

**Hazardous Waste Management Facility Allocation Committee
Draft Summary Minutes — July 22, 2005**

Members Present:

Laura Abrams, Councilmember, Orinda
Mark Green, Mayor, Union City
Mark Luce, Supervisor, Napa County
Andy Parsons, Asst. Chief, Sonoma County OES
Dona Spring, Councilmember, City of Berkeley

Alternates:

Rory Bakke, Alameda County WMA
Robin Bedell-Waite, Contra Costa County
Narcisa Untal, Solano County
Rob D'Arcy, Santa Clara County

Others Present:

Gillian Adams, ABAG staff
Jennifer Krebs, ABAG staff
Ceil Scandone, ABAG staff

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 10:20 am.

Approval of Minutes of July 23, 2004 Meeting: In response to Luce's motion to approve the minutes, D'Arcy requested that his comments (Page 3, Discussion section, 4th paragraph) be amended to reflect the fact that the arrangement between Santa Clara County and Dell Computer was not successful. Green moved for approval of the minutes, and the motion was seconded by Bedell-Waite. Minutes were approved as amended.

2003 Hazardous Waste Report / Facility Allocations: Krebs presented the final draft of the staff report (Attachment B) that analyzes data about hazardous waste generation and treatment capacity trends for the region. This is the second year using the new formula that tracks actual wastes, as reported on the manifests sent by generators to DTSC, rather than relying on projections or assumptions. Key findings include:

- Alameda, San Mateo, and Santa Clara counties have large Treatment, Storage and Disposal (TSD) facilities and a surplus of hazardous waste treatment capacity.
- Napa, Marin, and Sonoma counties have few large hazardous waste generators and modest treatment deficits.
- San Francisco, Solano, and Contra Costa counties have large hazardous waste generators and no permitted TSDs. These counties have larger capacity deficits.
- Although the rankings within the three groupings may change from year to year, overall trends will persist for the foreseeable future.
- There is a loose correlation between jobs and hazardous wastes. However, there are some anomalies to this trend, largely because employees are classified based on a firm's output rather than their specific job description.

The report outlined the following recommendations for the committee's consideration:

1. Approve the county rankings based upon application of the updated capacity Formula to 2003 data.
2. Undertake local government outreach efforts to inform elected officials, planners and other agency staff of the current status of hazardous waste generation and treatment capacity regionally and in each county and enlist their support for source reduction/pollution prevention efforts.
3. Continue to support the Bay Area Green Business Program.
4. Pursue opportunities to work more effectively with CAL-EPA Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Pollution Prevention Branch, CIWMB and other partners.
5. Continue to review data and rankings annually.

Subject to Committee approval of a Scope of Work, and availability of additional funding, the report recommends that the Committee:

6. Undertake a new regional project. Potential projects include:
 - **Universal Waste** – On February 9, 2006, new regulations on universal wastes will come into effect. Residents and small quantity generators, who now dispose of waste batteries, waste fluorescent light bulbs, and other u-wastes with their solid waste, will be required to either recycle these or dispose of them as hazardous wastes. The committee could assist with a public outreach campaign to let residents and small quantity generators learn how to dispose of u-wastes properly. This could be done by collecting available outreach materials and disseminating them to appropriate local government agencies.
 - **Electronic Waste** – To date, it appears that no agency has developed a comprehensive list of the services/level of e-waste treatment and recycling that approved e-waste “recyclers” are performing. The committee might oversee the development of a list of e-waste recyclers that designates their actual services (dismantling, recycling or treating). This list could be used by Household Hazardous Waste Programs and businesses.
 - **Household Hazardous Waste** –All counties collect hazardous waste. The committee could oversee a study analyzing the changing types of household hazardous waste collected since the introduction of e-waste and u-waste streams.

The committee discussed the data and trends outlined in the charts and tables. Green asked whether the current trends for generation and treatment capacity in each county were expected to continue. There was general agreement that overall trends would remain the same, although Bedell-Waite mentioned that pollution prevention efforts might reduce waste generation and highlighted DTSC's work with oil refineries. Scandone noted that refineries have reduced waste output and are managing more onsite, which helps ensure the region has sufficient treatment capacity.

Bakke suggested working with other types of industrial generators to help them reduce waste generation. Bedell-Waite agreed, since there are few hazardous waste programs directed to these businesses. Further discussion of future projects was postponed until after introduction of the other possible project topics.

Abrams moved to accept the report. The motion was seconded by Green and unanimously approved.

Electronic Waste / Universal Waste: Krebs distributed handouts with background about electronic and universal wastes and then described three possibilities for a new regional project focused on these wastes (see above). This generated a lively discussion about the merits and challenges of each project idea, and which one would most closely match the Committee's mission and the needs of its members. In the end, committee members determined that more information was needed before they could decide which project to pursue.

Luce made a motion for the TAC to review the project ideas discussed and report back to the committee with more information about the scope, budget, and staffing for each idea. The motion was seconded by Green and unanimously approved.

Green Business Program Updates: Scandone reported that the program has over 500 certified Green Businesses and that the pace of certifications is accelerating. She reported that the City and County of San Francisco program is now fully launched, with a waiting list of at least 100 businesses and the Santa Clara County program has expanded to all cities within the county and expects to certify 50 businesses in the coming year. Scandone noted that thanks to Andy Parson's support this was the first time in many years that Sonoma County made financial contributions to the program. She also reported that the program has hired a marketing firm to develop a regional marketing strategy using \$10,000 received from Stopwaste.org.

Scandone presented updated hotel, restaurant and auto checklists which had undergone routine revisions for approval. Untal made a motion for approval, which was seconded by Parsons and unanimously approved.

Fiscal Year 2005/06 Budget and Workplan: Scandone summarized FY 2004/2005 accomplishments and contents of Proposed Budget & Workplan for FY 2005/2006. She noted that the budget is based on the assumption that the committee funding level of \$6,400 per county (plus an additional \$4,000 from BAAQMD) will be continued even though there has been no increase in over 12 years. Green stated that the budget should include a fee increase this year. After discussion, there was a proposal to increase the fee by the Consumer Price Index compounded over the years since the last fee increase, with the figure to be calculated by ABAG's accounting department. Additional fees will be used to fund a special project related to Universal/E-Waste, and increased staff time for the Green Business Program. Narcisa Untal, alternate for Supervisor Reagan of Solano County, noted that she was not authorized to vote on a fee increase decision for the county, and would consult with Supervisor Reagan.

Green's motion to approve the budget and work plan with a fee increase to be determined by CPI compounded since the last increase was seconded by Abrams and approved by 7 votes to 0, with Untal abstaining.

Next Meeting: The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for October 28, 2005 from 10:00 am to Noon at ABAG's office in the MetroCenter.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15.