

ATTACHMENT B

**MINUTES OF MEETINGS OF THE FACILITY AND PLAN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
REGARDING COMMENTS ON THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY PRELIMINARY
DRAFT REVISED COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT, DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT, AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE DOCUMENT**

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

SPECIAL MEETING
February 25, 2022

WEB CONFERENCE

Los Angeles County Public Works
900 South Fremont Avenue
Alhambra, CA 91803

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dorcas (Dee) Hanson-Lugo, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health
Patrick Holland, Los Angeles County Public Works
Betsey Landis, Chair, Environmental Organization Representative
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative
Sam Shammass, Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts

OTHERS PRESENT:

Joe Bartolata, Los Angeles County Public Works
Tim Fargo, City of Los Angeles
Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens
Carol Oyola, Los Angeles County Public Works
Trishina Robinson, Los Angeles County Public Works
Aric Rodriguez, Los Angeles County Public Works
Coby Skye, Los Angeles County Public Works
Carlos Slythe, Los Angeles County Public Works
Jeffrey Zhu, Los Angeles County Public Works

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Betsey Landis called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

II. DISCUSSION OF FPRS COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT WRITTEN RESPONSES TO TASK FORCE COMMENTS AND THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE PRELIMINARY DRAFT REVISED CSE

The Subcommittee agreed to review the document chapter-by-chapter, addressing questions and/or comments by respective members.

Attachment A - Draft Written Responses to Task Force comments on the Preliminary Draft Revised CSE

Mr. Mike Mohajer noted his comments for Response to Comment #3 and Response to Comment #11. Mr. Mohajer also informed that the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is extensively involved with the household hazardous waste element in the Integrated Waste Management Plan, in addition to the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) and is not certain if there is room to expand on that fact.

There were no other comments on Attachment A from Subcommittee members.

Attachment B - [Proposed Revisions to the Preliminary Draft Revised CSE](#)

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Mr. Mohajer noted his comment to Chapter 1, page 3, and the 1996 dates conflicting. He also mentioned that the Task Force was extensively involved in the preparation of the document, and it should be noted throughout the document that Public Works and the Task Force worked in collaboration.

Ms. Landis noted adding a sentence about regional electrical power sources to the last paragraph on page 8, under transformation technology. Mr. Holland strongly disagreed because the document has nothing to do with power generation, but rather is a disposal planning capacity document. However, he commented a sentence would be added.

There were no other comments on Chapter 1 from Subcommittee members.

Chapter 2 – Goals and Policies

Mr. Mohajer noted his comments being added to Policy No. 4.5 on page 4 to read: “The cities in Los Angeles County, the County, and the Task Force, as part of their LUP (zoning variance) and Finding of Conformance or similar process, will support

Class III landfill operators to use appropriate materials, when technically feasible and environmentally safe, such as tarps, for landfill daily cover, in order to conserve landfill capacity.; Policy No. 7.1 on page 7; and Table 2-1 to read: The cities in Los Angeles County, the County, and the Task Force will introduce, support and promote legislation and regulation which would provide uniform, minimum, and feasible standards for State agencies to establish environmental and regulatory requirements for all solid waste management facilities., Policy No. 6.2 on page 6, and Policy No. 7.1 on page 7 to change from “Support Entity (SE)” to “Lead Entity (LE).

Ms. Landis noted her comments being added to Table 2-1; Goal No. 1, Goal No. 3, Goal No. 5, and Goal No. 7. She elaborated on her discontentment with the choices of potential sites developers considered. Mr. Holland responded that the Task Force does not decide where developers identify their projects to be sited and that Public Works received letters such as the City of Santa Monica identifying sites. Therefore, those sites will remain in the document.

There were no other comments on Chapter 2 from Subcommittee members.

Chapter 3 - Existing Solid Waste Disposal Facilities

On page 3 where it lists major Class III landfills that have closed or stopped receiving municipal solid waste (MSW), Mr. Mohajer asked who ordered the stop of MSW. Mr. Holland responded he could not recall, but staff could look into and inform the Subcommittee. Mr. Mohajer commented that he was one of the citizens pushing for the closure of the Azusa Landfill due to groundwater contamination which the community also addressed to the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) so would like document to note the Water Board ordered to stop receiving MSW.

On page 4 regarding Savage Canyon, Mr. Mohajer noted his comment to add "(primarily for City of Whittier waste use only)".

On page 7, second to the last paragraph regarding Commerce Refuse-to-Energy Facility (CREF), Mr. Mohajer noted dates should be included. Mr. Sam Shammass commented he would look up the closure date and notify Public Works staff.

There were no other comments on Chapter 3 from Subcommittee members.

Chapter 4 - Current Disposal Rate and Assessment of Disposal Capacity Needs

Ms. Landis requested adding to Table 4-14 footnotes, the uses of alternative and conversion technologies and creating electrical power and note sanitized compost because compost must be heated to at least 1,000 degrees.

