

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

September 19, 2024

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jorgel Chavez, League of California Cities
Margaret Clark, League of California Cities
Eddie De La Riva, League of California Cities
Jeff Farano, Sr., Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries
Jim Smith, Teamster Local 396, City of Los Angeles
Jordan R. Sisson, California Waste and Recycling Association

COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY OTHERS:

Robert Ferrante, rep by Russ Vakharia, Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Barbara Ferrer, rep by Dorcas (Dee) Hanson-Lugo, Los Angeles County Public Health
Wayne Nastri, rep by Phillip Crabbe III, South Coast Air Quality Management District
Mark Pestrella, rep by Miki Esposito, 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:

Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative
Rafael Prieto, City of Los Angeles

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jonathan Brazile, Office of County Counsel Los Angeles County
Basil Cantu, Long Beach Public Works
Alylene Gonzalez, California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery
(CalRecycle)
Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens
Siyavash Araumi, Los Angeles County Public Works
Charles Darensbourg, Los Angeles County Public Works
Perla Gomez, Los Angeles County Public Works
Anna Gov, Los Angeles County Public Works
Omar Carrillo Maldonado, Los Angeles County Public Works
Gladys Rietze, Los Angeles County Public Works
Carol Saucillo, Los Angeles County Public Works
Christopher Sheppard, Los Angeles County Public Works
Cid Tesoro, Los Angeles County Public Works
Airon Tee, Los Angeles County Public Works
Kawsar Vazifdar, Los Angeles County Public Works
Caleb Yun, Los Angeles County Public Works

I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 1:02 p.m. by Ms. Miki Esposito who served as Chair, representing Director Mark Pestrella.

II. APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 15, 2024, MINUTES

Mr. Eddie De La Riva made a motion to approve the August 15, 2024, minutes as amended, and Ms. Erin Rowland seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

III. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

The following was reported by Mr. Siyavash Araumi:

- There were close to 830 bills that were sent to the Assembly and Senate floors where they had until August 31, 2024, to reach the Governor's desk.
- The Governor has until September 30, 2024, to sign or veto bills.
- There were 25 Assembly and Senate bills, respectively, on the [Legislative Table](#), 16 of which are active and 9 that are dead.

The following bills are dead:

- AB 2514 (Aguiar-Curry) – amended 07/03/24 – Solid waste: organic waste: diversion: hydrogen: biomethane.
- SB 1234 (Allen) – amended 06/10/24 – Hazardous materials: metal shredding facilities.

The following bills were forwarded to the Governor:

- AB 863 (Aguiar-Curry, Dodd) – amended 08/27/24 – Carpet recycling: producer responsibility organizations: fines: succession: training.
- AB 2346 (Lee) – amended 08/23/24 – Organic waste reduction regulations: procurement of recovered organic waste products.
- SB 615 (Allen, Min) – amended 08/27/24 – Vehicle traction batteries.
- SB 707 (Newman) – amended 08/22/24 – Responsible Textile Recovery Act 2024.
- SB 1066 (Blakespear) – amended 08/22/2024 – Hazardous waste: marine flares: manufacturer responsibility.
- SB 1143 (Allen) – amended 03/21/24 – Household Hazardous Waste Extended Producer Responsibility.

The following bill was signed by the Governor:

- SB 1113 (Newman) – amended 03/31/24 – Beverage container recycling: pilot projects: extension.

Los Angeles County Public Works (PW) staff will continue to work with the CEO-LAIR on bills that have been recommended by the Task Force to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors for advocacy.

Ms. Margaret Clark asked if used bottles were affected by the pilot program in SB 1113. Mr. Araumi responded that the regular program and its used bottles were not affected by the pilot program.

IV. REPORT AND COMMENT ON CALRECYCLE'S ZERO WASTE PLAN

Mr. Charles Darensbourg provided an [overview](#) of CalRecycle's Zero Waste Plan, which was a follow-up to last month's Task Force meeting where staff described in detail various items covered at CalRecycle's August 14, 2024, Zero Waste Plan Workshop.

Ms. Clark commented on the Bioenergy Association of California [letter](#) to CalRecycle under item number 2, regarding CalRecycle's fear of providing funding for projects that use gasification or pyrolysis, and that California cannot achieve 75 percent organics diversion without significant investment in infrastructure for biomass waste. She agreed with that statement and asked if the Task Force had submitted a comment letter on the issue. Mr. Darensbourg responded that the Task Force, nor did PW, send comment letters, but that PW staff anticipated opportunities in the future.

