

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

**Minutes of January 15, 2015**

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

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Margaret Clark, California League of Cities-Los Angeles Division  
Mayor Mary Ann Lutz, California League of Cities-Los Angeles Division  
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative  
Betsey Landis, Environmental Organization Representative  
Ron Saldana, Los Angeles County Disposal Association

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY OTHERS:**

Gail Farber, rep by Carlos Ruiz, County of Los Angeles Dept. of Public Works  
Cynthia Harding, rep by Gerardo Villalobos, County of Los Angeles Department of  
Public Health  
Grace Robinson Hyde, rep by Chris Salomon, County Sanitation Districts of  
Los Angeles County  
Enrique Zaldivar, rep by Reina Pereira/Karen Coca, City of Los Angeles Bureau of  
Sanitation  
Barry Wallerstein, rep by Ed Pupka, South Coast Air Quality Management District

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:**

Dr. Sam Perdomo, Business/Commerce Representative  
Carl Clark, Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, Inc.  
David Kim, City of Los Angeles  
Michael Conway, City of Long Beach Public Works Department  
Mitchell Englander, City of Los Angeles

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Kevin Best and Stephen Beitz, Real Energy  
Rob Sherman, Republic Services  
Primitivo Nuñez, CalRecycle  
Julia Weissman, County Counsel  
Cesar Leon, TetraTech BAS  
Kumari Gossai, Los Angeles County Department of Public Health  
Tranette Sanders, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Coby Skye, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Karlo Manalo, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Anna Gov, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Gabriel Arenas, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Frank Chin, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Curtis Williams and Dale Sargent, City of Santa Clarita  
Wayde Hunter, NVC/GHNNC  
Iris Chi, Regional Planning

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting called to order at 1:05 p.m., by Ms. Margaret Clark.

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 16, 2014, MINUTES**

A motion was made to approve the November 20, 2014, minutes as corrected. The motion carried unanimously.

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

Mr. Coby Skye reported the ATAS received two presentations that morning, one from MSolTech regarding the USC/Wrigley Institute for Environmental Studies on Avalon, and the other from Republic Services regarding their conversion technology activities. The ATAS also discussed recent events such as the VerdeXchange conference where Public Works will moderate a panel discussion regarding conversion technologies, and the progress of the CR&R anaerobic digestion facility which is due to break ground later this year. Lastly, the ATAS considered a proposal to facilitate a conversion technology conference sometime in 2015 to promote discussion regarding conversion technologies. A concept was circulated by the ATAS, and the ATAS voted to make some adjustments to the concept and to recommend to the Task Force that the ATAS work with the County to organize a Conversion Technology (CT) conference. A motion directing the ATAS to work with the County to organize a CT conference was made by Mayor Mary Ann Lutz, seconded by Mr. Carlos Ruiz, and passed with one abstention (Mr. Mike Mohajer).

**IV. REPORT FROM THE FACILITY PLAN & REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE (FPRS)**

Ms. Betsey Landis gave her report from the Facility Plan & Review Subcommittee (FPRS). Mr. Landis reported that during the FPRS meeting, the response letters from the City of Los Angeles Planning Department (City Planning) and County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning (County Planning) regarding the "land use" agencies' efforts on nuisance mitigations were discussed. At the meeting, Mr. Mohajer reported that both letters indicated that "...air quality monitoring has not shown evidence of an imminent or substantial risk to health, safety, or welfare of the local community." Mr. Mohajer commented that it would be helpful to understand the basis the City Planning and County Planning had considered in arriving at this assertion given that the Sunshine Canyon Landfill just received seven Notices of Violation from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) during the month of December 2014 due to verified odor complaints. Consequently, the Facility and

Plan Review Subcommittee adopted a motion to recommend to the Task Force to send letters to the City Planning and County Planning to provide the criteria used in how they each determined, respectively, that air quality monitoring for the Landfill has shown no evidence of an imminent or substantial risk to health, safety, and welfare of the local community. Ms. Landis made a motion to send the letters as recommended by the Subcommittee. Mr. Mohajer seconded the motion, which carried with two members abstaining (Mr. Carlos Ruiz and Mr. Gerardo Villalobos).

