

RIVERSIDE COUNTY
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL
(COUNTYWIDE LOCAL TASK FORCE)

AGENDA

Thursday
APRIL 18, 2013
1:00 p.m.

12:30 p.m. – Lunch Served to Members

Riverside County
Waste Management Department
14310 Frederick Street
Moreno Valley, CA 92553

ITEM

1. CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS
2. COMMENTS FROM LTF MEMBERS
3. APPROVAL OF MARCH 15, 2012 MINUTES
4. STAFF PRESENTATIONS
 - A. Lamb Canyon Liner Construction
 - B. CIWMP 5-Year Report Update
 - C. Landfill System Study Update
 - D. CVC Expansion
5. PUBLIC COMMENTS
6. ANNOUNCEMENTS
7. ADJOURNMENT

NOTE: The Advisory Council may take action on any of the published agenda items. Non-exempt materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Solid Waste Management Advisory Council (Countywide Local Task Force) after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection at the Waste Management Department during normal business hours. Such documents are also available on the Waste Management Department's website at www.rivcowm.org subject to staff's ability to post the documents before the meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and Government Code Section 54954.2, if special assistance is needed to participate in a Committee meeting, please contact the Riverside County Waste Management Department (951) 486-3200. Notification of at least 48 hours prior to meeting time will assist staff in assuring that reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility at the meeting.

**RIVERSIDE COUNTY
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL
(COUNTYWIDE LOCAL TASK FORCE)**

Minutes

March 15, 2012

**MEMBERS
PRESENT**

Simon Housman	County Sup. District #4
Russell Keenan	Engineering
Frankie Riddle	CVAG
Bob Magee	CLHWMA
Ed Campos	IEDA
Jordan Ehrenkranz	WRCOG
Ella Zanowic	WRCOG
Robert Moran	EDA
Richard Schmid	Agriculture
Mike Gardner	City of Riverside
Miguel Arciniega	County Sup. District #5
Terry Wold	County Sup. District #1
Bruce Scott	Agriculture

ALTERNATES

Ariana Ayala	City of Moreno Valley
Don Robinson	WRCOG
Chris Cunningham	IEDA
Dean Wetter	City of Corona
Ryan Ross	Waste Management Dept.
Linda Krupa	WRCOG
Dale West	City of Temecula

GUESTS

Jeff Smith	City of Riverside
Jennifer DiCiao	WRCOG
Dan Noble	IEDA & ACP
David Davis	MSW Consultants
Kurt Schoppe	SA Recycling

**MEMBERS
ABSENT**

Chuck Tobin
Tom Freeman
Katie Barrows
Ted Dumas
Robert Lemon
Curtis Showalter
Patrick Richardson

REPRESENTING

IEDA
EDA
Environmental Community Institute of Scrap Recycling
City of Moreno Valley
City of Corona
City of Temecula

STAFF

Hans Kernkamp	Waste Management Dept.
Joe McCann	Waste Management Dept.
Andrew Cortez	Waste Management Dept.
Fouad Mina	Waste Management Dept.
Gary Anderson	Waste Management Dept.
Todd Shibata	Waste Management Dept.
Frances Zamora	Waste Management Dept.
Greg Reyes	Environmental Health Dept.

AGENDA ITEM 1 CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. by Vice-Chairperson Simon Housman with self-introductions.

