

MEETING  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD  
LOCAL ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

--o0o--

COPY

BOARD ROOM  
8800 CAL CENTER DRIVE  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

--o0o--

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1995

9:00 A.M.

--o0o--

Vicki L. Medeiros, C.S.R.

License No. 7871

A P P E A R A N C E S

--o0o--

WESLEY CHESBRO, Committee Chairman  
Board Member

ROBERT C. FRAZEE, Board Member

JANET GOTCH, Board Member

I N D E X

--o0o--

	<u>Page</u>
Proceedings	1
Call to order and roll call	1
Agenda Item 1	1
Agenda Item 2	5
Agenda Item 3	14
Agenda Item 4	15
Agenda Item 5	26
Agenda Item 20	39
Adjournment	46
Certificate of Reporter	47

--o0o--

P R O C E E D I N G S

--o0o--

1  
2  
3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Good morning. This  
4 is the meeting of the Local Assistance and Planning  
5 Committee.

6 I know there was a reason we decided to meet at  
7 9:00 on Monday morning. I'm not sure what it was, but  
8 congratulations for all being here.

9 Let's begin by calling the roll.

10 MS. MARSH: Board Members Frazee.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Here.

12 MS. MARSH: Gotch.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: Here.

14 MS. MARSH: Chairman Chesbro.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Here.

16 The first item is a report by Judy Friedman on the  
17 waste activities -- excuse me, from the Diversion Planning  
18 and Local Assistance Division.

19 MS. FRIEDMAN: Good morning, Chairman Chesbro and  
20 Committee Members.

21 This item is an update on some of the major  
22 activities of the Diversion Planning and Local Assistance  
23 Division. In this report, I will also provide an update on  
24 the status of any other Agenda Item within this Agenda.

25 First, local plans, elements of sixteen

1 jurisdictions are on today's Agenda, a combination of SRREs,  
2 HHWEs and the NDFEs, and this represents 17 individual  
3 elements. To date, the Board has considered 394 SRREs, has  
4 approved 331 of those, conditionally approved 55 and  
5 disapproved 8.

6 If the Board adopts staff's recommendations, after  
7 this month's Board meeting, the Board will have approved 335  
8 SRREs, conditionally approved 55 and disapproved 8, and that  
9 represents approximately a 98 percent approval or  
10 conditional approval rate and a 2 percent disapproved rate.

11 Next month we anticipate bringing the planning  
12 documents for approximately 15 jurisdictions before the  
13 Committee.

14 This month we assisted jurisdictions throughout  
15 the State on issues such as cooperation in the countywide  
16 siting elements and summary plans, submittal of waste  
17 management planning documents, regional agencies' annual  
18 reports in measuring goal achievement and petitions for  
19 reductions in the goals.

20 Other planning issues, the fifth addition of  
21 Infocycling was prepared and mailed out to interested  
22 parties this month. Staff participated on a panel at the  
23 League of California Cities Annual Conference, in San  
24 Francisco, and at the Southern California Association of  
25 Governments Task Force on Alternative Waste Management

1 Strategies, and our participation was received positively at  
2 both events.

3 The staff is continuing to expedite the review  
4 process for the siting element summary plan of the  
5 Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan for Orange  
6 County and local jurisdiction elements for the cities in  
7 Orange County.

8 Staff met with the Office of Emergency Services  
9 staff to discuss procedures for local governments to follow  
10 in requesting financial and technical assistance after a  
11 disaster related to -- management programs. The  
12 November/December issue of MSW Management Magazine is now on  
13 the shelf in stores everywhere.

14 - It contains an article, written by Nancy Car, of  
15 the Waste Characterization Analysis Branch, entitled  
16 "California's New Waste Characterization Method and  
17 Database." The Board offers the tools to help local  
18 governments meet diversion goals.

19 There has been a lot of interest in the methods,  
20 and we feel it will be an excellent planning tool for the  
21 Board, local jurisdictions and industry.

22 The Board announcement, information of  
23 regulations, the Board adopted the proposed adjustment  
24 method of regulations at their October 24, 1995 meeting, and  
25 the regulations will be submitted to OAL for review and

1 final approval in this month. If approved, the regulations  
2 will be effective by January 1, 1996.

3 Used Oil and Household Hazardous Waste, the total  
4 number of certified centers as of October 31, 1995, we have  
5 1,494 certified centers, 408 industrial generators, 57  
6 curbside programs and one electric utility.

7 Since September 1, or the last couple of months,  
8 we have certified 174 centers. We have recertified 17. We  
9 have registered 8 industrial generators and 1 curbside  
10 program.

11 Conference flyers for the first Statewide  
12 Household Hazardous Waste conference, to be held in  
13 February, were mailed out this last month; and 71 of the 162  
14 first cycle and second cycle Block Grants have been closed  
15 out; and 65 Household Hazardous Waste discretionary grant  
16 applications continue to be reviewed and will be completed  
17 by early November.

18 We have completed the 1995 Used Oil Recycling Rate  
19 Bi-Annual Report. This report represents 30 months of oil  
20 sales and recycling data from January 1993 through June 1995  
21 and is required to be produced bi-annually.

22 In this period, 62 million gallons of used oil was  
23 re-generated, and the adjusted recycling rate is 61 percent  
24 for that period.

25 Public Education and Programs Implementation, 38

1 new sites have been added to the Project Recycle. Staff has  
2 provided technical assistance and guidance in the start-up  
3 of these new recycling programs.

4 These sites include CalTrans maintenance stations,  
5 community colleges and State offices. Staff is working with  
6 Cabrillo College on a composting project, and we will be  
7 meeting with representatives of the college on November 27,  
8 this month.

9 The California Conservation Corps has requested  
10 assistance in starting up recycling programs at 14  
11 residential centers.

12 This concludes my report. There are no updates on  
13 today's Agenda Items that I am responsible for.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Thank you very much.

15 That's always a fun part of the Committee Agenda  
16 is to hear a little bit of the progress that we are making  
17 on so many fronts.

18 And speaking of which, we are going to hear now  
19 from Dan Gorfain on Waste Prevention activities of the Waste  
20 Prevention and Market Development Division.