Ms. Landis also reported that County Counsel Julia Weissman told the FPRS that the Azusa Land Reclamation Landfill may have a Finding of Conformance (FOC) for the whole property. The operator of the Azusa Land Reclamation Landfill has not yet provided staff with information necessary to determine the completeness of the FOC application. Mr. Villalobos referenced the letter sent to the operator from the Task Force on January 14, 2015, and informed that the letter has asked for a certified copy of the Addendum. However, the Addendum document was never certified, but it was posted and subsequently filed with the registrar recorder. Mr. Villalobos indicated that he would provide a copy of the letter from the registrar recorder.

Ms. Landis also reported that staff has drafted a letter with Task Force's comments on the December 19, 2014, Regional Water Quality Control Board's (Water Board) Public Notice for revisions to the Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) for the Sunshine Canyon Landfill. The letter is also requesting the Water Board to extend the review/comment period by 30 days to submit additional comments. A motion to recommend to the Task Force to send the letter was adopted by the Subcommittee. Ms. Landis advised the members to listen to staff's report on the Water Board's Public Notice prior to recommending the letter be forwarded to the Water Board as approved by the Task Force.

Ms. Landis also mentioned that staff reported on the proposed Air Monitoring Contract for the Landfill. The Subcommittee adopted a motion to recommend to the Task Force to send letters to the City Planning and County Planning stating the need for better coordination with all Technical Advisory Committee's (TAC's) member agencies as well as the community on future monitoring contracts related to the Landfill. Ms. Landis indicated that, while this subject was discussed at the FPRS meeting, she advised members to listen to staff's report prior to recommending that the said letters be sent to the City Planning and County Planning.

**V. SUNSHINE CANYON LANDFILL'S WDRS REVISIONS OF MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM**

Mr. Karlo Manalo discussed the Water Board's Public Notice regarding the proposed revisions to the MRP for the Sunshine Canyon Landfill.

On December 19, 2014, the Water Board released a Public Notice for comments on the proposed revisions to the MPR included in the Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) Permit for the Sunshine Canyon Landfill. This program requires Republic Services to implement groundwater monitoring at the Landfill.

The proposed revisions include: reclassification of certain down-gradient wells to up-gradient wells; reduction in sampling frequencies for certain wells; removal of groundwater level monitoring for groundwater extraction wells; reduction in frequency of data analysis of certain "Supplemental Parameters;" and reduction in frequency of confirmative sampling.

Staff determined that the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Summary in the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) relies on the Water Board to monitor and enhance the groundwater monitoring as it deems necessary.

Upon staff's review of the proposed revisions to the program, staff would like to recommend the following comments be sent to the Water Board:

- Monitoring wells PZ-4, DW-2, and DW-3 are the only down-gradient wells located southeast of the unlined City South portion of the Landfill that can detect any future/potential groundwater contamination in this particular area. Moreover, this portion of the Landfill has no protective systems in-place that can prevent any potential Landfill contaminants from spreading out to the nearest groundwater. Consequently, wells PZ-4, DW-2, and DW-3 need to be retained as down-gradient wells to further assist the Landfill in ensuring that potential contamination to the closest groundwater as well as to off-site properties in the vicinity of the Landfill are prevented.
- For all groundwater monitoring points, all "Supplemental Parameters," except for field "Supplemental Parameters" (such as pH, specific conductance, temperature, and turbidity), and all constituents of concern listed in Table T-2 of the MRP (including those that are not listed in Table T-2 but are detected through sampling), should be monitored and analyzed at least once each year to avoid any potential migration of contaminants to the closest groundwater.
- Confirmative sampling should be conducted by Water Board staff on at least two random occasions from two or more groundwater monitoring points, and as needed, for every five years to ensure that quality and validity of data collected at the Landfill are maintained.
- The subject Public Notice does not address the impact(s) of the proposal on the appropriate Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) identified in the Landfill's California Environmental Quality Act's (CEQA) final documents which, as a "Responsible Agency," were utilized by the Water

Board to grant the subject facility's WDR. As such, the proposed MRP revisions need to be reviewed to ensure full consistency and compliance with the appropriate MMRPs enumerated in the Landfill's CEQA documents, which are under the purview of the Water Board.

As the deadline for submission of comments to the Water Board is on January 19, 2015, Mr. Manalo presented a draft letter to the Task Force providing these comments for the consideration.

