

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

COPY

--oOo--

Board Room
8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, California

--oOo--

Wednesday, December 6, 1995
9:12 a.m.

--oOo--

Doris M. Bailey, CSR, RPR
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License Number 8751

A P P E A R A N C E S

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

WESLEY CHESBRO, Chairman
JANET GOTCH, Member
ROBERT C. FRAZEE, Member

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

ELLIOT BLOCK, Legal Counsel
DOROTHY RICE, Chief Deputy Director
JUDITH FRIEDMAN, Deputy Director
DANIEL GORFAIN, Deputy Director
KATHY MARSH, Secretary

--oOo--

I N D E X

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| Proceedings | 1 |
| Roll Call | 1 |
| Agenda Item Number One | 1 |
| Agenda Item Number Two | 10 |
| Agenda Item Number Three | 19 |
| Agenda Item Number Four | 20 |
| Agenda Item Number Five | 22 |
| Agenda Item Number Six | 28 |
| Agenda Item Number Nine | 30 |
| Agenda Item Number 12 | 40 |
| Agenda Item Number 14 | 43 |
| Agenda Item Number 22 | 44 |
| Adjournment | 45 |
| Certificate of Certified Shorthand Reporter | 46 |

--oOo--

1 some of the major activities of the Diversion, Planning and
2 Local Assistance Division. And in this report I will also
3 provide an update on the status of any of our agenda items in
4 this agenda.

5 First, local plans. Elements of 20 jurisdictions
6 are on today's agenda, a combination of SRREs, HHWEs, and
7 NDFEs, and this represents 25 individual elements. Statewide
8 we are at approximately 85 percent received for the SRREs, 60
9 percent for the HHWEs, and 75 percent for the NDFEs. And to
10 date the Board has considered 392 SRREs, and has approved 397
11 of them, conditionally approved 53, and disapproved eight.

12 If the Board adopts staff's recommendations after
13 this month's board meeting, the Board will have approved 408
14 SRREs, conditionally approved 55, and disapproved eight. And
15 that represents an approximately 98 percent approval,
16 conditional approval rate, and a two percent disapproval
17 rate.

18 Next month we anticipate bringing the planning
19 documents for approximately ten jurisdictions before the
20 committee.

21 Other planning issues. The Office of Local
22 Assistance and the Waste Characterization and Analysis Branch
23 have coordinated efforts to present training sessions for all
24 jurisdictions beginning December 7th.

25 The focus of the training is to explain the Board's

1 policy on plan implementation and measure compliance with the
2 diversion goals. Staff will make presentations to
3 jurisdictions in thirteen counties during the month of
4 December.

5 Staff continues to work with Sacramento County to
6 facilitate the revision of their previously disapproved SRRE
7 in order to bring Sacramento County's SRRE to a
8 recommendation for approval in front of the Board before the
9 extension deadline of February 10th, 1996. The county has
10 revised the document and is proceeding with the local
11 adoption process.

12 Barring any unforeseen circumstances, the revisions
13 to the SRRE should be submitted to the Board for
14 consideration by January 1st, which is well ahead of the
15 extension deadline. So there's good progress being made
16 there.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Good news.

18 DEPUTY DIRECTOR FRIEDMAN: Right. Staff
19 continued --

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I just said good news.

21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR FRIEDMAN: Staff continues to work
22 with the Policy, Research and Technical Assistance Committee
23 in strategizing the future work concerning the landfill
24 capacity study.

25 The report toward ensuring adequate landfill

1 capacity has been distributed to almost 200 interested
2 parties in accordance with direction received from the
3 committee in May. And in order to facilitated feedback
4 concerning the Board's role in assisting local governments
5 and in achieving the mandated 15 years of disposal capacity,
6 a focus group meeting will be held in February, 1996.

7 Staff received over 190 responses to the October
8 Infocycling survey for jurisdictions or interested parties of
9 the requirements of their software needs for the model annual
10 report. Staff is working with INB to determine what standard
11 version we can make available to jurisdictions
12 electronically.

13 Staff held two workshops on the development of the
14 disposal characterization method and associated databases on
15 November 29th in Irvine, and on December 5th in Sacramento.
16 So we've, we're continuing to make progress on that project
17 as well.

18 An update on some regulations. The emergency
19 regulations to consolidate the model annual reporting
20 requirements due date to August 1st of each year was approved
21 by OAL on November 21st, 1995. So that was a pretty swift
22 action on the part of the Board and OAL to get new
23 regulations in place.

24 Some updates on used oil and household hazardous
25 waste. The total number of certified centers as of November

1 30th of this year are 1,542 certified centers, 420 industrial
2 generators, 60 curbside programs, and one electric utility.
3 And since November 1st we have certified 77 centers,
4 recertified seven, registered eighteen industrial generators
5 and three curbside programs.

6 The city of Santa Monica, through a used oil
7 opportunity grant, hosted the first Southern California
8 regional forum on used oil on November 2nd.

9 The forum was an opportunity for local government
10 and non-profit grantees to meet in one place, network and
11 learn about other oil programs in their area. Approximately
12 175 people attended the all day conference.

13 Session topics included certified center
14 recruitment, and public education and outreach strategies.
15 Comments from attendees were overwhelmingly positive, with
16 many suggesting that a similar forum be held next year in the
17 Orange County area.

18 Used oil block grant applications were due November
19 30th. The application form for this fourth cycle is much
20 simplified from previous cycles. Local governments were very
21 responsive to these changes, and staff expects more
22 jurisdictions to apply.

23 The second used oil round table was held on
24 November 3rd in Long Beach. The comments and suggestions
25 received will be combined with those of the first meeting of

1 August 28th.

2 The issues will be categorized into those
3 concerning statute, regulation, or policy. Staff will then
4 analyze each issue and bring recommendations to the Board as
5 appropriate.

6 Many of the issues are currently being addressed
7 through regulatory revision proposals which will be coming
8 before the committee and Board.

