

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

**Minutes of March 16, 2006**

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Albert Avoian, Business/Commerce Representative  
Margaret Clark, League of California Cities—Los Angeles Division  
Betsey Landis, Environmental Organization Representative  
Mary Ann Lutz, League of California Cities—Los Angeles Division  
Joe Massey, Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, Inc.  
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative  
Ron Saldana, Los Angeles County Disposal Association  
Greig Smith, City of Los Angeles Appointee

COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY OTHERS:

Dr. Bruce Chernof, rep. by Ken Murray, County of L.A. Dept. of Health Services  
Rita Robinson, rep. by Karen Coca, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation  
Jim Stahl, rep. by Charles Boehmke, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County  
Don Wolfe, rep. by Carlos Ruiz, County of L.A. Dept. of Public Works  
Mark Waronek, rep. by Michael Miller, League of CA Cities—Los Angeles Division

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Christine F. Andersen, City of Long Beach  
David Kim, City of Los Angeles Appointee  
Gerry Miller, City of Los Angeles Appointee  
Dr. Barry Wallerstein, South Coast Air Quality Management District

OTHERS PRESENT:

Paul Alva, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Chuk Agu, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
George De La O, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
John McTaggart, General Public Representative Alternate  
Primitivo Nunez, California Integrated Waste Management Board  
Ursula Schmidt, City of Pasadena  
Coby Skye, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Necy Sumait, Arkenol, Inc.  
Wu Tan, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Steve Uselton, California Integrated Waste Management Board  
Cynthia Vant Hul, Waste Management, Inc.

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 1:10 p.m.

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 23, 2006**

A motion was made to approve the minutes of February 23, 2006. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Margaret Clark reminded the Task Force members that the Statement of Economic Interest forms (Form 700) are due April 3, 2006.

**III. PRESENTATION ON ARKENOL, INC.**

Ms. Nocy Sumait, Vice President of Arkenol, Inc., conducted a presentation on Arkenol, Inc.'s production of ethanol from post-sorted municipal solid waste and other biomass (see attachment). Arkenol, Inc.'s parent company ARK Energy, Inc., an energy and co-generation power plant developer, was seeking thermal hosts for power plan opportunities. Further review of viable business alternatives pointed the way to the production of ethanol from biomass.

Ms. Sumait provided a description of the ethanol production process, which they began to develop 12 years ago. They operated a pilot facility in the City of Orange, California for five years in the 1990's to test equipment and various feedstock. This feedstock included post sorted municipal solid waste, green waste, agricultural waste, and bagasse (left-over sugar cane).

Ms. Sumait discussed Arkenol, Inc.'s partnership with JGC Corporation, a Japanese company in 2000. JGC Corporation constructed a demonstration facility in Izumi, Japan, using funds provided by the New Energy and Industrial Technology Development Organization. She highlighted the Izumi facility and the advantages of Arkenol, Inc.'s technology over competing processes.

Ms. Sumait further explained that in the transportation fuel market, ethanol is primarily used to produce E-10 (10 percent ethanol, 90 percent gasoline) in most of the United States and E-5.7 (5.7 percent ethanol) in California. E-85 (85 percent ethanol blend with gasoline) is made for flexible fuel vehicles. The Federal government is promoting the use of ethanol and other renewable fuels through their Energy Policy Act.

Ms. Sumait stated that many hurdles have kept them from building a facility in the United States. These obstacles include Arkenol, Inc.'s limited resources to develop their technology and the lack of focus of government agencies in

promoting biomass technologies. She added that California has an abundance of biomass and it needs to find a renewable resource to increase energy security and decrease dependence on petroleum supplies. Also, a renewable resource would divert trash from landfills and offer new opportunities for agriculture.

#### **IV. STATUS ON SUNSHINE CANYON LANDFILL**

Mr. Greig Smith stated that in 2005, the City of Los Angeles adopted a five-year phase-out plan for Sunshine Canyon Landfill and issued a policy statement. Also, the City issued a request for proposals for alternatives to Sunshine Canyon Landfill. The landfill operators for El Sobrante Landfill and Avenal Landfill came forward with reasonable proposals.