Ms. Clark commented that AB 2514, which is now dead, would have allowed funding and that the Task Force did recommend supporting the bill, which had been advocated for nearly 25 years.

Mr. Jordan Sisson asked if the fees of \$1.40 per ton referenced in the Baseline Report and established by State law (AB 1220, Eastin, Chapter 656, Statutes of 1993) are getting passed down to the residents or were they on the landfill operators. Mr. Darensbourg responded that he did not see any restrictions for fees not being passed down to haulers and then ultimately to residents. It was just a fee that landfills must pay.

Mr. Sisson asked if the CalRecycle's Baseline Report is due in 2026. Mr. Darensbourg confirmed it was. Mr. Sisson understood that the comment period ended, but expressed hopes that there will be opportunity for the Task Force

to opine on some recommendations to the Baseline Report for the Zero Waste Plan in the future.

Mr. Ron Milo asked who CalRecycle was specifically targeting for the Zero Waste Plan at the public workshops. Mr. Darenbourg responded that CalRecycle's target audience was very broad and included local jurisdictions, non-governmental organizations, the waste hauler industry, State legislators, and any stakeholders that have interest in zero waste.

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

Tetra Tech provided a [presentation](#) on SB 1383 Renewable Natural Gas (RNG) procurement, which included definitions, compliance methods, challenges, opportunities, procurement targets, and conversion factors.

Tetra Tech reported that they:

- Are preparing a presentation for the November Task Force meeting, which will provide a broad perspective on organic waste management challenges, anaerobic digestion (AD) technologies, and the AD industry in California.
- Are finalizing a Countywide Siting Evaluation for the development of AD and/or thermal CT facilities within Los Angeles County.
- Have submitted a first Draft AD White Paper, which provides an objective overview of AD technologies and the state of the industry.
- Have submitted a Draft Long-Term Solid Waste Disposal Needs Study for Antelope Valley in compliance with the Lancaster Landfill Conditional Use Permit, Condition 92, which includes the performance of 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 evaluate the limits of waste and surrounding utilities for the potential development of AD and/or thermal CT facilities.

Ms. Clark asked Mr. Araumi to summarize the SB 1383 RNG presentation given to the ATAS. Mr. Araumi responded that the presentation would be shared.

Ms. Esposito inquired about the anticipated completion date for the Draft AD White Paper and Draft Long-Term Solid Waste Disposal Needs Study. Mr. Araumi responded that the drafts are expected to be finalized before the holiday season unless higher priority projects arise. He also noted that these projects could be presented to the Task Force.

Mr. Araumi also mentioned that PW staff provided an update on upcoming CT events and conferences during the ATAS meeting, which can be found in the [Conversion Technology Newsletter](#).

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

Mr. Christopher Sheppard reported the following from the FPRS meeting:

Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL)

- Update on Notices of Violation (NOV) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) and Regional Planning, as well as mitigation measures.
- During the FPRS meeting, a motion was passed to request the Task Force to reach out to Regional Planning requesting additional time to the reduction deadline, which is at the end of the year, by an additional six months to allow operators time to comply with the tonnage reduction in the NOV by 129,000 tons. Also, to request operators to submit quarterly updates.

Ms. Esposito asked why extending the reduction time is critical. Mr. Sheppard explained that reducing 129,000 tons by the end of the year would be challenging. CCL currently handles about 7,000 tons per day and is also requesting approval to place waste in an older cell. He further added that a condition in the current Conditional Use Permit will reduce CCL's allowable tonnage from 2.8 million to 1.8 million tons annually. These restrictions put pressure on other regional waste facilities, including landfills and transfer stations. As such more time is needed to adjust and manage where the waste will go.

Mr. Sisson raised key concerns about the waste system's sensitivity and the cascading impacts of minor disruptions. He noted the challenge of removing 130,000 tons from CCL in 90 days, equivalent to over 1,400 tons daily, which is significant. Mr. Sisson further noted that if nothing is done, potential impacts would be: 1) the question of where waste would go, whether to transfer stations or other facilities, causing truck traffic with nearby residents; 2) shock in waste rates that residents pay for; and 3) elections in November and nobody being in the position to make tough decisions during campaign season. Mr. Sisson concluded that extending the deadline six months will allow some of the major factors to resolve themselves.

