

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD
AGENDA BRIEFING WORKSHOP

JOE SERNA JR., CAL EPA BUILDING
CENTRAL VALLEY AUDITORIUM
1001 I STREET, SECOND FLOOR
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 2001

9:35 A.M.

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

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

ii

A P P E A R A N C E S

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

LINDA MOULTON-PATTERSON, Chair
DAN EATON
JOSE MEDINA
DAVID A. ROBERTI

STAFF PRESENT:

BONNIE BRUCE, Interim Executive Director
KARIN FISH, Chief Deputy Director
KATHRYN TOBIAS, Chief Legal Counsel
DEBORAH MCKEE, Board Administrative Assistant

--oOo--

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

iii

I N D E X

	PAGE
Call to order	1
Opening Remarks	1
Discussion of the Trash Cutters Awards and State Agency Awards Selection Criteria and Awards Categories	2
Oral Update on SB 2202 Working Group Meetings Held to Discuss Potential Improvements to the Diversion Rate Measurement System	9
Adjournment	35
Certificate of Certified Shorthand Reporter	36

--oOo--

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 --oOo--

3 BOARD CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Good morning,
4 everybody, welcome to our public agenda review, public
5 briefing, whatever we're calling it this week. But we're
6 really glad to have you here.

7 As you can see, a number of members could not be
8 here, and I did want to note for the record Mr. Paparian
9 is absent today as he's in Washington, D.C. this week
10 representing the Board and Cal EPA at conferences and
11 meetings on E-waste and product stewardship.

12 And Mr. Jones, I'll note for the record, is ill.

13 And Mr. Senator Roberti will be in shortly.

14 So anyway, we're going to be moving along quite
15 quickly today and we have a, but we do have a long
16 agenda.

17 The way we've been working it for public
18 comments, if you would like to speak on an item, if you
19 will wait until the end of that section. For example, if
20 we are doing TJ's section, admin, if you'll wait until
21 the end and then we'll take the public comments. We try
22 and make our public briefings very informal, and so at
23 this time I'll turn it over to Bonnie.

24 (Thereupon staff presented briefings on the
25 proposed agenda.)

1 BOARD CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: The way we're
2 going to proceed this morning, the Board will not be
3 having a closed session today, but we have two items,
4 discussion items.

5 Bonnie, are we going to do Trash Cutters awards
6 first, and then go into 2202? My suggestion is we just
7 go right into that.

8 INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BRUCE: That's
9 correct, we're prepared to go forward on both of those
10 items.

11 MS. MOULTON-PATTERSON: Okay. Good morning.

12 MS. SAKAKIHARA: Good morning. My name is Susan
13 Sakakihara, I'm the supervisor of the Bay Area Outreach
14 section in the Diversion, Planning and Local Assistance
15 Office.

16 In 1998 the Board developed a Trash Cutters
17 Award Program. This program recognizes local governments
18 for their outstanding efforts in implementing integrated
19 waste reduction programs, and provides an opportunity to
20 share their success with other local governments who may
21 benefit from their experience.

22 As a result of the positive feedback the Board
23 has received regarding the need to recognize local
24 jurisdiction's efforts, Board staff is proposing to model
25 the State Agency Awards program after the Trash Cutters

1 Awards program.

2 The purpose of this item is to seek feedback
3 from the Board on the proposed scoring criteria, and the
4 award categories for the 2001 Trash Cutter Awards
5 program, and for the new State Agency Award Program.

6 This will be the fourth year the Board will
7 recognize local governments, and the first year that
8 state agencies and facilities will be recognized for
9 their outstanding waste reduction efforts.

10 At the November 14th, 2000 Board meeting, the
11 Board addressed the need to discuss and provide feedback
12 on the scoring criteria and award categories for the
13 awards programs.

14 Also at that meeting it was recommended that a
15 green procurement policy become an eligibility
16 requirement for all applicants. This eligibility
17 requirement includes having the policy, submission of the
18 State Agency Buy Recycled Program known as SABRP, in the
19 reports, and fulfillment of the SABRP requirements.

20 Additionally, in preparing the scoring criteria
21 and award categories, staff have reviewed the Board's
22 other award program, RAP, to ensure consistency.

23 The proposed scoring criteria are provided in
24 attachments one and two, and the proposed award
25 categories are identified in attachments three and four

1 of the agenda item.

2 As directed, Board staff have incorporated into
3 both the local government and State Agency Awards program
4 a green procurement policy, and also incorporated a waste
5 reduction and high volume sites category for mass public
6 attendance places such as convention centers, museums,
7 and parks as an award category.