Mr. Smith explained that the policy statement incorporated a 600 tons per day reduction, in the first year starting on July 1, 2006, and 1,000 tons per day each year thereafter, until the phase out in year five. For the first year, 300 tons per day will be going to El Sobrante Landfill, and 300 tons per day will go to Avenal Landfill. The City of Los Angeles is working on a plan for the 1,000 tons per day for second year through fifth year. The City Council will have final negotiations on March 17, 2006.

Mr. Smith stated that emissions from the transportation of such waste to El Sobrante Landfill and Avenal Landfills are a concern. The City of Los Angeles is working to have more green diesel trucks used for this transportation.

Mr. Smith clarified that the Avenal Landfill is located in Kings County, south of Fresno, and about 200 miles north of Los Angeles. It is a brand new permitted landfill that has plenty of available capacity. The landfill is permitted to take waste from other municipalities. The Avenal City Manager and Mayor visited several other municipalities, including the City of Los Angeles, encouraging the cities to use their landfill. Host fees will be used to build a community center and pool.

#### **V. REPORT FROM THE CIWMB**

Mr. Steve Uselton reported that the Annual Reports were due on April 1, 2006. Most jurisdictions are participating in the biennial review process, which means that each city's 2003-04 reports will be reviewed to verify local jurisdiction compliance. Two-thirds of the jurisdictions in Los Angeles County have reported a diversion rate of at least 50 percent.

The California Integrated Waste Management Board (Waste Board) is in the process of reviewing the jurisdictions' generation studies. Part of the review process is the site visits, which have been valuable.

Nearly 400 State agencies and facilities also have to turn in an Annual Report. Six State agencies did not meet the 50 percent diversion goal, and are working with the Waste Board to achieve compliance. Although there is no penalty for the State agencies that fail to meet the goal, they will be referred to the Governor and the Legislature.

Mr. Uselton clarified that the University of California system schools are not required to submit an Annual Report. They declined to voluntarily submit a report when requested by the Waste Board. The Waste Board followed up with the University of California system, and found that their programs are comparable to the community colleges, and California State Universities.

Mr. Uselton reported that workshops on emerging technologies would be held on April 17 and 18, 2006, in Sacramento. The workshops will include topics such as the overview of technologies, plans at existing facilities, research and development data, emissions data, residuals data, and source materials.

## **VI. COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT CHAPTER 7 REVISIONS**

Mr. Chuk Agu presented Chapter 7 revisions of the Countywide Siting Element (see attachment). Chapter 7 provides a description and location of sites identified as potentially suitable for development of new disposal facilities and potential expansion of existing disposal facilities. The presentation focused on an overview of the methodology used, the major issues, assumptions, and revisions.

As part of the methodology, on February 16, 2005, Task Force letter was forwarded to the cities with potential landfill expansions, such as cities of Glendale, Whittier, Palmdale, and Los Angeles, to inquire about any objections to the potential landfill expansions. Mr. Agu indicated that no objections to the potential landfill expansion have been received from these cities. Also, staff researched, obtained, and updated the disposal facilities' background information through various means, including facility written surveys and site visits. New area view maps of the facilities were also developed showing property boundaries, closed, existing and potential expansion areas, and land use of contiguous parcels.

Major issues and assumptions include conversion technology and inert waste landfill issues and definition of expansion. Based on the current regulatory framework and lack of a formal definition on conversion technology, staff at this time conservatively considered conversion technology as transformation

and thus disposal for purposes of the Countywide Sitting Element (CSE) revision. For the purposes of this revision, inert waste landfills are those previously defined in the 1997 CSE as permitted unclassified inert waste landfills, and/or have a registration or full Solid Waste Facility Permit.

Mr. Agu explained that an expansion is an increase (e.g., horizontally or vertically) in the physical dimension of the facility or an extension or renewal of a permit whose expiration date may affect the operation of the facility. A previously proposed expansion that is now fully permitted is considered part of the existing facility even if it has not yet been developed or constructed. Fully permitted means that the land use/CSE, waste discharge requirement, and Solid Waste Facility Permit have already been obtained.

The major revisions include removal of Elsmere Landfill and Blind Canyon Landfill from list of future landfill sites; identification of locations of major material recovery facilities/transfer station in the County as sites potentially suitable for new conversion technology facilities; description of potential expansions of Antelope Valley Recycling and Disposal Facility, Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center, Chiquita Canyon Landfill, Scholl Canyon Sanitary Landfill, Sunshine Canyon Landfill (County/City-sides), and Peck Road Gravel Pit; a general update on all facility data, information and fact sheets, and new aerial view maps of facility sites. There are no new landfills or waste-to-energy facilities or expansions to waste-to-energy facilities.