Ms. Betsey Landis made a motion to send the comment letter to the Water Board with a request to extend the review/comment period by 30 days to submit additional comments. Mayor Mary Ann Lutz seconded the motion, which carried with three members abstaining (Mr. Chris Salomon, Mr. Gerardo Villalobos, and Mr. Ron Saldana).

## **VI. SUNSHINE CANYON LANDFILL – AIR MONITORING CONTRACT**

Ms. Anna Gov reported that there is an ongoing air quality monitoring program for Sunshine Canyon Landfill since December 2008. The City's Condition C.10.a of Ordinance No. 172,933 (City Ordinance) and the County's Condition 81 of the CUP requires an independent consultant to "...conduct tests of landfill dust and diesel particulates (PM 10 and Black Carbon) around the perimeter of the landfill property, with special attention given to the area south of the landfill above residential community..." The current air quality monitoring contract expires on June 2015.

On January 7, 2015, the City of Los Angeles Energy and Environmental Committee considered an agreement with the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning and Sonoma Technology to provide air quality monitoring services at the Landfill. The term of this contract is five years from the date of execution with two 12-month renewal options. The last day for City Council action is January 16, 2015.

This agreement includes the following two new programs that were not in the previous air quality monitoring services contract:

- A north-side (upwind) monitoring station
- The option to request that the Consultant conduct volatile organic compounds (VOC) and carbonyl samplings.

Ms. Landis expressed concerns that the City of Los Angeles might not inform the County of this contract, and she made a motion to send a letter to the City of Los Angeles encouraging the City to notify the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Public Works, and the County Board of Supervisors (Board) of what they are doing.

Mr. Carlos Ruiz made a clarification that per his understanding, the County Planning was in agreement with the City Planning, and the action has been taken to the City Council. It wasn't that the City of Los Angeles was taking the action by itself; but rather the two Planning Departments were in communication.

Ms. Iris Chi from County Regional Planning commented that the City and County drafted the contract together as representatives of the TAC. The condition in the County's Conditional Use Permit for the Landfill indicated that the consulting be selected by the TAC. Ms. Chi is not sure if the Conditions of the City Ordinance stipulate that the City must take the contract to the City Council, but the County's Condition does not state that it needs to go to the Board.

Mr. Mohajer added that the contract went to the City Council's Energy and Environment Committee for their approval and subsequently to the City Council and the Mayor, for approval. He questioned Ms. Chi's statement that the approval is only required by the TAC, which Ms. Chi confirmed. Mr. Mohajer added that, in any event, these are the actual legal documents that are out there. Mayor Mary Ann Lutz asked about the funding for this contract and if the County has to take the contract information to the Board or if it stay with the TAC only. Ms. Chi informed that the funding is provided by the operator and that the CUP does not require the contract to be approved by the Board.

Mr. Ruiz indicated that there is a condition within the City Ordinance and County's CUP that requires air quality monitoring services. Additionally, a Memorandum of Understanding between the City and the County also requires the coordination of both the City and the County regarding these monitoring services. Mr. Ruiz added that Public Works is a member of the TAC, and that the TAC is only an advisory for the two Planning Departments. Mr. Villalobos indicated that this item was brought up in the December 2014 TAC meeting. However, he does not recall the exact details of the discussion.

After Ms. Landis read off their Analysis of Proposed Contract a discussion among the Task Force members ensued.

After discussions that future contracts should seek feedback from the community and have better coordination among the agencies, Mr. Mohajer made a motion to send a letter to the City Planning and County Planning that there should be more communication among the involved agencies. Ms. Landis agree to the changes to her motion. Ms. Margaret Clark seconded the motion. The motion carried with three abstaining (Mr. Carlos Ruiz, Mr. Gerardo Villalobos, Mr. Ed Pupka) and one opposed (Ms. Karen Coca ).

## **VII. DRAFT REGULATIONS USED MATTRESS RECOVERY & RECYCLING PROGRAM**

Mr. Frank Chin reported updates on issues concerns on the Used Mattress Recovery proposed regulations. The written comment period ends on February 11, 2015. One major issue was bed bugs. Mr. Chin explained the current practice of the mattress recycler. Mr. Mohajer mentioned that there are no sanitizing requirements to get rid of the bed bugs. Mr. Chin will add all the Task Force beg bug comments in the letter to CalRecycle.