8 In an effort to increase the awareness of these
9 programs, Board staff promoted the awards at regional
10 workshops, local task force meetings, used e-mail, placed
11 articles in the California Supervisors Association of
12 Counties, CSAC, and the League of California Cities
13 newsletters, as well as working with the Board's Public
14 Affairs office.

15 To promote the local jurisdiction award winner
16 successes, Board staff has developed case studies for
17 each award recipient and published the case studies on
18 the Board's website.

19 Staff will also develop a similar case study
20 website for each state agency facility award recipient.

21 Staff has received feedback from jurisdictions
22 such as changing the timeline for this year's award
23 program.

24 Based on this feedback, for both programs staff
25 is proposing by September 1st, 2001, to distribute the

1 brochure and applications by mail, as well as placing it
2 on the Board's website.

3 For the first time applicants will be able to
4 complete the application on-line if they choose.

5 Applications will be due to the Board by
6 November 1st, 2001.

7 Staff anticipates bringing the proposed award
8 winners and honorable recognition recipients to the Board
9 for approval in December, and the awards will be
10 presented at the January, 2002 Board meeting.

11 In addition to the awards program, staff also
12 proposes that state agencies and facilities receive an
13 outstanding award for meeting the 25 and 50 percent
14 goals, as well as local governments for meeting their 50
15 percent goals.

16 Staff is also exploring the possibility of
17 developing an awards program to recognize school
18 districts that would be modeled after these programs.
19 This program will be presented to the Board as a
20 discussion item sometime in the future.

21 Upon receiving the Board's feedback, staff will
22 bring back to the Board in May an agenda item to approve
23 the proposed scoring criteria and award categories for
24 both the Trash Cutters Awards and the State Agency Award
25 Program.

1 This concludes my presentation. Are there any
2 questions?

3 ADVISOR COLE: I have a question. Did your
4 staff also work with the SABRP staff on this criteria?

5 MS. SAKAKIHARA: Yes. And they're included in
6 the loop. We're going to figure out how they review it,
7 but we haven't done that yet.

8 MS. SANBORN: So then on the selection criteria
9 for the state agency award, under eligibility it said
10 that the applicants must have a recycled content or green
11 procurement policy. Isn't that just required already in
12 the statute that they have that under SABRP.

13 MS. MORGAN: In response, Heidi, we talked to
14 Phil about that, and as I understand it, the statute does
15 not require that you necessarily have to have a policy,
16 but they have to submit their plan, and they have to be
17 meeting a certain level of purchasing recycled content
18 material.

19 So we're trying to do both things. We're trying
20 to encourage both policy, as well as purchasing the
21 materials, as well as submission of the plan. So we're
22 trying to get it all, including SABRP, as well as
23 promoting the Board's effort in encouraging both state
24 agencies and local agencies to have a policy, so we're
25 kind of doing it all with that one requirement.

1 MS. SANBORN: We're encouraging them to have a
2 policy in addition to just the requirement and law?

3 MS. MORGAN: Yeah, yeah. And it formalizes it,
4 so that's what we're after.

5 MS. SANBORN: Okay. Would it be appropriate to
6 also put in that they meet the 50 percent requirement of
7 buying recycled content product?

8 MS. MORGAN: Yeah, that will be in the brochure
9 that goes out to the state agencies so that it's clear on
10 what that means for an eligibility requirement for them.

11 MS. SANBORN: Okay. So it won't be changed on
12 here?

13 MS. MORGAN: Well this is the internal scoring
14 tool so it can be. But what will go out in the brochure
15 will be an explanation of what the eligibility
16 requirements are, and laying those out so it's clear.

17 We're also, really want to look to using the
18 brochure to promote the SABRP program, as well as the AB
19 75 program. So the brochure will be, you know, a good
20 piece to educate folks on it.

21 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: And so when will that be
22 ready for review?

23 MS. MORGAN: I think the timeline that the
24 brochures will go out sometime in August. They'll have
25 about two months to submit their applications, and then

1 we'll have a little less than thirty days to review the
2 applications.

3 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Okay. And when will you
4 have a rough draft of the brochure to look at?

5 MS. MORGAN: We anticipate probably within the
6 next month we'll have a rough draft of the brochure
7 finalized.

8 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Good, we'd like to take a
9 look at that.

10 BOARD CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Go, sure. Go
11 ahead, Heidi.

12 MS. SANBORN: In both the Trash Cutters and the
13 State Agency Awards categories the attachments three and
14 four on the first category is creative partnerships. And
15 it said that that includes coordination between the
16 public public or public private entities.

17 Does that include or exclude environmental
18 groups or non-profits?

19 MS. MORGAN: You know, we were assuming that
20 that would be included whether they're considered public
21 or private. Sometimes non-profit agencies are considered
22 private entities, sometimes they're considered public, so
23 we're trying to capture everyone by keeping it general.
24 So that's the intent.