AGENDA ITEM 2 COMMENTS FROM LTF MEMBERS

Bruce Scott said staff has asked him to do a formal presentation regarding the waste stream as it relates to agriculture, particularly source reduction and green waste areas. Mr. Scott said he has taken on several hats within the agricultural community to try and create sustainable solutions for agriculture. He said that is probably one of the reasons that he is involved on this panel is the fact the he feels there is a sense for collaboration and he has tried to bring that to the table. Mr. Scott said that agriculture, in particular dairies right now, is facing (in September 2012) a threat of a total ban of land application of any organic manure to soils within the surrounding watersheds. He said that is due to a constituent of concern by the name of TDS and its potential to leach the groundwater. He said under the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act it says that you cannot apply anything to the soil that might have a potential to contaminate. He said it is not the normal situation. He said it has been hard to get a lot of support state-wide or nationally when they go for grants on this subject because everyone thinks that it is an isolated situation or they do not know what they are talking about. Mr. Scott said the Regional Board was aware of this situation five years ago. He said they took a very pro-active approach and got several grants and did several studies to analyze the situation. Mr. Scott said by using short, medium, and long-term solutions, they tried to create a sustainability plan that is both economically and regulatorily sustainable. He said they got great kudos from many agencies as high up as the Federal EPA for their efforts in doing this proactively. He said they were under the assumption that they were going to allow them a soft landing compliance schedule, where they would be phased in over the next five years. Mr. Scott said they were at a public meeting the other day and the enforcement staff for the Regional Water Quality Control Board, who was not always involved in the dialogue, came up and stated that they were going to write the permit to where they had to be 100% compliant as of September 2012. Mr. Scott said this basically makes every agriculture operation within the watershed obsolete regulatorily and out of business. He said the Water Board said we are going to let you continue to contaminate, but you are going to assume a legacy load from the date of September 2012 to the time that you are 100% in compliance. Mr. Scott said he told the Water Board that the dairy industry has been in an economic depression since 2008, bounced back up a bit, and is now heading into a double-dip second one. He told them there is nowhere in the dairy business to assume a legacy liability. Mr. Scott said he further pointed out that the banks that finance dairies are not going to assume a legacy liability on the property that they hold as collateral. Mr. Scott said he firmly told them that they were practically putting everyone out of business and that they were way off course. Mr. Scott said since then he has had a lot of soil scientists, PhDs and others go through the roof and say there is not sound science to this. Mr. Scott said in the regulatory world you are guilty until you prove yourself innocent. He said they thought that they had done a substantial amount of that with their five-year study and highlighting short-term, medium-term, and long-term projects and now trying to head towards implementation. He said green waste is going to be the next issue and biosolids is already an issue. He has tried to take an approach where all of these feedstocks have been trucked to the closest neighbor that accepts it. Mr. Scott said and now they are going to be competing with those trucks going in the opposite direction. He said it is going to get to the point where the doors just keep closing. Mr. Scott said he has been looking for a

reasonable approach for handling things locally. He said that is his philosophy, if you create the problem then you should be dealing with it, not dumping it in somebody else's backyard.

Bruce Scott said a couple of years ago he discovered a technology that was not only feasible, but was actually permitted by SCAQMD. He said he did not think it was feasible because of the permitting requirement. He said he spoke with a company and they said yes we have investors and we are going to come out and build the place and handle all of your feedstock. Mr. Scott said he told them well wait a minute because we need to have some demonstration of compliance and five or ten years to get a permit to build a regional waste facility is not in our plan. They told him that is the size that is economical and cash flow is a key part of the project. He told them that he understands, but he is in California and you do not build a regional facility within a short period duration. They asked him what he would recommend. Mr. Scott told them that you take an existing facility and you start off small and you demonstrate, first off, that the technology is applicable and technically feasible. The company staff told Mr. Scott that they had done that. He said you make sure that it is regulatorily sustainable. The company staff told Mr. Scott that they had done that. Mr. Scott said basically you bring in an existing facility and treat an existing wastestream and accept no outside wastestreams. Mr. Scott said then you stay under the radar of all the compliance things. Mr. Scott said the company at first did not know if they liked that idea, because they wanted to go to a full-scale facility. He said they did take Mr. Scott's advice and wrote a grant submittal to the California Energy Commission under the alternative vehicular fuels program, and got the second highest score for that round. Mr. Scott said they were funded for a waste to energy project on a dairy in San Jacinto. He said that grant has now been executed and the equipment has been ordered. Mr. Scott said they are expecting this summer to be using a process of pyrolysis gasification and Fischer-Tropsch, and taking cow manure on his facility and turning it into liquid diesel fuel, with a California Energy Commission Grant, funding from the company Ag Waste Solutions, and his own family's deep pockets. Mr. Scott said he has since got the attention of the USDA, who funds agriculture facilities. He said they would give him funding for a digester, but would not give him funding for this project. Mr. Scott said he has invited the USDA to look at the project. He said after their review, they have decided that they would like to help fund the first pilot project on a dairy with this technology. He said so he broke the log jam of getting a federal mandate change on what is approved and what is not approved in less than a month. He said he is pleased with the project. The first equipment will arrive in April and the last piece somewhere around June or July of this year. He said they hope to have a tour presentation because that is what it is meant for. He said it has a huge potential for other feedstocks.

Simon Housman asked when you talk about the watershed, if Mr. Scott could give a geographical description of what that is. Bruce Scott said basically everything from San Jacinto, Hemet, and Perris. He said what they call the San Jacinto Watershed, down to Elsinore. He said they also have jurisdiction in the Chino Basin. Bob Magee said the watershed covers 750 square miles. Mr. Scott said everybody thinks it is just the dairies. He said it is the land application of any product that has TDS in its make-up.

