 OPPORTUNITY TO GET SOME INFORMATION OUT TO COMMUNITIES
20 IF, IN FACT, IT'S GOING TO INCLUDE HOUSEHOLD WASTE. AND
21 I THINK WE OUGHT TO KNOW WHAT THE RESULTS ARE GOING TO
22 BE.

23 MR. STRICKLER: THANK YOU. THAT'S A VERY TIMELY
24 COMMENT. THE TASKS NO. 11 AND 12 ON THE THING IS EXACTLY
25 ALONG THOSE LINES. IT'S DEVELOPMENT OF A HOUSEHOLD



1 HAZARDOUS WASTE INFORMATION PACKET AND THAT WE DO
2 PERIODIC MAILINGS. EVERY SIX MONTHS WE SHIP OUT TO THOSE
3 58 COUNTIES SOME CHANGES, SOME DIRECTIONS, ANY
4 INFORMATION THAT IS MAYBE VALUABLE TO THEM SO THEY CAN IN
5 TURN DISSEMINATE IT TO THE PUBLIC, TO THE COMMITTEES THAT
6 THEY CHAIR, FOR INSTANCE, ON NATURAL RESOURCES OR
7 ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY OR WHATEVER.

8 I REALLY SEE THAT AS A CONDUIT THAT THAT TYPE
9 OF INFORMATION REALLY SETS IN THERE WELL.

10 AND THEN THE LAST ITEM IS ON-SITE CONSULTATION
11 PROGRAM. AS OUR STAFF COMES UP TO SPEED -- AND I WANT TO
12 GUARANTEE YOU THAT WE'RE CERTAINLY NOT THE TECHNICAL
13 EXPERTS. I'LL NEED AWHILE TO COME UP TO SPEED AND LOOK
14 AT THE MATERIAL, BUT I CAN BE THERE AND I CAN PROBABLY BE
15 THERE IN NINE MONTHS OR A YEAR. OUR STAFF IS PRETTY MUCH
16 ON THE SAME LINE. WHEN WE GET THERE, WE'D LIKE TO COME
17 OUT AND LOOK AT SOMEBODY'S PROGRAM AND GET THEM SOMETHING
18 OR TELL THEM WHAT WE CAN AND CANNOT DO AT THIS POINT IN
19 TIME.

20 WE CAN'T DO IT WITH EVERYBODY. THERE ARE
21 BUDGET CONSTRICTIONS CERTAINLY. WE'D LIKE TO DEAL WITH
22 THE IMPORTANT ONES, THE ONES THAT WE CAN USE AS MODELS IN
23 OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY. WE'VE TALKED ABOUT THE
24 SMALLER COUNTIES. SMALLER COUNTIES HAVE UNIQUE PROBLEMS.
25 IN THIS PARTICULAR AREA, MIGHT BE ABLE TO GET A MODEL UP



1 FOR SMALLER COUNTIES VERSUS MEDIUM-SIZE OPERATIONS VERSUS
2 THE LARGE, URBAN OPERATIONS. SO THAT WOULD BE ON-SITE
3 CONSULTATION PURPOSE OF THAT.

4 I HAVE A TIMELINE IN YOUR PACKAGE. I'D LIKE
5 TO AT LEAST TO PUT IT UP SO THAT YOU CAN SEE SORT OF, AND
6 IT'S NOT THE MOST TECHNICAL TIMELINE YOU'VE EVER SEEN.

7 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: MS. BREMBERG HAS ANOTHER
8 QUESTION.

9 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: IN YOUR STATEMENT YOU SAID
10 THAT EVERY SIX MONTHS YOU PRESENTLY SEND OUT THINGS TO
11 COUNTY. DO YOU EVER TELL THEM TO SHARE THAT INFORMATION?
12 I MEAN I'M VIOTALLY INTERESTED IN THIS SUBJECT. WE ARE A
13 FULL SERVICE CITY AND I'M SURE WE'RE INCLUDED IN THE
14 MAILINGS. I'VE NEVER SEEN ONE.

15 MR. STRICKLER: I MISREPRESENTED MYSELF ALREADY.
16 WHAT I'M PROPOSING IS THAT WE DO GET UP A PERIODIC
17 MAILINGS EVERY SIX MONTHS. I DON'T KNOW THAT THAT'S BEEN
18 DONE. I UNDERSTAND THE NETWORK THAT SUE O'LEARY
19 DEVELOPED WAS VERY GOOD, BUT YOU HAD TO KNOW SUE AND YOU
20 HAD TO KNOW HER PHONE NUMBER AND SHE'D WORK REAL HARD FOR
21 YOU TO GET YOU AN ANSWER. I'D LIKE TO MAKE THAT A LITTLE
22 MORE FORMALIZED PROCESS AND MAIL IT OUT AND MAYBE EVEN
23 PRESENT IT SO IT COULD BE REDUPLICATED AND DISTRIBUTED.

24 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: THAT'S WHAT I'M SAYING.
25 MEMO TO PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR, HAZARDOUS WASTE



1 COORDINATOR, CITY COUNCILMEMBERS, SUPERVISORS, CITY
2 MANAGERS, COUNTY ADMINISTRATORS SO THAT MORE THAN ONE
3 PERSON WOULD READ IT AND FILE IT. IT DOES ABSOLUTELY NO
4 GOOD TO SAY I'VE WRITTEN TO 58 COUNTY PEOPLE IF NOT ONE
5 OTHER PERSON IN THE COUNTY KNOWS ABOUT IT AND THE
6 SERVICES THAT ARE AVAILABLE. I THINK IT'S A SUPER
7 PROGRAM, BUT THERE'S DETAILS THAT WILL MAKE IT MORE
8 SUCCESSFUL.

9 MR. STRICKLER: THAT'S OUR DATABASE. THE INTENT OF
10 THAT DATABASE IS TO SORT OF GET THAT GROUP OF FOLKS
11 TOGETHER, TO KNOW WHO THEY ARE. EVERYONE HAS A
12 DIFFERENT -- SOME PEOPLE ARE ONLY CONCERNED ABOUT THE
13 2448 GRANT MONEY. OTHER PEOPLE HAVE AN OPERATION AND
14 THEY WANT TO KNOW TECHNICAL INFORMATION. SO THAT DATA
15 BASE THING IS PRETTY IMPORTANT BECAUSE WE'LL HAVE TO BE
16 ABLE PULL THOSE DIFFERENT INTEREST GROUPS OUT AND SUPPLY
17 THAT INFORMATION TO THEM. THAT'S REALLY IMPORTANT.

18 AS FAR AS THE STAFFING GOES, I'D LIKE TO
19 CERTAINLY ANNOUNCE THAT WE HAVE ACQUIRED TWO NEW STAFF
20 PEOPLE. WE HAVE A CONTINGENT OF THREE PROFESSIONAL
21 PEOPLE WORKING ON HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE PROGRAMS
22 RIGHT NOW. THEY JOINED US THE FIRST PART OF THE MONTH.
23 WE WILL A FULL-TIME CLERICAL PERSON JOINING US NEXT
24 MONDAY, AND WE STILL HAVE ANOTHER POSITION AVAILABLE.