Ms. Esposito commented that there are many moving parts pertaining to CCL and that the Task Force needs to take high interest and focus on learning what the cascading impacts are for CCL not accepting waste; adding that Mr. Sisson

was trying to emphasize the point that if there is a reduction like this, it can ultimately reverberate in all communities. Currently, it is an isolated emergency at the landfill itself, but such restrictions can affect the waste hauling system. She further stated that PW is committed to take the next step and ask Regional Planning about flexibility available and if PW hears from its regulatory partners, the Task Force may want to reconvene, and not wait a full month.

Ms. Esposito then asked Mr. Jonathan Brazile with County Counsel to explain the process for holding an impromptu Task Force meeting. Mr. Brazile confirmed the Brown Act allows meetings before the next scheduled date, with the County Code typically requiring a 72-hour notice. However, he noted the County usually allows at least six days' notice, unless it is an emergency. Nevertheless, he also said that calling the CCL issue an emergency meeting might not meet the legal definition and would look into County policy.

Mr. Sheppard asked about the possibility of virtual meetings under the Brown Act. Mr. Brazile responded that virtual emergency meetings require extreme situations, like a fire, preventing in-person meetings.

Mr. Sisson asked if pre-COVID rules on remote meetings, where meetings were held in public places with posted agendas, were an option. Mr. Brazile indicated that he would check, as there is a difference between public access meetings and virtual meetings with commissioners attending from home offices. He further informed that commissioners can currently request virtual attendance in emergency situations, but a majority quorum would still need to meet in person.

Mr. Sisson asked if that required nine commissioners or a majority of five. Mr. Brazile confirmed he would look into the language.

Mr. Jorgel Chavez suggested PW staff send out a poll to the Task Force to pick a time and date for a meeting should the need arise.

Mr. Milo raised concerns about per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS)-containing materials, such as artificial turf, being landfilled and asked if landfills are still accepting them. Mr. Sisson noted the issue was not discussed at the FPRS meeting but felt it was within the Task Force's scope. Mr. Sheppard added that PFAS requirements have been widely discussed in recent years. He offered that staff could provide an overview at a future meeting. Ms. Esposito requested it be added as a topic for a future FPRS meeting.

Sunshine Canyon Landfill (SCL)

Mr. Sheppard reported the following updates for the SCL.

- During the month of August 2024, 65 odor complaints were made to AQMD, which increased from the 47 odor complaints reported last month.
- Update on Second Quarter Vegetation Report.
 - The FPRS passed a motion unanimously for staff to request the Landfill Operator to provide an update on repair activity on the irrigation system on the City Side of SCL.

A motion was passed to request the Task Force to reach out to Regional Planning requesting additional time to the reduction deadline, which is at the end of the year, by an additional six months to allow operators time to comply with the tonnage reduction. Also, to request operators to submit quarterly updates.

Ms. Esposito asked Mr. Brazile for clarification on whether the Brown Act requires a 30-day period for motions to be acted upon. Mr. Brazile expressed concerns about ensuring compliance with the Brown Act and was cautious about the Task Force sending a letter to another County agency.

After extensive discussion, Ms. Margaret Clark suggested a slight amendment to the motion, which was seconded by Mr. Jordan Sisson. The amended motion was for the Task Force to support PW in reaching out to Regional Planning requesting additional time by extending the NOV reduction deadline, which is on December 31, 2024, by an additional six months to allow Landfill Operators time to comply with the reduction of 129,000 tons to avoid unintended consequences as discussed at the FPRS and Task Force meetings on September 19, 2024. Also, to request Landfill Operators to submit quarterly updates. Motion passed with eight voting yes (Ms. Clark, Mr. Sisson, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Jeffrey Farano, Ms. Dorcas (Dee) Hanson-Lugo, Mr. Milo, Mr. Jim Smith, and Mr. Russ Vakharia) and three abstaining (Mr. Phillip Crabbe III, Ms. Esposito, and Ms. Roland).

VII. CALRECYCLE UPDATE

Ms. Adylene Gonzalez provided an [update](#) to the Task Force.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Hunter conveyed his gratitude on the motion that the Task Force passed regarding CCL and tonnage reductions, stating it was much clearer than as originally suggested by the FPRS.

At last month's Task Force meeting Ms. Clark suggested that local jurisdictions provide outreach to residents on what can be recycled, such as kitchen magnets that indicate what can be recycled. Mr. Milo shared kitchen magnets with the Task Force that the City of Los Angeles provides to their residents that show such information. He also presented labels, both in English and Spanish, with QR codes that are placed on top of blue, green, and black bins to assist residents on what they can throw away or recycle.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:48 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled to be held on Thursday, October 17, 2024, at 1 p.m.