9 Public education and programs implementation.
10 Staff has added thirty-nine new sites to Project Recycle,
11 the state's mandated recycle program. Staff has provided
12 assistance and guidance to 31 state offices, five community
13 colleges, one state park, one maintenance station, and one
14 warehouse facility. Over the last two months of October,
15 November, staff have assisted in the start up of 77 new
16 sites. So we're continuing to have the state's own efforts
17 increase with regard to recycling and waste prevention.

18 Staff received a call for assistance from a
19 representative of the Santa Ynez Chumash Indian casino in
20 Santa Barbara County. The visit by staff was strictly a
21 courtesy visit since the state has no jurisdiction or mandate
22 to implement recycling or waste prevention programs on Indian
23 lands.

24 Staff provided some technical materials to assist
25 them in establishing a more comprehensive waste prevention

1 program with all the necessary elements. They expressed
2 their appreciation and offered to keep us informed of their
3 progress.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: That raises some
5 interesting questions. Which I don't, of course giving them
6 to you could like this I don't necessarily expect answers off
7 the top of your head. But I assume that the waste that's
8 generated on Indian reservations, if it's disposed of in
9 another jurisdiction's landfill if it's not on the
10 reservation is part of the waste stream that's counted under
11 939?

12 DEPUTY DIRECTOR FRIEDMAN: That's correct.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: So even if there's no
14 mandate on Indian reservations, we probably ought to be
15 concerned about their waste generation and diversion, and the
16 effect on local jurisdictions, just as though say it was a
17 state agency or federal facility or something else that we
18 may not have any ability to force diversion but through our
19 assistance we may be able to help the local jurisdictions
20 deal with that waste stream.

21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR FRIEDMAN: We've had a number of
22 questions and requests for assistance in that area before,
23 and we have provided materials, either to the local
24 governments or to the Indian Lands Community directly, and
25 always letting the local government know of that, of those

1 requests.

2 But yeah, this kind of requests have come up
3 before, and we've tried to make sure we provide good
4 assistance. Because you're right, there's no mandate for
5 them to do this.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Well most of the
7 reservations in the state are fairly small, the waste impact
8 probably isn't that great. But when you get a facility like
9 the gambling facility on a reservation, the potential waste
10 generation on the reservation goes up considerably because
11 you have all those visitors. So I think that's something we
12 ought to take pretty seriously, I think. Thanks.

13 DEPUTY DIRECTOR FRIEDMAN: Now for an update on the
14 items on today's agenda.

15 Agenda item 17 has been pulled from today's agenda.
16 After numerous discussions with representatives of the County
17 of Orange, we concur that the agenda items for the Orange
18 County summary plan and and siting element should be pulled
19 from the December committee meeting and Board meetings.

20 The reasons for this are two-fold. If we pull the
21 agenda item and revise the tables, it would save the county
22 from having to revise the element during the first review.

23 Secondly, this would allow time for the City of La
24 Habra to finish the local adoption process for their
25 nondisposal facility element, and allow Board staff time to

1 review the document prior to the February meetings.

2 By placing the county wide summary plan and the
3 siting element on the February agenda along with the SRRE,
4 HHWE, and NDFE, we would be able to recommend approval for
5 the summary plan since the Board would have taken action on
6 La Habra's element, and the updated siting element. And at
7 the same time the CWIMP for Orange County would be complete.
8 So we would be able to accomplish everything at once as as
9 opposed to piecemealing it.

10 Item 21, our update on the cooperative marking
11 study has also been pulled. And this division has been
12 working closely with the Waste Prevention and Market
13 Development Division, and we needed a little more time to
14 coordinate our efforts. And we'll be bringing this item back
15 in January, 1996, after we accomplish that.

16 Also, I did want to say something about agenda item
17 18 which is consideration of the staff recommendations on the
18 adequacy of the household hazardous waste elements for the
19 City of San Diego, San Diego County.

20 The City of San Diego's HHWE is before the
21 committee for approval. In the agenda item staff noted under
22 area of concern several issues regarding the public
23 information and education section of the HHWE. To resolve
24 these issues the city was to report on these items in the
25 first annual report to the Board.

1 Subsequent to the preparation of the agenda item,
2 however, the city submitted a letter satisfactorily
3 addressing each of the points discussed in the area of
4 concern. As a result, the city will not need too discuss
5 those issues in the first annual report in any greater detail
6 than normal.

7 This concludes my presentation.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. Any questions?
9 Mr. Frazee?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: No.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. Thank you,
12 Judy.

13 Next I'm going to call on Dan Gorfain who's going
14 to report on activities of the Waste Prevention and Market
15 Development Division. Those activities that under the
16 jurisdiction of this committee.

17 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GORFAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
18 members of the committee. For the record I wanted to make
19 sure that everyone understands that the report is printed
20 double sided and in a --

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I like it.

22 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GORFAIN: -- mode of waste
23 prevention.

24 The prevention staff is working with the California
25 Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, CDF, on the dual

1 purpose effort to incorporate yard waste prevention into the
2 Fire Safe Landscaping campaign CDF is planning to roll out
3 this coming spring and summer.

4 The purpose of the campaign is to promote the use
5 of low waste, drought tolerant plants in the landscaping of
6 homes that have the potential of being involved in wildfires.

7 The basic principles of yard waste prevention
8 coincide quite well with CDF's initiative and objective and
9 goals.

10 Yard waste prevention staff sent approximately
11 eight hundred landscape waste reduction guides to local
12 governments who requested landscape business outreach
13 materials.

14 Additionally, staff provided broadcast copies to
15 the Board's home composting, of the Board home composting
16 videos to the cities of Cupertino and Monte Serrano for
17 broadcast on their local cable channels.

18 The Waste Prevention and Market Development
19 Division is currently recruiting an in-house Waste Reduction
20 Coordinator.

21 The executive staff agreed that the Board's
22 in-house efforts to institutionalize waste prevention would
23 be best administered out of the Waste Prevention and Market
24 Development Division.

25 This coordinator will be responsible for all

1 in-house collection activities.