25 MS. SANBORN: So the intent is that it's broad.

1 MS. MORGAN: Yes.

2 BOARD CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thanks, Heidi.

3 Any other questions? Comments? Okay. Thank
4 you very much.

5 We'll move on to 2202.

6 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Good morning.

7 BOARD CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Good morning.

8 MS. VAN KEKERIX: My name is Lorraine Van
9 Kekerix and I'm with the Waste Analysis Branch.
10 Hopefully everyone has a copy of the slides. They got
11 delivered upstairs to all the Board members and advisors
12 yesterday.

13 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT MCKEE: Excuse me,
14 Chairman Patterson. We'd like to take a break to get
15 this set up.

16 MS. MOULTON-PATTERSON: Oh, sure, we need a
17 break. We need ten minutes. Thank you.

18 MS. VAN KEKERIX: For everyone in the office who
19 doesn't have a copy, there are copies at the back of the
20 room in the table.

21 MS. MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.

22 We'll take a ten minute break right now.

23 (Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

24 MS. VAN KEKERIX: AB 2202 requires that the
25 Board prepare a report to the legislature. The Board is

1 required to establish, at a minimum, a working group to
2 evaluate the disposal reporting system, and submit the
3 report with recommendations for changes and improvements
4 by January 1 of 2002.

5 It requires that DRS, the disposal reporting
6 system be evaluated under differing conditions.

7 We have status or implementation of the DRS at
8 the local level by haulers, operators, and local
9 agencies.

10 And investigate the need for modification of the
11 disposal reporting system to improve accuracy.

12 We are to include recommendations for regulatory
13 and statutory changes to address disposal reporting
14 system deficiencies, and recommendations to improve
15 implementation and streamline reporting, including ways
16 to assist agencies to meet the requirements.

17 Now, back in December we came to the Board
18 meeting and got Board approval of looking at more than
19 just the minimum required of the disposal reporting
20 system, since disposal reporting is only one component of
21 our diversion rate measurement system.

22 And after the Board approved our doing an
23 expanded working group format for our report to the
24 legislature, we set up a structure to do that.

25 We have two working groups that are focusing on

1 improvements to the existing system, and those are the
2 disposal reporting system which has 28 members in the
3 group; and the adjustment method working group which has
4 seventeen members. In addition, we have an alternatives
5 working group that's focusing on alternatives to the
6 existing system, and that has 23 members.

7 After we have the three individual working
8 groups working on specific components, we will have a
9 synthesis group that will look at combined solutions from
10 all the groups, and how we can develop a workable and
11 improved diversion rate measurement system. And we're
12 looking to get members from each of the three individual
13 groups for a total of eighteen members on that synthesis
14 group.

15 The group members are representatives from all
16 the various interest groups, cities and counties
17 throughout California, both urban and rural, haulers,
18 disposal facility operators, recyclers, consultants,
19 environmental and special interest groups, and colleges
20 and universities.

21 We're holding three working group meetings for
22 each of those three groups in March, April, and May. And
23 they're working to identify issues and potential
24 solutions.

25 The solutions include improvements to the

1 existing system, both with and without legislation. The
2 solutions from all three of the groups, disposal
3 reporting, adjustment method, and alternatives, will be
4 forwarded to the synthesis group in early June.

5 The recommendations from the working groups and
6 Board staff will be included in a draft report that will
7 be released in July of 2001.

8 And we expect to have a thirty day public
9 comment period on that draft report, get all of the
10 proposed revisions, release a revised report in August of
11 2001, and bring the final report to the Board for their
12 consideration in October of 2001. And again, our final
13 report is due to the legislature in January of 2002.

14 And we're going to focus today on information
15 that we've been working on for the disposal reporting
16 group. And Tom Rudy, one of the staff people on that, is
17 going to go over some presentations on various
18 information and data that has been given to the disposal
19 reporting group.

20 MR. RUDY: Madam Chair and Board members, I'm
21 Tom Rudy from the Waste Analysis Branch and Diversion,
22 Planning, and Local Assistance Division.

23 (Thereupon a video presentation was shown.)

24 MR. RUDY: As stated, the DRS working group
25 meetings were set up according to broad areas of issues

1 that were heard from interested parties both at the
2 November, 1999 public workshop, and the public input
3 workshops that were held back in January of this year.

4 So far the DRS working group has held two
5 meetings, one in March to discuss hauler and self-haul
6 issues and solutions to those issues; and another one in
7 April where we discussed the waste allocation issues and
8 proposed solutions to those problems.

9 To assist groups in the examination of the
10 issues and possible solutions, and to help them make
11 suggestions for sound solutions, staff prepared a number
12 of data analyses and presentations for these groups.