25 WE'RE ALL ON A LEARNING CURVE. IT'S A PRETTY



1 BIG LEARNING CURVING; BUT AS IT FLATTENS OUT, I THINK WE
2 WILL BE A REAL SOLID UNIT FOR YOU, AND YOU CAN HAVE REAL
3 CONFIDENCE IN DIRECTING REFERRALS TO US AND MAKE SURE
4 THAT THEY GET HANDLED.

5 BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN: I'M VERY HAPPY WITH
6 EVERYTHING I'M HEARING, ALL THE THINGS YOU'RE SAYING YOU
7 ARE DOING, BUT I HOPE THAT YOU DON'T LOSE SITE --
8 ALTHOUGH I HEARD YOU MENTION MANY TIMES CONCERNING THE
9 PUBLIC AWARENESS ASPECT, DO NOT IN ANY WAY GET CHINTZY IN
10 THAT AREA FINANCIALLY OR ANY OTHER WAY WITH TIME OR MONEY
11 AND BOTH BECAUSE NO MATTER HOW GOOD A PROGRAM WE CAN PUT
12 TOGETHER OR YOU CAN PUT TOGETHER, WHATEVER THE CITIES DO
13 AND ALL THIS TECHNICAL STUFF GOING ON, IT'S NOT GOING TO
14 BE IMPLEMENTED WITHOUT THE COOPERATION OF THE PUBLIC
15 BECAUSE WHEN IT HAS TO DO WITH HOUSEHOLDS, JUST BEAR IN
16 MIND YOU CAN HAVE THE BEST SYSTEM IN TOWN, BUT IF THE
17 PLAYERS DON'T PLAY, AND WE DON'T HAVE ANY WAY TO ENFORCE
18 THEM REALISTICALLY, WE BETTER DARN WELL MAKE SURE THAT
19 YOUR STRONGEST -- I DON'T SAY ONE OF THE STRONG, BUT THE
20 STRONGEST SHOULD BE THE PUBLIC AWARENESS TO GET THEIR
21 COOPERATION TO THE REST OF IT BECOMES IT'S WORTHLESS
22 WITHOUT THEIR PARTICIPATION.

23 SO IF YOU DON'T HAVE ENOUGH MONEY IN YOUR
24 BUDGET, YOU CAN USE ALL YOU CAN IN THAT DIRECTION, FIND A
25 WAY TO FUDGE IT OUT OF OTHER AREAS BECAUSE THAT ONE IS



1 THE KEY TO THE WHOLE THING. WITHOUT IT, YOU HAVE NOTHING
2 AND DON'T EVER LOSE SITE OF THAT AND FEEL LIKE THAT'S
3 JUST LIKE A LITTLE EXTRA WE'LL TALK TO THE PUBLIC.
4 THEY'RE THE WHOLE FACTOR. IF YOU CAN DO THEM WELL, YOU
5 ALMOST DON'T NEED ANYTHING ELSE BECAUSE THEY'RE THE ONES
6 THAT CAN MAKE IT ALL WORK.

7 MR. STRICKLER: IT'S SORT OF GETTING THE HORSE TO
8 GALLOP. IF YOU CAN ADDRESS THEIR CONCERNS AND GET THEM
9 ONBOARD, I CERTAINLY AGREE WITH YOU.

10 I WOULD LIKE TO KEEP THAT THOUGHT IN MIND, AND
11 I'VE COMPLETED MY PRESENTATION ON THE BOARD ON OUR PLAN
12 OF ACTION FOR THE NEXT YEAR, SEE IF THERE ANY OTHER
13 QUESTIONS FROM BOARD MEMBERS; AND IF THERE ARE NOT, I'D
14 LIKE TO USE THE BOARD MEMBERS COMMENTS AND INTRODUCE THE
15 PRESIDENT, CHRIS CAMPBELL, FROM CALIFORNIA PARTNERSHIPS
16 WHO IS DOING PILOT PROJECTS FOR PUBLIC AWARENESS ON
17 HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE AND GIVE HIS INPUT ON SOME OF
18 THE COMMENTS JUST MADE AND WHAT'S GOING ON DOWN THERE.

19 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: I'D LIKE TO ASK ONE QUESTION.
20 IN THE PROCESS OF YOUR INVESTIGATIONS, HAVE YOU TALKED
21 WITH ANY PEOPLE AT HAZARDOUS CONTRACTORS, FOR INSTANCE,
22 PUT ON SOME OF THESE -- DONE SOME OF THESE PROJECTS?

23 MR. STRICKLER: TO BE QUITE HONEST, NO, SIR, I HAVE
24 NOT. THEY ARE ON MY LIST TO MEET WITH AND FIND OUT HOW
25 OPERATIONALLY THESE THINGS HAPPEN. I THINK THAT THAT'S



1 AN EXCEEDINGLY IMPORTANT GROUP, NOT ONLY FOR THAT REASON,
2 BUT IT IS A -- IT'S A COMPONENT OF HOW THE THING ACTUALLY
3 HAPPENS. I'M A NUTS AND BOLTS KIND OF PERSON. THAT'S A
4 NUTS AND BOLTS ISSUE THAT I NEED TO FULLY UNDERSTAND.
5 WHEN I DO, I'LL CERTAINLY SHARE WITH ANYONE WHO IS
6 WILLING TO LISTEN TO ME.

7 WITH THAT, I'D LIKE TO INTRODUCE CHRIS
8 CAMPBELL, PRESIDENT OF CALIFORNIA PARTNERSHIPS. THANK
9 YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND ATTENTION.

10 MR. CAMPBELL: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, DAVID, MR.
11 CHAIR, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, BOARD STAFF. IT'S WITH REAL
12 PLEASURE THAT WE COME HERE TODAY TO GIVE YOU AN UPDATE
13 WITH REGARD TO THOSE ACTIVITIES WHICH WE HAVE CONTRACTED
14 WITH THE BOARD TO UNDERTAKE IN CONJUNCTION WITH
15 DEVELOPING PUBLIC AWARENESS PROGRAMS WITH RESPECT TO THE
16 ISSUE OF HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE.

17 AS YOU WILL RECALL, THIS PROJECT GREW OUT OF
18 THE WASTE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE WHICH THIS BOARD
19 SPONSORED LAST YEAR TO HELP HIGHLIGHT, IF YOU WILL, SOME
20 OF THE PUBLIC CONCERNS AND PUBLIC NEEDS WHICH EXIST WITH
21 REGARD TO THE OVERALL QUESTION OF WASTE MANAGEMENT.