2 Cal EPA has tasked the Air Resources Board with
3 drafting an umbrella MOU for each of its boards and
4 departments. Waste prevention staff commented on the ARB's
5 proposed green seal MOU, to which each cal EPA Board and
6 department will be required to sign.

7 And if any of you are interested, we can provide
8 you with a draft MOU that we received from ARB, and our
9 comments on it. If you'll please contact my office we'll be
10 happy to provide you a copy.

11 The waste prevention staff contacted the NRC source
12 reduction subcommittee chair that is conducting research on
13 transport packaging and developing a guide for businesses.

14 A training session on transport packaging will be
15 held at the next NRC Congress to be held in September of 1996
16 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Kathy Frevert will assist in
17 the research, and possibly, and possibly the how-to guide
18 that's being prepared.

19 Going back to the good old Charette, design
20 Charette. Staff is following up on its participation in the
21 Presidio Environment Design Charette at the National Park
22 Services Presidio facility in San Francisco.

23 The Board's staff became involved in the C&D
24 materials team, and has continued involvement with the
25 ongoing demolition activities currently underway on site in

1 the Presidio.

2 The National Park Service let five, let a five
3 phase contract demolish 78 structures, and has plans to
4 refurbish a number of additional buildings.

5 Staff is in contact with the site engineer and the
6 demolition contractor to document lead and asbestos abatement
7 materials salvaging and materials storage.

8 Staff is also, staff is also encouraging reuse of
9 materials whenever possible, and intends to document what
10 materials are and are not salvaged or reused and why.

11 The January, February, 1996 issue of the CALMAX
12 catalog has been published and distributed. Feature articles
13 include the Match of the Catalog between Cal State Humboldt
14 and Unocal Oil, a creative use story on circuit board's, and
15 a letter to CALMAX users from Planning and Local Assistance
16 Committee Chairman Chesbro.

17 The Match-of-the-Catalog's an excellent sample of
18 the long distance match in a marriage of reuse and recycling.
19 Unocal and Humboldt State are located over 300 miles apart,
20 as the crow flies anyway, showing that matches do occur
21 outside local areas.

22 As you will recall, last year the match of the year
23 also was between a Santa Cruz company and a school in Santa
24 Barbara County.

25 56, 56 plastic drums were exchanged -- excuse me.

1 Yeah. 56 plastic drums were exchanged, diverting
2 over half a ton of material from the landfill through this
3 exchange, thus saving money to both participants. The drums
4 are also being used as recycling containers. So benefit, a
5 mutual benefit to all.

6 The creative reuse article describes how several
7 companies use old computer circuit board's, high-tech
8 industry waste to make loose leaf binders, clocks,
9 clipboard's, key rings, and even jewelry. And I might add
10 that luckily I have a pair of shoes, but I also have one of
11 those little business card holders with a circuit board on
12 the outside of it. And unfortunately I didn't have it with
13 me this morning.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I wasn't sure if you
15 were going to say you had circuit board earrings.

16 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GORFAIN: That's next.

17 (Laughter.)

18 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GORFAIN: Last but not least, Bill
19 Orr recently took a trip to Walt Disney World in Florida, and
20 he was impressed by the visibility and aggressiveness of
21 waste prevention and recycling at Disney World.

22 For example, there was a separate recycling
23 container in each motel room. And according to information
24 distributed in the rooms, Disney World currently recycles 46
25 percent of the waste, of their waste generated, use reclaimed

1 water for irrigation, have recycling teams centered at each
2 resort, and here is the kicker, change bed sheets every three
3 days, except either by request or except when there are new
4 guests.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: I have been in some
6 places like that.

7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GORFAIN: They also believe in
8 green purchasing and source reduction. They recycle 950 tons
9 of paper annually, and compost 10,000 cubic yards of limbs
10 and grass clippings at their facility.

11 Staff will be following up with the Disney
12 Corporation to find out, to learn about their efforts and
13 find out how, whether they are equally aggressive at
14 Disneyland in Anaheim, and we'll keep working with them.

15 But the Disney Company has been quite at the
16 forefront of a number of environmental kinds of issues, and
17 this is just another example.

18 That concludes my report.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. Thank you, Dan.
20 I was hoping to hear a little bit about the status of the
21 RPPC reports, the rigid plastic container reports that are
22 mandated under law and we are going to be receiving, we have
23 received, and we will be processing and considering in
24 January. Could you tell us a little bit about how many we've
25 gotten and where that stands?

1 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GORFAIN: Yes. Yes. This is in
2 reference to the Food and Consumer Manufacturers and Trade
3 Association reports. And the reports were due to the Board
4 on December 1st, and the Board must act on those by February
5 1st, approve or disapprove them subject to various
6 conditions.

7 We have received three trade association reports.
8 We have received the one report from the resin manufacturer
9 trade association, that's the American Plastics Council.

10 We have received 54 individual food and cosmetic
11 manufacturer reports. Staff is reviewing those, has started
12 the review of those, and will be prepared to come back to
13 this committee in January with its recommendations.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. It's been some
15 time since the committee or the Board have reviewed the
16 process for this. And one of the things that occurred to me
17 that I've spoken to staff about, and I thought it would be
18 important for the committee members to consider, was the
19 need, as we have found in the local plan approval process, to
20 have, make sure that the only options aren't approval or
21 disapproval, if you will. So we're not stuck with, if
22 somebody comes in with just some slight problems with the
23 report, our only options aren't either to slap them with a
24 disapproval or feel that we need to approve them because
25 they're, you know, they have, they're close to the line even

1 though they have some inadequacies.

2 So, I guess I would ask staff whether any
3 consideration has been given to the idea of a compliance
4 schedule approach or something else if we, if any of these
5 plans come in and are not, and staff feels they're not
6 adequate and they need improvement. What would be the
7 process for us to try to bring them up to us.

8 The goal is to get reports that we can approve, not
9 to have disapprovals. Just like I think that's been the goal
10 with our local plans, we want approved plans, we're not in
11 the business of trying to punish local governments.

