

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

Minutes of September 20, 2012

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Betsey Landis, Environmental Organization Representative  
Mary Ann Lutz, California League of Cities-Los Angeles Division  
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative  
Ron Saldana, Los Angeles County Disposal Association (Formerly GLASWMA)  
Eugene Sun, California League of Cities-Los Angeles Division

COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY OTHERS:

Mitchell Englander, rep. by Nicole Bernson, City of Los Angeles  
Gail Farber, rep. by Pat Proano, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Dr. Jonathan Fielding, rep. by Cindy Chen, County of Los Angeles Department of  
Public Health  
Dr. Barry Wallerstein, rep. by Jay Chen, South Coast Air Quality Management District

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Grace Chan, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County  
Carl Clark, Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, Inc.  
Margaret Clark, California League of Cities-Los Angeles Division  
Michael Conway, City of Long Beach  
David Kim, City of Los Angeles  
Gerry Miller, City of Los Angeles  
Sam Perdomo, Business/Commerce Representative  
Enrique Zaldivar, rep by Karen Coca, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mark Alpers, R3Consulting  
Gabriel Arenas, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Claudia Holguin, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Steve Howe, Generation Earth Tree People  
Wayde Hunter, NVC/GHNNC  
Walter McKinney, Clean Waste Tech.  
Frances Mandujano, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Corey Mayne, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Tobie Mitchell, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Peggy Polinsky, Independent  
Nik Reppuhn, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Coby Skye, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Bereket Tadele, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works

Call to order

Meeting called to order at 1:06 p.m.

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST MINUTES, 2012**

Mr. Eugene Sun made a motion seconded by Mr. Pat Proano to approve the minutes with minor corrections. The motion passed. Ms. Nicole Bernson mentioned that an Ad Hoc committee to review Task Force policies and procedures has been organized as discussed. Staff explained that it would be placed on the agenda when the working draft was completed and presented to the Task Force. Mr. Proano also explained that Ms. Margaret Clark, Task Force co-chair, contacted him and asked that the item not be placed on the agenda until the following month when she would be able to attend the meeting.

**II. FACILITY AND PLAN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE**

Ms. Betsey Landis reported the subcommittee discussed the new work being done at Sunshine Canyon Landfill including the installation of the new flare. They are working hard to get the new system up and running and recently entered the permit process for flare #10. They have doubled the horse power on two of the blowers doubling the amount of landfill gas being flared. A proposal was given for a revegetation mitigation plan at the landfill, and preparations are underway for the first section on the City side to be seeded in November. The subcommittee approved the definitions for conversion technologies and recovery and recommends the Task Force accepts them as well.

**III. REPORT FROM THE ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE (ATAS)**

Mr. George Gomez reported the subcommittee had a very productive and informative meeting. There was an update on Phase III and IV of the CT project. The CR&R conversion technology project at City of Perris is moving forward. The project received a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and CEQA signoff, and they are currently working on obtaining a Solid Waste Permit through CalRecycle. They are continuing to seek potential State, Federal, and Foundation grants for County planning activities. The subcommittee approved proposed definitions for "conversion technologies" and "recovery," including the word "solid" in the definition of "conversion technologies" as recommended by the Task Force and Facilities Subcommittee at their August meetings.

Ms. Tobie Mitchell provided information to the Subcommittee on the 2012 Bioenergy Action plan. The purpose of this report is to promote bioenergy project development in California. Additional information will be provided at the

next ATAS meeting. Ms. Mitchell also provided updates regarding two workshops hosted by CalRecycle that were held on September 19, 2012.

Mr. Pat Proano stated that the County Engineers Association Solid Waste Committee created a Conversion Technology Working Group. They recently met to set policy priorities including conversion technologies (CT). The City of Los Angeles was invited along with other local jurisdictions that have been involved with or currently have CT projects. Carol Mortensen, Director of CalRecycle and her policy advisor Scott Smithline were also invited to attend the meeting. CalRecycle is moving forward with workshops to establish standards for materials recovery facilities and subsequently more discussions on post-recycled material for conversion versus landfilling. Mr. Proano also met with the environmental advisor to Governor Brown and expressed the needs of Los Angeles County in line with the Governor's bioenergy action plan. He stated that the Governor's office is aware and has advised CalRecycle to make this issue a priority. Ms. Nicole Bernson was in attendance at the CT Working Group meetings.