Simon Housman asked what TDS is. Bruce Scott said TDS is technically Total Dissolved Solids. He said you take a volume of water and you evaporate it off and it is what is left at the bottom, which are basically all the minerals and organic and inorganic materials that are in a volume of water. He said these include nutrients that farmers buy and apply to the field in a commercial form. Mr. Scott said their soil samples show a deficit, because soil and manure are not a perfect blend. He said even if you are doing certain things you do need a lab analysis to bring everything into balance. Mr. Scott said he has asked what happens when he is showing a deficit of calcium in his soil and crops and brings in a ton

of calcium and puts it on the ground, if that isn't TDS. He said well yes it is because calcium is a component of TDS. He asked so now is he responsible for loading a beneficial nutrient. He said they told him they do not know. Mr. Scott said he asked for a definition of what constituents by mineral are of concern in the water table. He said TDS is also interchangeably used with the loading of salts.

Simon Housman asked what is meant by a legacy load. Bruce Scott said that means that anything that is prior to a specific date. It could have been the legacy from agriculture or municipal or urban or anything for 100 years, 50 years back before we even knew what these contaminants were, those are legacy loads. He asked who is responsible for them. Basically they are drawing a line in the sand as of September 2012. They have said you can load zero from that date forward, and anything that you do, even if you are using all the USDA, NRCS, EPA, best management practices for agriculture stewardship, those are still referred to as contamination. Simon Housman asked if this would be similar to the Haz Mat law, where once you are on that piece of property whatever happens on that property forever follows you and can come back to you. Mr. Scott said that is correct. He has been told that the property owners can assume that load liability, which then becomes an encumbrance on the property. Mr. Scott said whether they are going to soften their position, he does not know. Bruce Scott said anyone that goes down to Home Depot and buys a bag of planter mix or anything else basically could be held liable. They are not going to that level, but are basically regulating out organic farming. Mr. Scott said everybody wants to go back to green, organic and sustainable and here they are saying that you can put synthetic fertilizer, but you cannot put organic fertilizer.

Simon Housman asked how many people in the room know what pyrolysis gasification is. Simon Housman asked and is it considered diversion. Hans Kernkamp said it is not considered diversion. He said conversion technologies are not considered diversion. He said they are treated as a transformation process so it counts against you. Hans Kernkamp said from what he knows pyrolysis gasification is a chemical transformation of materials. He said it is a high heat process. He said it is different from a biological transformation such as anaerobic digestion or composting. Bruce Scott said it is putting any organic matter in a container that is sealed in the absence of air. A vacuum is drawn on the chamber. Heat is applied on the outside of the chamber so there is no combustion. He said it is like a pressure cooker in reverse. When you heat organic materials in the absence of air they will basically vaporize into flammable gases. When you use digestion, it is heating the organic material. He said once there is no longer enough energy left in it for the microbial activity they quit producing gas. He said digestion can only produce a certain amount of volume of gas out of a certain amount of organic material. He said the organic material has to be fresh. He said you still end up with a huge volume of residual solids left. He said the problem with digesters is that you also have to have it wet in order to get microbial activity to work right. He asked where does the salt end up, in a mass of stuff that you have turned into soot. He said the TDS will end up in the water column, which you have added water to create the situation. He said digesters do not work regulatorily here because we are trying to have a salt mitigation. Mr. Scott said with this process you end up with a by-product that is basically char and all of the salt is sequestered within the char. He said it now has about a 90% volume reduction over the volume that was originally put in. He said you end up with two by-products, char and vaporous gas. He said that is the first process.

Simon Housman said one of the things that have been a burden is all of these new technologies have come on line over the past 10 years. He said all of them are considered incineration and, therefore, do not count towards your diversion numbers. Mr. Housman said that is one of the major underlying regulatory battles that this Council is involved in. Every time that staff stands up and gives discussion

about some very obscure adjustment to some regulation, what they are talking about is whether that 50% line is moving and which way that 50% line is moving. He said they are little battles, but they accumulate. He said what we are seeing today is an example of a good idea addressing a major problem that has a huge upside that still is not going to address the 50% diversion issue. He said as he recalls now it is 75%.