22 A KEY FINDING OF THAT CONFERENCE WAS THAT IN
23 ORDER TO OBTAIN THE NECESSARY PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING WITH
24 REGARD TO THE DIMENSIONS OF THE WASTE PROBLEM, WE NEED TO
25 INCREASE PUBLIC AWARENESS. AND SO IN THAT CONTEXT, WE'VE



1 UNDERTAKEN, PURSUANT TO THE BOARD'S REQUEST, TO DEVELOP
2 PUBLIC/PRIVATE LINKAGES THAT WILL HELP TO LEVERAGE THE
3 VERY LIMITED RESOURCES. THOSE RESOURCES WHICH WERE MORE
4 LIMITED ORIGINALLY, WHICH SEEM TO BE GROWING NOW, WHICH I
5 THINK IS A SIGN TO THE GOOD, BUT TO DEVELOP A PARTNERSHIP
6 WHEREBY JURISDICTIONS COOPERATING WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF
7 THE PRIVATE SECTOR CAN HELP GET THE WORD OUT.

8 TO THAT END, WE'RE WORKING IN THREE COUNTIES
9 PLUS THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES RIGHT NOW. LOS ANGELES
10 CITY, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, ORANGE COUNTY, AND SAN
11 BERNARDINO COUNTY, AND LET ME VERY BRIEFLY GIVE YOU AN
12 UPDATE AS TO WHERE WE ARE.

13 THE MOST CURRENT PROGRAM IS ONE WHICH WILL BE
14 TAKING PLACE OR WILL BE KICKING OFF ON AUGUST 28TH WITH
15 REGARD TO LOS ANGELES COUNTY. IT WILL BE THE FIRST OF
16 FIVE COLLECTION PROGRAMS THAT THEY WILL BE UNDERTAKING
17 OVER THE PERIOD OF THE NEXT SEVERAL MONTHS. AND I HAVE
18 FOR YOU SOME LEAFLETS AND LET ME BRING THEM OVER HERE.

19 THESE LEAFLETS, PRODUCED BY THE COUNTY OF LOS
20 ANGELES, WILL BE DISTRIBUTED THROUGH A VARIETY OF RETAIL
21 LOCATIONS WITHIN THE FIRST PILOT AREA AND WILL BE
22 SIMILARLY DISTRIBUTED THROUGHOUT THE OTHER FOUR PILOT
23 AREAS WITHIN THE COURSE OF THE COUNTIES' PUBLIC EFFORT.

24 IF YOU WILL NOTE AT THE BOTTOM, WE WERE
25 SUCCESSFUL IN OBTAINING SUPPORT OF CHEVRON U.S.A. TO



1 PROVIDE, IN ADDITION TO THE BROCHURES WHICH ARE GOING TO
2 BE DISTRIBUTED, SOMEWHERE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD OF BETWEEN
3 2500 AND 5,000 COPIES OF THIS BOOK, "HAZARDOUS WASTE FROM
4 THE HOMES," WHICH WILL ALSO BE DISTRIBUTED TO PEOPLE WHO
5 BRING THEIR WASTE TO THE FACILITIES ON THE PARTICULAR
6 COLLECTION DAYS.

7 THESE BROCHURES WILL ALSO BE NOTED FOR THE
8 WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD'S PARTICIPATION IN CONJUNCTION
9 WITH PRIVATE SECTOR SPONSORSHIP. IN ADDITION TO THAT,
10 AND FOR THE FIRST KICKOFF PROGRAM, I'M REAL PLEASSED TO
11 ANNOUNCE TO YOU THAT 15,000 COPIES OF A BROCHURE SIMILAR
12 TO THE ONE YOU HAVE BEFORE YOU ARE BEING DISTRIBUTED OR
13 WILL BE DISTRIBUTED BY THE LOS VIRGINES WATER DISTRICT SO
14 THAT HOMEOWNERS WILL GET THE INFORMATION RIGHT IN THEIR
15 HANDS. RESIDENTS WILL GET THE INFORMATION RIGHT IN THEIR
16 HANDS.

17 THIS BEING THE FIRST PILOT EFFORT, LOS ANGELES
18 COUNTY COULD FIND ITSELF GOING OVER BUDGET VERY QUICKLY
19 IN TERMS OF THEIR RESPONSE. WE'RE VERY EXCITED THAT L.A.
20 COUNTY IS MOVING FORWARD. LOS ANGELES CITY IS SIMILARLY
21 MOVING FORWARD WITH THEIR FIRST TWO PILOT EFFORTS FOR
22 COUNCIL DISTRICTS NO. 1 AND 14.

23 WE'RE LOOKING TO PROVIDE SOME ASSISTANCE IN
24 THE WAY OF POSSIBLE VIDEO PRODUCTION FOR THEIR LARGER
25 COLLECTION PROGRAM THAT WILL TAKE PLACE PROBABLY SOMETIME



1 IN DECEMBER, AND WE'RE CONTINUING TO WORK WITH THEM ON
2 THAT.

3 WITH REGARD TO THE OTHER COUNTIES, SAN
4 BERNARDINO COUNTY, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY HAS
5 EXPRESSED ITS WILLINGNESS TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO SAN
6 BERNARDINO IN PUBLICIZING THEIR EXISTING COLLECTION
7 CENTER PROGRAMS. THEY HAVE FIVE COLLECTION CENTERS
8 ALREADY IN PLACE, AND THEY'LL BE CONDUCTING ONGOING
9 EFFORTS TO GET THE PUBLIC AND CITIZEN AT LARGE TO UTILIZE
10 THOSE FACILITIES.

11 A VARIETY OF OPTIONS ARE BEING EXPLORED. THEY
12 INCLUDE THE POSSIBLE USE OF DIRECT MAIL, THE POSSIBLE
13 UTILIZATION OF NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING, PROVIDING
14 ASSISTANCE TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ENTITY IN THE
15 PRODUCTION OF PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND ALSO A
16 VIDEO PRODUCT IS BEING EXPLORED. SOME COMBINATION OF
17 THOSE RESOURCES WILL BE UTILIZED, AND THE NEXT STEP
18 INVOLVES A MEETING BETWEEN REPRESENTATIVES FROM SOCAL ED
19 AND THE SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY REPRESENTATIVES TO FOCUS IN
20 ON EXACTLY WHAT THAT WILL BE.

21 FINALLY, WITH REGARD TO ORANGE COUNTY --

22 BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN: FOR A MOMENT ON THIS
23 BROCHURE, FOR PEOPLE OF LOS ANGELES TO GO TO CALABASAS
24 LANDFILL, ISN'T THAT A LITTLE UNREALISTIC?

25 MR. CAMPBELL: MR. ARAKALIAN, WHAT WE'LL BE DOING



1 OR I SHOULD SAY WHAT THE COUNTY IS DOING IS FIVE TARGETED
2 JURISDICTIONAL PROGRAMS. THEY WILL HAVE OTHER PROGRAMS
3 GOING ON THAT WILL BE IN THE PUENTE HILLS AREA, SPADRA
4 LANDFILL.