12 So could you respond to that a little bit, please?

13 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GORFAIN: Yes. That's correct.
14 What staff is going to be working on, I'm not prepared to
15 detail any measures that we're going to be recommending, you
16 know, for, to ensure compliance such as timelines, although
17 that clearly could fall within the realm of our
18 recommendations.

19 But the law does provide that the recommendations
20 that come to the Board, to the committee and the Board in
21 January include recommended actions that the Board may
22 require of each manufacturer. And we intend to do that.

23 The provision is that if the reports are not
24 approved, not approved that the Board may require various
25 actions be taken or levy fines, and it is up to the

1 manufacturer to select which way they want to go, whether
2 they want to accept a fine or implement corrective actions.

3 Either way it does not affect their requirement
4 that they still meet the requirements for law for compliance
5 in 1997. So this is just the one interim report.

6 So we will come back with these recommended actions
7 that the Board may consider. And in addition, but you're
8 right that the ultimate objective is to be able to approve
9 the report, so we are looking at ways to help accommodate and
10 facilitate the positive approach.

11 CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR RICE: The only thing I would
12 add is that we will be working with the legal office between
13 now and when the item comes forward in January to fully spell
14 out any and all options you might have in giving any latitude
15 that's appropriate under the law and working with companies
16 to come into compliance in a reasonable schedule.

17 So we need to fully explore under this law which
18 is, of course, different than the planning law, what are the
19 approaches other than approval, disapproval, are there other
20 things that can work, and provide you with that flexibility
21 when you need to act in January.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: If there's no
23 objection from the other committee members I would like to
24 just give general response to staff indicating that seeking
25 flexibility in the process to view ways to bring about

1 compliance, or I don't know if compliance is the right word
2 here, bring about plans that the Board can approve, as
3 opposed to just the choices of approve or disapprove would be
4 appreciated. And we'd encourage you to look at the options,
5 the legally available options within the statute and the
6 regulations to achieve that.

7 Is that --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: No problem.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Is that in
10 concurrence?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: Uh-huh.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. Thank you.

13 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GORFAIN: If I may, just one thing.
14 I do have some copies of the new CALMAX catalog. I don't
15 know if you received them in your offices, but I will leave
16 them with Kathy and she can distribute them.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Thanks.

18 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GORFAIN: Thank you.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. We will move on
20 to the consent agenda. Although before I do that I should,
21 and Judy's already mentioned some of them, I will mention the
22 items that have been pulled from today's agenda. And those
23 are ten, 11, 17, 20, and 21. I think you should have been
24 preinformed of that. And so those have been pulled.

25 The consent agenda is available on the back table.

1 And hopefully if anybody was concerned about what's on it
2 they've had a chance to look at it.

3 I will read the items that are on that agenda.
4 It's item seven, eight, the household hazardous waste and
5 non-disposal facility element for item nine, the household
6 hazardous waste facility element for item 12, and is that,
7 let's see, this is not clear. Is it also the household
8 hazardous waste element for item thirteen, or or is it all of
9 item 13?

10 CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR RICE: It's all of item 13.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: All of item 13 is on
12 consent. The household hazardous waste element and
13 nondisposal facility element for item 14. And then items 15,
14 16, 18, and 19. That's the consent agenda.

15 And if there's no changes or requests for any of
16 those to be pulled I will entertain a motion to approve
17 consent and forward it to the Board's consent agenda.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: Move to approve consent.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Second.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: It's been moved and
21 seconded. Would you call the roll, please?

22 SECRETARY MARSH: Board members Frazee.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Aye.

24 SECRETARY MARSH: Gotch.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: Aye.

1 SECRETARY MARSH: Chairman Chesbro.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Aye. Approved.

3 Okay. We will move on to agenda item number four
4 which is the CALMAX contract to the local government
5 commission. And I'll ask Mr. Orr to present this.

6 I should mention that this item was placed by staff
7 inadvertently on the planning committee agenda, and it should
8 have gone on the Administration Committee agenda. My office
9 has been in contact with the Chairman's office and there's,
10 you know, no problem in order to get this on the Board's
11 agenda with it being heard here. But it should have, all the
12 contracts now, contract awards I guess go before the
13 Administration Committee, and that's where it would have
14 normally been. But I don't think there's, we don't expect
15 any controversy or problems with this issue, unless there's
16 something I don't know.

17 Mr. Orr.

18 MR. ORR: Thank you Chair Chesbro, and good morning
19 committee members.

20 This morning we're here to consider the 1996 CALMAX
21 contract. This would be a slightly different term. The
22 contract will be for three issues to get it corresponding
23 with the fiscal year. It also includes the establishment of
24 a new region in the San Diego Baja Mexico border region.

25 We put out an RFP. One proposal was received in

1 response to that RFP. The proposal was scored by staff and
2 determined that the bid satisfactorily met the requirements
3 outlined in the scope of work.

4 The contract came in at \$69,019 which is well
5 within the \$75,000 that was allocated from the Board's
6 discretionary contract funds.

7 And staff recommends that the Board award the
8 contract to the Local Government Commission as the lowest
9 qualified bidder.

10 Are there any questions?

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Any questions from
12 staff on this?

13 If not, I will entertain a motion to approve the
14 contract and amount and forward it to the full Board for its
15 approval.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: So moved.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: So moved.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: And seconded.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: It's been moved and
20 seconded. We'll substitute the prior roll call and pass
21 this, three zero. And thank you very much.

22 We can place this on the consent, I think, if there
23 are no objections.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: No objections.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: We'll move to agenda

1 item five which is the consideration of the West Contra Costa
2 waste management authority regional agency agreement.

3 DEPUTY DIRECTOR FRIEDMAN: Yes. This particular
4 item has a long history. And in December of 1993 the Board
5 voted to disapprove the source reduction recycling elements
6 for the jurisdictions of Hercules, Pinole, Richmond, and San
7 Pablo. And the Board's decision was based on diversion
8 projections falling below the diversion mandates.