13 Among these are the results of unannounced DRS
14 site visits that have been conducted over calendar year
15 2000 and the first quarter of 2001.

16 There's also a summary of a landfill telephone
17 survey that was conducted to collect information on
18 scales used at facilities, and how verification of origin
19 data is accomplished.

20 We also presented an analysis of disposal data
21 from the 1997 study to determine what effect the length
22 of the survey period and the size of a jurisdiction has
23 on the accuracy of disposal data.

24 And finally, we presented them with a look at a
25 series of disposal trends that are used to determine

1 various impacts on jurisdictions.

2 As a result of the November, '99 DRS workshop
3 held at the Board, staff began unannounced visits to
4 facilities to document whether or not gate attendants
5 were asking their customers for the origin of their waste
6 for self-haul loads.

7 Now the visits were followed up by a letter
8 stating the results of our findings to each of these
9 landfill facilities.

10 If no origin questions were asked, we requested
11 that the operator explain their procedures for obtaining
12 origin information.

13 Our first quarter visits in the year 2000 were
14 confined to just one county and only three facilities.
15 But over the past five quarters we have visited over 201
16 facilities, broken down to 114 landfills and 87
17 transformation facilities, which is quite a few -- excuse
18 me, transfer stations.

19 What I'd like to do, though, is I'd like to
20 emphasize this was self-haul, an examination of
21 self-haul. Most of the waste is commercial or
22 residential brought in by haulers, but we were kind of
23 confined to self-haul numbers.

24 The second quarter of 2000 this slide shows we
25 visited 35 landfills and five transfer stations. And 58

1 percent of the facilities asked some sort of origin
2 questions, or at least asked where the customer was from.

3 And in the third quarter of that year 89
4 facilities were visited, and the percentage went up
5 considerably, to 73 percent asking origin questions.

6 Fourth quarter it went up to 72, and the first
7 quarter of the next, 2001, is also up to 72.

8 This slide shows the improvement in facilities
9 that didn't ask questions the first time through. So
10 what we did is those that didn't comply, we went and
11 revisited them, and a larger percentage of them corrected
12 the errors in not asking origin questions.

13 So there's some things that we've learned from
14 these self-haul visits. Some gate attendants know what
15 the origin survey is for, a lot of 'em don't.

16 Many facility operators really want to be in
17 compliance. More facilities are conducting daily origin
18 surveys. More and more it seems to increase for each
19 site visit that we go out and do.

20 And more facilities are asking where the waste
21 is from instead of asking where the driver is from.

22 Now these results I want to emphasize again are
23 for residential self-haul, and may be different for
24 results for the remainder of the waste stream, especially
25 the commercial self-haul sector.

1 We've also always had, been kind of uncertain
2 about the number of facilities that had scales, and used
3 them in the frequency of their origin surveys and
4 essentially also the kind of data tracked by the landfill
5 operators. So we decided to do our own telephone survey.

6 We set up a survey form and a database to track
7 the responses, and began calling all the landfill
8 operators to ask them questions about their operations.
9 We informed the operator that it was strictly voluntary,
10 and to date we have 96 telephone surveys completed.

11 The questions we asked them were:

12 How often does your facility conduct surveys?

13 Do you use the same survey methodology for
14 self-haul and commercial haulers?

15 Do you have scales?

16 Do you weigh your self-haul and commercial?

17 And do you use computers to track your data or
18 is it a manual system?

19 Our preliminary findings indicate that about 78
20 percent of those responding said that they do daily
21 surveys.

22 Eight percent conduct surveys only in the
23 designated survey week.

24 Another eight percent that do do daily surveys
25 but only for commercial haulers.

1 And about six percent said that their
2 jurisdiction accepts all waste so they don't bother to do
3 a survey.

4 As far as scale use is concerned, about 59
5 percent said they weigh both commercial and self-haul,
6 whereas 23 percent said they only weighed commercial.

7 11 percent failed to respond.

8 And seven percent either don't have scales or
9 they don't use them for weighing either commercial or
10 self-haul loads.

11 Some preliminary findings. We noticed many
12 jurisdictions have indicated that they would like to be
13 able to verify the origins of their loads delivered to
14 their disposal facility, obviously it's in their best
15 interest; but when it comes to verifying the waste
16 origin, 76 of the 96 operators responded to our question.

17 62 percent did not verify the origin.

18 Okay. Ten required that a driver's license or
19 an I.D. or a utility bill or something be used to verify.

20 Three accept other forms of verification.

21 And one required a pre-purchased ticket.

22 The next analysis that we presented to the DRS
23 working group concerned DRS data analysis major error
24 sources.

25 One of the items that SB 2202 requires is that

1 the Board evaluate the accuracy of the DRS under
2 differing circumstances. Some people have described this
3 as determining a margin of error for the disposal
4 reporting system. And as a part of that requirement,
5 staff has done some work in the area of DRS analysis.