Mr. Mohajer pointed out that the Countywide Summary Plan is different from the Countywide Siting Element, which is only one part of an overall Summary Plan. The Summary Plan compiles all the programs and documents prepared by the individual cities into one summarized plan. The Siting Element addresses only the disposal as they define it, which today is transformation and landfilling. Ms. Bernson added that AB 939 was established in the 80s and was in need of an update, which they are discussing. She also mentioned there was conversation about the MRF performance standard and emphasis was made on how crucial it is that southern California cities play an important role because northern California cities dominate the conversations and tools aren't available to southern California cities. She encouraged as many representatives as possible from southern California cities to participate in the process. Mr. Proano stated as an outreach component of the Siting Element, they should open up the opportunity to meet with the cities and reeducate them on what the issues are because the northern Californian issues take precedence and they aren't specific to Southern California needs. Government officials know little about the needs of the south so it's good that CalRecycle is involved because they will be able to explain what's going on to the Governor's office. Mr. Mohajer gave a brief history of the Task Force's introduction of conversion technologies to the legislators in the 1990's and the minimal support received at the time. He explained how much work was done and needs to be done to make it happen.

Mr. Coby Skye added that the subcommittee made a motion to recommend the Task Force send a comment letter regarding CalRecycle's MRF standard proposals. Mr. Proano added that he and Mr. Mohajer attended a workshop held by CalRecycle that discussed the MRF standards and what feedstock would be allowed for CTs. There are only two weeks to comment. CalRecycle will host

another workshop in southern California during the week October 15. Mr. Proano directed staff to reserve a conference room at Public Works headquarters to host the meeting. After a brief discussion, Ms. Mary Ann Lutz suggested to agenzize the recap of the CalRecycle's AB 341 & MRF Standards workshop for the October 18, 2012, meeting. A link to CalRecycle's website will be provided to Task Force members to view correspondence from other agencies regarding this matter.

#### IV. CONVERSION TECHNOLOGY AND RECOVERY DEFINITIONS

Mr. Coby Skye presented the following staff definitions of "[Conversion Technologies](#)" and "[Recovery](#)" for approval along with the attached [Proposed Changes to Waste Management Paradigm](#).

**Conversion Technologies:** The term "conversion technologies" refers to a wide array of technologies capable of converting post-recycled or residual solid waste into useful products, green fuels, and renewable energy through non-combustion thermal, chemical, or biological processes. Conversion technologies may include mechanical processes when combined with a secondary conversion process.

**Recovery:** Recovery is defined as any waste management operation that diverts a material from the waste stream and which results in a product with a potential economic or ecological benefit. Recovery mainly refers to the following operations (1) re-use, (2) material recovery such as recycling (3) biological recovery such as composting, and 4) energy recovery such as fuel production.

Mr. Mike Mohajer made the motion to accept staff's definitions "Conversion Technologies" and "Recovery" and approve the Changes to Waste Management Paradigm. It was seconded by Ms. Betsey Landis. There was some discussion, and Mr. Jay Chen suggested adding "thermal, chemical or biological" to and deleting "secondary" from the conversion technologies definition's conversion process. Mr. Pat Proano suggested adding "California" to the title of the Waste Management Paradigm. The motion passed unanimously with the suggested changes. Mr. Proano made a subsequent motion to send a letter to CalRecycle with copies to local agencies to accept the conversion technology and recovery definitions as agreed upon by the Task Force. The motion was seconded by Ms. Landis and passed unanimously.

**V. CONSIDERATION OF THE PRELIMINARY DRAFT COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT AND PRESENTATION ON THE 2011 COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN ANNUAL REPORT**

Mr. Martins asked if any of the Task Force members had any questions on the Siting Element and stated staff is still waiting on comments from members and the City of Los Angeles. Mr. Pat Proano mentioned the City of Los Angeles is working on their comments and they should be submitted soon. Mr. Mohajer explained that the approval process after all the comments have been received is very lengthy. Mr. Proano added that once the Task Force has approved the document, they will request the Board of Supervisors to release it and the communications consultant would find an effective way of communicating it to all the cities. Mr. Carlos Ruiz added that Public Works and the County have been preparing the draft and are working with Task Force members to get a draft version ready for circulation along with the environmental document.