Mr. Mike Mohajer objected to considering conversion technology facilities as transformation and/or disposal facilities at this time. In light of the continuing and ongoing confusion over the definition of conversion technology and transformation, Ms. Betsey Landis recommended to place a caveat in the CSE, that conversion technology is considered transformation only at the time of acceptance of the CSE, and concurrently including conversion technology facilities in the Non-disposal Facility Element. That Task Force also recommended developing a map of potentially suitable areas for developing conversion technology facilities in lieu of identifying specific sites such as the locations of major material recovery facilities/transfer station.

Due to the extensiveness and complexity of issues surrounding Chapter 7 revisions, and time constraints at the full Task Force meetings, a motion was made to complete review of Chapter 7 revisions at the Facility and Plan Review Subcommittee level with the Subcommittee providing update to the full Task Force, and for the Subcommittee to convene at the May 2006 Task Force meeting. The motion was passed unanimously.

**VII. ANTELOPE VALLEY ENVIRONMENTAL PRIDE WEEK AND CITY/COUNTY COLLABORATION**

Mr. Coby Skye presented on the Antelope Valley Environmental Pride Week and City/County Collaboration efforts (see attachment). The Antelope Valley is a large, rural area, and is sparsely populated. Illegal dumping is prevalent and is a significant issue threatening the health and safety of residents, impacting groundwater, and has cost millions in cleanup.

To address the illegal dumping issue, in 1996, by motion of Supervisor Antonovich, the Board of Supervisors created the Antelope Valley Illegal Dumping Task Force (A.V.I.D. Task Force). The A.V.I.D. Task Force consists of the cities of Palmdale and Lancaster, County agencies, including the Sheriff, local town councils, Waste Management, Inc., area residents, businesses, and other stakeholders.

The Task Force was able to implement several illegal dumping prevention programs, such as increased patrolling, increased public awareness via newspaper articles and television stories, numerous cleanup projects, increased educational efforts, and a toll free hotline to report illegal dumping.

In 2001, in order to increase public involvement and awareness, the Task Force initiated the Antelope Valley Environmental Pride Week (Pride Week) to tie in with Earth Day. The Pride Week consists of a variety of environmental events, including waste tire, household hazardous waste, and electronic waste collection events, collection events at the Antelope Valley Environmental Collection Center, Smart Gardening workshops, and cleanup projects. Free services for residents of unincorporated County areas of the Antelope Valley are available at the Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center. This year Pride Week is from April 22 through 29.

Mr. Skye stated the County is looking for sites for permanent HHW collection centers and also to coordinate with other cities to expand some of its Countywide programs. He reported that the Waste Board is coordinating a statewide task force for illegal dumping, to include some provisions for enforcement.

**VIII. REPORT FROM THE ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE**

Mr. Skye reported that the Alternative Technology Advisory Subcommittee met at the International Environmental Solutions' facility in Romoland in Riverside County. This site is a pyrolysis demonstration facility currently conducting a test for Air Quality Management District (AQMD) emissions profiles.

Mr. Skye announced the Waste Board is holding a Conversion Technology Workshop in Sacramento on April 17 and 18, 2006, and stated the City of Los Angeles and Senator Alarcon are also working on a conversion technology summit, but no date has been set.

Mr. Skye also mentioned Mr. Paul Alva made a presentation on conversion technologies to the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission, and was well received. The Commission found the presentation informative for planning purposes.

Mr. Skye stated he attended a hearing by the BioEnergy Interagency Working Group. They are working on a Statewide action plan, which includes the role of conversion technologies, and encourages the use of biomass as a resource. The draft action plan also includes a recommendation to the State to pass legislation providing diversion credit for conversion technology.

A motion was made to send a letter to the Board of Supervisors asking for their help to coordinate with other local agencies and jurisdictions to lobby on behalf of conversion technology, and to take a more active role in the lobbying effort. The motion was passed unanimously.

A motion was made to send a letter to the Governor requesting the AB 2770 report and supplemental report be provided to the Legislature. The motion was passed unanimously.