6 Now much of the background for this study comes
7 from a study that was conducted by the Board in 1997.

8 Essentially there are three major error sources
9 in the disposal reporting system.

10 First, there is an inherent error that is due to
11 extrapolation. This comes from extrapolating a weekly
12 relative allocation percentage, and applying it to a
13 total quarterly tonnage.

14 Now this is caused by assuming that the week or
15 weeks that you surveyed are actually representative of
16 your entire quarter. And even under ideal conditions we
17 know that a jurisdiction's tonnage will vary from week to
18 week due to weather conditions, hauler adjustments,
19 whatever.

20 A second error comes from what's called
21 non-regular disposal. And this occur from extrapolating
22 tonnage for jurisdictions who maybe disposes during the
23 survey week but doesn't dispose the other twelve weeks
24 out of the quarter, or doesn't dispose during the survey
25 week and does dispose the rest of the time.

1 And then a final error is a transactional error,
2 and this is caused by allocating the waste to the wrong
3 jurisdiction. And this occurs a lot of times when you
4 have a county, an unincorporated county in the city that
5 have the same name.

6 When you have a truck that is loaded with loads
7 from multiple jurisdictions and the driver does not have
8 an accurate percentage to break down where that waste
9 came from.

10 We focused our study mostly on the first two
11 sources of error, that is the extrapolation error and the
12 non-regular disposal error.

13 Again, the data source for this was from a 1997
14 study. The contractors obtained daily disposal data from
15 two Southern California counties, Riverside and San
16 Diego. And the data contains a total tonnage disposed by
17 each jurisdiction within the county at landfills within
18 the county for each week in the year 1995.

19 In order to determine the value of the inherent
20 errors in the system, each week was treated as a single
21 survey week. Using that week, extrapolated quarterly
22 tonnage was determined. And this tonnage was then
23 compared to what was known to have been disposed during
24 that quarter.

25 The tonnages were compiled into an annual

1 tonnage and compared to the actual annual tonnage for
2 each of those jurisdictions. So what we're doing is
3 we're taking, if you just did a survey, this is what your
4 annual allocation would be as opposed to this is what
5 your jurisdiction actually threw away.

6 Now this slide shows the average of the actual
7 value of the percent difference for the County of
8 Riverside.

9 As you can see, sometimes the difference is an
10 overprojection of what was actually disposed, and in some
11 cases it's an underprojection of what was actually
12 disposed.

13 Now if the data were perfect it would follow
14 that straight line regression analysis, but it's not.

15 On this slide we see the results of using the
16 designated survey weeks for each quarter in extrapolating
17 that to an annual tonnage. And a couple of things stand
18 out here.

19 For one, you can notice the clustering of the
20 data points at the lower end of the graph that's marked
21 actual tons disposed for the year. Now actual tons
22 disposed can be used as an indicator of jurisdiction
23 size. So you can see from this data that it indicates
24 that the smaller of the jurisdiction, the greater the
25 potential for an allocation error to occur, okay? Which

1 makes sense.

2 A thousand ton error for a jurisdiction that
3 disposes 10,000 tons a year is quite significant;
4 whereas a jurisdiction that disposes one hundred thousand
5 tons a year, 10,000 is minimal.

6 We also plotted the data using a two week survey
7 period to see if that improved it. And you can see the
8 numbers get a little bit closer to zero but they're still
9 scattered out. We still have the clustering for the
10 smaller jurisdictions where the error seems to be the
11 greatest.

12 Now that was '95 data, and we were able to get
13 some 2000 data from the County of Riverside. And you can
14 see that the numbers have improved percentage-wise, but
15 we still have the clustering that shows that the smaller
16 jurisdictions are, really have the biggest allocation
17 problems.

18 We were able to draw some conclusions from this
19 information. First of all, the DRS in and of itself does
20 not tend to either over estimate or underestimate
21 disposal. It's quite random. Sometimes it will give you
22 too much, sometimes it will give you not enough, okay.
23 That's using the one week survey period.

24 Secondly, it appears from the data that smaller
25 jurisdictions are the most adversely affected from the

1 DRS errors. And that's shown in the clustering that we
2 showed at the lower end of the spectrum.

3 Third, the length of the survey has a pronounced
4 effect on the precision of the errors. The longer the
5 survey period, that is the more data points, the more
6 precise the allocation would be.