9 Over this long time these jurisdictions have been
10 working very hard to come up with a cooperative agreement,
11 and also to prepare a regional SRRE.

12 We have before us two items which staff Michelle
13 Lawrence will be presenting to the committee today on these
14 items.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Michelle.

16 MS. RANGE: I'd like to just give -- this is Dianne
17 Range from the Office of Local Assistance. I'd like to just
18 briefly give you some background on this item, and just
19 mostly to emphasize that two years ago to the month, we, this
20 was the first countywide integrated waste management plan to
21 be considered by the Board. And I think it's noteworthy, of
22 19 of those jurisdictions source reduction recycling
23 elements, 'household hazardous waste elements, and
24 non-disposal facility elements, along with the county wide
25 siting element and the summary plan, only four of those

1 jurisdictions were disapproved, and those four were due to
2 the restricted diversion claims that fell below the mandate.

3 So since then staff have been working real closely
4 with the jurisdictions that did get the disapproval, and
5 we're here today to present both items five and six to you
6 because they relate closely to each other.

7 And Michelle Lawrence will be making the staff
8 presentation.

9 MS. LAWRENCE: Good morning. I'm very pleased to
10 be before you today with these two items. As Dianne
11 mentioned I was before this committee two years ago, actually
12 almost to the day, with a painful task of having to recommend
13 disapproval of four of the five jurisdictions that were
14 members of a joint powers authority in West Contra Costa
15 County.

16 Not only was it difficult to do that, but I was the
17 first staff having to do that as we began this document
18 review and approval process. And obviously in the interim
19 we've only disapproved eight more, so it's not something that
20 we really like to do.

21 The four jurisdictions, as Judy and Dianne
22 mentioned, were, actually all of the jurisdictions in this
23 county had issues with undocumented restricted waste in their
24 base year diversion claims, in their base year projections
25 for 1995 and the year 2000. But by the end of the 120-day

1 review period we were down to just four jurisdictions in that
2 category; Hercules, Pinole, Richmond, and San Pablo.

3 These four cities had adjusted diversion
4 projections ranging from 16 percent to 21 percent, and could
5 not supply adequate documentation of those restricted wastes.

6 The Board did, in fact, disapprove those four
7 cities' SRREs at its December, 1993 meeting and directed
8 staff to work with the cities to bring them into compliance.

9 We've continued to do that in the two years since
10 that Board action, including coming to the Board in September
11 of 1994 to request an extension to the compliance schedule on
12 behalf of those four cities.

13 It was at that time that I also informed the Board
14 that rather than revise and readopt their individual SRREs,
15 the cities would be preparing a regional SRRE with the City
16 of El Cerritos. And although El Cerritos had received an
17 approval on its SRRE, all five cities, as I mentioned, were
18 members of a JPA, Sheryl Hauler, and had already planned on
19 cooperating to build a material recovery facility.

20 The regional SRRE would detail the joint efforts of
21 these five cities to achieve the diversion mandates. With
22 that understanding staff and legal counsel began working with
23 the authority on amending their existing JPA to include
24 specific language satisfying our statutory and regulatory
25 requirements for regions formed for the purpose of sharing

1 achievement of disposal reduction mandates of 25 and 50
2 percent.

3 We've reviewed and commented on administrative
4 drafts, rough drafts, and final agreements.

5 Agenda item number five concerns the West Contra
6 Costa integrated waste management authorities regional agency
7 agreement. Statute requires any agreement forming a regional
8 agency for this purpose to be submitted to the Board for
9 review and approval at the time of the regional SRRE
10 submittal.

11 As a point of interest regarding this joint powers
12 authority, the five cities secured a \$17 million bond to
13 design and construct a MRF which we permitted last month at
14 our Board meeting, and which should begin operations next
15 month.

16 And on that note I'd like to hand it over to
17 Chairman Chesbro for recommended approval.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. We have a staff
19 recommendation. I would like to say that this is exceptional
20 in several respects.

21 One is that the regional cooperation between the
22 jurisdictions is notable, and I would like to congratulate
23 the jurisdictions on that. I know from personal experience,
24 and I know Mr. Frazee probably knows from personal
25 experience, that these regional efforts are not always easy.

1 That sometimes you have to get up the next morning after a
2 brutal fight the night before on some other regional issue,
3 and you know, leave your head at the door and smile and say
4 okay, let's work together. And that's not always easy for
5 folks to do when their job is to represent the interests of
6 their own jurisdictions.

7 So I think the cooperation is commendable, and I
8 hope we see a lot more of it. It's not something the state
9 can impose, it really depends on the goodwill and the efforts
10 of local officials.

11 Secondly, this is the way we had intended -- I was
12 talking earlier about the RPPC reports, about an in-between
13 approach that doesn't say you're bad, you're disapproved,
14 instead says we haven't reached agreement so let's work
15 together, let's extend the time, let's find ways to iron out
16 the differences and come up with an approach that will work.
17 And that has happened here. And I think it's, it's what we
18 intended, and it's a very good example of the process
19 working. So I'm excited about it from that standpoint as
20 well.

21 Let me ask if a representative of the regional
22 agency or any of the individual jurisdictions wish to address
23 the committee?

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We don't have a comment.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. There's no

1 comments.

2 Is there any other comments from committee members?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: None.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I'll entertain a
5 motion to accept staff recommendation and forward the
6 regional agreement to the Board for approval.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: So moved.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Second.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: It's been moved and
10 seconded. We'll substitute the prior roll call, the motion
11 carries three to zero, and we will place it on consent.

12 And we'll move on to item six.

13 MS. LAWRENCE: Great. From the previous item you
14 understand the background of the cities in question. Staff
15 is recommending approval of the regional source reduction and
16 recycling element for the West Contra Costa integrated waste
17 management authorities member agency cities of El Cerritos,
18 Hercules, Pinole, Richmond, and San Pablo.