21 Mr. Gorfain, good morning.

22 MR. GORFAIN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and  
23 Members of the Committee.

24 Steve Osterheim-Smith and Tom Estes, of the CIWMB  
25 staff, met with approximately 115 environmental

1 professionals and participated -- and along participated in  
2 an environmental design Charrette at the National Park  
3 Service Presidio facility, in San Francisco, in October.

4 The goal at the Presidio EDC, Environmental Design  
5 Charrette, is to translate a few of the President's Council  
6 on Sustainable Development Task Force policy statements into  
7 operational objectives which relate directly to communities  
8 within the San Francisco/Bay Area.

9 The Charrette focused on developing small-scale  
10 demonstration projects at the Presidio for each of the six  
11 issue areas, two of which were construction and demolition  
12 and organics.

13 The goal of each demonstration is to create a  
14 hands-on experience for visitors that will convey an  
15 understanding of the issues of sustainability in each of the  
16 six issue areas. At the end of the three intensive days of  
17 work, detailed plans were presented for specific activities  
18 the MPS should pursue in three time frames: present to one  
19 year; one to three years; and beyond three years.

20 It was agreed that all of this is a productive  
21 effort and that the group must stay involved to assist in  
22 completion of the plan's development. Staff will be working  
23 with the MPS staff to continue on that score.

24 Jeff Hunts, of the Waste Prevention and Program  
25 Development Section, is heading up the video portion of the

1 Agricultural Compost Use Program. Jeff spent October 30 and  
2 31 on the road with the video contractors, CSUS, filming  
3 cotton harvest, wine grape harvest, crushing and composting  
4 in Livermore, at Wente Brothers Winery, and interviewing key  
5 project participants.

6 Additional filming is scheduled for later this  
7 year, this winter, in coastal areas and in early spring for  
8 other inland sites.

9 The Board's Internet Web Home Page -- I can't talk  
10 this morning. I'm sorry.

11 The Board's Internet Web Home Page debut will be  
12 backed out by Waste Prevention World, the on-line version of  
13 the waste prevention information exchange. Through this Web  
14 site, browsers can obtain or will be able to obtain waste  
15 prevention information on a variety of topics, ranging from  
16 xeroscaping to xerographic toner cartridges.

17 Local waste reduction coordinators can view  
18 educational materials, order publications electronically and  
19 even download clip art images for use in their development  
20 of their own educational materials.

21 The Board's managers group saw a bit of a  
22 demonstration of some of the capabilities last Friday. It  
23 was very impressive, and hopefully, we will have wide-spread  
24 use over time.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Will it be to the

1 point anytime soon where we can have a demonstration like  
2 that at a Committee meeting?

3 MR. GORFAIN: I'm sure something like that can be  
4 arranged.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I'm not sure if it's  
6 ready for prime time, but what it is, it would be nice to  
7 see it.

8 MR. GORFAIN: Absolutely.

9 The staff was contacted by the City of the Davis  
10 to assist them with the placement of the CIWMB's backyard  
11 composting video within the Blockbuster Video stores, in  
12 Davis. In contacting Blockbuster, CIWMB staff found that in  
13 order to place the video in one store, all of the  
14 Blockbuster stores statewide would have to have a copy.

15 Even playing field, I suppose.

16 This was seen as a very beneficial thing, and so,  
17 staff began contacting other major video chains as well,  
18 within California, such as Hollywood Video, Warehouse Video  
19 and the like.

20 Staff will continue to work within the chain  
21 stores to determine what their criteria are for approval of  
22 distribution of this type of material.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Is Blockbuster going  
24 to offer it as one of those free educational videos, or is  
25 it going to be for rent?

1 I know they have a section where they --

2 MR. GORFAIN: I can't tell you the answer to that,  
3 but I suspect that it's going to be available -- well, it  
4 could be available either way, depending on who pays for the  
5 video in the first place.

6 Which gets me to that point of the current  
7 obstacle that staff sees running up against is determining a  
8 mechanism to pay for these videos. They cost approximately  
9 two dollars per tape.

10 Staff is available -- is being creative or trying  
11 to be creative in getting sponsorships to pay for the  
12 dubbing and printing of jackets and for the tapes  
13 themselves. We will keep you informed of progress in this  
14 regard.

15 As part of the Board's waste prevention efforts,  
16 staff have been working through local governments to promote  
17 on-site composting. The staff prepared many materials which  
18 comprised a composting information kit to assist local  
19 governments in that regard.

20 Staff's newest project compliments local  
21 government efforts and expands into University of California  
22 Extension Master Gardener Program.

23 Applications for a one-time funding to train  
24 community volunteers to teach home composting and home  
25 composting workshops was distributed to all University of

1 California Cooperative Extensions. Further, the funding  
2 addresses the development of volunteer composting  
3 instructors, which is one area in which further efforts are  
4 needed to encourage composting.

5 These instructors will operate similar to the  
6 Master Gardeners and will be trained on how to teach  
7 composting and then go into communities and pursue that  
8 teaching. Funding for this program is through the DDB  
9 Needham Public-Private Partnership contract.

10 Funds are being directed through the Cooperative  
11 Extensions, working in concert with local governments and  
12 private businesses. Staff is reviewing applications and  
13 will update you as appropriate.

14 Last item is that several months of staff and  
15 contractor effort culminated three separate waste reduction  
16 training sessions in San Jose, Carson and Riverside. These  
17 sessions attended by local businesses, local government and  
18 representatives of nonprofits were well received.

19 Carson attendees included Northrop, Mitsubishi  
20 Electric, Edison, CSU Northridge, three people from the City  
21 of Los Angeles, Compton and so forth.

22 Riverside had a larger portion of local government  
23 representatives, as well as a bank and other businesses in  
24 the hauler waste district people, who are very interested  
25 and enthusiastic about learning and helping businesses to

1 reduce waste.

2 We will continue to fine-tune the participants  
3 handbook and training manual based on these sessions.

4 Evaluation of the sessions were very positive.

5 The facility tour walk-through sessions were  
6 well-received by those attending as well. CSU Northridge  
7 and others expressed interest in providing additional  
8 training sessions.

9 We will be hosting a trainer session here on  
10 November 27, of this year.

11 That completes my report.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: On the subject of the  
14 distribution of the videos, have you looked at public  
15 libraries as a means of the clippings?

