

Facility and Plan Review Subcommittee
Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/
Integrated Waste Management Task Force

Minutes of October 19, 2006

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

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Albert Avoian, Business/Commerce Representative
Charles Boehmke, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
Betsey Landis, Environmental Organization Representative
John McTaggart, General Public Representative
Michael Miller, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative
Ken Murray, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health
Carlos Ruiz, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Rafael Prieto, City of Los Angeles

OTHERS PRESENT:

Paul Alva, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Chuk Agu, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Christine Casiño, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Mark Patti, City of Santa Clarita
Carl Pederson, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Wu Tan, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 11:03 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 21, 2006

A motion to approve the minutes of September 21, 2006 was made. Motion passed unanimously.

III. REVIEW OF THE WORKING DRAFT REVISIONS TO CHAPTER 9 OF THE COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT

Mr. Chuk Agu gave a presentation on the proposed revisions to Chapter 9 of the Countywide Siting Element (CSE). Chapter 9 provides a description and location of existing (and proposed new) out-of-county landfills that may be used to ensure that adequate disposal capacity is provided for solid waste generated in Los Angeles County during the 15-year planning period.

Mr. Agu indicated that due to the complexity and sensitivity of the issues involved in revising Chapter 9 and the difficulty in obtaining and verifying out-of-county landfill information, working documents (listed below) were provided to the Subcommittee to seek guidance on how Chapter 9 should be structured:

- Proposed table of contents
- Proposed criteria to select out-of-county landfills
- Proposed list of existing and potential new out-of-county landfills tentatively selected for out-of-county disposal
- Proposed list of solid waste stations and inter-modal/rail-loading facilities tentatively identified for exporting waste to out-of-county landfills
- Proposed map of out-of-county landfills within California

The Subcommittee provided staff with conceptual and specific comments, including, but not limited to:

1. Table of Contents

- Move Section 9.2 (Limitations of the Out-of-County Disposal Option) to the beginning of the Chapter (as is in the 1997 CSE) so that the reader will not overlook it.
- When deleting facilities listed in the 1997 CSE, state up-front that such facilities are no longer potentially viable or include a footnote with similar statement.

2. Criteria for identifying out-of-county landfills

- Simplify the criteria for identifying out-of-county landfills so that it will not be too restrictive.
- Continue to use the existing regulatory requirement of providing adequate disposal capacity for the 15-year planning period when determining how many out-of-county landfills to include.
- Delete “having pending or ongoing litigation” from the criteria for identifying out-of-county landfills.
- Do not include the “rail access” criterion for selecting out-of-county landfills since in some cases contracts for transportation of waste by truck have won over transportation by rail up to about 200 miles. However, if it is included, the write-up should recognize that trucking can still be an option, depending on whichever is more cost-effective.
- Establish criteria for identifying new inter-modal/rail-loading facilities.

3. Definitions

- Substitute the term “mega landfill” with another term since it is not recognized by the industry.

4. Out-of-County Landfills

- Verify if El Sobrante Landfill is required to have a conditional use permit.
- Identify Mesquite Regional Landfill as an “existing” instead of a “new” landfill since it is fully permitted and could receive waste. However, this does not apply to Eagle Mountain Landfill.
- For each out-of-county landfill listed, continue to verify if any County/City ordinance or landfill restrictions exist that prevent the importation of waste from Los Angeles County.
- Butterfield Landfill in Arizona may not be a good choice for out-of-county landfill since it does not have a limit in its daily tonnage which may cause a faster depletion of its capacity before the end of the planning period.

5. Solid Waste Stations and Inter-modal/Rail-loading Facilities

- Identifying inter-modal/rail-loading facilities located at the Port of Los Angeles is not a good choice because of current port congestion and air pollution issues, however, indicate that it was investigated but are not viable.
- Consider identifying in some limited scope, the inter-modal/rail-loading facilities located outside Los Angeles County.
- Check with solid waste station operators and their corresponding land use authority to verify if they are looking into operating an inter-modal/rail-loading facility.
- Consider changing the phrase “potential inter-modal/rail-loading facilities” to “potential inter-modal/rail-loading capabilities” or a similar term.

- CSD has investigated existing inter-modal/rail-loading facilities and determined that they are not interested in transporting solid waste. Therefore, it is better to identify proposed new facilities.

A motion was made to incorporate the comments in the revised draft Chapter 9 for future review and consideration by the Subcommittee. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. OPEN DISCUSSION/PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

V. NEXT MEETING DATE

To be announced at a later date.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:53 a.m.