

Bay Area Hazardous Waste Management Facility Allocation Committee

Draft Minutes of the May 30, 2014 Meeting

Attendance:

Members

Mark Luce
Karen Mitchoff
Kevin Miller
Pete Sanchez
Ronit Bryant

Alternates

Paris Greenlee
Steven Lederer
Lisa Steinman (on phone)
Narcisa Untal (on phone)

Technical Advisory Committee/Staff

Adrien Baudrimont (SFEP)
JoAnna Bullock
Maggie Johnson
Kevin Miller

Call to Order/Introductions: Chair Mark Luce called the meeting to order at 10:10. He welcomed everyone to the meeting and initiated a round of introductions.

Adoption of Minutes: Pete Sanchez moved; Karen Mitchoff seconded, and the minutes of the May 31, 2013 meeting were unanimously approved.

Sustainable Processing of Universal and Electronic Waste Recycling Progress Report:

Presentation by Adrien Baudrimont:

Committee decided in 2012 to pursue this study but due to staff time constraints, there was a delay in project commencement. Staff began work on the study in January 2013.

An info graph was presented showing 40 million tons of U & E waste is generated annually worldwide and only a very small percentage of the waste is actually recycled. U & E waste is a growing waste stream that is largely exported from the US and Europe to developing countries. One of the purposes of this study is examine opportunities to bring recycling jobs to the Bay Area.

Products in the study include batteries, fluorescent bulbs, cell phones, computers, rigid plastics, and leaded glass. The study will identify the constraints, opportunities, and make recommendations to the committee.

Initial work tasks included interviews with stakeholders, a TAC meeting and two site visits.

Interview and TAC meeting are summarized in Appendix A of Attachment B. The site visits were revealing and generated useful information. Photos of both site visits were presented. Both facilities had numerous piles of electronics. Workers sort the waste stream by hand then it is processed in machines.

Staff noted the advanced technology of the CEAR, Inc machine that separates instead of shredding waste stream. CEAR's machine creates very little dust and therefore virtually eliminates the issue of toxics that are dust born. This makes the equipment appropriate for solar panel recycling which is now prohibited in CA because of the toxins in the dust.

Steve Lederer said manager at CEAR told him because of CA regulations, solar panels are not processed in CA. All panels are shipped to AR and NV for processing. The CEAR staff told him during the site visit CA regulations are too stringent. CA encourages the use of solar panels but current regulation prohibits processing/recycling them.

Narcisa Untal asked if the difficulty with regulation rests with DTSC or CalRecycle. Steve replied he believes the issue is with DTSC and perhaps CARB.

Paris Greenlee said the issue with solar panel processing is largely with DTSC because beyond a certain point, its no longer considered processing but hazardous waste treatment which requires a permit. The CEAR operation is a manageable process that doesn't create significant health or safety issues associated with conventional treatment. He believes an opportunity exists to get the right people together to address relaxing regulation for this process. Mark added yes, some sort of universal waste exception.

Ronit Byrant asked if solar panels are processed in other locations and how they are processed. Steve replied yes, panels are processed in AR, we do not know how they are processed. Steve replied It's not more complicated that CRT regulations and it's a growing industry. Mark Luce said it would be great to have more industry in CA .

Adrien shared solar panels are fragile and have a high replacement rate.

Maggie Johnson asked if CEAR mentioned where the bag house dust is disposed of. Adrien replied no. Paris said the machine doesn't generate much dust because it isn't shredding. Dust generated at this facility would be largely polymers and not regulated as hazardous waste. It is the cleanest solid waste industrial operations he has seen. Steve agreed. Paris said there were many questions and not enough time during the one site visit.

JoAnna Bullock asked if another site visit is warranted. Mark Luce said DTSC and other interested state agencies should be invited to attend.

Karen Mitchoff offered to connect staff with Kish Rishov at GoBiz to further the discussion of getting new businesses in CA through legislation or regulatory revision. Mark said this group should be able to get the ear of DTSC and other regulatory agencies.

Adrien highlighted the barriers and opportunities of siting a recycling facility in the Bay Area.

Another consideration for siting facilities is power. Steve said the manager at CEAR told him the existing power infrastructure was a major reason for locating at the former Mather Air Force Base. Not all industrial locations have the infrastructure to meet heavy power demand of a large industrial plant.

Adrien ended the presentation with next steps including soliciting feedback from the committee, forming a stakeholder group, completing study and final report.

Napa ships electronic waste to Fresno which does not comport to AB 32. What if jurisdictions received a credit for more local solutions.

Ronit Bryant asked if there are small start-up companies that could take on recycling – something along the lines of pilot projects. Also public private partnerships might be a vehicle to pursue. Adrien: There are companies in Silicon Valley interested in electronic waste that could offer insight. Ronit said it would be great if Silicon Valley companies interested in sustainability could offer resources toward this effort.

Karen Mitchoff said if interim CRT regulation is expiring, perhaps this is an opportunity to revisit the matter particularly if technology has advanced. Karen also mentioned the importance of sharing this information with the Executive Board via a shortened presentation – a snap shot report. Venture Capital wants to put their investment into green – so we should approach them.

Green Purchasing Regional Case Studies and Website Updates

Adrien presented the work to date on the case studies and website updates. Also shared the piggybacking project at Stopwaste.org and the DTSC safer consumer products newly released product list.

2014 Legislation Update

Updates on five bills were included in Attachment D. No action was needed on three of the bills - two of the bills were voted on; a third was turned into a grant program. The committee voted that a position of support be conveyed to the Legislation and Governmental Organization Committee for SB 270 Padilla, Solid Waste: Single – use Carryout Bags and AB 2748 Committee of Environmental Safety and Toxic Material, Hazardous Waste (Used Paint Recovery): Business Plan. Maggie Johnson shared that AB 2284 was gutted and is now a grant program. Mark Luce called for a motion, Karen Mitchoff motioned, ___ seconded, consensus.

Green Business Program Update

JoAnna Bullock provided summary of challenges, opportunities and advances in the program. Paris Greenlee added that Green Business Program has collected great information and metrics on the water and energy conserved and waste avoided. The metrics of the program show how

valuable the program is and confirms its credibility. It requires a heavy demand of resources.

Steve cautioned us not to burden the program with a lot of fixed cost. While growth is necessary, incurring costs that make the program too expensive to administer should be avoided.

Mark Luce said it would be valuable to showcase the metrics of the Green Business Program on the web. Paris offered to provide metrics to ABAG and that perhaps we can discuss at the next GB coordinators meeting. Mark said the web site presentation could be helpful for program advocacy.

Budget and Work Plan

Karen Mitchoff asked for clarity on the proposed reserve to cover contributions not received. JoAnna explained Sonoma County has not paid its contribution for 2012 or 2013 due to decreases in fees collected. The reserve is to create a small cushion in the event annual contributions are not received in full.

Karen Mitchoff moved for approval of the budget; _____ seconded, consensus

Mark Luce called for new business. None mentioned. Next meeting in October or November 2014.

Meeting Adjourned