Ms. Emiko Thompson presented the attached [2011 Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan Annual Report](#). She stated the purpose of the report is to provide an annual update to the California Integrated Waste Management Plan as required under AB 939. She highlighted that the report contains two parts. The first part is a description of whether the Countywide Summary Plan needs to be revised. The Summary Plan (approved by CalRecycle in 1999) describes the steps that are to be taken by local agencies in order to achieve the diversion mandate. In August 2010, CalRecycle approved the County's 5-Year Review Report, which concluded that an update to the Summary Plan was not necessary due to the significant regional programs and efforts by the Cities and County. This report continues to find that a revision to the Summary Plan is not necessary. The second part of the Annual Report is an update to the Countywide Siting Element. The Siting Element describes how the County and cities plan to dispose of their solid waste for a 15-year planning period. Since there have been changes to the remaining disposal capacity since the time the existing Siting Element was approved back in 1997, the annual report details those changes.

The report also gives an overview of major permit changes. In June 2011, Antelope Valley Landfill obtained a permit to expand an 11-acre bridge area located between Unit I and II to allow for a single waste footprint. The expansion added 9-million tons of capacity and about 8-yr of life to the landfill. The Landfill expansions described in the report are Chiquita Canyon Landfill, Lancaster Landfill, Scholl Canyon Landfill, and Savage Canyon Landfill.

A Disposal Capacity Analyses was done based on several scenarios. The worst and best case scenarios were highlighted. The "Status Quo/Worst-Case" Scenario assumed there are no increases in the diversion rate, exports remain at the rate of 6,200 tons per day and there are no conversion technology facilities. In this case, the disposal demand exceeds the available disposal capacity

around year 2014, and illustrates that reliance on the existing disposal capacity alone is not sufficient to meet the County's long-term disposal needs. The "Multi-Faceted/Best-Case" Scenario approach assumes that the diversion rate increases from 55% to 75%, Chiquita Canyon Landfill is expanded in 2015, conversion technology facilities are operational and provide up to 10,000 tons per day of capacity, and waste-by-rail becomes operational. This scenario's disposal demand stays within the available capacity and illustrates that long-term disposal capacity will be adequate through a multi-faced approach of increased diversion, landfill expansions, conversion technology facilities, and exports.

## VI. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Mr. Corey Mayne presented the status of the attached [Legislative Summary](#) and highlighted the following three bills that still required action.

**SB 1128** – Staff recommended the Task Force send a letter requesting Governor Brown's signature. Mr. Mike Mohajer made the motion to send the letter. It was seconded by Ms. Betsey Landis and passed unanimously.

**AB 1900** – The original Task Force position was to oppose unless amended. The bill has been amended several times and staff's recommendation is to take a neutral position.

**AB 2196** – This bill is related to AB 1900 and staff's recommendation is to take a neutral position. Ms. Betsey Landis made a motion seconded by Mr. Pat Proano for the Task Force to stay neutral on AB 1900 and AB 2196. The motion passed with one abstention from Mr. Mike Mohajer.

Mr. Pat Proano announced that on September 18, 2012, Los Angeles County Supervisor Don Knabe introduced a motion calling upon federal and state legislators to amend decades-old laws and regulations to encourage the development of innovative waste conversion technologies, and that the Board of Supervisors will officially take action on his motion on September 25, 2012. Ms. Betsey Landis made a motion to send the Board of Supervisors a letter of support and appreciation for Supervisor Knabe's motion to promote conversion technologies. It was seconded by Ms. Mary Ann Lutz. Mr. Proano suggested that a separate letter also be sent to all the local jurisdictions requesting their support and for them to adopt similar resolutions to the County's. The motion passed as amended with one abstention from Mr. Jay Chen.