19 Once approved by the Board, this document will
20 supercede the previously disapproved SRREs for the cities of
21 Hercules, Pinole, Richmond, and San Pablo, and the previously
22 approved SRRE for the city of El Cerritos.

23 The regional source reduction and recycling element
24 details actions needed to reduce waste, recycling collected
25 materials, and provide for a centralized composting for yard

1 waste.

2 The regional education and information program
3 identifies actions needed to educate and inform residents
4 businesses and industries of the opportunities to reduce
5 waste generation, and to use recycling and composting
6 services being provided by the authority through agreements
7 at the integrated resource recovery facility in Richmond.

8 The regional source reduction and recycling element
9 adequately describes and selects programs and activities to
10 ensure compliance with AB 939.

11 Staff recommends approval of the West Contra Costa
12 integrated waste management authorities regional source
13 reduction and recycling element.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. Any questions
15 from committee members?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: None.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Any comments from the
18 public or the agencies? No.

19 I will entertain a motion to accept staff
20 recommendation to approve the regional SRRE.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: So moved.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: Seconded.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: It's been moved and
24 seconded. We will substitute the prior roll call. We will
25 forward it to the Board's consent agenda.

1 So good work everyone all around. And what did you
2 say earlier Judy, that brings us to 98 percent approval, is
3 that right?

4 DEPUTY DIRECTOR FRIEDMAN: Well actually I think
5 it's even better than that.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: So that was pre,
7 before the action it was 98?

8 DEPUTY DIRECTOR FRIEDMAN: I just calculated in my
9 head. I think with this action, after the Board final action
10 we're going to be down to four jurisdictions with outstanding
11 disapprovals at this point.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: That's in the
13 neighborhood of one percent or something.

14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR FRIEDMAN: Yeah.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Great. We're very
16 appreciative of all of the efforts by staff and by the
17 jurisdictions.

18 Let's see. The next agenda item is consideration
19 of staff, it's item nine, it's consideration of staff
20 recommendation on the adequacy of the multijurisdictional
21 SRRE and petition for reduced medium term diversion
22 requirements for the city of Bishop and the County of Inyo.

23 And it was pointed out to me earlier that there may
24 have been a typo or a mistake in the agenda item in that the
25 reason for this consideration is because it's a rural

1 jurisdiction, and that's from Section 41787, not 41785. So I
2 just wanted it on the record to clarify that.

3 DEPUTY DIRECTOR FRIEDMAN: Thank you. The city and
4 county have already received short term planning reductions
5 to 15 percent for 1995, and they're now asking for medium
6 term reductions. The city of Bishop is asking for 28.9
7 percent, and the county is asking for 25.5.

8 And we're also looking at a recommendation on the
9 multijurisdictional SRRE for these jurisdictions.

10 With that I'll turn the presentation over to John
11 Nuffer and John Brooks with the Office of Local Assistance.

12 MR. BROOKS: Thank you. I'm John Brooks from the
13 Office of Local Assistance. Good morning chairman and
14 committee members.

15 I'm here to present a petition for reduction of the
16 50 percent goals and ask for your approval of a joint SRRE
17 for the city of Bishop and unincorporated Inyo County.

18 The county is third largest county in the United
19 States. It has over 10,000 square miles. It has
20 approximately 18,900 residents. Many of the residents are
21 located hours away from population centers.

22 Counties in the eastern part of the state bordered
23 by Nevada, and during the winter the mountain passes are
24 closed and most of the materials that are diverted are
25 trucked to L.A., a distance of 250 miles one way.

1 Statewide household income as noted in the 1990
2 census is 35,798 and the average in Inyo county is 24,386.

3 In general Inyo county averages two percent above
4 the average statewide unemployment rate. Combined, the two
5 jurisdictions contribute .00043 percent to the solid waste
6 disposed of in the State of California.

7 The city of Bishop and the county of Inyo prepared
8 joint planning documents and have implemented or plan to
9 implement the following programs; a drop off buy back center,
10 Christmas tree recycling, newspaper drop off, cement and
11 asphalt diversion, scrap metal and white goods collection at
12 the landfill, newspaper articles and education, public
13 education campaign on reducing junk mail, and commercial
14 cardboard collection and back haul by K-mart and the
15 landfill.

16 The county has been a leader in looking at regional
17 solutions to their problems. They were instrumental in the
18 formation of the regional council of rural counties,
19 environmental services joint powers authority. ESJPA is
20 trying to bring economies of scale to the rural areas.

21 The county and the city are also very interested in
22 the Board's study of cooperative marketing. They feel that
23 through such efforts the high cost of implementing programs
24 for small jurisdictions that are far from markets may be
25 reduced and may make more programs feasible.

1 The programs that the county and city have
2 implemented so far have been effective and well accepted by
3 the public.

4 The county and the city received a reduction in
5 their diversion requirements in December of 1993. The city
6 and county were both granted a reduced rate of 50 percent for
7 the 1995 short term goals. At that time it was the direction
8 of the Board to not consider reductions for the medium term
9 goals.

10 The county and city are petitioning for reduction
11 of the medium term goals now while they are submitting their
12 planning documents for approval. A discussion of their
13 consistency with the Board's medium term reduction policy is
14 attached to your agenda.

15 Upon careful review of the characteristics and
16 potential for diversion in the city and the county, staff
17 believe that the request is reasonable and recommend that the
18 Board grant the requested reductions.

19 For the city, after adjusting the base year data
20 for restricted waste types, the year 1995 projection changed
21 from 17.2 percent to 15.8 percent. And the year 2000
22 projection changed from 29.9 percent to 28.9 percent.

23 The city plans to meet the reduced goals for 1995
24 and are asking for reduction of the year 2000 goals to 20.9
25 percent.

1 For the county, after adjusting the base year data
2 for restricted waste types, the year 1995 projection changed
3 from 14.7 percent to 13.6 percent. And the year 2000
4 projection changed from 26.3 percent to 25.5 percent.