Bob Magee said he sits on a task force for the Lake Elsinore-San Jacinto Watershed Board and asked Mr. Scott for his contact information. Mr. Scott said he brought it up at a watershed council meeting and there was a lot of enthusiasm from Bill White because of the fact that they are faced with multi-million dollar bio-solid disposal issues. He said the same piece of equipment that he is proposing to put on his place is at L.A. Sanitation operating today. He said they are having some problems with the bio-solids handling of it.

Mr. Scott said if you want to learn something interesting type in Google, the word bio-char. He said that is the hottest buzz word in soil fertility. Mr. Scott said another word to Google is Sonoma bio-char initiative. He said one of the big power companies up there is subsidizing bio-char to be brought to the community for use in application on soils for nutrient sequestration and all kinds of other water quality objectives.

Bruce Scott said there is also the Fischer-Tropsch process. So, we are not creating anything new.

Simon Housman said so Mr. Scott has a pilot test program that is going to turn cow manure into diesel fuel.

AGENDA ITEM 3 APPROVAL OF MAY 19, 2011 MINUTES

Simon Housman asked if there were any corrections, additions or deletions to the minutes. Mr. Housman stated he had the following correction:

- Page 9, second paragraph, eighth sentence should re: He said it is anything but a stream.
- Page 10, first paragraph, third line should read: He said so the County decided to build...
- Page 10, second paragraph, fourth sentence should read: He said one of the....would no longer meet its 50% standard.
- Page 10, fourth paragraph, fifth sentence should read: Only the Federal Government...
- Page 10, fourth paragraph, eighth sentence should read: He said....we are beginning to see some control on this problem.
- Page 10, fourth paragraph, ninth sentence should read: He said that....we cannot influence.
- Page 10, fourth paragraph, last sentence should read: Reservations are like a separate state.
- Page 11, first paragraph, fourth sentence should read: Mr. Housman said Chiriaco Summit...
- Page 11, first paragraph, eighth sentence should be deleted.

Frankie Riddle moved to approve the minutes as amended, seconded by Ella Zanowic. The minutes were filed.

AGENDA ITEM 4 APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 20, 2011 MINUTES

Ella Zanowic moved that the minutes of the October 20, 2011, meeting be approved as submitted, seconded by Russell Keenan. The minutes were filed.

ITEM 5
STAFF PRESENTATIONS

A. NPDES Industrial Permit Update

Todd Shibata gave a presentation on this item. Mr. Shibata said what he is talking about today is industrial storm water discharges. He said storm water discharge is rainwater runoff that leaves the property boundaries. If rainwater hits the ground and just stays there or soaks into the ground it is not something that is regulated. When it leaves the property, the water quality is regulated. It is regulated first by the US Environmental Protection Agency, which is authorized by the Federal Clean Water Act. Mr. Shibata said in California the regulations are administered by the State Water Resources Control Board. He said sometimes those regulations are administered by local water boards. He said the permit that he is talking about is a statewide permit. Mr. Shibata said there are ten industrial categories, including landfills. He said a mining facility is one such industry, as well as scrap metal facilities. He said the State Water Resources Control Board issued a permit for those ten industrial categories in 1997. He said environmental regulations only get more stringent over time, they don't often become more relaxed. The 1997 permit required the Department to prepare and implement Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPP) for all of our facilities. He said those are plans that specify what potential pollutants are at our sites and how we are going to manage those pollutants from getting into the storm water. Another key requirement was that staff was supposed to physically observe storm water discharge water quality. Staff was supposed to make a qualitative assessment. This means that when it is raining you have to go outside to a property boundary and watch the storm water leave your site. If you have ten locations where storm water leaves your property, you are supposed to go out to ten locations and observe the storm water. Mr. Shibata said you are also required to sample and analyze the storm water discharge water quality. He said so you not only make a qualitative assessment of the water quality, but make a quantitative one as well. He said so you have to collect a storm water sample, and submit it to a laboratory to have it analyzed for a number of constituents depending on what your potential pollutants could be. He said those are the key requirements of that permit. Mr. Shibata said the 1997 permit is very old. He said regulations change all of the time so this one is fairly outdated. He said the State Water Resources Control Board did try and change it in 2005. He said there was a draft permit that was issued and there were substantial changes proposed. He said it did not go anywhere. There were a lot of comments and opposition to that permit. More recently, in January 2011, they issued another draft permit. He said that permit received over 250 formal comment letters that were submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board. He said those comment letters were authored by consultants, cities, counties, local districts, small and large industrial companies, and industrial trade organizations. He said the Waste Management Department helped author a comment letter as part of an industrial trade organization. He said that the 2011 draft permit, if it were to be implemented as it was originally drafted, would have substantial changes to the 1997 permit and to the Waste Management Department specifically and how we do business.