## **IX. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Mr. Skye provided a status on the following Legislative Bills (see attachment):

- AB 2127-Introduced by Plescia

This Bill would require the analysis of the potential environmental impacts caused by the random disposal of used alkaline batteries in a permitted solid waste landfill facility.

- AB 2206-Introduced by Montanez

This Bill would require a local jurisdiction to report on the progress made in the diversion and recycling of waste material at multifamily dwellings in their Annual Report to the Waste Board. The Bill would add an additional factor related to diversion and recycling of solid waste from multifamily dwellings that the Board would be required to consider in determining the appropriateness of imposing

penalties on a local jurisdiction. A motion was made to watch AB 2206. The motion was passed unanimously.

- AB 2253-Introduced by Hancock

This Bill would authorize the seizure of vehicles used in illegal dumping activities. A motion was made to send a letter of support for AB 2253, and request the author to include language consistent with existing local ordinances. The motion was passed unanimously.

- AB 2271-Introduced by Koretz

This Bill would expand the current Rechargeable Battery Recycling Act to include all household batteries. A motion was made to send a letter of support for AB 2271. The motion was passed unanimously.

- AB 3001-Introduced by Pavley

This Bill would provide that a covered electronic device also includes personal computers. The Bill would require a retailer to collect a \$6 fee from the consumer at the time of sales. Discussion ensued. A motion to send a letter of support for AB 3001 was made. The motion was passed with Mr. Charles Boehmke abstaining, and Ms. Betsey Landis, and Mr. Ken Murray. Mr. Joe Massey opposing.

- SB 757-Introduced by Kehoe

This Bill would enact the Oil Conservation, Efficiency, and Alternative Fuels Act, which would declare that it is the policy of the State and that State agencies shall take all cost-effective and technologically feasible action needed to reduce the growth of petroleum consumption, and increase transportation energy conservation, efficiency, and the use of alternative fuel. Mr. Skye recommended that language be included so that conversion technology meets this policy. A motion was made to revisit this Bill at April's Task Force meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

- AB 2845-Introduced by Bogh

Ms. Karen Coca provided information regarding AB 2845. It increases the payments from the California Beverage Container Recycling Fund to the cities and the counties from \$10.5 million to

\$15 million. Staff to provide more information on AB 2845 for April's Task Force meeting and for the Bill to be included in the updated legislative table.

- SB 1573-Introduced by Alarcon

This Bill would require the Waste Board to adopt regulations to establish guidelines for the manufacture, purchase, and disposal of packaging. It would prohibit manufacturer and purchasers from using excess packaging, and require manufacturers to use specific percentages of recyclable material in the production of packaging. A motion was made to watch this Bill. The motion was passed unanimously.

- SB 1515-Introduced by Kehoe

This Bill would require the Waste Board to conduct a study of the environmental benefits of expanding the operating hours of solid waste facilities as a means of reducing traffic congestion and enabling collection and transfer vehicle fleet operators to access the facilities during off-peak hours.

- AB 2160-Introduced by Lieu

This Bill would enact legislation requiring State agencies to develop voluntary Statewide residential green building guidelines.

- AB 2878-Introduced by Ruskin

This Bill would enact the "Green" Building Act of 2006 and would require the Secretary for Environmental Protection to adopt regulations by July 1, 2007. These would incorporate sustainable building practices into the planning, operations, policymaking, and regulatory functions of capital outlay and building management processes.

- AB 2928-Introduced by Laird

This Bill would require the Waste Board and local agencies to maximize the use of green building construction.

- AB 2118-Introduced by Matthews

Mr. Mike Mohajer provided information on AB 2118. AB 2118 is scheduled to be heard by the Assembly of Natural Resources on March 27, 2006. A motion to have a draft letter to Assembly Member Barbara Matthews was made. The letter should include background information on Matthews' letter to the Waste Board, stating that her intent for AB 2770 was not to provide diversion credit, and ask her to withdraw her signature. The motion was passed unanimously.

**X. NEXT MEETING DATE**

The next meeting date is tentatively scheduled for Thursday, April 20, 2006, at 1 p.m.

**XI. OPEN DISCUSSION/PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. George De La O announced that the Public Works' Earth Day event would be held on April 20, 2006 from 11 a.m. to 2 p.m. He invited the Task Force members to come early to take part in the activities.

The meeting adjourned at 3:46 p.m.