5 BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN: I UNDERSTAND. IF YOU ARE
6 GOING TO GO THAT FAR, THIS IS -- YOUR'RE NOT --

7 MR. CAMPBELL: IT'S ONLY IN THE CALABASAS REGION
8 OUT IN THE UNINCORPORATED --

9 BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN: I THOUGHT HE SAID L.A.
10 COUNTY. ALL OF THE CITY PEOPLE -- THAT'S GETTING A
11 LITTLE BIT --

12 MR. CAMPBELL: THERE WILL BE FIVE PILOT EFFORTS,
13 AND THE TARGET FOR THE COUNTY IS THE UNINCORPORATED AREAS
14 OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY WHICH ARE SERVICED BY THE --

15 BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN: THE SPOT FOR L.A.

16 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: WHAT ARE THE OTHER TWO YOU
17 SAID?

18 MR. CAMPBELL: SPADRA, PALOS VERDES, PUENTE HILLS,
19 AND SOUTHGATE.

20 AND, FINALLY, WITH REGARD TO ORANGE COUNTY,
21 GTE CALIFORNIA, THE CALIFORNIA SUBSIDIARY OF GENERAL
22 TELEPHONE AND ELECTRONICS, HAS AGREED OR I SHOULD SAY HAS
23 EXPRESSED ITS WILLINGNESS TO ASSIST THE COUNTY IN THE
24 PRODUCTION OF A VIDEO THAT WOULD ALSO HIGHLIGHT THE
25 ISSUES SURROUNDING HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE, ITS



1 HANDLING, ITS DISPOSAL.

2 OUT NEXT STEP WITH REGARD TO THAT PROJECT IS
3 TO, AGAIN, ARRANGE A MEETING WITH REGARD TO THE GTE
4 PRIVATE SECTOR AND THE ORANGE COUNTY PUBLIC SECTOR
5 REPRESENTATIVES TO PUT IT TOGETHER.

6 SO IN A NUTSHELL, WHAT WE'RE ATTEMPTING TO DO
7 AND THROUGH THIS CONTRACT HAVE BEEN ABLE TO DO IS WORK
8 WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR TO LEVERAGE,
9 IF YOU WILL, THE PUBLIC SECTOR WHICH HAVE FUNDED THIS
10 CONTRACT TO BRING IN RESOURCES WHICH WE BELIEVE WILL NOT
11 ONLY MORE THAN BALANCE OUT THE MONIES BEING EXPENDED FROM
12 A CONTRACT STANDPOINT, BUT WHICH WILL ALSO, HOPEFULLY,
13 SET A PRECEDENTIAL BASE UPON WHICH WE CAN THEN DEVELOP
14 FUTURE EFFORTS, NOT ONLY WITH THESE JURISDICTIONS, BUT
15 WITH OTHERS.

16 SO WITH THAT, I'D BE HAPPY TO ENTERTAIN ANY
17 QUESTIONS.

18 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS?

19 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: MR. BEAUTROW, JUST A
20 COMMENT. I KNOW IT'S NOT PART OF YOUR CONTRACT, BUT I
21 THINK IT WOULD BE VERY WISE IF YOU WOULD JUST SEND A DO
22 AND DO NOT SPEAK ON THIS ISSUE WITHOUT BEING
23 KNOWLEDGEABLE BECAUSE I WAS AT A BREAKFAST -- THE ONLY
24 REASON I'M INTERESTED IS I WAS AT A BREAKFAST AND MAN
25 FROM THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT STOOD UP



1 AND ANNOUNCED THAT SHOAL CANYON IN GLENDALE WAS GOING TO
2 BE ONE OF THESE THINGS, AND I KNEW NOTHING ABOUT IT AND
3 IT SURE GOT MY ATTENTION.

4 SO I BEHAVED MYSELF AND I DIDN'T HIT HIM. I
5 WENT BACK AND MADE A TELEPHONE CALL TO FIND OUT IF THIS
6 WERE TRUE. YEAH, THEY WERE CONSIDERING IT. I SAID,
7 "WELL, YOU KNOW, IT MIGHT BE A NICE GESTURE IF YOU TALK
8 TO US ABOUT IT."

9 SO IF YOU HAVE A SPEAKERS BUREAU, WHICH I
10 ASSUME WILL BE PART OF IT BECAUSE A LOT OF HOMEOWNERS
11 GROUPS AND A LOT OF CITIES ARE GOING TO WANT TO KNOW THE
12 NUTS AND BOLTS ON THIS PARTICULAR IN L.A. COUNTY WHEN
13 THIS STUFF REALLY GETS DISSEMINATED. GIVE THEM A LIST OF
14 DO NOTS.

15 MR. CAMPBELL: ONE OF THE BIG DO'S IS MAKE SURE
16 YOU'VE GOT YOUR FACTS STRAIGHT.

17 BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN: ON HERE, FOR EXAMPLE, YOU
18 CITE -- YOU NAME A FEW THINGS THAT AREN'T HAZARDOUS, YOU
19 KNOW, TO GIVE A PERSON AN IDEA WHAT PART OF THE HOUSE
20 THESE THINGS, THEN YOU LIST THESE THINGS HERE THAT THEY
21 COULD NOT TAKE PRESENTLY. WHAT -- DOES ASBESTOS FALL
22 INTO THIS CATEGORY OF WHAT THEY CAN TAKE?

23 MR. CAMPBELL: I'M NOT REALLY QUALIFIED TO COMMENT
24 ON THAT. THIS MATERIAL WAS PRODUCED EXCLUSIVELY UNDER
25 THE AUSPICES OF THE L.A. SANITATION DISTRICT.



1 BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN: THE REASON I ASK THAT IS
2 JUST THE LITTLE THINGS I HEAR, YOU KNOW, CONVERSATION
3 FROM PEOPLE, ASBESTOS SEEMS TO POSE A PROBLEM FOR
4 LAYPEOPLE AT HOME BECAUSE WHEN THEY DO WORK ON THEIR AIR
5 CONDITIONING OR DUCTS, IF THEY HAVE AN OLDER HOME THAT
6 HAS THE OLD ASBESTOS STUFF, THEY ALWAYS -- I CONTINUALLY
7 GET ASKED: "WHAT DO YOU DO WITH IT?"

