

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

February 15, 2024

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Margaret Clark, League of California Cities
Jim Smith, City of Los Angeles
Jordan R. Sisson, Los Angeles County Disposal Association

COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY OTHERS:

Robert Ferrante, rep by Sam Shammass, Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Barbara Ferrer, rep by Karen Gork, Los Angeles County Public Health
Wayne Nastri, rep by Philip Crabbe, III, South Coast Air Quality Management District
Mark Pestrella, rep by Shari Afshari, Los Angeles County Public Works
Barbara Romero, rep by Ron Milo, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation
Eric Lopez, rep by Erin Rowland, Long Beach Public Works

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Jorgel Chavez, League of California Cities
Eddie De La Riva, League of California Cities
Jeff Farano, Sr., Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative
Rafael Prieto, City of Los Angeles

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jonathan Brazile, Office of County Counsel Los Angeles County
Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens
Ken Habaradas, Los Angeles County Public Health
Josephine Chen, Los Angeles County Public Works
Perla Gomez, Los Angeles County Public Works
Michael Harmon, Los Angeles County Public Works
Tran Kiem, Los Angeles County Public Works
Darren Kwan, Los Angeles County Public Works
Karlo Manalo, Los Angeles County Public Works
Dave Nguyen, Los Angeles County Public Works
Vanessa Olivas, Los Angeles County Public Works
Genevieve Osmena, Los Angeles County Public Works
Fahim Rahimi, Los Angeles County Public Works
Carol Saucillo, Los Angeles County Public Works
Christopher Sheppard, Los Angeles County Public Works
Airon Tee, Los Angeles County Public Works
Emiko Thompson, Los Angeles County Public Works
Kawsar Vazifdar, Los Angeles County Public Works

I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 1:06 p.m. by Ms. Shari Afshari, who served as Alternate Chair.

II. APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 18, 2024, MINUTES

Mr. Sam Shammass made a motion to approve the January 18, 2024, minutes and Mr. Ron Milo seconded. Motion passed with one abstention.

III. REPORT FROM THE PUBLIC AND INFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE (PEIS)

Ms. Vanessa Olivas provided the update due to the absence of the PEIS Chair. There was no quorum so previous meeting minutes will be voted on at the next PEIS meeting on May 16, 2024. The Subcommittee reviewed six articles to be published in the spring issue of the Inside Solid Waste Newsletter.

IV. REPORT FROM THE ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE (ATAS)

Mr. Fahim reported the following from the ATAS meeting:

Tetra Tech provided a [presentation](#) on their ongoing evaluation of potential locations countywide for solid waste processing infrastructure, such as anaerobic digestion (AD) or thermal conversion technology (CT) facilities.

Tetra Tech also provided the following updates. They:

- Submitted the Draft Long-Term Solid Waste Disposal Needs Study for the Antelope Valley, in compliance with Lancaster Landfill Conditional Use Permit, Condition 92, for Public Works' review. The study includes a high-level review of economic, environmental, and technical considerations for CT facility options.
- Are performing a detailed feasibility evaluation of three closed landfill sites that will investigate land availability and land use compatibility.
- Are finalizing a Fact Sheet and Power Point Presentation for the proposed AD Facility at Calabasas Landfill in support of community outreach.

Staff provided an update on upcoming CT events and conferences that may be found in the [Conversion Technology Newsletter](#).

Ms. Margaret Clark asked if there were any other states using CTs for their trash to make energy. Ms. Erin Rowland commented that the state of Florida is looking into a variety of CT options and may possibly receive some federal funding. Mr. Rahimi responded that staff would develop a list of CT projects.

V. REPORT FROM THE FACILITY AND PLAN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE (FPRS)

Mr. Shammass provided the following update due to the absence of the temporary FPRS Chair and indicated there was no quorum:

Chiquita Canyon Landfill

- The South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) issued 12 Notices of Violation (NOVs) in January 2024. The State Water Resources Control Board issued 1 NOV for failure to submit an NPDES annual report.
- Discussion regarding the US Environmental Protection Agency establishing a task force of various regulatory agencies to address odor issues.

Sunshine Canyon Landfill

- There were 204 odor complaints made to the AQMD hotline and 9 NOVs issued in January 2024.
- Vegetation Report was provided, and native plants are growing well.
- Discussion regarding January and February storms that had no impact to off-site property. Landfill Operator is working with Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) to repair erosion caused by rainfall.

