

FACILITY AND PLAN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/
Integrated Waste Management Task Force

Minutes of June 19, 2003

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

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Betsey Landis, Environmental Organization Representative
Virginia Maloles, County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services
Michael Miller, Leagues of California Cities-Los Angeles Division
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Albert Avoian, Business/Commerce Representative
John Gullede, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
Rafael Prieto, City of Los Angeles
Ledra Sanchez, City of Gardena

OTHERS PRESENT:

Shari Afshari, County of Los Angeles DPW
Ray Andersen, Waste Management, Inc.
Doug Corcoran, Waste Management, Inc.
Eric Cruse, East Valley Coalition
Ellen Mackey, East Valley Coalition

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 11:43 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 20, 2003

The minutes of March 20, 2003, were unanimously approved as presented.

III. CONSIDERATION OF A FINDING OF CONFORMANCE FOR BRADLEY LANDFILL

Mr. Martins Aiyetiwa from the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works provided a staff report (attached) on the Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center (BLRC) to Subcommittee members. He stated that Waste Management Recycling and Disposal Services of California, Inc., (Waste Management) is the owner and operator of the BLRC. Waste Management has requested the Task Force grant a Finding of Conformance (FOC) for the expansion and continued operation of the BLRC through April 14, 2007. Mr. Aiyetiwa explained that staff believes the FOC request is in accordance with the requirements of the Countywide Siting Element (CSE).

Mr. Doug Corcoran, manager of the BLRC from Waste Management, provided a brief overview of the BLRC regrade project. He stated the regrade project is the subject of the FOC that Waste Management is requesting. He used a poster-sized aerial view image of the BLRC site as a visual aid throughout his overview.

Mr. Corcoran explained the regrade project began in 1997. The project received initial approval from the City of Los Angeles Planning Department (Planning Department) in 1998, and then was approved by the City of Los Angeles Local Enforcement Agency (LEA). However, he stated that since its initial approval, Waste Management has completely redone the regrade project in collaboration with the California Integrated Waste Management Board (Waste Board), the City Planning Department, and the LEA.

Mr. Corcoran explained the BLRC site is divided into two major areas. The first area is Bradley East, which is the oldest portion of the BLRC site. Mr. Corcoran stated that Bradley East is an unlined area of the BLRC that has not gone through the formal closure process, but is not currently operating as a landfill.

The second area of the BLRC is the Bradley West extension. The Bradley West extension was the area that is the subject of the regrade. Mr. Corcoran explained the regrade redesigned the Bradley West area by making the side slopes steeper and giving the top area a flatter surface. There was an amount of waste that Waste Management was still permitted to dispose in the Bradley East area, but that capacity was incorporated into the redesign of the Bradley West area to avoid further disposal in the unlined Bradley East area. Mr. Corcoran stated the regrade project essentially accomplished movement of waste, but there was no net increase in volume permitted beyond what had already been evaluated under CEQA.

Mr. Corcoran described the drainage design features of the regrade project, which dedicated an area as a detention basin for the stormwater on the BLRC site. Mr. Corcoran concluded his overview by stating the regrade project was intended to ensure that waste is disposed in a lined area and to improve the site's drainage system.

Ms. Betsey Landis asked if a silt problem exists because the grade was steepened. Mr. Corcoran stated that the steeper slopes have resulted in less soil movement. He explained that Waste Management also vegetates all the way around the BLRC site to prevent soil movement. Mr. Corcoran stated that any silt that is in the stormwater is collected in the detention basin onsite. He explained that if the basin dries out, the silt is removed and used as daily cover on the landfill.

Ms. Landis asked if repeatedly using silt as daily cover would result in increasingly toxic silt that could blow around in the air and become a particulate problem for the surrounding community. Mr. Corcoran stated the silt is not a problem because the site is vegetated. Ms. Landis asked who ensures that vegetation occurs, considering the BLRC is not regulated on Saturday. Mr. Corcoran explained that the BLRC is subject to the same regulations every day, including Saturday.

Ms. Landis asked what the slope grade is for the BLRC. Mr. Corcoran explained the slope grade varies over the whole site, but Waste Management is required to maintain an average slope grade of 10 percent or less over the entire site.

