

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

**Minutes of November 21, 2013, Meeting**

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

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bahman Hajjaliakbar, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Betsey Landis, Environmental Organization Representative  
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative  
Christopher Salomon, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County  
Gerardo Villalobos, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Charles Modica, City of Los Angeles

OTHERS PRESENT:

Clark Ajwani, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Joe Bartolata, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Russell Bukoff, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Rainer Globus, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Dave Hauser, Republic Services, Inc.  
Patrick Holland, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition/Granada Hills North Neighborhood Council  
Jason W. Jones, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Patrick Kwong, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Karlo Manalo, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Dave Nguyen, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Saeid Shirzadegan, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Bereket Tadele, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Emiko Thompson, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Julia Weissman, County Counsel

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 11:15 a.m.

**II. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 17, 2013, MEETING MINUTES**

A motion to approve the Minutes of the October 17, 2013, meeting was unanimously approved subject to the following revisions:

- Revise the last sentence on the third paragraph on page 5 to read: “As over half of all odor complaints are not responded to, the statistics might not have described the whole picture.”
- Replace the term “Public Works” with the word “staff” in the last sentence of the second paragraph on page 8:
- Replace the word “directed” with “requested” on the third paragraph on page 8.

**III. CONSIDERATION OF A FINDING OF CONFORMANCE FOR THE SAVAGE CANYON LANDFILL IN THE CITY OF WHITTIER – KARLO MANALO**

Mr. Karlo Manalo reported that staff received a request from Mr. David Pelsler, the City of Whittier Director of Public Works, for this item to be continued to the next Subcommittee meeting. He requested additional time to further understand conditions in the Finding of Conformance (FOC), their potential impact on the Landfill’s operations, and their relationship to the Countywide Siting Element.

Mr. Manalo stated that it is staff’s recommendation that this item be continued to the next Subcommittee meeting. As requested, staff will also be extending notification of the upcoming meeting to any community groups who may have interest in the Savage Canyon Landfill FOC discussion.

Ms. Betsey Landis asked why staff proposed to limit the daily intake of all materials to 350 tons per day (tpd). Mr. Manalo explained that staff had reviewed the 1977 Environmental Impact Report and the 2001 Initial Study and neither of those environmental documents acknowledged the receipt of beneficial use materials. He added that the traffic impact analysis only accounted for the 350 tpd of solid waste for disposal in both documents, which was the basis for the recommended tonnage limit in the FOC. Mr. Gerardo Villalobos stated the City’s contention is that they

have historically been receiving beneficial use materials along with municipal solid waste.

Mr. Mike Mohajer asked if traffic impacts had been analyzed in the CEQA documents for the receipt of inerts. Mr. Manalo replied that impacts on traffic had not been considered for inerts. Mr. Mohajer expressed that he would like to see documentation that exempts the City of Whittier from providing a traffic study analysis.

Mr. Chris Salomon commented that CEQA documents do not necessarily need to be revised if the project is not altered. The Subcommittee agreed that it would like to hear the City of Whittier's explanation for not revising CEQA to include impacts to traffic.

Mr. Mohajer emphasized the issue is not CEQA, rather it is the project's consistency with the Los Angeles County Countywide Siting Element (CSE), of which traffic is one component. To that end, Mr. Mohajer requested that Section VI. (5) of the Staff Report on the Savage Canyon Landfill FOC ([Staff Report](#)) should be revised to include the individual requirements that need to be satisfied in order for the project to be in compliance with the CSE.

Discussion ensued and Mr. Mohajer requested the following additional revisions to the Staff Report:

- Change the term "non-hazardous municipal waste" in the Waste Type Section on page 3 of the document to "solid waste" as defined by the Public Resources Code.
- Revise the Project Schedule Section on page 4 to read "Continues operation of the Landfill."
- Change the term "County of Los Angeles" to "LEA as an agent of CalRecycle" in Section A. (ii.) on page 5.
- Revise the second sentence in Section A. (iv.) to read: "The facility is required to comply with the City of Whittier's Source Reduction and Recycling Element."