5 The original 1995 projection was based on meeting
6 criteria to obtain base year diversion credit for scrap
7 metal. For this reason, the County of Inyo is requesting
8 that they be given a reduction of 13.6 percent for the 1995
9 goals, and 25.5 percent for the year 2000 goals.

10 In conclusion, staff are recommending the Board
11 approve the city of Bishop's request for reduction of the
12 2000 goal for 28.9 percent, and the County of Inyo's request
13 for reduction of the 1995 goal to 13.6 percent, and the 2,000
14 to 25.5 percent.

15 Staff are also recommending approval for the County
16 of Inyo and the City of Bishop's source reduction recycling
17 element.

18 And I'd be happy to take any questions that you
19 have. And Chuck Hamilton from Inyo County is also here to
20 address the Board.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Well I had a couple of
22 questions. Let me ask whether the committee members have any
23 before I begin.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: I just wanted to make a
25 comment, Mr. Chairman, having some familiarity with this

1 county and what is pointed out in the report that was not
2 presented. Less than two percent of the land in this very
3 low population county is privately owned. 98 percent is
4 government owned land, so it's extremely difficult for
5 private sector and for local jurisdictions to accomplish any
6 major reductions, and I think that the reductions are
7 appropriate.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Well I want to note
9 that they do have a broad range of programs, first of all,
10 and that's significant. I mean they're making the effort
11 which is difficult in a very, very small community.

12 And secondly, they have a very low per capita waste
13 generation rate which is generally true of rural counties,
14 and is one of the bases for the legislature giving them more
15 flexibility.

16 That being said I do have a couple of questions
17 though before I'm fully satisfied and ready to vote for this.

18 One is, how does the median term diversion
19 requirement of 25.5 percent compare to the other reductions
20 that we've granted?

21 MR. BROOKS: So far we've given reductions to three
22 other jurisdictions, one was Alpine County for the medium
23 term, and they were reduced to 25 percent. And then Modoc
24 County was reduced to 36.8 percent. And the City of Alturas,
25 which is in Modoc County, was reduced to 36.3 percent.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: So this is a little
2 lower than the ones we have granted. Can you, I guess I
3 should have warned you before I came in here to ask you these
4 questions, and so if you can't answer them off the top of
5 your head I'll understand.

6 But can you give me any sense of the difference
7 between this situation and the other ones that have been
8 granted somewhat higher requirements?

9 MR. BROOKS: The Modoc example. Modoc, along with
10 Lassen County, had chosen to go to Lockwood. So they truck
11 down the 395 and go out of the state into Nevada. And along
12 the way they pretty much pass through Susanville. And Lassen
13 County is trying to build a material recoveries facility
14 there, and Modoc County is planning on participating. So
15 they believe that through such participation their materials
16 are heading that way anyhow, so they can increase.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: So they have a better
18 diversion opportunity available to them simply by the matter
19 of where these other activities might be going on.

20 MR. BROOKS: Correct.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. And any other
22 jurisdictions come to mind? That's the most obvious one,
23 but --

24 MR. BROOKS: Those are the only ones that I'm aware
25 that have received a medium term reduction.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. The other thing
2 is you show on agenda page 22, I guess it's page five of the
3 item, 269 tons of scrap metal that I guess have been
4 disallowed or --

5 MR. BROOKS: Yes.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Why is that, and why
7 can't that be diverted? Or is it being diverted but can't be
8 counted?

9 MR. BROOKS: It's being diverted but not being
10 counted. It's not allowed to be counted.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. I see. Any
12 other questions? Comments?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: No.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I'll entertain a
15 motion to accept staff's recommendation to approve medium
16 term reductions for both the County of Inyo and the City of
17 Bishop, and approve the SRRE for both of the jurisdictions.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: So moved.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: It's been moved.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Second.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: And seconded. We'll
22 substitute the prior roll call.

23 And I guess I should have, I'm sorry, somebody came
24 all the way down from Inyo and I should have given them the
25 opportunity to talk to us before we finalize this. I'll hold

1 the outcome in abeyance for a moment, and see if you convince
2 us to go the other way than it's obviously going to go, which
3 I'm sure you don't want to do.

4 Chuck Hamilton.

5 MR. HAMILTON: Good morning. I'm Chuck Hamilton.
6 I'm the deputy county administrator for Inyo County and the
7 solid waste director for Inyo County.

8 I want to take a second to commend your staff, not
9 only Mr. Brooks and Mr. Nuffer who I deal with quite often.
10 It doesn't matter which department I happen to call here,
11 I've always received a lot of helpful information and a lot
12 of support and I appreciate it.

13 Ever since this Board approved the reduction of the
14 short term goals, Inyo County hasn't just been sitting on the
15 sidelines. Some of the things that we've done in addition to
16 the programs that were mentioned here this morning, we have
17 applied for and been awarded just about every waste oil grant
18 that you guys have offered, and we will have four certified
19 waste oil centers come on line probably in March of '96.

20 We've utilized a lot of the public information that
21 this Board has provided.

22 We have some of the posters that talk about source
23 reduction and waste prevention. We've posted these around
24 town. And we've also used a lot of the camera ready art that
25 you've provided.

1 We have implemented the, a monthly waste prevention
2 tips in our local newspaper, and we've also had the monthly
3 waste reduction information in the newspaper too, one of the,
4 and in fact, as I said, it will come out every month.

5 The first one that we did happened to be the "shop
6 in the nude" flyer or brochure that came out where it talked
7 about buying things singly, not in wrapping.

8 We also are working with staff, with the market
9 development program, and we encourage this, the feasibility
10 study of the cooperative marketing of recyclables.

11 We had just finished a brochure that we used your
12 brochure as a model, your waste prevention brochure. And we
13 kind of massaged it a little bit and included waste
14 prevention and then waste oil recycling. And I brought a
15 copy of it today. This will obviously be folded in threes,
16 but I just picked this up yesterday from the printer. And it
17 talks about recycling, our waste prevention and oil
18 recycling, and it has our four recycling centers that will
19 come on line in March as I mentioned.

