

Facility and Plan Review Subcommittee  
Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/  
Integrated Waste Management Task Force

**Minutes of November 16, 2006**

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

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Betsy Landis, Environmental Organization Representative  
John McTaggart, General Public Representative  
Michael Miller, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division  
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative  
Ken Murray, County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Albert Avoian, Avoian Enterprises Inc.  
Rafael Prieto, City of Los Angeles  
Charles Boehmke, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County

OTHERS PRESENT:

John Kilgore, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County  
Coby Skye, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works  
Paul Alva, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works  
Chuk Agu, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works  
Christine Frias, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works  
Christine Casino, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works  
Carl Pederson, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works  
Nichole Horton, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 11:07 a.m.

**II. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 19, 2006 MINUTES**

A motion to approve the minutes of the October 19, 2006 meeting was made. Motion passed unanimously.

**III. COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT CHAPTER 5 REVISIONS – COBY SKYE**

Mr. Coby Skye made a Power Point presentation ([See Attachment A](#)) on the revisions to Chapter 5 of the Countywide Siting Element (CSE). Chapter 5 describes alternative technologies to landfilling, their viability, and their current state of development.

Mr. Skye indicated that due to the complexity and sensitivity of the issues involved in revising Chapter 5, a draft Table of Contents ([See Attachment B](#)) was provided to seek Task Force guidance on the structure of the Chapter.

The Subcommittee provided staff with the following comments and instructions regarding the following issues:

1. Clarification of widely used alternative technology terminology

- Define and clarify widely used alternative technology terms in Chapter 5 for the purpose of the CSE while acknowledging any differences with statutory definitions of the terms, and taking into account definitions of terms in the previously revised Chapters and glossary of terms of the CSE.
- Explain the difference between the CSE and statutory definition of the widely used alternative technology terms included in Chapter 5. Also, explain the reason for excluding any widely used alternative technology term that will be deliberately omitted from Chapter 5.

2. Purpose of Chapter 5 and how it relates to the CSE

- Categorize the discussions on alternative technologies in Chapter 5 into two groups (combustion systems and conversion technologies(CT)).
- Remove and move the previous Section 5.6 (Alternative Methods for Extending the Life of existing Class III Landfills) to another Chapter in order to maintain the focus of Chapter 5 on alternative technologies.
- Discuss specific technologies and processes, their waste streams, and benefits only in a generic sense rather than as specific proprietary technologies, as in the existing CSE.

3. Incorporating the Conversion Technology Evaluation (CTE) Report

- The County of Los Angeles Conversion Technology Evaluation (CTE) Report could be “incorporated by reference” but with a language making it clear that a revision to the CTE Report is not tantamount to a revision to the CSE. Also, do not include the CTE Report as an Appendix to the CSE. Alternatively, CTE Report should be heavily referenced and cited in Chapter 5 for detailed discussions of the processes and technologies, in order to simplify and reduce the text of Chapter 5.

4. Assessment of the development and status of the various alternative technologies

- Though proprietary processes are currently included in Chapter 5 of the existing CSE, details on proprietary technologies should be removed from the revised Chapter 5 and the CTE Report should be referenced for detailed proprietary information.
- Include discussion on specific technology types, parameters of feedstock, order of magnitude for feedstock, and tipping fees in addition to referencing the CTE Report.
- Include a comparison Table of all CT processes that are included in Chapter 5.
- Findings of academic studies and reports on conversion technologies such as those by University of California Davis and Riverside should be considered and incorporated.

- Include some discussion on tire shredding to educate the public on the role of the tire shredding industry and uses of waste tire such as rubberized asphalt. Tire shredding will be discussed in a separate chapter as part of the alternative methods for extending the life of existing class III landfills.

#### 5. Environmental and economic benefits and costs of alternative technologies

- Quantify and mention the energy benefits of the CT processes as part of this Chapter.
- Expand the discussion and examples on alternative technologies' operations overseas (e.g., Japan or Europe) and locally to showcase successes of the technologies.
- Indicate that currently, there are no facilities in the United States managing solid waste with these proposed conversion technologies and that the actual benefits and environmental impacts are still to be determined and defined for specific waste streams. Therefore, the Task Force intends to continue its efforts regarding the proposed demonstration facility.
- Confine the discussion on the benefits for the specific technologies to waste streams handled and residue produced rather than making assessment that are not yet proven.

#### 6. Permitting and Siting Issues for Conversion Technologies

- Discuss impact of transportation cost and the environmental impact of transportation of waste.
- To note that even though the permitting and siting issues for the proposed CT demonstration facility are minimized due to proposed co-location of CT facilities with existing MRFs/TS, the potential future permitting and siting issues need to be accounted for due to the need for a 15-year planning period for the CSE.

7. Identifying local efforts in support of alternative technologies

- Acknowledge Task Force's efforts and support for alternative technologies over the last decade. in the introduction section of the Chapter. Also, mention Task Force's efforts with URS, the Conversion Technology Public Outreach Contracts, etc.
- Mention City of Los Angeles' efforts in comparison with current County of Los Angeles' efforts, including the RENEW LA Resource Management Blueprint.

**IV. OPEN DISCUSSION/PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no public comments or open discussion.

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 12:03 p.m.