

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

Minutes of August 31, 2006

County of Los Angeles
Department of Public Works
3rd Floor Annex, Large Conference Room
900 South Fremont Avenue
Alhambra, California

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Fernando Berton, California Integrated Waste Management Task Force
Alex Helou, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation
Kay Martin, Bioenergy Producers Association
Michael Theroux, Theroux Environmental Consulting
P. Christine Urbach, Los Angeles County Department of Public Health
Ed Wheless, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Mike Mohajer, Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Task Force
Eugene Tseng, Eugene Tseng and Associates
John McTaggart, Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Task Force
Jeff Yann, Hacienda Heights Improvement Association

COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY OTHERS

Paul Alva, represented by Coby Skye, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works

OTHERS PRESENT:

Nicole Horton, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Virginia Jauregui, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Mark McDannel, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
Miguel Zermeno, City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:06 a.m.

II. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FROM TECHNOLOGY SUPPLIERS

On August 10, 2006, ARI sent letters to the 14 technology suppliers that were previously evaluated by the Subcommittee in the Phase I process. These letters were used to determine if new information would warrant further consideration. With 13 out of the 14 suppliers responding to the initial August 10th letter, on August 25, 2006, ARI drafted a memorandum that summarized the responses from these technology suppliers. All six preferred suppliers from Phase I responded, and were recommended by ARI to receive the eventual RFI for Phase II. Of the eight additional technology suppliers that passed the screening criteria in Phase I, ARI recommended three as Phase II participants: Ebara Corporation; Arrow Ecology; and International Environmental Solutions.

Both Ebara Corporation and International Environmental Solutions have technologies that can be operated essentially as incinerators. Because the Subcommittee previously decided that incineration technologies would not be considered, the Subcommittee affirmed that these suppliers could not be considered unless they utilized a technology with a clear distinction from incineration. The Subcommittee also discussed the inclusion of Arrow Ecology, which utilizes anaerobic digestion, in the Phase II process. The Subcommittee excluded anaerobic digestion technologies during Phase I, primarily because anaerobic digestion falls under the State's definition of composting technology, and produces less electricity and more residual waste than thermal technologies. When given the opportunity to address these limitations, Arrow Ecology demonstrated their unique technology performs better than average by producing more biogas (and therefore more electricity) than typical, less compost than typical, and less residual waste than typical for anaerobic digestion. Therefore, the Subcommittee allowed Arrow Ecology to proceed to Phase II, on condition that residual waste and energy efficiency would be factors in the eventual ranking criteria.

III. RECOMMENDATION OF PARTICIPANTS FOR PHASE II EVALUATION

The Subcommittee discussed technologies who had not participated in Phase I that contacted the County expressing an interest in participating. Following discussion, the Subcommittee recommended that ARI send a letter to those technology suppliers that

had directly contacted the County following the release of the Phase I report. Like the letters that were sent to the 14 technology suppliers previously, this letter would request specific information related to each supplier's given technology, and an assurance of their ability and willingness to participate in the Phase II process. ARI will evaluate the responses received, and provide a recommendation on which suppliers should receive the RFI. ARI estimated that the process of contacting and evaluating these additional companies would extend the evaluation process by one to two months.

IV. OPEN DISCUSSION

No discussion ensued.

V. NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting is scheduled for September 21, 2006 at 10am.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:18am.