

Alternative Technology Advisory Subcommittee  
Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/  
Integrated Waste Management Task Force  
**Minutes of June 21, 2012**

*(NOTE: The revisions shown are based on the transcript of the 6/21/12 Meeting. Addition are shown in italic and underlined and deletion shown by strikethrough. 9/13/12)*

County of Los Angeles  
Department of Public Works  
Conference Room B  
900 South Fremont Avenue  
Alhambra, California

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition  
John Kaddis, Los Angeles County Department of Public Health  
Ron Kent, Southern California Gas Company  
Mike Mohajer, Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Task Force  
Kay Martin\*, Bioenergy Producers Association  
Eugene Sun, Council Member, City of San Marino  
Jeff Yann, Hacienda Heights Improvement Association  
Mark McDannel, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (LACSD)

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

David Cieply, Republic- Allied Waste Company  
Jacques Franco, Department of Resource Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle)  
Alex Helou, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation  
Eugene Tseng, UCLA Solid Waste Program

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY OTHERS:

Suk Chong, represented by Coby Skye, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works

OTHERS PRESENT:

Sue Higgins\* Alternative Resources Inc (ARI)  
Becky Bendikson, Sunshine Canyon Landfill-Community Advisory Committee  
Anthony Bertrand, Republic Services  
Macaria Flores, Cerrell Associates  
William Gorham, Cerrell Associates  
George Gomez, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works  
Achaya Kelapanda, Republic Services  
Tobie Mitchell, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works  
Pat Proano, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works

\*Designates participants over the phone



## **I. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Coby Skye called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

## **II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM APRIL 19 AND MAY 17, 2012 MEETING**

The May 17, 2012 minutes approval was postponed to the next ATAS meeting. Mr. Mohajer made a motion to approve the April 19, 2012 minutes. Mr. Wayne Hunter seconded the motion. The motion passed.

## **III. RECAP ON CONVERSION TECHNOLOGY EVENTS/MEETINGS**

Mr. Pat Proano provided a recap on a meetings held in Sacramento with CalRecycle, the Air Resources Board, the California Energy Commission, and the Department of Natural Resources. A delegation representing several local jurisdictions, the recyclers, University of California at Riverside, an environmental group and utility representative (California Conversion Technology Coalition) participated in these meetings intended to educate the various agency heads about the benefits and opportunities for conversion technologies in California.

Ms. Kay Martin asked what the relationship is between the California Conversion Technology Coalition and the Task Force. Mr. Skye stated that one key difference is that the ATAS and the Task Force are entities that address issues impacting the solid waste management system on a countywide basis, whereas the Coalition is a group focused on promoting conversion technologies statewide.

Mr. Pat Proano indicated that the Department of Public Works is very active with the California State Association of Counties (CSAC). The CSAC has a public waste committee which meets on a regular basis and he is the co-chair of that committee. The committee is scheduled to meet in Septembers addressing regulatory and legislative issues related to solid waste. There is a CT subcommittee within that committee that met with the above State agencies in Sacramento. The subcommittee is an advisory group and needs more involvement by MRF operators and technology providers.

Ms. Martin asked whether or not the Task Force is an advisory group for body to the County and participating in the statewide Coalition? Mr. Pat Proano stated that the ATAS is a part of the team and the coalition is open to anyone in favor of CT. and Task Force are key stakeholders in support of conversion technologies. He added that a different the County's approach is needed. going to be positive and His approach is to

be collaborative with everyone, including CalRecycle. Not to be at odds with them. Be adults. Taking extreme positions is not helpful.

Ms. Martin indicated that staff at CalRecycle has been supportive of CTs but no support beyond that in terms of legislation. While differing with Ms. Martin, Mr. Proano concluded that he has seen changes. The letter from the Governor to Plasco Energy is very helpful as well as the offers by Scott Smithline and Caroll Mortensen of CalRecycle to coordinate efforts with him.