Mr. Shammass confirmed with County Sanitation District records that the closure of CREF is June 2018.

Mr. Aric Rodriguez commented that staff understood Ms. Landis' comments and that Table 4-14 details permitted capacity planning and not what happens at the facilities, which is detailed in other chapters. He suggested reviewing other locations where it describes composting methods and include the specific concerns. Ms. Landis felt it was important to note in the capacity planning section under footnotes.

There were no other comments on Chapter 5 from Subcommittee members.

Chapter 5 - Alternative Technologies

Under Alternative Technologies on page 7, third paragraph, Ms. Landis asked if the permit was renewed for a plant that closed. Mr. Shammass responded that the facility is still in operation, but that he would check on the EPA RIN certification received to include the language. Mr. Holland mentioned it was one of the biggest facilities taking in a huge amounts of food waste and commended the County Sanitation Districts.

Ms. Landis noted her comment on page 14, first paragraph to read: "Nevertheless, conversion technologies should be continually evaluated and developed so that the County may manage a significant share of its solid waste in the future."

Ms. Landis noted her comment on page 17, Biological Conversion Process, to include the heating of compost to read: "Biological conversion processes are designed for biodegradable organics only under controlled temperature and require an extensive amount of pre-processing."

There were no other comments on Chapter 5 from Subcommittee members.

Chapter 6 – Facility Siting Criteria

There were no comments on Chapter 6 from Subcommittee members.

Chapter 7 – Proposed In-County Facility Locations and Descriptions

Ms. Landis asked on the Proposed In-County Facility Locations and Descriptions if there were any sites that are fully permitted since 2010 and not being used. Mr. Bartolata responded he was not sure about the sites listed in the document being permitted. She assumed that perhaps some of those permits had lapsed since they were from 2010 and wondered why Public Works had not done anything with those sites. Mr. Holland responded that except for the Calabasas Landfill,

Public Works is not really looking to develop projects directly, but rather depends on the private sector to approach Public Works on developing these facilities. Public Works does have an interest in trying to enter into public private partnerships, which is the model being looked at for the Calabasas Landfill anaerobic digestion project. Ms. Landis recommended Public Works working with the County Board of Supervisors. She continued with her concerns about the need for electrical power and the fact that she is hoping Calabasas Landfill is attractive to the community.

There were no other comments on Chapter 7 from Subcommittee members.

Chapter 8 – General Plan Consistency

There were no comments on Chapter 8 from Subcommittee members.

Chapter 10 – Finding of Conformance

Mr. Mohajer noted his comments on Section 10.7.4, page 6, under Revocation of Finding of Conformance to read: "The Task Force may revoke a Finding of Conformance (FOC) if the Project proponent does not meet the conditions of the FOC. The cause of revocation shall be documented in the Notice of Revocation to the appropriate local agency with land use authority, Air Quality Management Districts, Regional Water Quality Control Board, LEA, CalRecycle, and the Project owner and operator."

Mr. Mohajer noted his comments on page 5 of Table 10-1, 3a to read: "Obtain and provide to the County all data necessary for cities in Los Angeles County and the County to comply with the mandates of AB 939 (1989) and SB 1383 (2016) by using the Los Angeles County Solid Waste Information Management System."

Mr. Mohajer noted his comments on page 7, under Permits and Documentation to add: "Environmental Justice analysis."

There were no other comments on Chapter 10 from Subcommittee members.

List of Acronyms

Ms. Landis mentioned three acronyms missing including: California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), Alternative Technology (AT) and Conversion Technology (CT).

There were no other comments on List of Acronyms from Subcommittee members.

Glossary of Terms

There were no comments on Glossary of Terms from Subcommittee members.

Environmental Justice Document

On page 1 dated July 2021, Mr. Mohajer asked if the document had been adopted. Mr. Rodriguez responded that this document is part of the environmental documentation that will accompany the Countywide Siting Element document. It will go to the Board of Supervisors simultaneously for certification when they also authorize the release of the Countywide Siting Element to the cities. Mr. Mohajer asked what the role of the Task Force is for reviewing and commenting on the environmental justice (EJ) document. Mr. Mohajer elaborated on the important political issue regarding EJ and how compliance must be met in order for the Task Force to issue a FOC and that this EJ document would be used as a basis for issuing a FOC. Mr. Mohajer mentioned not reviewing the document and stated that the EJ by itself is so large and is involved in many issues. He was unaware that EJ is also included with the California Environmental Quality Act so staff may want to review. He continued that the EJ may have to also be reviewed by the Task Force if they are to use. The other option is for the Task Force to have its own EJ. Mr. Mohajer continued his comments to the EJ document and asked what the Task Force's role was. Mr. Holland responded that Public Works staff would look into the EJ document to understand the role of the Task Force. Discussion ensued regarding the EJ document and Mr. Mohajer's comments under the Background Information and Supervisorial District 5 photos including adding Antelope Valley Town Councils, Val Verde communities, and North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens. Mr. Mohajer recommended staff review the redistricting of boundaries for the Supervisorial Districts to make certain they are current and the possibility someone may bring up that the data in the EJ is based on 2018 data instead of 2022. Lastly, on the last page of the EJ document, Mr. Mohajer commented on the Conclusion paragraph to read: "Effective environmental justice outreach will also aid in the adoption of the CSE by a majority of the 88 cities with the majority of the incorporated population in the County."