During public comment, Mr. Wayne Hunter of the North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens indicated that in 2015, Sunshine Canyon Landfill (SCL) had 1,795 odor complaints. In 2023, SCL had 1,721 odor complaints which was the second highest year recorded. He noted that after the Order for Abatement Hearing which required SCL to correct the problem, odor complaints dropped to 208 odor complaints. Mr. Hunter also stated that the SCL Toe Berm may not be correctly compacted and that soil trucks were bypassing the scales. He explained that a buttress must be built in front of the landfill entrance in order for SCL to build the landfill higher and gain the full air capacity they have available in their original plans. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Ron Milo asked Mr. Shammass if the NOVs reported are updated in the Solid Waste Information System (SWIS). Ms. Karen Gork indicated that NOVs issued by AQMD are not in the SWIS, but LEA inspection reports are. The LEA inspector tracks the total number of NOVs issued by AQMD because of the

requirement in the permit conditions that NOV's be communicated to the LEA, which are also noted in the inspection reports.

VI. REPORT ON AGENDA ITEM REQUESTS

As requested at last month's Task Force meeting, Ms. Genevieve Osmena addressed the miscommunication between staff and the commissioner requesting Assembly Bill (AB) 817 being put on January's Agenda. The confusion was primarily because of the 2013 amendment date noted on the request which directed staff to legislation on elections, rather than to the appropriate 2023 amendment date related to AB 817 that was requested. When staff clarified the item, the deadline had passed to enable it to be posted on the agenda. In addition, because AB 817 is a two-year bill, staff was unable to push it through the process and place on the January agenda. However, it is on the [Legislative Table](#) this month and will be mentioned in the Legislative Update. Staff will work diligently to communicate and clarify requested agenda items by commissioners.

Ms. Clark brought up the statement reflected in last month's minutes, where she asked why staff did not simply call or text Mr. Mohajer for clarification, and that the answer noted was not satisfactory to her. Ms. Osmena acknowledged that staff's communication could have been better as staff was trying to get clarification via e-mail instead of my phone call.

Ms. Clark asked if the procedure was changing for requesting agenda items. Ms. Osmena referenced the process for requesting agenda items, as noted on [Page 12, Section VIII, Commission Meetings](#), of the [Los Angeles County Commission Manual](#), and the collaboration between the Chair, commissioners, and staff. E-mails to commissioners requesting agenda items will continue to be sent and requested items will be reviewed and determined in a collaborative effort.

Ms. Clark stated that commissioners were always able to add an agenda item, provided it was submitted to staff in time. She asked with the collaboration, if the Chair can decide not to include a requested item on the agenda. Ms. Osmena responded that the Chair will call the requestor if there is an issue or misunderstanding, to make certain all sides agree to what the agenda item is. Ms. Osmena also noted this was not a new process, but a process being refined where requested agenda items will be communicated to the Chair.

Ms. Clark stated she wanted to make certain that requested agenda items were not a veto process by the Chair. Ms. Osmena responded it was not.

To address Ms. Clark's concern, Mr. Jordan Sisson suggested to add a standing item at the end of the agenda noting items for future consideration, so Task Force members may request items. He added that other committees do the same thing. Ms. Clark concurred and wanted to make certain that both ways to request items would be available (e-mail requests).

During public comment, Mr. Hunter noted that [Page 12, Section VIII, Commission Meetings](#) states Executive Director, Commission Liaison, or Commission Staff, in collaboration with the Chairperson, will ensure that the agenda follows standard formatting and language guidelines. It does not say that the Chairperson has the ability to determine whether or not a request is a valid item to be on agenda according to the Brown Act, which he believed was Ms. Clark's concern, as well as Mr. Mohajer's and his own concern. Ms. Afshari appreciated the comments, and stated the issue would be looked into and that agenda items will be a collaborative effort, making certain there is value and alignment with the Task Force.

Ms. Clark asked who changed the process and decided it would go into effect. Ms. Osmena responded it was not one person, but rather with recent discussions over the past couple of months, brought to light that this Task Force needed to align with County Policy for commissions under the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors (Board). Ms. Osmena also indicated that Mr. Sisson had a reasonable request for adding a standing item at the end of the agenda noting items for future consideration and would confirm the request. Discussion ensued.

VII. REPORT ON [COUNTY CODE 3.67.60](#)

Mr. Jonathan Brazile provided a brief overview of Task Force authority of the alternate when the Director of Public Works is unavailable to attend and Chair a Task Force meeting. When analyzing issues related to the Task Force responsibilities and authorities, the Task Force should look to the highest legal authority applicable which is the State law that created the Task Force and the County Code that embodied the Task Force. The Director is an ex-officio member pursuant to County Code 3.67.020. His designated alternate has the same authority and responsibility as the Chair, including running the meeting (County Code 3.67.030). Analysis determined that "alternate" and "representative" are one and the same. The [Abridged Robert's Rules of Order](#) in the [Los Angeles County Commission Manual](#) states that in the absence of the Chairperson (including alternate), the Vice-Chair shall perform the duties of the Chairperson. Both the Abridged Robert's Rules of Order and Los Angeles County Commission Manual

are guides and are not the highest authority since the County Code provides specific instructions for the Task Force.