Mr. Shibata stated that the Department supports protection and preservation of storm water quality. He said staff opposes a lot of portions of the 2011 draft permit, but a lot of portions

were valid and they were good steps to enhance the water quality. He said some of the key new requirements are:

- Best Management Practices, and they were specific best management practices. He said regardless of what type of facility you had and whether it was appropriate or not, there were certain things that the draft permit was making you do. He said in the previous permit you could determine for yourself what was most appropriate for your facility and what you were doing. With this permit they lay out a set of rules and say you have to do this. He said one of those things would be a weekly inspection, regardless of whether it rains or not. Hans Kernkamp said and for the solid waste system it is even more significant because there are multiple facilities throughout the County. He said if you have just one industrial facility, then that might be feasible. Simon Housman asked if they differentiate between active and legacy. Todd Shibata said all of the Department's active sites are permitted under the Industrial Storm Water Discharge Permit. He said some of the older sites are also permitted. He said the closed Anza Landfill has an active industrial storm water permit there. He said as the permit reads, staff would have to go out weekly and inspect that site.
- Increased Training/Certification Requirements. This requirement is for staff that are going to be involved with the storm water quality at our facilities. He said there was a less defined requirement in the 1997 permit. He said there are some very specific training requirements under the 2011 draft permit.
- Observe Storm Water Discharge Quality. He said one of the main things is that they had to do inspections immediately prior to any anticipated storm. He said as we know, rain is often forecast and it just doesn't happen. He said regardless of whether it happens or not, once there is a forecast of rain there is a different kind of inspection that staff would be required to perform. He said as you can anticipate, that could take a lot of time. Every single time that you had a chance of rain, you had to go and inspect the site.
- Sample and Analyze Storm Water Discharge Water Quality. He said previously they were supposed to sample and analyze storm water. One of the new requirements is that they have increased the sampling frequency from two times per year, which was the past requirement, to as much as every day a storm event generates discharge. He said for example in 2010 at the WMD sites there were 25 working days that they would have had to go out and sample as opposed to two.
- Discharge is Subject to Numeric Effluent Limits. Todd Shibata said when we discharge from the property and analyze those samples we would get data. For example, one of the parameters is ph. So previously if you had a high ph situation or low ph situation, then you would say okay something is contaminating the storm water and we need to take a look and see what the contamination problem is and fix it. Now, they have specific threshold limits for ph for example, for high ph and low ph conditions. He said if you exceed those, you violate the permit and then you could be subject to fines and other enforcement actions by the Water Board. He said those did not previously exist. Mr. Shibata said as the 2011 permit was drafted, this would result in a significant increase in

the Department's use of both labor and monetary resources. He said in terms of labor, site sampling would increase, as much as 20 times more than what we previously had. He said water sampling, instead of two storms per year, as much as 20-30 days of sampling per year. He said a lot more site personnel would be required to actually implement these best management practices or improvements throughout our facilities. He said in terms of direct costs, the Department would have to spend a lot more money on third party laboratory testing. He said we use state certified labs to perform our analysis, and those sample numbers increase dramatically. He said the best management practice materials would have to actually be paid by the Department. He said this would require more hay bales, silt fence or hydro mulch, all of which have costs. He said sometimes we do a lot of labor in-house, but sometimes we contract the work out, so there are also construction contracts that we would have to spend money on.

Mr. Shibata said based on the industrial trade group that the Department is part of, it has been estimated that costs could be anywhere from \$50,000 -\$100,000 per site/year, and that is obviously a significant cost. Mr. Shibata said that for the Department's main sites, Badlands and Lamb Canyon, that number is definitely applicable. He said for some of the smaller sites and the desert sites, that number is probably a little high. He said regarding the future of the 2011 Draft Permit, it was initially issued in January 2011, and comments were received in April 2011. He said the Department is actively engaged in the permit rule making process. He tries to track the permit weekly to get any updates that he can. He said the State Water Resources Control Board is still working on the permit, but nothing official has been put out. The Department will continue as a major contributor to the Solid Waste Industrial Storm Water Partnership, which includes a number of major solid waste municipalities as well as private companies. Mr. Shibata said what he last heard is that it is supposed to come out in April 2012. He said there are some legislators getting involved and the State Water Resources Control Board did receive a lot of feedback. The Department will continue to participate in workshops, conference calls and comment letters to ensure fair industrial storm water quality regulations.

