

Attachment A

Bay Area Hazardous Waste Management Facility Allocation Committee Minutes of October 29, 2010 Meeting

Attendance:

Members

Ronit Bryant
Mark Green
Mark Luce
Tiffany Reneé
Bob Simmons
Gayle B. Uilkemma

Alternates

Rob D'Arcy
Debra Kaufman
Steve Lederer
Alex Soulard
Narcisa Untal (phone)

Technical Advisory Committee/Staff:

Sushma Bhatia
Jennifer Krebs
Matt McCarron
Ceil Scandone

Guests:

David Rist, DTSC
Linda Spencer, Consultant
Lisa Steinman, Sonoma Co. Waste Mgmt. (phone)

Call to Order/Introductions: The meeting was called to order at 10:03 by Committee Chair Mark Luce

Adoption of Minutes of March 26, 2010 Meeting: Motion to adopt minutes, Ulkema, seconded by Bryant, unanimous vote for adoption.

Hazardous Waste Data Report 2008/2009: Linda Spencer reviewed the content and findings of the Hazardous Waste Generation and Treatment Trends Report (2008 and 2009 manifest data), Attachment B in the agenda package. The powerpoint slides of her presentation are attached.

After the presentation, committee members posed a variety of questions and concerns, including:

- Gayle Ulkema - Why is Chevron not listed as a Large Generator? Who's doing source reduction? How do we find out?

Matt McCarron of DTSC noted that SB14 & SB 1916 required large generators such as refineries to implement source reduction and pollution prevention actions. The result is that refinery wastes are declining. He also mentioned that National Semiconductor, which used to be the region's largest generator, has dropped off list entirely. NUMMI of Fremont has closed as well.

- Mark Green – Under Sustainable Communities Strategy, it is not a good idea to ship wastes offsite. How can the committee ensure more on-site treatment?
- Tiffany Reneé– Sonoma is looking at plasma gasification to treat all garbage. This could increase the treatment of more wastes locally if successful.

Matt McCarron noted that every 18 months, a consultant contacts DTSC that they wish to use a technology such as plasma gasification, however, no consultant or municipality in California has been successful siting a facility. Most recently Santa Cruz tried to site one and failed. Debra Kaufman noted that Sacramento looked at one and declined. McCarron noted that cement kilns which can burn many waste types are currently running at 50% capacity.

- Ronit Bryant – In the next report for the committee, it might be worth separating land-filled wastes and recycled wastes. Recycled waste is sustainable, land-filled not so. She'd also like more information on U-wastes. Should we be worried about them filling our landfills?

Matt McCarron and Steve Lederer noted that lots of u-wastes are currently being landfilled. McCarron noted that in 1990, 440 facilities were operating under RCRA. The current number of

RCRA treatment facilities is 45. The 20% of wastes treated within the Bay Area will decline & the carbon footprint to treat HW will increase.

- Mark Luce – It is not good environmental health to site TSDs near population so number of local TSDs will not grow.
- Tiffany Reneé – Is there a way to capture Cradle to Cradle treatment of hazardous waste?

Matt McCarron – there are no manifests for e-wastes so it's hard to track from cradle to cradle. Rob Darcy noted that there are commodities markets – lots of computer wastes are recycled. Other wastes, such as PCBs, not recycled.

Adoption of Report: Motion to accept report and its findings, Bryant, seconded by Reneé, unanimous vote for approval.

Legislative Review: Rob Darcy reviewed the bills included on attachment C in the packet. Of the 6 Extended Producer Responsibility bills that were introduced in 2010, 3 were successful:

- AB 1343, Huffman, Architectural Paint Recycling
- AB 2398, Perez, Product Stewardship for Carpet
- SB 346, Kehoe, Phasing out Copper in Brakepads

The paint legislation is very significant. 60% of the household hazardous waste stream in Santa Clara County is paint at a cost of \$1.5 million a year. The Architectural Coatings Association is supportive. The law will be effective in April 2012. At that point the industry will begin funding collection and transportation of paint.

The carpet legislation has some issues to address. It was intended to create higher diversion levels not recycling. There is talk of incineration.

Legislation that did not make it through the legislature include efforts to establish a comprehensive Extended Producer Responsibility framework that would have affected many products, a lighting efficiency/takeback bill and a battery stewardship bill. The battery bill included rechargeable batteries. That generated concern from companies that manufacture devices that are rechargeable. In the future the CPSC will work on sharps, fluorescents, and batteries.

Environmentally Preferable/Sustainable Purchasing: Ceil Scandone described the October 20, 2010 Buying Green...Buying Smart (Sustainable Purchasing) Conference to the Committee. Roughly 60 people attended from around the region. Alicia Culver of the Responsible Purchasing Network was responsible for contacting speakers and developing the content along with Committee Staff. Materials from the conference can be downloaded from http://www.responsiblepurchasing.org/bay_area/index.php

Green Business Program: Scandone described the ongoing efforts to work out the bugs, enhance and fully integrate the online measurement and management system into the Program. The development and improvement effort has been led by Sushma Bhatia, the San Francisco coordinator, with significant contributions from Robin Bedell-Waite, the Contra Costa County coordinator, and Matt McCarron of DTSC. One new checklist is in progress. It is for Property Management firms. To be certified, the firm will have to demonstrate that their own office and a significant percentage of the properties they manage meet the Green Business standards.

Uilkema recommended that the Program improve the appearance of the certificates businesses receive when they are certified. Simmons suggested adding a graphic or photo.

Green Chemistry Initiative: McCarron distributed a flow chart that illustrates the proposed prioritization, alternatives assessment and regulatory response framework for the Green Chemistry initiative. The chart is available on the Department of Toxic Substances Control site at http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/PollutionPrevention/GreenChemistryInitiative/upload/Draft_Regulatory_Flow_Chart.pdf . DTSC estimates that it will take 6 years from start to end to evaluate a chemical.

Next meeting: The next meeting will be scheduled to enable timely review of proposed legislation and the budget and work plan, for a date to be determined in February or March 2011.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.