For confirmation, Mr. Sisson interpreted that the Chairperson, then the alternate, govern the meeting. If the Chairperson and the alternate are not in attendance, the Vice-Chair will chair the meeting. Therefore, it is State law, the County Code, and then the bylaws that would govern instruction. Mr. Brazile confirmed yes.

VIII. REPORT ON THE PROCESS OF FILLING VACANT POSITION AND APPOINTING CHAIR TO FACILITY AND PLAN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

At last month's meeting, the Task Force passed a motion for staff to report on the existing process to fill vacancies, to recommend a future process, and how to source candidates. Ms. Osmena informed the Task Force that there was no formal written process nor Task Force bylaws for the establishment of respective [Subcommittees](#). Research, which included Minutes dating back 20 years, suggests that the FPRS may have been established in early 2000 by the Task Force who has the authority to create Subcommittees and ad hoc committees, but there was no record of appointing a Chair that was an environmental representative. The most recent PEIS member appointed to the PEIS in 2021 was at the request of the current PEIS Chair. The formation of the ATAS was established under the requirement of the [Puente Hills Conditional Use Permit](#).

Ms. Osmena offered for future discussion that the Task Force may consider requesting staff to begin the development of draft bylaws or possibly creating an ad hoc committee to assist in collaboration with County Counsel in developing draft bylaws. Staff has also looked into other County commission bylaws, which can be tailored to Task Force needs in the development of a bylaws document. Ms. Afshari recommended that this be brought back to the Task Force for discussion and action as the bylaws are developed.

IX. PRESENTATION ON UPDATES TO 2020 GOALS & PIRORITIES REPORT

Ms. Osmena provided a brief update of the [2020 Goals & Priorities Report](#). Staff will disseminate with track changes to the Task Force for their review and edits. Once edits and comments are provided, staff will compile them and bring it back for Task Force members to discuss.

X. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Ms. Perla Gomez provided the Legislative Update:

- January 31, 2024, was the last day for 2-year bills to move out of their house of origin.
- February 16, 2024, will be the last day for new bills to be introduced this year.
- Newly introduced bills must be in print for 30 days before any action or votes can be taken on them.

Staff continued with the legislative update. The status of 11 two-year bills were noted on the [Legislative Table](#). No bills were recommended to the Chief Executive Office (CEO).

Ms. Gomez informed that the Task Force may add a bill onto the Legislative Table and if they would like more information on the bill, it may be requested under future agenda considerations which would allow staff ample time to provide the information at the subsequent meeting. Ms. Clark asked if at the subsequent meeting, the Task Force can take a position on that bill. Ms. Afshari responded that recommendations must be directed to the CEO, so they may review and make certain it is aligned with the County's Legislative Agenda, and then they would communicate the recommendation to the Board and that the Task Force may not work directly with the Legislature. Ms. Clark noted that the Task Force had always been able to analyze and take positions on legislation. Discussion ensued.

Los Angeles County Public Works Director, Mark Pestrella, Chair of the Task Force indicated that the Task Force has a critical role in the management of waste across Los Angeles County and in reading the original law that created this Task Force, it was clear that more coordination was needed at the County and regional level, which the State acknowledged. Director Pestrella gave an update on the current changes with Task Force procedures relating to legislation.

Ms. Clark expressed to Director Pestrella that the process was a step backward by taking away the Task Force's input on legislation. With this process change, recommendations by the Task Force to the Board is subject to the CEO's discretion to move forward recommendations. She also indicated that the Task Force was created to study this complex issue with legislation. As representative to the cities and the public, she and other Task Force members are aware of solid waste concerns because they receive calls from the public on solid waste issues. Director Pestrella responded that the Task Force is following the practice of the Board and the law with respect to legislation and that the CEO is managing the

recommendations of legislation. Therefore, the Task Force is recommending positions and not taking positions on legislation. As the discussion progressed, Director Pestrella suggested to Ms. Afshari that Ms. Clark's issues should be agendaized so everyone can have an understanding and have a say about their interpretation of Task Force authority.

Mr. Sisson asked for the CEO's timeline so the Task Force can prioritize bills. Director Pestrella indicated working collaboratively with the Task Force to set deadlines and expressed his willingness to work with each represented agency.

Ms. Erin Rowland shared the City of Long Beach's concern regarding AB 2346 and would like to collaborate with County staff and other region stakeholders regarding the bill.

Mr. Sisson requested that staff provide a written update on AB 1201, and Senate Bills 54 and 1383. Ms. Gomez responded that staff would review the bills and provide the information at the next Task Force meeting.

XI. CALRECYCLE UPDATE

CalRecycle was unable to attend but submitted [update](#) to staff to disseminate to the Task Force after the meeting.

XII. PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:47 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled to be held on Thursday, March 21, 2024, at 1 p.m.