8 ALL I'VE EVER SAID IS CALL SOME OF THESE --
9 CALL ONE OF THE LICENSED HAULERS TO GET RID OF IT FOR YOU
10 BECAUSE REALLY YOU KNOW ABOUT WHAT CHANCES ARE THAT
11 THEY'RE GOING TO DO THAT BECAUSE THAT'S SOMETHING THEY
12 GET A LOT OF ONLY BECAUSE IT'S ABOUT THE TIME AROUND NOW
13 THAT ALL THE OLD ASBESTOS ARE GETTING TIRED AND THERE'S A
14 LOT OF CHANGING GOING ON TO THE NEWER DUCT WORK. SO I
15 THINK THAT'S A THING THAT SHOULD LOOK INTO; AND THEN WHEN
16 YOU DO FIND A SOLUTION FOR IT, IF IT FALLS IN THIS
17 CATEGORY, IDENTIFY IT BECAUSE IT'S NOT A SMALL THING.
18 IT'S PRETTY GOOD SIZE ONE.

19 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: SAM, YOU BRING IN A GOOD
20 QUESTION HERE BECAUSE THERE'S A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF
21 THINGS -- THIS IS A MUCH MORE TECHNICAL AREA THAN THE
22 PEOPLE THAT STARTED OUT TO DO IT REALIZE. ASBESTOS WOULD
23 NOT BE TAKEN ON ONE OF THESE PROGRAMS. AS A MATTER OF
24 FACT, ASBESTOS IS PUT IN A SPECIAL CATEGORY THAT ONLY A
25 PERSON WITH A LICENSE TO HANDLE ASBESTOS CAN HANDLE IT.



1600 EAST FOURTH STREET, SUITE 220
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92701
TELEPHONE (714) 953-4447

Barristers'
reporting service

1 IT DOESN'T EVEN GO UNDER THE NORMAL HAZARDOUS WASTE
2 CONTRACTOR UNLESS HE HAS A SPECIAL LICENSE.

3 IF YOU START GETTING -- LIST ALL THE THINGS
4 THAT WOULDN'T BE TAKEN THERE, YOU PROBABLY WOULD HAVE A
5 PRETTY LARGE ONE. THAT'S ANOTHER REASON THAT BOTHERS ME
6 WHEN THEY START TALKING ABOUT COMINGLING THIS WITH SMALL
7 VOLUME GENERATORS BECAUSE THEY'RE GOING TO OPEN UP A CAN
8 OF WORMS. I THINK THEY NEED TO KEEP THE HOUSEHOLD
9 HAZARDOUS PROGRAM TO HOUSEHOLDS AND NOT AND ANY KIND OF
10 COMMERCIAL PEOPLE.

11 WHEN YOU GET INTO SMALL VOLUME GENERATORS, I
12 DON'T KNOW WHAT THEY'RE TALKING ABOUT BECAUSE HERE THEY
13 LIST FIVE -- IN ALL OF THE HOUSEHOLD PROGRAMS BECAUSE MY
14 COMPANY HAS RUN A NUMBER OF THEM, YOU ARE LIMITED TO A
15 5-GALLON LIMIT. WELL, THERE'S A LOT OF SMALL VOLUME
16 GENERATORS THAT WOULD PRODUCE A WHOLE LOT MORE THAN 5
17 GALLONS.

18 SO I THINK AS YOU GO ALONG, YOU ARE GOING TO
19 GET QUITE AN EDUCATION IN THIS FIELD OF TOXICS THAT --
20 BUT THAT WOULD BE MY SUGGESTION, BOTH TO THE LEGISLATIVE
21 AND TO THE ENFORCEMENT AND EVERYTHING ELSE, THAT THEY
22 KEEP THE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS PROGRAMS STRICTLY TO
23 HOUSEHOLDS AND THEN IT'S MORE UNDERSTANDABLE.

24 BOARD MEMBER ARAKALIAN: AGAIN, EVEN MORE SO NOW, I
25 SAY HERE WE ARE MEMBERS OF THIS BOARD AND WE PROBABLY



1600 EAST FOURTH STREET, SUITE 220
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92701
TELEPHONE (714) 953-4447

barristers'
reporting service

1 CAN'T GIVE YOU, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE MAN WHO'S IN
2 THE BUSINESS, REALLY A SENSIBLE SOLUTION OF HOW TO DO
3 THAT PARTICULAR ITEM I MENTIONED. HOW DO WE THEN EXPECT
4 THE LAYPERSON TO KNOW? I MEAN, WE DON'T KNOW AND WE'RE
5 SUPPOSED TO BE THE BIG PROS HERE. SO MAYBE THAT'S
6 SOMETHING WE SHOULD LOOK INTO, FIND OUT WHAT IT SHOULD
7 TAKE, AND FIND OUT HOW TO ADDRESS THAT SITUATION BECAUSE
8 I DO KNOW THAT IT IS A VERY POPULAR -- PROBABLY THE
9 PERSON WILL GET RID OF MORE OF THAT IN A YEAR'S TIME,
10 SAY, IN BULK THAN HE WILL MAYBE IN AN INSECTICIDE CAN.
11 WHEN THEY DO TEAR IT OFF, THEY'VE GOT SCADS OF THAT
12 STUFF.

13 MR. CAMPBELL: MR. ARAKALIAN, YOU MAKE A VERY GOOD
14 POINT AND I THINK IT GOES BACK TO DAVID STRICKLER'S
15 COMMENTS EARLIER WITH REGARD TO THE STATE OF THE PROGRAM
16 AND THE STATE OF RESOURCES WHICH HAVE BEEN AVAILABLE TO
17 THIS BOARD WITH REGARD TO THIS PARTICULAR ISSUE.

18 I WOULD NOTE THAT IN THE PERIOD SINCE MR.
19 STRICKLER HAS BEEN ON, WE HAVE FOUND A GREAT DEAL OF
20 ADDITIONAL RESPONSIVENESS AND ATTENTION TO DETAIL, WHICH
21 I THINK IS GOING TO SERVE THIS PROGRAM WELL AS IT
22 DEVELOPS AND AS THEY PUT THEIR STAFF ON-LINE. YOUR
23 COMMENTS PROVIDE A FOCAL POINT FOR ACTION.

24 IN ADDITION TO THAT, I BELIEVE THAT THIS IS,
25 INDEED, ONE OF THE GREATEST AREAS OF OPPORTUNITY WHICH



1 EXITS IN TERMS OF BRINGING HOME THE ISSUE OF OUR WASTE
2 MANAGEMENT, FOR WANT OF A BETTER TERM, FUTURE AS RELATES
3 TO THE NEED TO THE DEVELOP NEW FACILITIES, NEW SITES, NEW
4 APPROACHES IN HANDLING WASTE. SO I THINK THIS BOARD IS
5 IN A TREMENDOUS POSITION TO HAVE A TREMENDOUS INFLUENCE
6 ON PUBLIC POLICY AS WE MOVE INTO THE 1990S.

7 BOARD MEMBER VARNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, JUST A COUPLE
8 OTHER COMMENTS. ONE OF THEM THAT SAM BROUGHT UP AWHILE
9 AGO, THE THING ABOUT PUBLIC AWARENESS, AND THAT REALLY IS
10 GOING TO BE HIGHLY IMPORTANT IN THIS WHOLE ISSUE. BUT
11 FIRST, YOU BEING THE CONTRACTOR WHO'S GOING TO PUT THIS
12 OUT, IS GOING TO HAVE TO GET AN EDUCATION YOURSELF SO YOU
13 GIVE OUT CORRECT INFORMATION.