The second item Mr. Chin talked about was the reimbursements to the governments for illegal dumping of mattresses. Mr. Chin met with the Mattress Recycling Counsel and was informed that they are proposing a grant application process for the recycling of mattresses.

Mr. Carlos Ruiz, made a motion to send a letter to CalRecycle expressing concerns regarding erroneous fees for different cities. Include comments about administrative related issues along with previous comments the Task Force was concerned about for SB 254 and SB 1274 concerning bed bugs and reimbursement of costs to government for illegal dumping of mattresses. Ms. Reina Pereira seconded the motion. The motion carried with one abstaining (Mr. Ed Pupka).

## **VIII. UPDATE ON ALAMEDA COUNTY PHARMACEUTICAL WASTE LAWSUIT & CONSIDERATION OF AMICUS CURIAE**

Ms. Tranette Sanders gave an update on the Alameda County Pharmaceutical Waste Lawsuit. She reported that that PhARMA's last appeal in the lawsuit against Alameda County to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals was unsuccessful, and they had until December 30, 2014, to file with the U.S. Supreme Court. On December 29, 2014, PhARMA filed an appeal with the U.S. Supreme Court and is now waiting to see if the case will be heard.

Mr. Mohajer stated the Task Force considered this matter at the October meeting and agreed that if PhARMA filed an appeal the Task Force would send a letter to all the cities and the County asking them to submit an amicus brief to join the lawsuit in support of the Alameda County Ordinance. If they did not appeal then , the Task Force should send a letter to the cities and the County encouraging them to adopt an ordinance similar to the Alameda County Ordinance. The Task Force questioned the process of the amicus brief and directed staff to seek County Counsel advice about filing.

Ms. Julia Weissman, Counsel for Los Angeles County, gave a short presentation regarding Supreme Court procedures, including the process for filing "amicus

curiae" briefs. She stated a party that wants the Supreme Court to reverse a decision from a Circuit Court of Appeal (i.e., a party seeking to overturn a decision from the Ninth Circuit) can file what is called a petition for certiorari with the United States Supreme Court, asking them to hear the case. The Supreme Court only grants about one percent of these petitions. Considerations that the Court uses in determining whether to grant a petition for certiorari include whether there has been a split in the circuits on a particular Federal issue that the Supreme Court needs to resolve, or whether an issue is otherwise significant enough that the Supreme Court needs to decide the issue. When a party that has lost in the Court of Appeals files a petition for certiorari in the Supreme Court, the opposing party can file an opposition, but is not required to do so. Once the Supreme Court decides to hear a case, it then sets a schedule for the parties to brief and argue the merits of the case.

Ms. Weismann further stated amicus curiae briefs (also known as "friend of the court") can be filed by persons and groups who are not parties to the lawsuit for the purpose of "bring[ing] to the attention of the Court relevant matter not already brought to its attention by the parties." Most commonly, amicus briefs are filed on the merits of the case. They can also be filed in support on a petition for cert, to help convince the Supreme Court to hear a case. They are almost never filed in opposition to a petition for certiorari, in order to convince the court not to hear a case. If the Supreme Court decides to hear the Alameda County Case, that is the time when non-parties such as the County would think about filing an amicus brief. A group of entities that are in a similar position on an issue (such as League of Cities or Association of Counties) can get together and sign onto a single brief and share the cost. Each individual entity does not need to file its own brief.

As an illustration of the time it takes for the Supreme Court to hear a case, in the Natural Resources Defense Council case against the County, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal's Decision was July 2011; the Supreme Court decided to hear the case in June 2012. The case was argued before the Supreme Court in December 2012 and the Supreme Court decided the case January 2013.

Mr. Mohajer added based on Ms. Weissman's report the Task Force should not make a decision at this time whether or not to send a letter to the cities or County seeking support to file an amicus curiae, but should wait and see how Alameda County is going to be respond to the petition. Mr. Mohajer also indicated that it would be much better to have this document brought to court by the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) and the League of Cities rather than individual jurisdictions. Mr. Mohajer recommends tabling this item until Public Works and Ms. Weissman finds out if CSAC and the League will be filing and reports back to the Task Force. Mayor Mary Ann Lutz agreed with Mr. Mohajer.