There were no other comments on EJ from Subcommittee members.

Ms. Landis brought up her concerns about the proposed alternative technology facilities in existing Class III Landfills, including sites in Santa Monica. She brought up the City of Carson's Dominguez Channel and the problems that will arise in trying to get something developed at that location due to the recent problems at that location. She continued with her disagreement with building a facility on the Santa Monica Pier and that Santa Monica citizens will think it is a joke. Mr. Mohajer responded that the Santa Monica Pier was proposed by the City of Santa Monica and the document was provided to Santa Monica for comments. Ms. Landis commented that there are other sites to use. Mr. Holland responded that

Public Works reached out to all the developers from the previous list of identified sites to see if they still had plans to develop those sites and some of those sites had come off the list for various reasons. Each of the potential sites listed were verified by the developer, as well as verified by the host jurisdictions as being okay to identify in the Countywide Siting Element. Ms. Landis commented that the document should give clarity and detail as to current permission for the potential sites from 2010. Mr. Holland responded that the list was current and asked Ms. Landis if she was looking at the page 358, Table 7-1. She responded that in the original document, it was noted on top of the page. Mr. Holland responded not needing to include the previous locations because the Countywide Siting Element includes the current potential locations. He offered that staff may provide Ms. Landis with an update of what happened to the potential sites that are off the list and that the list does not have to be included in the final document. Discussion ensued regarding Ms. Landis stating that the 2010 list showed fully permitted locations. She requested a footnote stating revisiting the proposed sites and that building on those sites are no longer available.

Ms. Dee Hanson-Lugo asked about the nine facilities listed and the photograph below, in that she thought the locations of the photographs would be identified. Mr. Holland responded that staff was working on identifying photographs in the document.

Ms. Landis continued with her concerns of sites being proposed at Santa Monica Pier and Dominguez Channel. Ms. Hanson-Lugo commented that she was very familiar with the list of potential sites and that the list does not necessarily say what will be built at those facilities. She also mentioned the limited space and a lot of technology available that may not result in a major project. Mr. Shammas noted that the Santa Monica Pier is only 2.5 acres, which is a tiny facility. Mr. Holland stated if anyone has questions regarding the location, they may be referred to the City of Santa Monica. Ms. Landis mentioned her concerns of the ocean rising and moving inland and into the groundwater, which is a serious problem especially within the next 15 years.

Ms. Landis did not see how the Subcommittee could concur with the draft that was given of the Countywide Siting Element. Mr. Rodriguez responded that staff could make all the corrections and could have a draft ready for the mailout in preparation for the next Subcommittee meeting on March 17, 2022, at which time the Subcommittee can review all the corrections and potentially concur in moving it up to the Task Force for review. Mr. Mohajer agreed with Mr. Rodriguez' recommendation.

Ms. Landis thanked staff for working with the Subcommittee on the Countywide Siting Element. Mr. Holland also thanked all staff.

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No Comments.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:02 a.m.

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

SPECIAL MEETING
November 9, 2021

WEB CONFERENCE

Los Angeles County Public Works
900 South Fremont Avenue
Alhambra, CA 91803

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dorcas (Dee) Hanson-Lugo, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health
Betsey Landis, Chair, Environmental Organization Representative
Carlos Ruiz, Los Angeles County Public Works
Sam Shammass, Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative
Reina Pereira, City of Los Angeles

OTHERS PRESENT:

Martins Aiyetiwa, Los Angeles County Public Works
Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens
Carol Oyola, Los Angeles County Public Works
Jeffrey Zhu, Los Angeles County Public Works

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Betsey Landis called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

II. DISCUSSION OF FPRS COMMENTS ON THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY PRELIMINARY DRAFT REVISED COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT AND DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Ms. Landis noted having many comments on what needed correcting on the Los Angeles County Preliminary Draft Revised Countywide Siting Element (Draft Revised CSE) and Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR):

- Reduce reliance on out of county waste disposal, not buy more air-polluting trucks to send our solid waste to other counties.
- Need to develop local electricity facility sources and emphasis on proceeding with alternative conversion facilities for electricity.
- Re-evaluate the list of potential locations for alternative technology facility in Los Angeles County. Most sites identified are unusable (e.g., Santa Monica Pier, Santa Monica Airport, City of Carson).
- Ms. Landis also mentioned that she will provide her entire comments soon.