7 And this could lead us to a, what I call some
8 intuitive conclusions. The first being, in order for us
9 to get a good understanding on the potential
10 extrapolation errors caused by the mathematical
11 extrapolation techniques, we need to have daily data to
12 run the analysis. In other words, we need to be able to
13 compare actual disposal with projected disposal, so we
14 need to get that data from the jurisdictions.

15 Another conclusion that one can intuitively draw
16 is that you remember that transaction error that I spoke
17 about at the beginning where the waste is allocated to
18 the wrong jurisdiction for whatever reason; it's
19 impossible -- or not impossible, but it's extremely
20 difficult to be able to quantify that error.

21 The extrapolation errors from the map that
22 results in a mathematical method, so it's relatively easy
23 to calculate those, but the transactional errors are
24 based on whether or not somebody tells you the right
25 information on any given day, and it's very difficult to

1 get your hands around that error.

2 And that's why I developed the last conclusion
3 that the margin of error is a very elusive beast, and to
4 come up with a accurate margin of error to be used in the
5 DRS system is going to be a rather monumental task.

6 The last presentation we made to the DRS group
7 concerned trends in disposal, okay. And this analysis
8 was created to determine whether trends and patterns
9 existed in jurisdictional disposal data.

10 Just to clarify, the patterns include things
11 like seasonal variations; whereas trends would be
12 increases or decreases in disposal over time.

13 By identifying outliers in these patterns and
14 trends, it makes it easier to determine which
15 jurisdictions or types of jurisdictions may have
16 potential accuracy issues.

17 Staff found that quarterly DRS disposal is
18 highly variable at the jurisdiction level. Some
19 jurisdictions show strong patterns or trends, while
20 others don't. In fact, some jurisdictions show no
21 patterns or no trends at all.

22 Here's an example of a jurisdiction with a
23 strong seasonal pattern. And you can see that it looks
24 like the third quarter is very high in disposal. And the
25 unusually high third quarter of '98 is still the seasonal

1 variation in disposal in Mariposa County, and that's
2 where the off is.

3 This next example is an example of a
4 jurisdiction showing a strong trend in disposal over
5 time. Disposal at Adelanto is clearly going up as you
6 can see by the annual averages which are the red dashes,
7 okay.

8 Adelanto shows a pretty good seasonal pattern as
9 well, although it's not as clear as the one in Mariposa.

10 And finally, we have here a jurisdiction which
11 shows no clear patterns in the quarterly data, nor does
12 it show a really strong trend.

13 The annual average is decreased from '95 to '97,
14 and starts to increase from '98 to '99.

15 This may indeed be a realistic trend for the
16 City of Albany, but further investigation would be
17 recommended for something like this.

18 Types of potential outliers. The annual
19 average -- excuse me.

20 Staff defined three basic types of outliers. An
21 annual average outlier would be a quarter where the data
22 is significantly different from the annual average of
23 that year. A data point seems significantly different if
24 it is greater than 150 percent or less than 70 percent of
25 the annual average.

1 A seasonal outlier would be mainly for those
2 jurisdictions that show seasonal patterns, and could be
3 applied to other jurisdictions as well.

4 A Seasonal outlier is defined as a quarter that
5 is significantly different than the average of the rest
6 of the quarters for each year.

7 For example, if you're looking at the first
8 quarter of 1998, it would be compared to the average of
9 the first quarters from the years '95 through '99.

10 A data point is deemed significantly different
11 if the percentages is greater than 125 percent or less
12 than 75.

13 And then finally we looked at extreme changes
14 from quarter to quarter, again using the 150 and 75
15 percent criteria.

16 So let's look at some examples of the different
17 types of outliers.

18 The first one we'll look at is an average annual
19 outlier, and we'll look at Alpine Incorporated.

20 BOARD CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: It shows and
21 that pulls the annual average all the way up causing the
22 other three quarters to be flagged as outliers.

23 Now although it is possible that the data for
24 the third quarter is correct, it's extreme and should be
25 investigated further.

1 Next we can look at a seasonal one from Thousand
2 Oaks. And again it's a pretty strong seasonal pattern
3 with peaks showing up during the third quarter of each
4 year. However, the third quarter actually dipped
5 significantly in '99 and, in fact, is the lowest data
6 point of all the quarters.

7 Now while this may be correct and disposal
8 actually did go down, it does again merit further
9 investigation.

10 And let's look at a quarterly change here.
11 Finally we'll look at Marin County Regional Agency. This
12 is an example of a quarterly outlier.

13 As you can see, the fourth quarter of '98 shows
14 a significant increase in disposal. The extreme value
15 for the fourth quarter of '98 causes two data points to
16 be flagged as outliers because of this extreme quarterly
17 change.