Bruce Scott asked if one of the highly contested components to this was the toxicity issue? Todd Shibata said he does not recall toxicity testing language.

Russell Keenan asked if Water Board staff has to have the same certification and training requirements as the regulated industry members. He asked what constitutes their authority to regulate that if they are not similarly trained. Todd Shibata said they do not and those are some issues that have gone to litigation. They have in a sense over-stepped their boundary. Mr. Keenan asked regarding staffing of the Water Board, where are they going to get the people to review, enforce, and follow-up? Mr. Shibata said that obviously is another issue. He said they do not enforce industrial permit regulations as they stand, very well. He said the proposed permit revisions make it more complicated, burdensome, and costly.

Simon Housman asked if there is any reason as to why they are doing this other than the fact that the permit is old? Todd Shibata said it is an old permit and it also has some problems. Mr. Shibata said the way they did it was they did not involve the industry to see what is going to work and what is not going to work. He said they kind of just said

we are going to improve water quality and this is what we are going to do. Simon Housman said it seems that they are shifting from creating a safety net that would detect a major problem to something that is supposed to maintain a constant level, which is a very different way of approaching the issue.

B. Legislative Update

Gary Anderson distributed a handout and gave an update on the following legislation:

- Regarding the problem that jurisdictions are having with manhole covers disappearing. He said there are two Bills that are going to start going through the process. He said one is in Assembly as a placeholder (AB 2298) saying it is the legislature's intent to do something about this. He said in the Senate, Senator Emerson from has something that is quite detailed (SB 1387). Mr. Anderson said one thing in SB 1387 is that if a person brings something to a recycler, they have to have some proof that he is a certified agent of the agency and that he can recycle that item.
- Mr. Anderson said regarding Illegal Disposal. There is a placeholder in the Senate by Hancock, SB 1118. That says the Legislature is declaring its intention to enact legislation on the illegal disposal of solid waste.
- AB 2257, Achadjian. It says if a landfill is not considered a nuisance at the time it opened and if it has been in operation for three years, it will not be considered a nuisance if conditions in the locality change. He said they have some exceptions, which are 1) Obstructions and 2) This subdivision shall not invalidate any provision of the Health and Safety Code, Fish and Game Code, Food and Agricultural Code or Division 7 (commencing with Section 13000) of the Water Code.
- Mr. Anderson said Proposition 26 was passed in November 2010 by the voters. It changed the State Constitution to provide that certain levies, charges, or exactions imposed by the State and adopted after January 1, 2010, but before November 3, 2010, will be voided one year later in November 2011, unless it is re-enacted to comply with the new Constitutional Amendment.
- In 2010 the LTF spent some time talking about the Solid Waste Carpet Stewardship Program where the manufacturers and the trade associations take responsibility by coming up with a plan of how they are going to encourage recycling of carpet over time and there is a fee that was going to be charged. Proposition 26 kind of wiped that out. AB 1029, Perez, is a two year Bill that is trying to re-enact the whole Carpet Stewardship Program.
- AB 1178, Ma. This is related to Solid Waste Place of Origin. A city or county may not otherwise restrict or limit in any way the importation of solid waste in a privately owned facility in that city or county based on the place of origin.

Mr. Anderson said the discussion that the Task Force had back in May of last year was that they recommended opposing this Bill, and recommended that the Board of Supervisors take a similar stand, which they did. He said the supporters of the Bill have said that they changed it in such a way that the local land use authority is not taken away. He said if you look at it closely, any land use authority would still have to come under where you can't restrict importation of waste. Nothing else has happened with this Bill yet, but it is a two year Bill.

C. Landfill System Study Update

Hans Kernkamp gave a power point presentation regarding the Riverside County Solid Waste System Study. Mr. Kernkamp said staff is very close to taking the two studies to the Board of Supervisors (Board).

Hans Kernkamp said this particular issue is an issue for the Solid Waste Management Advisory Council. Simon Housman said he is inclined to put together a letter for his signature, as Chairman, to be sent to the Board of Supervisors. He asked if anyone would object to him doing that. Frankie Riddle asked if that would be included as part of staff's report. Hans Kernkamp it could be included with the staff report. He said he feels a letter would make the Council's position much more clear. The Council agreed to submit a letter to the Board of Supervisors to be signed by the Chairman of the Solid Waste Management Advisory Council.

**AGENDA ITEM 6
PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

**AGENDA ITEM 7
ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None.

**AGENDA ITEM 8
ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:04 p.m.

HWK:fz

PD# 117407