#### IV. DISCUSSION ON RECENT LETTERS REGARDING THE SALINAS VALLEY PLASCO PROJECT

Ms. Martin suggested having a broader discussion within the Task Force regarding the CT feedstock-neutral system as proposed by CalRecycle, what constitutes such a system and what makes the system work. ~~a statewide legislative approach for conversion technologies.~~ Mr. Proano stated that the County's consultant (ARI) has initiated gathering preliminary thoughts and ideas for a MRF first or feedstock standard, and asked Ms. Sue Higgins to elaborate in these findings. Ms. Higgins stated that ARI and Cerell Associates coordinated a conference call on June 14, 2012, with County staff, Coalition, technology providers, MRF operators and other industry representatives, to obtain input and ideas on how to proceed with a potential MRF Performance Standard that was suggested by CalRecycle in their AB341 draft Report to the Legislature, Numerical based standard vs. performance based, and best management practices. During this conference call, caution was expressed regarding the path of moving toward anything numerically based. The group ~~also highlighted pros and cons of the proposal,~~ and highlighted the need to be mindful of the variability that is out there, many regions with differences in feedstock, and ~~not establishing a standard that is restricted or confining to the industry.~~ Ms. Higgins concluded that the information gathered from the conference call has been compiled, summarized and forwarded to the County.

Ms. Martin asked if this information can be provided to the Task Force at the today's meeting? ~~will be presented at the next Task Force meeting.~~ Mr. Skye stated that they just started on this effort and more time is needed before the info can be released. However, in response to Ms. Martin's request, Mr. Skye indicted that the info will be available at the next ATAS meeting. ~~, as mentioned by Mr. Proano, staff just began preliminary discussions on this topic with the County team and are going to be involving additional stakeholders, such as the ATAS and the Task Force at the appropriate time.~~

Mr. Mohajer stated the following:

We are discussing two separate issues; first issue is the Plasco issue and second is that, the County formed a coalition under the County Engineers Association of California. Mr. Proano stated that the coalition is evolving under the umbrella of the California State Association of Counties.

Plasco received a letter from Calrecycle over two years ago, identifying their project in Salinas Valley, CA as gasification according to Public Resources code, section 40117. Following this determination, they received Renewable Energy Portfolio Standard (RPS) pre-certification from the California Energy Commission that the energy being generated from the Plasco project is renewable.

Now the administration changed, CalRecycle decided to withdraw the determination. Salinas Valley Counsel wrote a letter to CalRecycle asking for legal justification on how they went back on their previous determination. As a result of this issue, Governor Brown's office sent a letter to Plasco, expressing support of legislation that will allow Plasco project to proceed in a pilot bases, and be reconsidered as an eligible renewable energy resource under State Law. In addition, the Governor fully supports CalRecycle's efforts to develop alternative polices regarding waste to energy in California, including the development of a technology neutral, feedstock based standard to replace the definition of gasification for the purpose of determining RPS eligibility.

Mr. Mohajer indicated that the Task Force has been involved with the CT issue since 1999, and he is skeptical about promises being made. Industry has to know rules of the game so they can invest and move forward with development of CTs in California. He then Mr. Mohajer made a motion to request the Task Force to send a letter to CalRecycle, expressing concern over the issue and offer to work collaboratively with CalRecycle to ensure that this issue moves forward and does not affect other projects in the State. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jeff Yann. Mr. Proano suggested that the entire Subcommittee have the opportunity to review the letter before it is sent. This was supported by the rest of the Subcommittee.

## V. UPDATE ON PHASE III & IV CONTRACT

Ms. Sue Higgins provided the following updates:

- ARI is currently working with Cerrell Associates (Cerrell) and their

subcontractor Teknowlage, to finalize and publish a technology and financial services database and web-based models. The database and models are running on a temporary domain hosted by Teknowlage. In addition, ARI is looking into re-issuing a Request for Expressions of Interest.