14 I WANT TO POINT OUT -- YOU KNOW, THEY TALK
15 ABOUT THESE CENTERS WHERE YOU BRING THE STUFF TO AND EVEN
16 WAS ALLUDED TO MAYBE COLLECTION SYSTEMS GOING AROUND TO
17 THE HOMES AND SO FORTH IS A VERY DANGEROUS CONCEPT, I
18 NOTICED IN YOUR -- WHOEVER PUT THIS BROCHURE OUT KNEW
19 WHAT THEY WERE DOING BECAUSE THERE'S A LITTLE UNDERLINED
20 THING THAT SAYS "DO NOT MIX SEPARATE PRODUCTS TOGETHER."
21 HIGHLY IMPORTANT.

22 YET, IN YOUR PICTURE HERE, THEY'VE GOT THEM
23 ALL MIXED UP, AND THAT'S WHERE THEY REAL DANGER COMES IN
24 WITH A LOT OF THE HOUSEHOLD CHEMICALS. THEY IN
25 THEMSELVES SOMETIMES ARE NOT HIGHLY DANGEROUS, BUT MIXED



1 TOGETHER CAN BECOME DEADLY. SO, YOU KNOW, THEY'RE
2 CONTRADICTING THEMSELVES WHEN THEY START TALKING ABOUT
3 THESE THEORETICAL PROGRAMS THAT REALLY IS MIXING
4 EVERYTHING TOGETHER, BUT THAT'S ONE THING YOU ABSOLUTELY
5 DON'T WANT TO DO. SO THERE HAS TO BE SOME KIND OF
6 INFORMATION PUT OUT SO THAT IT KEEPS THAT CLEARLY IN
7 FOCUS.

8 MR. CAMPBELL: I THINK THAT'S A GOOD POINT, AND
9 I'LL COMMUNICATE THAT OBSERVATION BACK TO THE COUNTY.

10 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: I WOULD SAY THAT THIS
11 PARTICULAR PIECE OF ADVERTISING IS ONE OF THE MOST
12 PROFESSIONAL THAT I'VE SEEN. YOU KNOW, THERE'S A LOT OF
13 THIS KIND OF MATERIAL THAT HAS BEEN DISTRIBUTED, SOME
14 GOOD, SOME NOT SO GOOD. THIS IS OF THE QUALITY, ASSUMING
15 THAT YOU TAILOR THE TEXT TO FIT ANYTHING, YOU COULD PUT
16 THIS IN TIME MAGAZINE OR SOMETHING AS FAR AS GETTING YOUR
17 ATTENTION. IT'S VERY VISUALLY ORIENTED. IT GETS THE
18 MESSAGE ACROSS.

19 MR. CAMPBELL: WE'VE BEEN VERY, VERY GRATIFIED BY
20 THE LEVEL OF PROFESSIONALISM.

21 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: I THINK IT IS PRETTY EVIDENT
22 THAT THE BOARD SUPPORTS THIS WHOLE CONCEPT AND PROGRAM
23 WHOLEHARTEDLY AND UNANIMOUSLY; AND ALTHOUGH THERE'S NO
24 ACTION TO BE TAKEN ON THIS ITEM FOR INFORMATION, WE'RE
25 GOING TO BE KEPT UP-TO-DATE AND PURSUE THIS.



1 MR. CAMPBELL: INASMUCH AS WE'RE HERE AS A POINT OF
2 INFORMATION, ONE INTRODUCTION I'D LIKE TO MAKE --

3 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: MAY I SAY SOMETHING BEFORE
4 YOU INTRODUCE SOMEBODY ELSE?

5 MR. CAMPBELL: OF COURSE.

6 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: EXCUE ME. TO FOLLOW UP ON
7 WHAT MR. VARNER SAID, WHICH IS TERRIBLY, TERRIBLY
8 IMPORTANT, WHEN WE DID OUR HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE
9 COLLECTION, WE HAD EVERY SUPERMARKET IN THE CITY OF
10 GLENDALE GOT A BRIGHT, BRIGHT COLORED FLIER IN THEIR
11 GROCERY SACK STATING WHERE IT WAS, ALL THE REGULAR
12 INFORMATION, BUT WE CANNOT ACCEPT AND IT LISTED THE
13 THINGS THAT WE COULD NOT, SO SAVE YOURSELF THE TROUBLE OF
14 CARRYING IT AND PUTTING IT IN YOUR TRUNK AND DRIVING IT
15 DOWN TO TAKE IT BACK HOME.

16 AND THAT MAY OR MAY NOT BE VALID, BUT IT
17 CERTAINLY DID WORK. IT SAVED A LOT OF TIME AND ENERGY ON
18 THE PART OF THE FOLKS BECAUSE IF THEY DID SHOW UP WITH
19 SOMETHING THAT WAS WRONG, THEN THEY WERE NOT ANGRY WHEN
20 TOLD WE WON'T TAKE IT BECAUSE IF THEY COME IN WITHOUT
21 KNOWING WHAT THEY CAN'T BRING, THEY'RE VERY, VERY UPSET
22 WHEN YOU TELL THEM TO TAKE IT BACK HOME. WHAT AM I
23 SUPPOSED TO DO WITH IT...AND THE MARKETS DID IT WITH A
24 CHEERFUL HEART, AND IT DIDN'T COST US ANYTHING EXCEPT
25 PRINTING UP THE LIST.



1 MR. CAMPBELL: THE MARKETS' HEARTS ARE SOMEWHAT
2 HEAVY THESE DAYS AS THEY'RE LOOKING INTO THE FACE OF A
3 POTENTIAL LAWSUIT WITH REGARD TO PROPOSITION 65. WE'VE
4 MADE INQUIRIES WITH RESPECT TO THE SUPERMARKET AND
5 THEY'VE GOT A LITTLE PROBLEM.

6 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: WE WENT TO THE LOCAL
7 MANAGERS. WE DID NOT GO THROUGH HEADQUARTERS. WE WENT
8 TO THE LOCAL MANAGERS AND EXPLAINED AS GOOD CITIZENS OF
9 THE COMMUNITY AND BEING SUPPORTED BY THE COMMUNITY AND,
10 GEE, WE'RE GLAD YOU ARE HERE, PUT THESE IN YOUR SACKS.