Mr. Sam Shammass mentioned that the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts is currently working on a comment letter that they plan to submit. He noted a few issues:

- Corrections on the life of Calabasas Landfill should be based on exhaustion of capacity and not the estimated closure date on their Solid Waste Facility Permit.
- To have flexibility for landfill operators, they do mention balefilling as a potential requirement. However, some landfills have physical or operational constraints that may not allow that.
- The landfill operator should have flexibility in the use of different types of covers.
- Discussion on the history of waste-by-rail and that economic viability should be mentioned as one of the issues with starting operation of the waste-by-rail system.

Mr. Ruiz provided the following comments:

- The Siting Element should continue to promote and develop strategies to support the development of conversion technologies and, to the extent the County can develop those sites within Los Angeles County, that will certainly alleviate the need for exporting waste out of the County. He also expressed the need to have long-term capacity to handle what is currently going to landfills.

- Developing in-County capacity through conversion technologies should be a priority but we should not close the door to the export of solid waste if that means extending the life of in-County capacity.
- Putting more emphasis on conversion technologies as a means of managing waste and derive useful products, whether electricity, fuel or other things, to help manage all of the organic waste.
- Re-evaluate the list of proposed potential locations for alternative technology facilities in Los Angeles County. These sites should at least pass some basic criteria, even though at the end, the placement or identification of a site in the document does not mean that that a facility must be developed in that location. The local jurisdiction has the ultimate authority to determine land use within its boundaries.

Ms. Dee Hanson-Lugo commented that she had not had time to read the entire Draft CSE, nor is she aware if others in Public Health have reviewed it. However, the areas that Ms. Hanson-Lugo reviewed pertained to the solid waste sections of the Local Enforcement Agency and agreed with Ms. Landis that the Draft CSE needs to be rewritten. Landfill operators have approached the Local Enforcement Agency proposing research projects on some sort of anaerobic digestion and does not know if this is triggered by cities or the County. Ms. Hanson-Lugo agreed that landfill operators will have to change the way they manage their solid waste because of SB 1383. Her belief is that it is more profitable for cities to develop a closed landfill site into a parking lot for Amazon instead of looking at those potential sites for solid waste infrastructure, and that economics has a lot to do with who will invest in what type of project.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Wayde Hunter of the North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens provided the following comments:

- Landfill photo or any photos of a facility used in the document should be identified or labeled accordingly.
- Sunshine Canyon Landfill in the Draft CSE is noted as a minor landfill and should be recognized as a major landfill.
- Requested to see a summary of comments previously provided by Mr. Mike Mohajer.

Ms. Landis commented she would like to forward a motion to the Task Force about having both the Draft CSE and Draft EIR rewritten. Mr. Ruiz offered his suggestion that it would help Public Works in responding to the comments by being as specific as possible, rather than stating that it needs to be rewritten, because that may be difficult to interpret. Other Subcommittee members agreed. Ms. Landis responded that she and Mr. Mohajer had already submitted their comments and that there

were some excellent comments at today's special meeting that staff may incorporate.

Mr. Ruiz commented that the public review period was still open until November 15, 2021. Mr. Aiyetiwa indicated that the next Task Force meeting was on November 18, 2021, which was outside of the public review period. However, staff would accept Task Force comments after the public review period is over. Mr. Aiyetiwa's recommendation was for the Subcommittee to submit its collective comments to the Task Force and then the Task Force may send the comments to the County. Mr. Ruiz suggested that staff summarize the comments received today so they could be presented at next week's Subcommittee meeting and then submitted to the Task Force for consideration. His recommendation was for the Task Force to consider the submittal of comments to the County and Public Works and that staff would accept comments from the Task Force and would continue to work with the Subcommittee.

Ms. Hanson-Lugo asked if the public review period could be extended. Mr. Aiyetiwa responded that it could, but that there was no request to extend the period at the last Task Force meeting. By law, the County has 105 days after the end of the public review period to prepare written responses to comments received and prepare the final draft. Once the final draft is completed with all comments being considered, it will be sent to the Task Force for review before releasing it to the cities for local adoption.

Ms. Landis made a motion to request the Task Force, based on today's meeting comments, to have Public Works address the comments received and revise the Draft CSE and Draft EIR, accordingly. Mr. Ruiz seconded the motion for the purpose of discussion.

Mr. Aiyetiwa clarified the process that staff would be preparing a draft letter from the Task Force to the County, which will include all the comments that have been received from the Subcommittee, public, as well as Mr. Hunter's verbal comments. The draft letter will be sent to the Subcommittee for review and consideration and then the Subcommittee could forward to the Task Force for their approval to be sent to the County.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:04 p.m.