16 MR. GORFAIN: We don't believe staff looked at  
17 public libraries, but that's an excellent suggestion.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: I know the one's in our  
19 area do video check-outs, and that would be a good place,  
20 perhaps even better than the commercial stores, to get the  
21 material out.

22 MR. GORFAIN: We will certainly pursue that  
23 excellent point.

24 Thanks.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I'm very excited

1 about the progress with the waste prevention.

2 We have struggled on a lot of fronts to get it to  
3 the top of the hierarchy where it belongs, and I'm glad to  
4 see that it's moving forward and that there has been a good  
5 response.

6 I participated with a number of the staff in  
7 Sacramento the other day in the workshop and kick-off for  
8 the Sacramento Valley Chapter of the Recycled Paper  
9 Coalition, and there was a really great turnout of  
10 businesses, and interestingly, the main focus of that effort  
11 is market development for procurement and also getting  
12 collection going, recycled paper going, but there was a lot  
13 of talk about waste prevention as well.

14 I think business has quickly moved to the  
15 bottomline and figured out that if you give them a few more  
16 hints about reducing the actual consumption then that  
17 quickly develops as a very cost effective technique and  
18 takes on momentum.

19 MR. GORFAIN: I think it's important to note that  
20 you are right that the Recycled Paper Coalition is being,  
21 the Sacramento Valley Chapter is being established as part  
22 of the Market Development Program and is part of the Project  
23 Buy Recycled strategy, the alliances that we are forming to  
24 stimulate buying recycled, but as part of that and the  
25 concept of the alliance is built around the notion that in

1 order to make the whole loop function one has to combine  
2 awareness and action in the areas of waste prevention,  
3 recycling and buy recycled and involve local government in  
4 the process.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Once again,  
6 challenging us to be the Integrated Waste Management Board  
7 to illustrate that we can deal with all of these things in  
8 the same discussion.

9 I think businesses don't see the dividing line.  
10 They are interested in figuring out how to set up a  
11 comprehensive system.

12 MR. GORFAIN: That's right.

13 We are going to start folding some of your other  
14 Board programs, such as the WRAP Program, in our own  
15 in-house waste prevention program results. There is  
16 marketing tools for showing businesses, demonstrating to  
17 businesses and having businesses demonstrate to other  
18 businesses that, in fact, there are monetary benefits, which  
19 always appeals to businesses in doing those three things  
20 together.

21 The other thing I wanted to mention is that for  
22 the first time as part of the Annual Report for 1995, we  
23 will have a separate section on waste prevention. As you  
24 may know, in the Annual Report we are going to have progress  
25 reports for several areas.

1 Waste prevention will have its own slot this time.  
2 So, we are definitely working to raise the profile of the  
3 top of the hierarchy.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Any questions for  
5 either Judy or Dan?

6 Thank you for the presentation.

7 We will move to the Consent Agenda.

8 I failed to mention that there are speaker forms  
9 in the back of the room. That's an important consideration  
10 if there is a Consent Agenda Item you are interested in  
11 commenting on.

12 So, at this point I would obviously accept anyone  
13 waiving their hand at me if there is something they want  
14 pulled.

15 The Consent Agenda is available at the back of the  
16 room, and the purpose of this process is to streamline the  
17 Board's consideration of local planning documents.

18 Again, I think having so many of them on Consent  
19 is a positive reflection on both the constructive efforts of  
20 local governments to get good documents before the Board and  
21 also good work by our staff to work with them and get the  
22 issues ironed out before they come before us.

23 As you can see, it's a pretty simple Committee  
24 Agenda this month, because of the fact that most of the  
25 items are on Consent. The items that are all listed for

1 Consent are Items 6, 8 through 19.

2 I entertain any requests to remove any items from  
3 the Committee or from the public.

4 There are none.

5 I'll ask for a motion.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Move approval.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: I second.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: The motion is to  
9 approve the Consent Agenda and forward it to the Board's  
10 Consent Agenda.

11 Call the roll, please.

12 MS. MARSH: Committee Members Frazee.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Aye.

14 MS. MARSH: Gotch.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: Aye.

16 MS. MARSH: Chairman Chesbro.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Aye.

18 The motion carries.

19 Agenda Item 4 is consideration of the Scoring  
20 Criteria and Process for the 1996/97 Local Government Used  
21 Oil Opportunity Grant Program.

22 Who is going to do this?

23 MS. FRIEDMAN: I will start that.

24 At the July 27, 1994 meeting, the Board approved a  
25 new process for awarding grants. At the beginning of each

1 grant cycle, the appropriate policy committee and full Board  
2 established its scoring criteria and ranking process that  
3 will be used to evaluate grant applications.

4 At this time, I would like to introduce Carol  
5 Mortensen and Nora Keenan, of the Used Oil Grant Program.  
6 Carol will present Agenda Item 4, consideration of the  
7 proposed Scoring Criteria and Ranking Process for the 1996  
8 Local Government Used Oil Opportunity Grant Program, and  
9 Nora will present Agenda Item 5, consideration of the  
10 proposed Scoring Criteria and Evaluation Process for the  
11 1996/97 Used Oil Grant for Nonprofit Organizations.

12 MS. MORTENSEN: Good morning. My name is Carol  
13 Mortensen, from the Used Oil Recycling Programs Grants  
14 Section.

15 The item before you this morning asks for your  
16 consideration of the evaluation process and scoring criteria  
17 for the 1996 Used Oil Opportunity Grant. The Opportunity  
18 Grant is one of the two main grants that the Used Oil  
19 Program offers to local governments.

20 The other grant, the Block Grant, is a  
21 non-competitive grant which uses per capita based funding.  
22 The Opportunity grant is competitive, open to all local  
23 governments and provides funds for cities or counties to  
24 establish used oil recycling opportunities in their  
25 communities.

1           These grants are particularly beneficial to  
2 smaller jurisdictions who are not eligible for large awards  
3 through the per capita based funding system of the Block  
4 Grants. The Opportunity Grant also allows the level of  
5 funding often necessary to jump-start new or expand existing  
6 used oil collection programs.