11 MR. CAMPBELL: ON THAT NOTE, I WOULD JUST ADD WE'RE
12 WORKING THAT ANGLE RIGHT NOW.

13 FINALLY, ONE INTRODUCTION. ASSISTING US IN
14 THIS PROJECT AND THE INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBLE FOR LOCAL
15 GOVERNMENT RELATION LIAISON PRIMARILY IS WITH ME TODAY,
16 FLEW UP FROM LOS ANGELES, MR. GREG FLETCHER FROM PATCO'S
17 COMMUNICATION. I JUST WANTED YOU TO SEE HIM SO YOU COULD
18 PUT A FACE TO A NAME.

19 AND WITH THAT, I WANT TO THANK YOU VERY MUCH
20 FOR YOUR QUESTIONS AND FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND YOUR
21 SUPPORT, AND WE'LL BE BACK AT YOU SOON WITH A CONTINUING
22 UPDATE.

23 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. GOING
24 BACK ON THE AGENDA, I WANT TO TELL YOU THAT ITEM 16 AND
25 17, WHICH HAVE TO DO WITH OUR CONTRACT FUNDS, BUDGET



1 CHANGE PROPOSALS, ARE GOING TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD
2 MEETING AS A BOARD, BUT WITHIN A COMMITTEE STRUCTURE.
3 WE'RE GOING TO START THAT AT 8 O'CLOCK IN THE MORNING,
4 AND THIS SESSION IS GOING TO STOP AT 3 O'CLOCK SINCE WE
5 HAVE THIS LANDFILL TASK FORCE COMMITTEE.

6 SO ARE WE READY TO GO TO --

7 MR. EOWAN: WE CAN GO TO ITEM NO. 18.

8 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: WE'LL PROCEED, THEN, WITH ITEM
9 NO. 18, DISPOSAL REGIONS IN L.A. COUNTY.

10 MR. OLDALL: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS PARTICULAR ITEM
11 CONCERNS A REPORT THAT CAME OUT OF AB 223 AND CALLED FOR
12 A JOINT STUDY, AND YOU WILL REMEMBER THAT WE'VE BEEN
13 WORKING CLOSELY WITH THE L.A. SAN DISTRICTS VIRTUALLY ALL
14 YEAR IN PUTTING TOGETHER A REPORT THAT DID COME TO THE
15 BOARD AT THE JUNE MEETING.

16 I THINK JOHN SMITH WILL BE HERE TO UPDATE THE
17 BOARD. WE WERE HOPING THAT SOMEONE FROM L.A. SAN WAS
18 GOING TO MAKE IT UP TODAY. WE JUST GOT A MESSAGE THT
19 THEY COULDN'T MAKE IT UP DUE TO THE PLANE SITUATIONS
20 AGAIN, BUT I THINK WE'VE BEEN WORKING CLOSELY WITH THEM
21 AND JOHN IS PREPARED TO CARRY ON WITH THE ITEM.

22 MR. SMITH: MR. CHAIRMAN AND BOARD MEMBERS, AT THE
23 JUNE MEETING THE DRAFT REPORT WAS DISCUSSED AND CONCERNS
24 OF BOARD STAFF AND MEMBERS WERE ALSO DISCUSSED AT THAT
25 MEETING. SINCE THE JUNE MEETING, BOARD STAFF AND COUNTY



1 SANITATION DISTRICT STAFF HAVE BEEN CAREFULLY LOOKING AT
2 THE CONCERNS THAT WERE RAISED.

3 WE ALSO -- THE DISTRICT ALSO HAD MET WITH
4 ASSEMBLYWOMAN TANNER OVER THE REPORT, AND THEY INDICATED
5 TO US THAT SHE DIDN'T HAVE ANY PROBLEMS WITH THE REPORT.

6 AFTER CAREFULLY LOOKING AT THE CONCERNS THAT
7 WERE EXPRESSED AND ALSO KEEPING IN MIND THE JULY 1
8 DEADLINE FOR THAT REPORT, STAFF FELT AND SANITATION
9 DISTRICT STAFF FELT THAT THE COMMENTS -- REALLY THAT THE
10 REPORT COULD STAND AS IT WAS.

11 BOARD STAFF, HOWEVER, FELT THAT THE CONCERNS
12 THAT WERE EXPRESSED BY THE BOARD ARE SUGGESTING SOME
13 FUTURE STUDY AREAS FOR THE L.A. REGIONS. THOSE FUTURE
14 STUDY AREAS THAT WERE SUGGESTED BY THESE COMMENTS IN THE
15 REPORT WERE THAT A STUDY BE DONE TO DETERMINE THE MAXIMUM
16 PERCENTAGE OF WASTE THAT CAN BE DIVERTED THROUGH -- FROM
17 LANDFILLS THROUGH WASTE-TO-ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES. A
18 PERCENT OF 23 WAS INDICATED IN THE REPORT.

19 I THINK A FUTURE STUDY WOULD GIVE US A BETTER
20 NUMBER ON THAT. I THINK THE STUDY ALSO SEEMED TO SUGGEST
21 THAT THE TRUE WASTE DIVERSION POTENTIAL FOR MATERIAL
22 RECOVERY PROGRAMS FOR THE COMMERCIAL WASTE STREAM NEEDS
23 TO BE LOOKED AT. AND I THINK THE OTHER AREA THAT NEEDS
24 TO BE LOOKED AT IS -- WOULD BE THE BEST METHODS FOR
25 ENSURING THAT RESPONSIBLE LOCAL DECISIONS BE MADE ON THE



1 FUTURE SITING OF FACILITIES.

2 AND A LAST FUTURE AREA OF STUDY WOULD BE THE
3 ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS CAUSED BY THE
4 CONTINUING CONSOLIDATION OF FACILITIES IN THE REGION AND
5 THE PREMATURE CLOSING OF EXISTING SITES.

6 STAFF WOULD RECOMMEND THAT THIS REPORT, AS
7 SUBMITTED, BE SENT TO THE LEGISLATURE. WE'D ALSO ASK
8 THAT BOARD STAFF BE DIRECTED TO PREPARE A LETTER TO
9 ASSEMBLYWOMAN TANNER OUTLINING THESE FUTURE STUDY AREAS.

10 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: IS THERE ANY COMMENTS?

11 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: JOHN, I AGREE THAT THIS
12 SHOULD BE SENT OVER BECAUSE THE BASIC INFORMATION IS, YOU
13 KNOW, JUST FINE EXCEPT THAT I THINK YOU SHOULD GIVE A
14 CAVEAT TO ASSEMBLYWOMAN TANNER IN THAT SOME OF THIS DATA
15 IS WAY OUTDATED, AND I'M LOOKING AT POPULATIONS AND SO
16 FORTH. FOR INSTANCE, THE CITY OF GLENDALE IS MORE THAN
17 20,000 FOLKS SHORT, SO THE GENERATION OF SOLID WASTE
18 WOULD GO UP. AND I KNOW THAT BURBANK'S FIGURES ARE
19 WRONG, LA CANADA'S FIGURES ARE WRONG. I KNOW THEY GO UP
20 INCREMENTALLY, BUT THE PROBLEM IS ALSO GOING UP
21 INCREMENTALLY.