- Revise the description of Section VIII. (3.), “Types of Waste Materials,” to be consistent with the term for the Waste Type Section used on page 3 (Mr. Mohajer asked to be provided with the Joint Technical Document reference in this Section).
- Provide a reference to the attachment addressed in Section VIII (6.) “Limits of Fill” on page seven.

Mr. Mohajer also requested staff to find out if the City of Whittier has in the past reported any beneficial use materials being accepted at Savage Canyon Landfill.

After further discussion, the Subcommittee requested staff to send a letter to the City of Whittier stating that the Subcommittee accepted the City’s request to continue this item to the next Subcommittee meeting.

#### **IV. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT**

Mr. Joe Bartolata reported that at the previous Subcommittee meeting on October 17, 2013, the Subcommittee requested staff to make necessary revisions to the Preliminary Draft of the CSE to reflect changes due to the enactment of Assembly Bill 1126, regarding engineered municipal solid waste (EMSW) conversion.

Mr. Joe Bartolata discussed the following proposed revisions ([see enclosure](#)) made by staff:

- The List of Acronyms on page 1 of the enclosure includes the acronym “EMSW” for engineered municipal solid waste.
- The Glossary of Terms on pages 1 to 3 includes the terms “EMSW conversion” and “EMSW conversion facility.” The existing definitions of “recycle or recycling,” “solid waste disposal, dispose or disposal,” “solid waste facility,” “transfer or processing station, or station,” and “transformation” have also being amended.
- The definition of “transformation (waste-to-energy) facility” in several chapters has been amended to include EMSW conversion.

- Section 10.3 Specific Requirements, Public Resources Code Section 50001 has been amended to include EMSW facility.

Ms. Landis asked staff for clarification on Part (3) of the definition for “transfer or processing station” if the term “operations premises” is the correct term. Staff responded by saying that the term is exactly how the regulation is written. Staff also agreed to pluralize the word “requirement” in Section 10.6, second paragraph, on page 6 of the enclosure.

Mr. Bartolata requested the Subcommittee to concur with the proposed revisions and to recommend to the Task Force to approve the changes. Mr. Salomon made a motion to accept staff’s recommended changes, as amended, to the CSE. The motion was seconded and passed. Mr. Mohajer was absent when the vote was taken.

## **V. UPDATE ON THE SUNSHINE CANYON CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL**

### Odor Complaints

Mr. Clark Ajwani provided the Subcommittee with a graph prepared by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) detailing the monthly and annual odor complaints at the Sunshine Canyon Landfill through the month of October, 2013.

Mr. Ajwani reported that 176 odor complaints were made to the AQMD in October 2013.

- 9 complaints were verified by inspectors to be trash odors.
- 59 complaints were verified to be landfill gas odors.
- 63 complaints were called in, but inspectors could not verify the odor upon arrival.
- 45 complaints were not responded to by AQMD’s staff.

The number of complaints received in October increased by 29 percent, compared to the number of complaints received in September. The

number of complaints received in October of 2013 was about the same as the number of complaints received in October of last year.

Discussion ensued and Mr. Mohajer requested information on how the issue of nuisance related to odors is being addressed by both the City and County Planning Departments.

Mr. Wayde Hunter expressed continued frustration with odor complaints at the Landfill and its effects on the health, safety and welfare of the surrounding communities. Ms. Landis responded that the new sewer connection, scheduled for installation in spring 2014, will provide some relief to the odors.

Mr. Hauser commented that Republic Service's objective is to have zero odor complaints at the Landfill. He noted that new gas extraction wells are being installed and that odor complaints have been reduced at the Landfill. He believes the nine inch soil requirement is a detriment to the landfill gas collection system.

### THIRD QUARTER VEGETATION REPORT

Mr. Russell Bukoff provided a [PowerPoint Presentation](#) on the Third Quarter 2013 Vegetation Report on the Sunshine Canyon City/County Landfill. His presentation primarily discussed the respective City and County sage mitigation areas and described the following:

#### Update on County and City Sides

- Interim areas will be seeded, amended, or mulched in the fourth quarter of 2013 to take advantage of winter rains.
- A weed abatement program is in place and actively followed.
- The Particulate Matter (PM) 10 Oak tree mitigation area will be completing the fifth and final year of monitoring and maintenance at the end of 2013. The majority of oak trees are in fair to excellent condition, although they are still small and do not yet provide the PM 10 buffer.