7           Funding levels for the Opportunity Grant are ideal  
8 for setting up the infrastructure necessary to implement  
9 successful sustainable used oil recycling programs.

10           Major expenditures often associated with new or  
11 expanded programs, such as retrofitting vehicles for  
12 curbside collection of used oil, the oil portion of  
13 permanent collection facilities and collection tanks, are  
14 common uses of Opportunity Grant funds.

15           The criteria before you today are for the third  
16 cycle Opportunity Grant. In the first cycle, awarded in May  
17 of 1993, we funded 54 applications, for \$8.3 million. The  
18 second cycle was awarded in May of this year to 62  
19 applicants, for another \$8.3 million.

20           As I mentioned before, these funds are being used  
21 to establish or expand collection opportunities. For  
22 example, the County of Sacramento used funds from the first  
23 cycle Opportunity Grant to fund the oil portion of two new  
24 battery, oil and paint collection facilities at their  
25 transfer stations.

1           The County of San Diego is using their second  
2 cycle funds to establish new curbside collection routes for  
3 used oil and to expand existing routes. They are also  
4 working to establish on-campus oil recycling at the county's  
5 high schools.

6           The Regional Council of Rural Counties has used  
7 its second cycle funds to establish collection opportunities  
8 for 14 rural counties, many of which have not had an oil  
9 program before.

10           Staff believes that these types of programs are  
11 good examples of the intent of the Opportunity Grant. As  
12 the used oil program -- used oil recycling program matures,  
13 an increasing number of recycling incentive claims are made  
14 by registered industrial generators, curbside collections  
15 programs and certified collection centers, the result will  
16 be decreasing amounts of funds available for the Opportunity  
17 Grant.

18           Staff is aware of this trend and is encouraging  
19 local governments to take advantage of the current funding  
20 levels to start or expand used oil collection programs and  
21 to establish the local infrastructure necessary for a  
22 successful program.

23           Local governments are also being made aware that  
24 while the Opportunity Grant is an avenue to begin new  
25 programs or expand existing one's, the non-competitive Block

1 Grant should be viewed as a maintenance fund for their  
2 programs.

3 Staff believes that while the amount of funding  
4 available for Opportunity Grants will decline over time, the  
5 emphasis on the use of the funds to establish collection  
6 opportunities will be reflected in the scoring criteria to  
7 ensure that jurisdictions that need the extra level of  
8 funding to begin a program will be successful.

9 This concludes my presentation. I will be happy  
10 to answer any questions.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Questions?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Yes, I do Mr. Chairman.

13 One item that came to mind after reviewing this,  
14 under the preference criteria, Item 12, applicant was not a  
15 recipient of the second cycle, it seems to me that there are  
16 two groups of applicants in that category.

17 One could have applied and missed the cut-off and  
18 one's that are applying new. I wonder if we have any way of  
19 ranking those and giving the one's that applied previously  
20 and had a good application but there was not sufficient  
21 funding to give preference over those?

22 MS. MORTENSEN: It's based on not receiving the  
23 money.

24 So, if they did miss the cut-off, and they  
25 applied, they would still receive those five points.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: These are only one's  
2 that applied before?

3 MS. MORTENSEN: No.

4 It's anybody who has not received any money  
5 through the last cycle.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: There are two different  
7 kinds of applicants?

8 MS. MORTENSEN: Yes.

9 As long as they didn't receive money last year,  
10 regardless of the circumstances, they would receive those  
11 criteria points.

12 MS. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Frazee, I think the distinction  
13 that's being made here is that even if they did apply and  
14 didn't receive funds, for the reason that you gave, they  
15 still would get the preference points.

16 So, I think that takes care of your concern of  
17 those who applied, but because there wasn't sufficient  
18 funds, they would still get that preference point.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: It may be a very remote  
20 possibility, but is there not a chance that someone in that  
21 category would get bumped a second time if there was a tie,  
22 if you will?

23 MS. FRIEDMAN: I think that's a good question.

24 I think that there is a remote possibility that  
25 that could happen.

1           COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: It might be extremely  
2 remote, but I just want -- if we have someone that's  
3 applying year after year and keeps missing -- have a first  
4 year applicant come in ahead of them.

5           MS. MORTENSEN: Every year when we have done these  
6 grants, we have learned about how to write a grant  
7 application.

8           I think this year's general review criteria  
9 provide applicants a lot more guidance on how to write a  
10 good application. I think if they follow our directions,  
11 and we get a good application from them, I think your  
12 scenario would be very remote.

13           COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Were there one's last  
14 year that applied and just missed the cut-off?

15           MS. MORTENSEN: Yes.

16           COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: I thought I remembered  
17 one.

18           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: In fact, we asked  
19 staff to do some special attention and work with them, not  
20 in terms of changing the criteria, but to make sure that  
21 their applications were adequate and have a better chance of  
22 funding.

23           I remember being concerned by Imperial County  
24 being a fairly large, low-income part of the State that got  
25 missed, but it seems like there was another one, too,

1 someplace in the valley here.

2 MS. FRIEDMAN: I know staff have worked  
3 extensively, per the Committee's direction, with those  
4 jurisdictions to help them and assist them in knowing how to  
5 write the appropriate grant applications.

6 MS. MORTENSEN: I would like to bring to the  
7 Committee's attention that this is probably going to get --  
8 these people that miss the cut-off, we are going to have  
9 more and more people that aren't going to be funded just  
10 because of the decrease in the funds that are available.

11 This year we estimate between \$5 and \$7 million  
12 available for these grants. So, year after year it's going  
13 to get tighter and tighter.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Can you talk about  
15 that, the formula that's causing it to be -- the competitive  
16 grants less money to be available for that.

17 MS. MORTENSEN: I can give it a shot.

18 It's based on the recycling -- the Used Oil  
19 Recycling Fund. After we pay out Block Grants, and after we  
20 pay out recycling incentives, 40 percent of that money is  
21 available for Opportunity Grants. Right now we are  
22 estimating somewhere between \$5 and \$7 million, and that  
23 depends on any reversion from the first and second cycle  
24 Block Grants, when we receive payments from oil  
25 manufacturers and how much we pay out in recycling

1 incentives.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Is there an  
3 assumption that the number of the people claiming incentives  
4 is going to increase?