22 I'M SURE THAT SHE IS VERY MUCH AWARE OF THE
23 FACT THAT THE CITIES IN HER DISTRICT ARE NOT REMAINING
24 STAGNANT AND THAT ALL THE REST OF THEM SO THAT THE
25 PROBLEM AND THE AMOUNT OF WASTE GENERATED IS GOING UP AT



1 AN ALARMING RATE. AND I'M SURE SHE UNDERSTANDS THAT; BUT
2 WHEN YOU SEE IT PRINTED, THOSE FIGURES TEND TO GET LOCKED
3 IN. AND I'M SURE THAT NO ONE WANTS TO MAKE THE MISTAKE
4 OF THINKING THAT THE PROBLEM IS STAGNANT. THANK YOU.

5 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: ANY OTHER COMMENTS? I NOTICE
6 THAT IT SAYS THE SOURCES OF INFORMATION ARE THE SURVEYS
7 BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND THE SAN DISTRICT
8 BACK IN '87 AND THEY COMPOSITED THE RESULTS.

9 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: THEY PRINTED THEM AS '88.

10 MR. SMITH: LATE '87.

11 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: SO THE FOUR RECOMMENDATIONS
12 WERE LISTED UP THERE IN THIS -- WELL, THERE WAS A
13 NUMBER --

14 MR. SMITH: VARIOUS STUDY AREAS.

15 MR. OLDALL: THEY'RE IDENTIFIED ON PAGE 333.

16 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: -- ON PAGE 333, AND I GUESS
17 THAT ABSENT ANY NEGATIVES, I DON'T GUESS WE NEED TO VOTE
18 ON IT. DO WE ALL CONCUR THAT THE BOARD ACCEPT THIS
19 REPORT AND REFER IT TO LEGISLATURE AND DIRECT STAFF TO
20 PREPARE THE LETTER TO ASSEMBLYWOMAN TANNER?

21 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: WITH THE VARIOUS CAVEATS.

22 MR. OLDALL: WITH MS. BREMBERG'S STATEMENT, SURE.
23 SO WE SHALL DO IT.

24 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: NO OBJECTION, WE WILL DO IT.

25 MR. SMITH: THANK YOU.



1 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: WE'VE HAVE GOT ONE MORE ITEM, I
2 THINK, THAT WE CAN HANDLE BEFORE WE HAVE TO ADJOURN, NO.
3 20. THEN I KNOW JOELLEN WANTED TO HAVE A MINUTE WITH US
4 BEFORE RECYCLING MARKETS. MR. RELLIS IS HERE I SEE.

5 MR. RELLIS: MR. BEAUTROW AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD,
6 I'M PLEASSED THAT THE SUMMARY OF THE MARKETS CONFERENCE IS
7 BEFORE YOU, AND I BELIEVE, IF ACCEPTED, IT WILL BE
8 PUBLISHED BY YOUR BOARD AND DISTRIBUTED BROADLY, WE HOPE.

9 MANY OF THE ISSUES TAKEN UP AT THAT CONFERENCE
10 ARE NOW -- HAVE WORKED THEIR WAY BACK INTO WASHINGTON,
11 AND THE COMMERCE DEPARTMENT THERE IS PERSUING THE MARKET
12 QUESTION VIGOROUSLY AND SO IS THE CONGRESS OFFICE OF
13 TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT, BUT MARKETS REMAIN THE CENTRAL
14 QUESTION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF RECYCLING IN CALIFORNIA.
15 AND IT'S HOPED THAT THAT INFORMATION GENERATED OUT OF THE
16 CONFERENCE WILL BE OF USE THROUGHOUT THE STATE. THAT'S
17 ALL I REALLY HAVE TO SAY.

18 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: IS THERE ANY OTHER QUESTIONS OF
19 MR. RELLIS? COMMENTS?

20 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: WERE YOU HERE WHEN WE WENT
21 THROUGH THE MARKET THING THIS MORNING?

22 MR. RELLIS: NO, I WASN'T.

23 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: MAYBE WE SHOULD GIVE YOU A
24 COPY OF THE QUARTERLY MARKETING REPORT. IT WILL RATTLE
25 YOUR CAGE A LITTLE.



1 MR. RELLIS: I'D BE GLAD TO SEE IT. I HAVE NO IDEA
2 WHAT'S BEING REFERRED TO.

3 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: QUARTERLY MARKET REPORT ON
4 RECYCLABLES.

5 MR. RELLIS: MARKETS ARE DOWN AND GOING DOWN.

6 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: THAT'S WHAT IT SHOWED.

7 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: IN OTHER WORDS, THE CURVES ARE
8 GOING DOWNWARD FOR VARIOUS REASONS.

9 ANY OTHER QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS? OKAY. WE
10 NEED TO ACCEPT THIS REPORT FOR DISTRIBUTION.

11 BOARD MEMBER BREMBERG: SO MOVED.

12 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: SECOND.

13 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED.
14 ANY OBJECTIONS? SO ORDERED.

15 MR. RELLIS: THANK YOU.

16 CHAIRMAN BEAUTROW: THANKS, MR. RELLIS. SO WE'LL
17 RECONVENE THE BOARD MEETING TO 9 O'CLOCK TOMORROW MORNING
18 WHEN WE OFFICIALLY NOTICE; HOWEVER, AS I MENTIONED
19 EARLIER, WE ARE GOING TO START AT EIGHT WITH A COMMITTEE
20 STRUCTURE AND THERE WILL BE A QUORUM OF THE BOARD
21 PRESENT, SO IT IS AN OPEN MEETING.

22 THAT WILL CONCLUDE THE ACTIVITIES FOR THIS
23 DAY. WE'RE ALSO GOING TO AT 3 O'CLOCK HAVE THIS TASK
24 FORCE TO DISCUSS THE LANDFILL COSTS.

25 BUT BEFORE WE QUIT, COULD WE HEAR JOELLEN?



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

YOU HAVE SOME REMARKS ON -- JUST INFORMALLY.

SO WE'LL ADJOURN THEN TILL 8 O'CLOCK IN THE
MORNING -- RECESS.

(END OF PROCEEDINGS.)



1600 EAST FOURTH STREET, SUITE 220
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92701
TELEPHONE (714) 953-4447

barristers'
reporting service


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

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, BETH C. DRAIN, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT ON THE 11TH DAY OF AUGUST 1988, I DID REPORT IN SHORTHAND THE TESTIMONY AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE FOREGOING HEARING; THAT AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER, I DID TRANSCRIBE MY SHORTHAND NOTES INTO TYPEWRITING; AND THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES THEREOF.

Beth C. Drain
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER

CERTIFICATE NO. 7152



1600 EAST FOURTH STREET, SUITE 220
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92701
TELEPHONE (714) 953-4447

Barristers'
reporting service