Ms. Landis asked if Waste Management's current drainage system setup meets the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Mr. Corcoran stated that the RWQCB has been out to the site to check and inspect the system. Ms. Ellen Mackey from the East Valley

Coalition stated the RWQCB required Waste Management to address their stormwater runoff issue. Ms. Mackey explained that Waste Management decided to construct a stormwater drainage system on the BLRC site as a response to the RWQCB requirement. Mr. Corcoran asserted that Ms. Mackey's statement was not correct and explained that Waste Management feels responsible for handling stormwater runoff.

Mr. Mohajer asked where the methane gas monitoring systems at the boundaries are, how far apart they are installed, and how deep they are at the BLRC site. Mr. Corcoran responded that they cannot be spotted on the aerial view image, but they are all along the site. He stated he is not sure how far apart they are installed, but they are installed according to their permit and are continually inspected and reviewed. Mr. Mohajer stated that he would like to see the as-built drawings on the perimeter monitoring system.

Mr. Mohajer asked if there are monitoring wells outside the liner system and whether Waste Management has done any monitoring of the structures near the fill area. Mr. Corcoran stated they have Sierra monitors, which are in-building monitors, in several buildings.

Mr. Mohajer asked whether the single-family residences near the BLRC site are within 150 feet of the site. Mr. Corcoran stated that he would have to measure the distance between the site and the residences.

Mr. Mohajer suggested the Task Force forward a letter to the City of Los Angeles Building Department, the City of Los Angeles Fire Department, and the LEA. The letter would ask them to explain the safety measures required of Waste Management to protect structures surrounding the BLRC site. The letter would also ask them to verify that these safety measures adequately protect the businesses and residences surrounding the BLRC site.

Ms. Ellen Mackey stated that she wants to make a clarification about the liners. She stated that one of the things that she requested as a member of the community is a diagram of the liner system. She stated that the bottom of the 200-foot landfill is a one-foot clay liner. Ms. Mackey stated there is a major portion of the landfill that does not have lining on the side, but instead has clay shingles so that water is diverted toward the center.

Ms. Mackey explained that according to the diagrams handed out by the Air Quality Management District (AQMD) showing their monitors, there are approximately nine monitors. Mr. Michael Miller stated that an AQMD monitor

is not the same as a gas monitor in or below a structure. He stated that he would like to know what the cross-section looks like.

Mr. Corcoran stated that Waste Management had not received feedback on their application for an FOC until they found out the item was placed on the Task Force agenda. He stated many good questions have been raised and asked if it would serve the whole process better to list all the questions and allow him and his engineers some time to review everything to answer the questions. Subcommittee members listed the following as items they would like Waste Management to address and clarify prior to returning to the Subcommittee for an FOC determination:

- Landfill gas perimeter monitoring system, including details of monitoring probes, spacing, depths and locations of monitoring wells, and proximity to the waste fill.
- Relationship of the site to surrounding properties including locations of residential and commercial buildings within 1,000 feet of the landfill
- Site drainage, including bench drains and down drains
- As-built liner plans, details, cross sections, and boundaries
- Diversion activities at the site, including types and quantities of materials recycled at the materials recovery facility and the recycling rate
- Monitoring of the site by the LEA and other agencies
- Explanation as to how the site will operate until 2007
- Closure plan, including proposed uses and schedule for various closure and post-closure activities
- Top deck drainage plan that allows for settlement and compaction over a period of time
- The site's available capacity, comparing how much has actually been used and how much is still available
- A letter from Waste Management detailing their willingness to actively support conversion technology
- Measures to ensure accuracy of waste origin survey information
- Measures to prevent acceptance of radioactive waste
- Listing of persons the community may contact with their concerns

A motion was made for staff to provide Waste Management with a letter listing the items on which the Subcommittee would like clarification and to request this information be sent to the Department of Public Works, who are staff on the Task Force, and once the information is reviewed, Waste Management can come back to the Subcommittee and the full Task Force for consideration of the FOC. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Corcoran agreed to provide information on these items to staff before returning to the Task Force for further FOC review. He invited Subcommittee and Task Force members to visit the BLRC site to gain a better understanding of the site.

IV. OPEN DISCUSSION/PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Eric Cruse stated that he has a business next door to the facility and has witnessed dumping in the middle of the night and other suspicious activities. Ms. Mackey asked when the concern of the local community comes into the FOC process.

In response to Ms. Mackey's question, a motion was made to have Waste Management provide staff with a list of people the community should contact with their concerns, so that it can be available at the next Task Force meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:12 p.m.