18 So now the first quarter of '99 probably isn't
19 an outlier, but because it, the average was pulled up so
20 high it now falls into that criteria. But it's better to
21 err on the side of caution, and we again want to
22 investigate why this occurred.

23 So in summary of the data, in most counties,
24 jurisdiction level data shows more potential outliers
25 than countywide data. In fact, in 28 counties, all the

1 jurisdiction outliers disappear when you look at the
2 countywide data.

3 In nine other counties the outlier rates
4 decreased significantly.

5 There are 16 counties in which the outlier rate
6 either stays the same, or in the case of some counties it
7 increases slightly.

8 Ten of these are already regional agencies,
9 although they're very small.

10 Twelve out of the 16 could qualify as rural
11 agencies under the law, and they represent less than
12 one-half of one percent of statewide disposal.

13 The other four counties are either regional
14 agencies or have no incorporated cities and therefore are
15 similar to regional agencies, and therefore represent
16 only about three percent of the total statewide disposal.

17 And finally, there are four counties that are
18 already regional agencies and have no outliers.

19 Most of the counties that have outlier rates are
20 very small. In fact, if you add up the 1999 disposal for
21 the 25 counties that have at least one quarterly outlier,
22 they represent only seven percent of the statewide
23 disposal.

24 So with the exception of San Francisco and San
25 Joaquin County, each of the counties are less than one

1 percent of statewide disposal.

2 Now the average disposal for these 23 counties
3 was about 56,000 tons in 1999. So that leads us to the
4 possible conclusion that, in general, the data is more
5 stable, and perhaps more accurate for larger
6 jurisdictions than it is for smaller ones.

7 And you can compile that back to the previous
8 study we discussed where it showed the disposal rates
9 using disposal allocation using the survey.

10 Now let's look at some quick examples of these
11 counties. Here we see Riverside County has a gradual
12 upward trend in disposal over time with a slight seasonal
13 pattern. Where the variability may be high for some
14 jurisdictions, most are relatively stable.

15 Here's Sacramento County where there's been a
16 relatively large number of outliers and jurisdiction
17 data, but zero outliers at the county level.

18 Now in the past some landfills in this county
19 did daily surveys. Just recently they all started doing
20 daily surveys.

21 Jurisdictions that send to a variety of
22 landfills with a variety of survey methods also have some
23 allocation issues. But again, this is a reasonably
24 stable trend.

25 Finally we have Colusa County which is a

1 regional agency that shows a very high number of
2 outliers, and a high variability in the quarter as well
3 as annual disposal.

4 There's no pattern here, no obvious trend. It
5 sends its waste to landfills in several different
6 counties, some do daily surveys, some don't do daily
7 surveys.

8 So we get some conclusions out of this. The DRS
9 data shows a lot of variability at the jurisdiction
10 level. Many jurisdictions show patterns such as
11 seasonality and trends over time while others do not.

12 Jurisdictions with annual disposal of less than
13 25,000 tons show more variability than outliers.

14 And in addition, jurisdictions with greater than
15 one hundred thousand tons show considerably less
16 variability.

17 Countywide patterns and trends seem to be more
18 stable in general than jurisdictional data.

19 And most potential outliers disappear when the
20 data is aggregated to the county level.

21 Now this may not hold true for smaller counties
22 with annual disposal of less than 60,000 tons. Many of
23 those smaller rural regional agencies have unstable
24 disposal patterns and trends and many potential outliers.

25 Therefore, regionalization may not necessarily

1 create better disposal data for small counties; however,
2 it is important to note that these smaller counties
3 contribute very little to the statewide disposal, less
4 than one-half of one percent.

5 Finally, in counties such as Riverside where
6 daily waste origin surveys are conducted, even the
7 smaller jurisdictions here have fairly stable disposal,
8 with less variability and fewer potential outliers.

9 Daily surveys may prove to be the solution in
10 counties where disposal allocation issues are severe.

11 That's pretty much what we finished with those.
12 We do have future presentations coming up, presentations
13 on the adjustment methods and alternatives, and you'll be
14 seeing those in the future.

15 MS. VAN KEKERIX: I think Tom pretty well
16 summarized the conclusions in that last slide for a
17 number of them.

18 We've done a lot of data analysis so that you
19 have a good analytical basis for any recommendations
20 coming to you from either the working group or the staff.

21 And it does seem that there is a lot more error
22 for smaller jurisdictions, and that when we look at
23 larger areas we get more stable data.

24 And one of the things, I'm not sure it got
25 emphasized a lot, but in order to take a look at how much

1 error there is, we have to rely on voluntary provision of
2 Daily data by counties. So you saw some examples for
3 Riverside County because Riverside does gather data
4 daily, and they were willing to provide the information
5 for us.