Mr. Mayne indicated staff intends to present the future legislative items in the same summary format presented at today's meeting. Nicole Bernson noted that she's requested that the agenda specify which bills would be addressed. Mr. Mohajer stated that if that were done it would limit what could and couldn't be

acted on. It was decided that question would be presented when the County Counsel comes to present the Brown Act guidelines.

**VII. UPDATE ON CALRECYCLE'S DRAFT REGULATORY REVISIONS TO TITLES 14 AND 27, AND WATER BOARD'S PROPOSED STATEWIDE ORDER, REGARDING COMPOSTING FACILITIES**

Mr. Nik Reppuhn reported on August 7, 2012, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) released a draft Order detailing the proposed requirements for the discharge of waste at composting facilities. Staff attended the public workshop on August 28, 2012, where the Water Board presented this Order and answered questions. Staff also sent a letter dated September 11, 2012, on behalf of the Task Force, providing comments on the draft Order.

Some of the comments addressed the needs to clearly define terms to have a uniform meaning throughout the entire document as well as consistency with all applicable codes. Staff recommended using a hydraulic conductivity of  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  cm/s or less on all graded surfaces on site and on all containment structures. Staff also recommended finding mechanisms to ensure that chipping and grinding operations would also be subject to appropriate levels of regulations as composting facilities.

Staff also reported that a draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration is currently out for public review and staff plans to send comments by the due date of October 10. The Water Board may approve the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and adopt the Order at the end of their October 16<sup>th</sup> meeting.

On September 14, 2012, CalRecycle released its Initial Discussion Draft Regulatory Text for Issues 5, 6, 7, and 12. A brief description was provided for each issue: Issue 5 - Regulatory Coordination of Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) to allow Fats, Oils, and Greases (FOGs) for co-digestion with wastewater; Issue 6 - Green Material Contamination and the physical contaminant limit by weight of product; Issue 7 - Apply the transfer/processing and compostable material handling/design to Anaerobic Digestion (AD) Facility Permitting; and Issue 12 - Clarify "Maximum Permitted Tonnage" on Permit Application by updating the Solid Waste Facility Permit (SWFP) and Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) Form and Instructions.

On October 3, 2012, CalRecycle will hold an Informal Workshop in Baldwin Park to review and answer questions regarding all 14 issues. Staff will review the new draft text and prepare a comment letter prior to the October 12, 2012, comment deadline.

Ms. Betsey Landis made a motion to send a comment letter to CalRecycle on the Draft Regulatory Revisions to Titles 14 and 27 addressing TF composting concerns. Mr. Mike Mohajer seconded the motion and it passed with three abstentions from Nicole Bernson, Cindy Chen, and Jay Chen.

**VIII. UPDATE ON THE SANTA MONICA INTERN PROGRAM**

Ms. Frances Mandujano reported that currently the County has a CBEEP program that partners with four other colleges and Santa Monica is not one of them. As directed by a motion made by Mr. Mike Mohajer to send letters to the County Los Angeles Board of Supervisors and the Department of Human Resources, Ms. Natalie Jimenez submitted letters requesting Santa Monica, Golden West and Irvine Valley College students participate in the current intern program. Mr. Mohajer and staff conducted further research on the programs and contacted the Director of the County Department of Human Resources. It was determined that it the Department of Human Resources would like to keep their current program policy in place so the Task Force will not be able to take advantage to the Santa Monica Program. Mr. Mohajer suggested if the Task Force wanted to continue to pursue it, they could write letters to the Board of Supervisors and the Department of Human Resources. Mr. Pat Proano indicated that the County also has a student worker program in place where regular college students and engineering students can work a minimum of 20 hours a week and receive pay and a volunteer program as well that serve as their intern program. Ms. Mary Ann Lutz presented two options the Task Force could take one being taking it to a Board of Supervisors and asking them to look into it and the other is to send a letter to all the municipalities in the County highlighting the program. Mr. Proano offered to try and speak to the Department of Human Resources again about the possibility of opening up their current program to include the two-year programs that Santa Monica College offers before going to the Board of Supervisors. The Task Force agreed.

**IX. REPORT FROM CALRECYCLE**

There was no report.

**X. NEXT MEETING DATE**

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 18, in Conference Room B.

**XI. OPEN DISCUSSION**

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

ts