5 Is that the reason why the funds available for  
6 this would decrease?

7 MR. DELMAGE: Chairman Chesbro, Mitch Delmage,  
8 Manager of the Used Oil Program.

9 As we report every month that the number of  
10 certified recycling centers is going up, industrial  
11 generators is going up, the assumption is that more and more  
12 people have an opportunity to recycle and that more and more  
13 people will be getting their 16 cents. So, it's just like  
14 with the Integrated Waste Management Fund, the more  
15 successful we become, the less money there is available.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: It gets claimed by  
17 somebody, either by the person asking for the redemption or  
18 by the center?

19 MR. DELMAGE: That's correct.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: But the money winds  
21 up being claimed by somebody instead of just having been  
22 paid but not collected.

23 The more oil that gets recycled, the more will be  
24 claimed by somebody.

25 MR. DELMAGE: That's right.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I guess that's pretty  
2 obvious. Sorry to digress there.

3 I had a couple of other questions.

4 There was a question last year, and I'm not  
5 expressing bias, I'm just interested in what staff's  
6 position is, there was some discussion about the consultants  
7 and the role that the consultants play. There was some  
8 allegation by some consultant that we had in the criteria or  
9 the staff's analysis.

10 Any response or discussion about what the approach  
11 is to consideration of applications that either were  
12 prepared by consultants or would be somehow administered or  
13 carried out by consultants?

14 MR. DELMAGE: I can say that last year and the  
15 year before that staff have done a very good job of being  
16 objective.

17 One of the reasons that we have the criteria is so  
18 that everybody out there knows what we are expecting.

19 This year is no different. We are looking at  
20 these applications with a blind eye of who is sending them  
21 in, whether it's a small jurisdiction or a large  
22 jurisdiction or a consultant representing a jurisdiction.

23 One of the problems in the past is that  
24 consultants have represented multiple jurisdictions, and the  
25 applications have come to us in a way that, how should I

1 say, they haven't been focused on that jurisdiction.

2 So, when we are looking at the programs, we are  
3 looking at how the program will fit in a particular  
4 jurisdiction.

5 If a similar program comes to us from several  
6 jurisdictions, it may be more appropriate for one  
7 jurisdiction than the other, then we will score it  
8 appropriately. So, one jurisdiction or one application for  
9 a jurisdiction may make it where another one won't.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: It sounds like the  
11 problem is more the question of whether the application is  
12 adequate for that jurisdiction and its ranking of the  
13 quality of the application as opposed to who prepared it.

14 You don't say because it was prepared by X --

15 MR. DELMAGE: That's right.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay.

17 The other question that I have is how are we  
18 handling the question of multi-jurisdictional applications?  
19 Is there incentive or is there any benefit to jurisdictions  
20 to join together, because in some parts of the State, you  
21 know, multiple programs for jurisdictions that are right  
22 next door to each other are duplicative and not a good  
23 efficient use of resources.

24 Are we focusing at all on assisting if local  
25 jurisdictions chose to work together?

1 MS. MORTENSEN: Definitely.

2 We have given them, under the preference criteria,  
3 Number 9, we have given them ten points if they are a  
4 regional applicant. Especially from the grant manager point  
5 of view, it's a lot easier to manage one grant with several  
6 jurisdictions than several grants for independent  
7 jurisdictions.

8 So, we definitely are encouraging that.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. Any other  
10 questions?

11 If not, I will entertain a motion to accept the  
12 staff's recommendation to approve the proposed scoring  
13 criteria and ranking process and forward the staff  
14 Resolution to the full Board.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: So moved.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Second.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Moved and seconded.

18 We will substitute the prior roll call. It  
19 passes, three to zero. We will place it on Consent.

20 Okay. We will move to Agenda Item 5, which is  
21 similar, except that it's for Grants to Nonprofit  
22 Organizations.

23 MS. KEENAN: Good morning, Chairman Chesbro and  
24 Committee Members.

25 My name is Nora Keenan. I work with Carol in the

1 Used Oil Grants Program.

2 Today I am here to present Agenda Item No. 5,  
3 consideration of Scoring Criteria and Process for the  
4 1996/97 Used Oil Grant for Nonprofit Organizations.

5 As you may know, the Grant for Nonprofit  
6 Organizations is one of four used oil grants awarded by the  
7 Board. In addition to the Opportunity Grants you've just  
8 heard about, the Board also awards population-based Block  
9 Grants to local governments and Grants for Research and  
10 Development.

11 The Public Resources Code 48632(b) authorizes a  
12 grant program to nonprofit organizations for the  
13 establishment of used oil collection centers, purchase of  
14 used oil containers to be used in an environmentally sound  
15 manner and to obtain equipment and establish procedures to  
16 comply with Federal, State and local laws.

17 Because it is the intent of the law to reduce  
18 illegal disposal through increasing recycling opportunities  
19 and enhanced public awareness, the categories of eligible  
20 programs will be expanded this year to include a wider  
21 variety of fundable programs, particularly educational  
22 programs for schools and the public.

23 Approximately \$2 million will be available, based  
24 on statutory formula, allocating ten percent of the funds  
25 remaining in the Used Oil Recycling Fund after payment of

1 Block Grants and recycling incentives. With a maximum of  
2 \$75,000 awarded per application, at least 26 grants will be  
3 funded.

4 This will be the second cycle of Grants for  
5 Nonprofit Organizations. The first cycle commenced June 30,  
6 of this year; 19 were funded, for approximately \$1.2  
7 million.

8 The primary focus of most of these programs is on  
9 used oil collection, container distribution and associated  
10 public education and outreach. Although it is still  
11 relatively early in the grant term, significant achievements  
12 have already been made.

13 Based on the encouraging returns from the first  
14 cycle, I have no reticence about implementing a second cycle  
15 of used oil Grants for Nonprofits.

16 At this time I would like to conclude my  
17 presentation and ask if there are any questions.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Questions?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: I wanted to raise one  
20 issue on this subject.

21 In looking at the past grants, there seems to have  
22 been a lot of emphasis in programs where nonprofit  
23 organizations distribute containers, and it looks from my  
24 distance, and may not be the case, and I wonder if you have  
25 any information on the subject, that what is happening is

1 sort of this mass distribution, and how many of these  
2 containers are actually being used for the purpose intended,  
3 and how many are just because it's something nice to take  
4 home and used for another purpose?