6 We can do additional data analyses if other
7 people choose to voluntarily provide us with that data.

8 We hope to come back to talk with you in May
9 with an update on some of the issues identified by the
10 adjustment method. In June, talk to you about what the
11 alternatives group has found. Come back in July for an
12 update on the synthesis group, and to give you
13 preliminary recommendations that are coming out of that
14 as we release that draft report for public comment.

15 We'd be happy to answer any questions.

16 BOARD CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Okay. Thank
17 you. Questions?

18 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Yes, I had a question.
19 You make the statement there that, in regard to the
20 self-haul visits more facilities are asking where the
21 waste is from instead of where the driver is from. I
22 wonder if you could explain that?

23 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Yes. That's an extremely
24 important question when we look at who the waste gets
25 assigned to, which we sometimes call allocation issues.

1 If you have a roofer who works in five
2 communities and he goes to the landfill and somebody
3 says, "Well where are you from?" He may tell you that,
4 just for example, he lives in Alhambra. But if he did a
5 roofing job in Monterey Park, that's where the waste came
6 from. So where the waste came from and where the driver
7 lives may be two completely different things, and that's
8 one of the kinds of errors that we get depending on if
9 they ask the question the right way.

10 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Your example is good, but
11 it's a pretty large problem for different waste. For
12 example, if a hauler wants to pick a place where he has
13 designated as the central location where the trash was
14 generated, crazy quilt boundaries throughout California
15 make that impossible for, you know, for the city
16 engineers of some cities to even know where these lines
17 are.

18 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Well that is an issue,
19 particularly in areas that have, as you said, pretty
20 crazy quilt boundaries. Or, for instance, again we've
21 been hearing about a lot of examples from L.A. County so
22 I'll just use one of those.

23 Part of West Covina is unincorporated county,
24 and part of it is West Covina City. And when people are
25 asked where they are from, they may not know whether

1 they're in the unincorporated county or from the city.
2 They know they're from West Covina. So there are some
3 issues with that.

4 One of the things that some people have done to
5 get around that, and in particular we know that Riverside
6 County has gotten around this issue by working more
7 directly with the haulers and the hauler dispatchers to
8 get the information; because they have much more detailed
9 information on what the boundaries are and where they're
10 picking up their loads and how much they're getting from
11 different disposers.

12 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: And do you not also want
13 to know where the waste is from, or is that noted in the
14 report?

15 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Yes, yes. That's the real
16 crucial question is where the waste is from, especially
17 if you have somebody who lives in one city but is
18 bringing loads from different cities.

19 And we have seen an improvement in that in our
20 unannounced site visits.

21 MS. MOULTON-PATTERSON: Lorraine, are there
22 still problems with cities that have similar names?

23 MS. VAN KEKERIX: There are still problems with
24 cities that have similar names. Rolling Hills and
25 Rolling Hills Estates down south; the City of Orange and

1 Orange County; Los Angeles and Los Angeles County; there
2 are a number of problems.

3 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Isn't there also a
4 problem of intentional deception in these cases where a
5 landfill will only take waste from certain jurisdictions,
6 then the enterprising hauler, if he feels that nobody's
7 really checking, and anybody can get away with something
8 if they try hard enough I guess, will just designate one
9 of the illicit jurisdictions --

10 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Right, there are some, in
11 particular, that post signs that they will only take
12 waste from certain jurisdictions, and so, of course, the
13 people who don't want to drive to the next transfer
14 station or landfill may tell them that they are from one
15 of the acceptable cities.

16 MR. ALEMAN: In your study methodology you
17 indicate that there was a, in your conclusion that there
18 is, that the margin of error is elusive.

19 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Right.

20 MR. ALEMAN: Is there ranges?

21 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Well the problem on margin of
22 error is that we need to get all of that daily data so
23 that we compare it to what the minimum requirement is,
24 you do a survey week and extrapolate that out.

25 So if we don't, if we don't voluntarily get the

1 daily data, then we can't take a look at margin of error
2 for each jurisdiction or on a statewide basis. We can
3 take a look at it for the data that's being voluntarily
4 provided to us.

5 But that's why we said it was elusive because
6 you need to have that daily data to compare the
7 extrapolated data to.

8 MS. MOULTON-PATTERSON: Any other questions?

9 Okay. Thank you very much for the information.

10 And Bonnie, is there anything else?

11 INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BRUCE: That
12 concludes our briefing.

13 MS. MOULTON-PATTERSON: Okay. Well thank you
14 very much for coming, and if there are any comments from
15 the audience we'll be glad to take them now.

16 Seeing none, we're adjourned.

17 (Thereupon the foregoing was concluded at

18 11:29 a.m.)

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 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 1st day of May, 2001.

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