#### Update on County Side

- Conditions on the County Side sage mitigation area remain unchanged. A substantial portion of the county-side mitigation area continues to be bare and problematic for establishment of vegetation, primarily because of highly eroded and toxic soils
- Only the lower southern quarter of the mitigation area contains vegetation, which is where the highest concentration of native species (mostly buckwheat) occurs.

#### Update on City Side

- The sage pilot project continues to be monitored, maintained and the results of the project will be evaluated in 2014.
- Germination of coastal sage scrub species through seeding has been poor.
- Two saltbush species (four-wing saltbush and quail bush) were found to dominate the vegetation cover in the trial plot.
- Container plantings of coyote brush and chamise have survived.
- Approximate 70 percent of the vegetated areas within middle deck continue to be dominated by non-native species.

Ms. Landis asked that the term “coastal sage scrub” be replaced with “sage scrub,” in future reports, as this is a better term to refer to a mixture of inland and desert sage scrub that exists at the Landfill. She also advised that telegraph weed (*Heterotheca grandiflora*), which is a native plant, should be considered in future reports as a member of the sage scrub family rather than a weed.

Mr. Hunter expressed dissatisfaction with the results of the vegetation efforts made by the Landfill’s operator. He also commented that the recommendations made by John Minch and Associates (Republic’s Consultant), in the quarterly vegetation reports, don’t appear to be addressed by the operator. Mr. Hunter also asked that more recent photos be included in the reports.

Ms. Landis concurred with Mr. Hunter and requested that a table be included in the report which describes how the recommendations have been addressed. Mr. Bukoff responded that it is normal practice for Republic to include in the report a section that addresses the recommendations; however, it was not included in this report. He also reported that in a previous meeting, the Subcommittee requested that staff meet with Republic to discuss recommendations made by the County Biologist, Joe Decruyenaere, to enhance re-vegetation efforts at the Landfill. This meeting will be held on December 5, 2013, and will include representatives from Republic, Los Angeles City Planning, County Biologist, the Independent Monitor (UltraSystems), and County Public Works staff.

#### Interagency Task Force

Ms. Emiko Thompson provided an update on the efforts of the Interagency Working Group on addressing odors at the Sunshine Canyon Landfill. Ms. Thompson mentioned that at last month's Subcommittee meeting, staff was asked to report back regarding whether all of the agencies of the Interagency Working Group had reviewed the August 27, 2013, letter from Mr. Wayne Tsuda of the Sunshine Canyon Landfill Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) to the Task Force. Ms. Thompson informed the Subcommittee that at the time the letter was drafted, the LEA did ask for comments on the draft letter from all of the agencies. Ms. Thompson further stated Public Works reviewed the draft letter and provided comments, which were incorporated into the final letter. Mr. Mohajer re-iterated the Subcommittee's inquiry if each member agency commented on the letter. Ms. Thompson responded by saying that other than Public Works, it appears the AQMD provided comments on the letter.

Ms. Thompson also reported that the LEA is currently in the process of preparing a document which includes a tabulation of the mitigation measures that were collectively developed by the Working Group in the Interagency Memo dated June 24, 2013. Each agency was asked to provide comments on the document. The document identifies the responsible agencies, and the status or timeline, for each of the respective measures. Staff anticipates the LEA will finalize this document over the next few weeks.



**VI. DISCUSSION ON FINDING OF CONFORMANCE QUARTERLY REPORTS**

Due to time constraints, discussion on this item was postponed until the next Subcommittee meeting.

**VII. OPEN DISCUSSION/PUBLIC DISCUSSION**

Mr. Mohajer stated he was in opposition of the Subcommittee's concurrence with staff's recommendation on the proposed revisions to the CSE, as part of item IV. He stated that approval of the revisions should be postponed until regulations have been written to implement Assembly Bill 1126.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.