**IX. HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE COLLECTION MANAGEMENT, AND ADMINISTRATION ANALYSIS**

Ms. Tranette Sanders provided an overview on the Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) Program. She described the various collection components of the the HHW program and its funding sources such as, Solid Waste Management fees, Unincorporated County landfill fees, and other sources such as grants.

Mr. Mike Mohajer asked for this item to be in the Agenda specifically to evaluate the cost of providing service in various ways. This year the author of AB 45 is coming up with an intent language based on a curbside collection program in San Mateo. Based on the discussions, the bill will direct jurisdictions to provide curbside collections and door-to-door collections as the primary method of collection.

Mr. Mohajer would like staff to monitor Cities and Counties throughout the State of California to see what kind of programs they provide and what their costs are. Once AB 45 comes out with the specific language, staff will have the tools to argue that the services currently being provided is the best way, and curbside collection is not the appropriate way to collect hazardous material.

Mr. Mohajer made a motion for staff to collect as much information as they can from Cities' and Counties' curbside collections and door-to-door programs throughout the State of California within the next six weeks and provide the summary to the Task Force. Mayor Lutz seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**X. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Mr. Chris Sheppard gave an overview on AB 45. This bill would express the Legislature's intent to enact legislation that would establish curbside household hazardous waste collection programs, door-to-door household hazardous waste collection programs, and household hazardous waste residential pickup services as the principal means of collecting household hazardous waste and diverting it from California's landfills and waterways. The bill mentions a number of cities in California are already using curbside household hazardous waste collection programs, door-to-door household hazardous waste collection programs, and household hazardous waste and that waste disposal companies and local governments that have implemented these programs and services have found them to be successful and inexpensive; however, there is no actual data that supports these contentions. Mr. Sheppard recommends the Task Force to take an oppose position. Staff will continue to analyze the issue and compile data, and if additional relevant data is collected then staff can send an additional letter.

Mr. Ruiz added that of the Solid Waste Management fee that the County collects on the tonnage that is being disposed, half of that money goes into the HHW program and the County augments this funding through the Permit fees they charge through the unincorporated landfills. That's where we go from 7.2 million to over 9 million. That's only one program, we have made the argument before that there is more HHW, that we want to collect. There is no way local governments have the money to handle that. Mr. Ruiz stated that EPR is the way to go so that the burden is not put on local governments.

Mr. Mohajer added, prior to the e-waste collection program being designated as hazardous, the amount of e-waste being collected as part of the Los Angeles County Countywide Program, increase significantly, to the point that 70 percent of materials being collected are e-waste based on the Form 303.

Mayor Mary Ann Lutz made the motion to send a letter as Mr. Sheppard suggested. Ms. Landis seconded the motion. The motion carried with two abstaining (Mr. Chris Salomon and Ron Saldana).

Ms. Sheppard also mentioned AB 48, which is the reincarnation of the cigarette single use filter ban. This bill was on the Task Force legislative table last year, but no position was taken at the time. It's back and they are proposing to ban the sale of single-use filtered cigarettes in the State of California. Staff will watch this bill.

Ms. Reina Pereira brought to the Task Force's attention SB 47, which is the monitoring of crumb rubber and synthetic turf in public and private schools and public facilities. Ms. Pereira would like the Task Force to review this bill as it may have a negative impact on local governments.

Mr. Mohajer added that recently there has been articles that claim that soccer fields that have crumb rubber have been sending out hazardous substances and they are promoting prohibition. Supervisor Antonovich requested for the County Department of Public Health to verify if the crumb rubber at soccer fields are producing hazardous particles, and the Public Health Department US EPA found no basis for concern at this time. Mr. Mohajer made a motion to oppose this bill. Mayor Lutz recommend staff to bring this bill back next month and provide the Task Force with more information before they take a position. Motion was dismissed until further information is provided.