- ARI provided technical assistance and technology information to IRS Demolition for a potential CT project development at their site in South Gate.
- ARI in conjunction with the County is currently working on developing an approach to categorize/prioritize Phase IV sites based on status of development, and County involvement to focus County technical resources on the more advanced higher priority projects, and to identify the appropriate level of monitoring for less advanced projects.

## **VI. UPDATE ON CONVERSION TECHNOLOGY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES AND ACTION PLAN**

Mr. William Gorham provided the following updates:

- On May 8 and 9, 2012, the County, Cerrell, and other stakeholders participated in a meeting in Sacramento with the Director of CalRecycle, California Air Resources Board, California Energy Commission, and the Department of Natural Resources.
- Cerrell participated on the California Contract Cities Annual Municipal Seminar, at this event we were able to interact with approximately 250 attendees and communicate the positive message of CTs in California.

~~Mr. Pat Proano express his gratitude to~~ thanked Cerrell, for the hard work and crafting messages and talking points on CTs and bringing some truth and reality about CTs. ~~participation on the California Contract Cities Annual Seminar, their participation was very valuable to help us inform and communicate the importance of CTs to other County and Cities entities.~~

Mr. Skye added that 175 people signed up for the County's monthly CT newsletter. Mr. Proano indicated that they are committed to recycling and CTs. The issue is technical and hard to get your pitch out in a short period of time. Also, there is a lot of negativity in articles written about CTs. He and staff have met with PR people to discuss and consider counter-articles. They also are considering the right time to announce the formation of the Coalition.

Mr. Mohajer inquired as to the Coalition's membership. He further indicated that he had previously asked for a list of attendees at the Sacramento meetings (May 8 and 9, 2012) and none has been provided.

Mr. Proano asked if this was bothering Mr. Mohajer? He then indicated that Public Works has not done anything on behalf of the Task Force. The purpose of the trip to Sacramento was to educate newly appointed people from the Governor Brown Administration about CTs and ongoing efforts by San Jose, Santa Barbara and Salinas Valley. He indicated they wanted an array of representation, including an environmental group in Santa Barbara, a scientist from UC Riverside, and Rainbow MRF representative.

In response, Mr. Mohajer indicated that the Task Force is a separate entity from the County DPW. It is a countywide advisory body, being involved with CTs, and the CalRecycle's AB 341 draft report which does not provide CTs with any credit toward the 75% diversion mandate while proposing MRF first concept.

Mr. Mohajer further indicated that as a follow up to the Sacramento May 8 & 9<sup>th</sup> meetings, he was advised by a member of the stakeholders that the County DPW conducted a teleconference meeting with the stakeholders on June 14, 2012. Mr. Mohajer expressed his concern with the lack of communication with the Task Force since the subject matter impacts the cities in LA County, too.

There was an exchange between Mr. Proano and Mr. Mohajer whereby Mr. Proano called Mr. Mohajer by something other than his name. Mr. Mohajer took exception and asked that this be noted for the record in the minutes.

Mr. Proano stated that Mr. Mohajer is making unfounded statements and he has been briefed. Their intention is to share all information with the Task Force and to be transparent.

Mr. Skye stated that staff will get summary and list of participant out to the Task force by next week.

## **VII. CONVERSION TECHNOLOGY ACTION PLAN**

Mr. Skye presented to the ATAS a revised draft copy of the Conversion Technology Action Plan for review and discussion. Mr. Mohajer recommended some changes to page 2, section 2 and page 7, section 5.1. Mr. Ron Kent also had comments regarding page 7, section 5.1. Mr. Skye encouraged the ATAS members to review and communicate any additional comments or changes to the Action Plan, so that it could be finalized by staff for the upcoming meeting.

**VIII. OPEN DISCUSSION**

No discussion.

**IX. NEXT MEETING DATE**

Tentatively scheduled for July 19, 2012

**X. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m.