5 Are they really doing the job for what they are  
6 intended? Do we have any information on that?

7 MS. KEENAN: I'm sure there is some of that going  
8 on.

9 I read every single application that came in last  
10 year, and it appeared to me based on -- last year we had the  
11 only eligible programs were the one's that were set in  
12 statute, setting up centers, distributing containers and  
13 buying equipment.

14 I think the nonprofits that were most interested  
15 in becoming part of the program found the easiest avenue to  
16 be eligible for funds, meaning distributing containers, when  
17 all they really wanted to do was public outreach, but the  
18 way the statute was written they weren't able to do that.

19 This year I want to expand so that they can do the  
20 public outreach that they wanted to do in the first place.

21 Container distribution has been very popular for  
22 nonprofit organizations. We have probably bought a few  
23 thousand containers, and when I brought the awards to the  
24 Board in April, Board Member Egigian had your same concerns  
25 that we were buying a tremendous amount of containers.

1 I did have a meeting with the six nonprofit  
2 organizations that are based in San Diego, and also a  
3 teleconference with the three that are targeting South  
4 Central LA, to get them to work together for possible cost  
5 savings for the mass purchases of containers that they were  
6 doing and also making sure they weren't going to be  
7 targeting the same neighborhoods.

8 So, I feel that for the existing programs we are  
9 reducing the overlap. There probably are some people -- you  
10 know, you get something for free, that's pretty nifty. But  
11 they are also targeting the communities that really do have  
12 a problem with illegal disposal, or they might just not know  
13 that you can use this handy container and take it to your  
14 neighborhood collection center.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: I'm just wondering what  
16 percentage of citizens actually change their own oil and end  
17 up with oil being recycled?

18 It seems that it can't be more than ten percent or  
19 so, and the emphasis should be on distribution of containers  
20 through facilities that are taking the used oil in, and  
21 perhaps that's where we are going.

22 MS. KEENAN: Some businesses do that.

23 Also, local governments and nonprofits like to  
24 take the initiative and have that as something tangible that  
25 they can put their name on and put a phone number on, so

1 people not only have a magnet or a flyer, they have  
2 something to hold on to for a long time.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: And communities that  
4 have curbside programs, it would be harder to use that  
5 approach, because the most convenient way to recycle  
6 anything, for example, Sacramento County, is to put it out  
7 on the curb.

8 I have a related question, if you are done.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: I've just started.

10 I'm just saying the most convenient way is -- one  
11 of my neighbors who was parked over the storm drain, and  
12 when I suggested to him that wasn't appropriate, he came out  
13 from under his truck with a wrench in his hands, and I  
14 decided my discretion was very warranted. I minded my own  
15 business then.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: We have done -- you  
17 know the question of who it is that is the home oil changer  
18 and what percentage they are, we have done significant  
19 public opinion research to identify what portion of the  
20 population they are.

21 To what degree are we using as a criteria for  
22 eligibility on an application or to what degree we are  
23 educating the nonprofits to be using that information in  
24 order to not just hand them out randomly but try to target  
25 the population, that is considered the most likely to be the

1 home oil changers.

2 MS. KEENAN: That is something that we would  
3 comment on when we got the applications.

4 If we felt that they were hitting the wrong target  
5 audience, we would let them know, well, isn't there a  
6 constituency that would be more appropriate?

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Is there a certain  
8 income level, certain age groups, certain gender who are  
9 more apt to change their own oil?

10 MS. KEENAN: Yes.

11 For example, South Central Los Angeles is  
12 definitely an underserved area for oil collection  
13 opportunities. Even though there are three nonprofits  
14 targeting there, we don't feel it's overlapped because three  
15 out of four do-it-yourselfers live in Southern California;  
16 55 percent of do-it-yourselfers are Hispanic.

17 That was the exact area that we wanted to target,  
18 even though the City of Los Angeles has their own grant and  
19 are doing their own thing, they can only do so much.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: We don't put that  
21 criteria up front.

22 We look at the application and then respond to the  
23 nonprofit. If 600 and 9 respond, if they are going to the  
24 Rolls Royces in Beverly Hills --

25 MS. KEENAN: They change their oil, too.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Statistically.

2 I want to avoid using stereotypes. But  
3 statistically they haven't targeted a group that our surveys  
4 have shown are the heaviest changers of their own oil.

5 MS. KEENAN: Yes, and if they submit an  
6 application that they are targeting a jurisdiction that we  
7 know already has a grant or is already well-served, then we  
8 will -- we definitely don't want to turn them away, but--

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Beverly Hills  
10 probably pays their household staff to change the oil.

11 I doubt that they change it themselves.

12 MR. DELMAGE: Chairman Chesbro, we have two  
13 contracts operating right now.

14 One is marketing for certified centers, and we are  
15 using a geographic information system to identify those  
16 areas of the State that are underserved. We want to get  
17 that infrastructure built up as good as we can.

18 We also have another contract to do public  
19 outreach. That is the implementation plan that you spoke to  
20 earlier that identified the target areas.

21 Now we are moving to the second phase. We have  
22 the infrastructure in place. It's building quickly.

23 Now we want to get out there and let people know  
24 that there are places to take their oil to, and that way  
25 they have the containers and the place to take it to as

1 well.

2 We have another contract that is going to be  
3 getting out to just about every owner of an automobile in  
4 the State. We have a contract with DMV to publish just a  
5 little one-liner.

6 It has our number of Recycle Your Oil. Call the  
7 hotline number. That will be going out on 62 million  
8 envelopes over the next year.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I think it has as  
10 much to do with people liking to work on their own vehicles  
11 as it does to do with which neighborhood it's in.

12 I still think that there is some effort that needs  
13 to go into trying to target the resources so they don't end  
14 up just sitting on the garage shelf or in the trunk of the  
15 car or something.

16 MS. KEENAN: By expanding it for just allowing  
17 public education programs, I'm hoping that only the  
18 nonprofits that really need to distribute containers as an  
19 integral part of their program will be asking for that  
20 instead of just using it as a way to be eligible for the  
21 grant.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: The one other  
23 question is coordination with the local jurisdiction in  
24 terms of avoiding the duplication, to what degree is that  
25 used as criteria?