20 And we are also working with staff to develop the
21 brochure that we received a copy of it, then we're going to
22 modify it. It's the "don't let your tires get tired"
23 brochure, how to care for your tires.

24 And like I said, in closing, we have used a lot of
25 the information that this Board has provided. It's been very

1 helpful to us not to have to go out and create our own
2 brochures.

3 Thank you.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Well it's really
5 notable to me, I remember when we had, I think it was Sierra
6 County here and also Alpine, that frequently the smaller
7 communities, even though they have special problems and we've
8 had to give them special consideration, are more aware and
9 more enthusiastic about what they're doing, what they're able
10 to do, than a lot of the larger jurisdictions. So I think
11 it's very exciting to see that a small community is doing the
12 level of activity you are.

13 One other point, I don't remember what they're
14 called, I think they are called customer service response
15 forms. Cal EPA has these little forms, and I love the
16 positive feedback and I know our staff does, it would be
17 great if you'd like let Cal EPA know that the Board is doing
18 its job here.

19 MR. HAMILTON: Okay.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Thanks.

21 CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR RICE: I believe there's a
22 survey form at the back of the room.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: We like to hear the
24 feedback, though. So thanks.

25 I will, now that the motion has been made and it's

1 been held in abeyance, I will substitute the prior roll call,
2 and the motion is carried three to zero. And we will place
3 this item on the Board's consent agenda.

4 Let's see. Next one is item 12 which is
5 consideration of staff recommendation for the City of South
6 El Monte in Los Angeles County. And we already approved the
7 household hazardous waste element on the consent calendar.

8 DEPUTY DIRECTOR FRIEDMAN: That's correct. And Mr.
9 Lloyd Dillon of the Office of Local Assistance will be making
10 the presentation for staff.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Mr. Dillon.

12 MR. DILLON: Good morning, how are you all this
13 morning?

14 As you stated, I'm Lloyd Dillon with the Office of
15 Local Assistance. And I'm here to make a presentation for
16 the City of South El Monte's SRRE, agenda item 12.

17 In the SRRE the city did identify some residential
18 collection and recycling programs, multi-family collection
19 and recycling programs. There's planned backyard composting
20 and yard waste collection programs.

21 They've got an extensive public awareness
22 promotional programs going, and they will have mandatory
23 commercial recycling and monitoring programs that's planned
24 in the future also.

25 In the solid waste generation study, their original

1 projections for the 25 percent goal were 40.6 percent and 51
2 percent for the 50 percent goal. It also included over 4,200
3 tons of excluded waste, most of which was scrap metals.

4 With the adjustments to take those restricted
5 materials out, it puts the new projections at 35.1 percent
6 for the 1995 goal, and 46.5 percent for the year 2000 goal.

7 Because the city's adjusted projections fall just
8 slightly below the 50 percent goal, staff is recommending
9 conditional approval of the source reduction recycling
10 element.

11 Staff's recommended condition would be the city
12 provide the additional information as necessary about new or
13 expanded programs in the city's first annual report. And
14 with the city's first annual report it is now due August 1st,
15 1996.

16 Staff has been in communication with the city and
17 they understand the condition of staff's recommendation.

18 So with that, staff recommends the committee
19 consider our recommendation of conditional approval for the
20 SRRE for the City of South El Monte.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. Is there a
22 representative of the city here?

23 MR. DILLON: I don't believe so.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: If not, let me ask if
25 there's any questions from committee members.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: None.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: If not, I will
3 entertain a motion to accept staff recommendation for
4 conditional approval for the SRRE for the City of South El
5 Monte and forward it to the full Board for its consent
6 agenda.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: So moved.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: So moved.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: Second.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: It's been moved and
11 seconded. We will substitute the prior roll call. Vote is
12 three zero. And we will place it on the Board's consent
13 agenda.

14 MR. DILLON: Thank you.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Thank you.

16 Next is item 14 which is consideration of staff
17 recommendations on the adequacy of the source reduction and
18 recycling element for the City of Yucaipa in San Bernardino
19 County.

20 DEPUTY DIRECTOR FRIEDMAN: Yes, this also is a
21 recommendation for conditional approval, and Tony Terhaar
22 will be making the presentation for staff.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Ms. Terhaar.

24 MS. TERHAAR: Good morning committee members. I'm
25 here to recommend for the City of Yucaipa's SRRE. This is

1 item fourteen on page 48 of your agenda package.

2 Even though the City of Yucaipa is projected to
3 exceed the 25 percent goal, they are projected to achieve 33
4 percent for 1995, they are not projected to achieve a 50
5 percent goal. Approximately 11,000 tons of restricted
6 materials were removed from the base year from the years 1995
7 and the year 2000. And as a result it reduced their 2000
8 year goal to 47.4 percent.

9 This percentage does fall within the parameters of
10 a conditional approval, and therefore we are recommending
11 that.

12 As a condition of the recommendation, we're asking
13 that the city provide further information in their first
14 annual report describing either expansion of existing
15 programs, or additional programs that will be implemented to
16 reach the 50 percent goal.

17 That concludes my presentation.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. I take it
19 there's no representative from Yucaipa here.

20 And are there any questions from committee members?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: No questions.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: If not, I'll entertain
23 a motion to accept staff recommendations for conditional
24 approval of the SRRE and forward it to the full Board for its
25 consent agenda.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: So moved.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Second.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: It's been moved and
4 seconded, we'll substitute the prior roll call. Motion
5 passes three zero. It's on consent.

6 And I think that takes care of the action items.
7 We are now in open discussion. Any open discussion?

8 Certainly no closed discussion. And so we will
9 adjourn.

10 (Thereupon the foregoing meeting was
11 concluded at 10:07 a.m.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

CERTIFICATE OF CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, DORIS M. BAILEY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter, in and for the State of California, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that I reported the foregoing meeting proceedings in shorthand writing; and thereafter caused my shorthand writing to be transcribed by computer.

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand as a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter on the 26th day of December, 1995.



Doris M. Bailey, CSR, RPR
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License Number 8751