## **XI. UPDATE ON CARPET STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM**

Mr. Gabriel Arenas provided an update for the State's carpet stewardship program established pursuant to AB 2398 (Perez, 2011). In September 2014, CalRecycle had found the program to be non-compliant. This status was granted after CalRecycle had designated the annual report submitted in July 2014 by the

carpet stewardship organization, Carpet America Recovery Effort (CARE), to be deficient in several aspects. In December of 2014, CARE sent a letter to CalRecycle Director Mortenson, which detailed several steps the organization is taking to address problematic issues CalRecycle had identified. The letter was accepted as an addendum to the stewardship plan; however, CalRecycle indicated that the non-compliant status of the program would remain in place. The status of the program would be reconsidered after reviewing the next annual report which is due in July 2015 and subsequent reports thereafter. The annual report will detail overall program activities including how the changes identified in the addendum have resolved issues which CalRecycle had found to be problematic.

Mr. Arenas provided several details of the activities identified in the addendum including, but not limited to: increased incentive payments for several types of carpet fibers that are not being recycled at an optimal rate; a new incentive for end-use of calcium carbonate; an increase in the assessment fee in order to pay for the increased/new incentives; as well as an award of a research grant to the University of Connecticut to study PET carpet recycling.

Mr. Mohajer noted that the carpet stewardship program had been in disarray for the last few years and the addendum and associated activities identified in the addendum are a good improvement for the program.

## **XII. CALRECYCLE UPDATE**

Mr. Primitivo Nuñez of CalRecycle reported the following:

### **AB 1826** Mandatory Organics Recycling (MORe) Implementation and AB 1594

- CalRecycle is still working on developing the implementation/guidance for the mandatory organics recycling law.
- Basic information about the law will be online shortly, with a comprehensive F.A.Q. section.
- CalRecycle will hold spring workshops that will discuss the implementation process in great detail and provide an opportunity for additional questions.
- One workshop will be in So Cal in April.

**Open Grant/Loan Cycles** - grant and loan information is available on the CalRecycle Grants website.

### Tire-Derived Aggregate (TDA) Grant Program

- The TDA Grant Program provides assistance to cities, counties, and special districts in solving a variety of engineering challenges.
- Applications are due January 22, 2015.

Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) Grant Program

- The Notice of Funds Available (NOFA) for the HHW Grant Program has been released.
- The Grant provide funding for local governments to implement safe HHW programs for HHW programs
- The anticipated allocation for FY 2015–16 for the HHW Grant Program is \$1,500,000. The maximum grant amount will be \$350,000 for each applicant.
- Applications are due January 28, 2015.

Illegal Disposal Site Abatement Grant Program

- This program provides financial assistance in the form of reimbursement grants up to \$500,000 to help public entities for cleanup and restoration of affected sites.
- The application deadline for Fiscal Year 2014/15 is February 4, 2015.

Tire Amnesty Grant Program

- This competitive grant program is designed to help divert waste tires from landfill disposal and prevent illegal tire dumping.
- The application period for this program is anticipated to open at the end of January.

**Upcoming Events**

- The next CalRecycle Monthly Public Meeting is scheduled for January 27, 2015, 10:00 a.m.–1:00 p.m. Webinar is accessible through the CalRecycle website.
- The next Household Hazardous Waste Information Exchange Event is sponsored by City of Los Angeles on January 22, 2015, in Playa Del Rey at the Environmental Learning Center/ Hyperion Treatment Plant.
- CalRecycle and the California Resource Recovery Association (CRRA) are sponsoring a Recycling Facility Financing Seminar on January 25, 2015, in the City of Lakewood, from 9 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Nuñez reported to the Task Force that he was able to follow up individually with some of the questions at the last meeting regarding grant questions related to why certain entities did not get the grant they applied for. CalRecycle staff is available to discuss scoring criteria before stakeholders apply for grants as well as after the award announcements are made to discuss why they did not get the grant.

Mr. Mohajer mentioned he has sent a letter to CalRecycle about the tire recycling grant and he would appreciate a written response.

### **XIII. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Ms. Karen Coca explained the City Franchise Request For Proposal process and on rumors dispelled. She indicated they received a lot of very good proposals and that no one knows of the proposal outcomes. Ms. Coca mentioned the City is in the evaluation process and will start the negotiations around the middle of the year. It will be in 2016 when they will bring the contracts forward and will become public.

### **XIV. NEXT MEETING DATE**

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 19, 2015, in Conference Room B.

The meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

fm

P:\epub\EA\EA\TF\TF\Minutes\2015 Minutes\TF MinutesJanuary15final