1 MS. KEENAN: It is incorporated in the general  
2 review criteria, No. 4, which is worth ten points,  
3 application exhibits knowledge of and coordination with  
4 local government used oil collection efforts.

5 One of the more beneficial things that came out of  
6 our teleconference with the City of LA and the LA nonprofits  
7 was that each nonprofit was going to set up their own  
8 hotline number, and that just didn't seem practical. You  
9 have a condensed area, geographic area, why have three  
10 numbers?

11 So, we invited the City of Los Angeles and asked  
12 if they would be willing to let the nonprofits tag onto  
13 their 1-800-98-TOXIC household hazardous waste line, and  
14 they were happy to do it.

15 We didn't have the coordination as a criteria in  
16 the first cycle, but in the second cycle we're making it  
17 clear that that's an important part of any successful  
18 application.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: On both of these oil  
20 grants, is there a restriction on the amount of the grant  
21 that can be used for administration?

22 MS. KEENAN: Not at this time, no.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: On the question of  
24 audits, do we have an audit procedure to go back and check  
25 any of these?

1 MS. KEENAN: Yes, we do.

2 First of all, these grants are paid in arrears.  
3 So, they do the work first and then submit invoices and time  
4 sheets to us.

5 They are fully aware that they need to keep all of  
6 their receipts and invoices for three years after the end of  
7 the grant term, because they are subject to a desk or field  
8 audit by the Board staff or the Department of Finance staff.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Thank you.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I was under the  
11 impression that there was some sort of review of the portion  
12 that went to services and administration that took place in  
13 the process.

14 MS. KEENAN: For the Block Grants, the competitive  
15 one's, we have put a percentage and a dollar amount limit on  
16 what people can spend on administration and to get prior  
17 approval if they are going exceed that.

18 But for our competitive programs, we haven't  
19 implemented that. It's not too late to add something like  
20 that, though.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: At the very least, I  
22 assume this would happen anyway, I hope.

23 Something comes at you that's clearly out of  
24 whack, you are going to say this is out if whack. I hate to  
25 be arbitrary and question depending on the circumstances how

1 it's described, but I do think that it would be the sense of  
2 the Committee that we would want that to be reviewed and  
3 analyzed in terms of its reasonableness.

4 Is that a correct assumption?

5 MS. KEENAN: Yes, and we do.

6 It's just when you are dealing with so many types  
7 of jurisdictions and organizations, it's difficult to put a  
8 limit on something, where if you have a program that's just  
9 starting up, you may have more administrative costs than for  
10 a maintenance program and where you draw the line.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: One other question I  
12 have is -- it refers to both items, local government grants  
13 and nonprofit grants, these nonprofits and local  
14 governments, if they operate an actual collection program  
15 also would be eligible to receive the fund as a result, the  
16 redemption funds that are collected, right?

17 For example, a government operating a curbside  
18 collection program?

19 MS. KEENAN: Yes, if it's certified and  
20 registered.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: So, getting back to  
22 the earlier discussion, what you could do in essence is  
23 shift to a more incentive based program, so instead of it  
24 being grants that just says, here is money, instead you  
25 recover the material, you get the money, which is not a good

1 start-up approach, but it is a good maintenance approach in  
2 terms of the idea that programs operate to maximize recovery  
3 in order to get the most money back to recover the costs.

4 That counter-balances the question of the  
5 shrinking grant money.

6 Any other questions?

7 MR. DELMAGE: One thing that I would like to add,  
8 in response to Mr. Frazee's question about the line and who  
9 falls below it, when an application comes in, they apply for  
10 a certain amount.

11 Our staff in reviewing the applications looks very  
12 closely at what they are proposing to do in the cost. We do  
13 our level best to work with the jurisdictions to reduce the  
14 amount that they are asking for so we can continue to lower  
15 that line and bring in as many jurisdictions into the  
16 program as possible.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. The motion  
18 that we need is to accept the staff recommendation to  
19 approve the proposed Scoring Criteria and Ranking Process  
20 and forward the Resolution to the full Board for adoption  
21 and placement on the Consent Calendar.

22 Robert moves.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: Second.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: We will substitute  
25 the prior roll call. The motion passes three, zero.

1 Thank you all very much.

2 That moves us to Item 20, which is consideration  
3 of adoption of Emergency Regulations for Consolidation of  
4 dates for Annual Reports on Diversion Progress.

5 MS. FRIEDMAN: I would like to give context for  
6 this item.

7 Recently we had brought before the Committee and  
8 the Board a proposal for consolidating our annual reporting  
9 requirements, and that was the proposal to combine the three  
10 annual reports into a single report and change the due date  
11 of each report to a single day in each year.

12 The Committee directed staff to submit as soon as  
13 possible their proposed regulatory due date change to OAL as  
14 emergency regulations, because of the large number of  
15 jurisdictions that are expected to submit their SRRE annual  
16 reports over the next couple months.

17 So, this is coming back to you with your direction  
18 and also what the Board had endorsed and having approval of  
19 these emergency regulations, which can then allow the  
20 jurisdictions to do what we propose.

21 With that I will introduce Sherrie Sala-Moore and  
22 Heidi Sanborn to make the presentation.

23 MS. SALA-MOORE: Good morning. I am Sherrie  
24 Sala-Moore, of the Waste Characterization and Analysis  
25 Branch, and with my is Heidi Sanborn, with the Office of

1 Local Assistance.

2 I will make our presentation today, and it will be  
3 very brief.

4 We did present a model annual report at the  
5 September Committee and Board meeting and received  
6 conceptual approval for the model. Also presented was a  
7 proposal to combine reporting requirements for the three  
8 annual reports into a consolidated report with a single  
9 annual due date.

10 The Committee directed staff to pursue the  
11 possibility of making these changes as emergency  
12 regulations.

13 Because of the large number of jurisdictions with  
14 annual reports due in the next few months, staff believe  
15 that revising the annual report due dates is the most  
16 critical revision needed at this time. So, the proposed  
17 emergency regulations only address the due date change.

