

Alternative Technology Advisory Subcommittee
Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/
Integrated Waste Management Task Force

Minutes of February 19, 2004

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Paul Alva, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Fernando Berton, California Integrated Waste Management Board
Alex Helou, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation
Kay Martin, County of Ventura Environmental & Energy Resources Department
John McTaggart, Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Task Force
Mike Mohajer, Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Task Force
Michael Theroux, Theroux Environmental Consulting
Eugene Tseng, Eugene Tseng and Associates
Christine Urbach, County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services
Ed Wheless, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
Jeff Yann, Hacienda Heights Improvement Association

OTHERS PRESENT:

Anoush Housepians, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Ben Lucha, City of Santa Clarita
Carlos Ruiz, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Jim Stewart, BRI Energy
Coby Skye, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Jessica Vallerand, City of Santa Clarita

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JANUARY 15, 2004

Subcommittee members requested the minutes be amended to include: Mr. Mike Mohajer's question regarding the Brown Act, Mr. Fernando Berton's comment on synergy with biofuels and ethanol, Mr. Michael Theroux's comment regarding access to external funds, and Mr. Jeff Yann's comments regarding remote landfills. In addition, Mr. Mohajer requested Public Works to clarify in writing the Subcommittee's status in regards to the Brown Act.

The minutes of January 15, 2004, were unanimously approved as amended.

III. SCOPE OF WORK REVIEW AND TIMELINE

Subcommittee members provided comments on the draft Scope of Work. Mr. Theroux stated the narrowness of the current version of the Scope of Work might potentially alienate a large contingent of the resource recovery/recycling industry. He suggested the Subcommittee needs to clearly demonstrate that it intends to be a complement to resource recovery and recycling, rather than a replacement. He stated the Subcommittee must recognize the limitations of the commercialization of current technologies. He stated that modularization and the use of multiple technologies would be more appropriate, keeping in mind that each technology is one piece of a puzzle rather than expecting one technology to be the solution to everything.

Subcommittee members agreed with Mr. Theroux's statements and discussed how to broaden the Scope of Work. Ms. Kay Martin stated a concern with going down the same path as other studies and ending up with a technology rather than technologies. The Subcommittee must identify objectives in performance standards for each technology. The performance standards that must be identified include waste stream, feedstock, environmental constraints, and product standards. Ms. Martin explained that once those performance standards are identified and the framework is defined, the information can be given to a consultant who will help the Subcommittee go out and find the companies that can meet those standards.

Subcommittee members discussed the Puente Hills Landfill CUP mandate to determine whether the Subcommittee should focus on one or more technologies in the Scope of Work. Ms. Martin stated the Subcommittee must

define the segment of the waste stream to address in order to narrow the Scope of Work. Mr. Theroux stated the Subcommittee has two choices regarding the development of the Scope of Work because the Subcommittee can either survey a lot of technologies to see if they fit a particular niche or pick a particular niche and find a technology that fits it. In addition, Mr. Theroux explained that technologies are not only feedstock specific, but also location specific. The Subcommittee must determine under what conditions the conversion technologies can be made economically feasible, pointing out that a technology may not be economically feasible on its own. He also pointed out that the closer we get to feedstock-specific waste management, the cleaner the technology.

Mr. John McTaggart stated the Subcommittee should focus on co-location since it would be easier to obtain an amendment to a permit than it would be to get a new one. Ms. Martin stated that all of the technologies require some sort of separation, so the Subcommittee may focus on something that can co-locate with a materials recovery facility (MRF). Mr. Theroux explained that co-location at a MRF would make it possible to determine the economic impact on resource recovery and recycling at that MRF.

Ms. Martin stated that if the Subcommittee started with the concept that one or more technologies would go on the back of a MRF, then the focus of the Scope of Work would be to locate potential MRFs, and characterize the stream that is coming off the back of each of those MRFs. She explained that once the known feedstock is determined, the Subcommittee can determine what technologies can be used.

Subcommittee members discussed feedstock analysis, potential MRF locations, and the number of technologies that may potentially be used at a MRF. Mr. Theroux summarized the list of criteria the Subcommittee should consider. He stated the Subcommittee should analyze potential MRF sites based on whether it would be feasible to amend the MRF permit, residuals coming off the MRF at the scale, and the end use for the MRF residual product. Subcommittee members discussed the importance of having a market for the product the chosen technology will produce.

Subcommittee members discussed the project in terms of regulatory compliance and environmental justice. Mr. Theroux stated the project should be used as a test case to assess points of regulatory compliance. Mr. Berton explained the Subcommittee should consider addressing environmental justice issues in terms of public participation. Mr. Yann suggested public participation is essential to dispel the myth that conversion is incineration.

Mr. Mohajer stated the Subcommittee's goal is to create something reasonable and to find a developer who is willing to put forth the financial resources required to get something done. He stated that issues like environmental justice and potential impacts on the recycling industries are not part of the goal the CUP mandates.

Mr. Alva explained that the Scope of Work will be a team effort. Subcommittee members further discussed methods of selecting a location and technology. Members agreed the project must move forward at a rapid pace. Members decided to communicate via teleconference and e-mail in addition to their scheduled monthly meetings. Members agreed to participate in a teleconference on February 26, 2004, at 9 a.m. to further discuss the Scope of Work so that Subcommittee members can reach a consensus on the Scope of Work before the next monthly meeting.

IV. OPEN DISCUSSION/PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no open discussion or public comment at the meeting.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:04 a.m.