18 The revisions to consolidate the various reports  
19 into a single annual report can be made using the standard  
20 regulatory process.

21 Committee Members received a revised version of  
22 the proposed emergency regulations and additional copies are  
23 available in the back of the room. These revised  
24 regulations differ slightly from what was included in the  
25 Agenda Item with minor changes to the existing language. It

1 does not effect the proposed revisions to the due date.

2           There are several important impacts of the  
3 existing regulations to be considered. For example,  
4 existing regulations require each annual report to be  
5 submitted by the anniversary date of the Board approval, or  
6 90 days from the anniversary date, depending on the  
7 document, creating staggered annual reporting time frames  
8 and reporting periods for local jurisdiction.

9           Also, over 150 jurisdictions have annual reports  
10 due between now and July 1996, in which they will only be  
11 able to present 1994 data. This would create extra work for  
12 these jurisdictions and would not provide the Board with the  
13 compliance year measurement of goal achievement.

14           Not changing the current regulations would also  
15 result in delaying the receipt of the 1995 compliance data  
16 for these over 150 jurisdictions until their second annual  
17 report is received, which could be as late as July 1997.

18           The proposed emergency regulations would change  
19 the annual reporting due date for all jurisdictions to  
20 August first of each year. All jurisdictions with SRREs  
21 approved by the December 31, 1995 date would submit their  
22 1995 compliance data in August 1996.

23           August first was chosen as it will be the earliest  
24 date the information would be available for jurisdictions to  
25 accurately calculate their progress toward achieving the

1 waste reduction goal for the previous calendar year.

2 The proposed emergency regulations will simplify  
3 reporting requirements for jurisdictions as well as tracking  
4 report due dates for staff. This would also eliminate the  
5 need to prepare and submit an additional annual report on  
6 1994 data for 150 jurisdictions.

7 In summary, staff are prepared to go to OAL with  
8 the emergency regulations, if the Board approves them. The  
9 Office of Local Assistance and Waste Characterization  
10 Analysis Branch staff have been receiving calls daily from  
11 concerned jurisdictions wondering whether if they should  
12 prepare their annual reports that are due to the Board in  
13 the near future.

14 At this time, the current regulations do require  
15 jurisdictions to submit their reports, and this could result  
16 in the reports being submitted in November or December of  
17 '95 and then again in August of '96. To address this  
18 immediate problem, staff have drafted a letter to notify  
19 jurisdictions of the proposed emergency regulations that  
20 changes the annual reporting due date to August first.

21 The options before the Committee are, one, to  
22 approve the proposed emergency regulations, direct staff to  
23 submit them to OAL as early as possible and follow these  
24 with permanent regulations; or two, direct staff not to  
25 pursue emergency regulations but to develop permanent

1 regulations that includes the due date change and report  
2 consolidation; or three, direct staff not to pursue any  
3 changes to existing regulations at this time.

4 Staff recommends that the Committee adopt the  
5 first option. Heidi and I are available for any questions.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: This seems clear that  
7 it will be a benefit to local jurisdictions, but I am just  
8 curious to what degree we have sought or received feedback  
9 from the local end about this being beneficial.

10 MS. SALA-MOORE: The workshops that we had this  
11 year, we did discuss that, especially in July, in summer,  
12 and it was brought up, but because of the Assembly Bill that  
13 was going to do this, we did bring it up with jurisdictions,  
14 and we did get an overwhelming response that they were for  
15 this.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Was that significant  
17 participation in terms of numbers?

18 MS. SALA-MOORE: Yes, actually it was.

19 It was a significant group.

20 MS. SANBORN: We had over 150 people attend the  
21 workshops representing different jurisdictions.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Are the League and  
23 CSAC aware of this or any other vehicles for local  
24 government input?

25 MS. FRIEDMAN: We have had informal discussions.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I'm not fearful of a  
2 big negative response.

3 I just would like to be able to say that we have  
4 had some sort of nod of approval to say that we were  
5 operating with local government's approval. This is sort of  
6 significant, what you have said, but we also have the more  
7 formal vehicles.

8 MS. FRIEDMAN: We can do that between the  
9 Committee and the Board meeting.

10 Overwhelmingly, they have asked for it. So, we  
11 are trying to respond.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I am not questioning  
13 that at all.

14 I'm just trying to make sure that we are doing our  
15 best job to get their nod of approval.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: I have a question.

17 We are moving on a project to do electronics by  
18 way of these reports; is that correct?

19 Is that under way?

20 MS. FRIEDMAN: That is correct.

21 That was reported when we came before the  
22 Committee in September that we were trying to also have this  
23 not require a lot of paperwork and be done electronically,  
24 that the jurisdiction could submit a disk.

25 MS. SALA-MOORE: As an update to that, in the

1 Infocycling that just went on in October, we did have a  
2 survey for jurisdictions to respond to what their hardware  
3 and software needs were, and I've received over 133  
4 responses so far.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: That was one of the  
6 issues raised on regulatory reform that I participated in  
7 recently, was the need to simplify the reports and to have  
8 them go in and file electronically.

9 MS. SALA-MOORE: The responses that we have  
10 received have been very encouraging as far as that we will  
11 be able to meet the majority of the jurisdictions' needs.

12 MS. SANBORN: We put in a request to IMB to work  
13 with them for development of the diskettes and possibly  
14 Internet.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: We will reduce more  
16 paper.

17 Any further discussion or questions?

18 I will entertain a motion to accept staff's  
19 recommendations and approve the proposed emergency  
20 regulations and direct staff to submit them at the earliest  
21 date possible to OAL and following OAL approval staff be  
22 directed to develop permanent regulations.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: So moved.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Second.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Substitute the prior

1 roll call. The motion carries three, zero.

2 That concludes our action Agenda. Thank you.

3 I will ask for any open discussion from the  
4 Committee Members.

5 If there is none, we will adjourn.

6 (Thereupon the meeting of the Local Assistance  
7 and Planning Committee was adjourned at 10:08.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, VICKI L. MEDEIROS, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing hearing was reported in shorthand by me, Vicki L. Medeiros, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, and thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this sixth day of December, 1995.



VICKI L. MEDEIROS

Certified Shorthand Reporter

License No. 7871