

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

Minutes of June 19, 2014, Meeting

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

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jeanne Biehler, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health
Betsey Landis, Environmental Organization Representative
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative
Carlos Ruiz, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Christopher Salomon, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County

OTHERS PRESENT:

Joe Bartolata, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Kevin Best, Real Energy, LLC
Stephen Beitz, Real Energy, LLC
Patti Costa, Republic Services, Inc.
Anna Gov, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
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
Karlo Manalo, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Rob Sherman, Republic Services, Inc.
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

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 11:10 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MAY 15, 2014, MEETING MINUTES

A motion to approve the Minutes of the May 19, 2014, meeting was made by Mr. Mike Mohajer and seconded by Ms. Jeanne Biehler. The motion passed with Mr. Chris Salomon abstaining.

III. UPDATE ON THE SUNSHINE CANYON CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL

Odor Complaints

Mr. Karlo Manalo informed the Subcommittee that the South Coast Air Quality Management District had not completed the odor complaint summary for the month of May 2014, for Sunshine Canyon City/County Landfill. Therefore, staff will be providing complaint summaries for both May and June at the next Subcommittee meeting.

Address Subcommittee's Questions from Previous Meetings

Ms. Patti Costa, Environmental Manager for Republic Services, Inc. (Republic), provided a [PowerPoint Presentation](#) with an update on issues discussed at previous Subcommittee meetings. These issues included the clearing of vegetation on the City-side Sage Mitigation area to allow for the installation of a pipeline; the stockpile of soil removed from the County top deck and later filled with solid waste; and the lack of use of beneficial use materials on site in the last two quarters.

Vegetation in City South Mitigation Areas:

Ms. Costa informed the Subcommittee that Republic installed 83 new vertical wells in the City South Mitigation Areas at the Landfill from March 2014 to May 2014 to support the Landfill's gas-to-energy facility and replace older and poorly performing wells. Seventy-five new wells were also installed on the City South portion of the site to connect new wells to the Gas Collection and Control System. Approximately 32,158 feet of pipeline were installed above ground, primarily to prevent vegetation from being disturbed.

Ms. Costa stated that only vegetation in the immediate vicinity of the project was disturbed. To further minimize impacts on existing vegetation, Republic designated pathways to work areas, installed lateral pipelines above ground, and installed new wells around, not within, the perimeter of the City South Sage Mitigation Pilot Project Area.

Ms. Costa discussed that prior mitigation efforts on 'A' and 'B' decks of City South have not been viewed as successful. Mitigation plans for these two decks will be based on the results from the Pilot Project Area and will be carried out in a phased approach and take into consideration existing native plants.

As maintenance is required of the Landfill's Gas Collection and Control System, work plans will be developed to minimize impacts to vegetation. When unavoidable, restoration of impacted areas will be conducted as soon as it is feasible and reasonable.

Mr. Wayde Hunter expressed dissatisfaction with revegetation efforts at the Landfill and commented that revegetation should hold a higher level of priority.

Soil Stockpile:

Ms. Costa commented that excavation and soil stockpiling are part of normal landfill operating procedures, as discussed in the Landfill's Joint Technical Document, Section B.5.1. All cells on the County portion of the site have been constructed and lined in accordance with design plans submitted to and subsequently approved by Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. Ms. Costa stated that no solid waste was placed in unapproved areas on the County side of the Landfill.

Ms. Costa reported that solid waste was disposed on the County deck in the latter part of 2013 during the construction of Cell CC-3A, Part 2. Surveys were conducted to ensure elevations of fill material were below the maximum permitted elevation of 1,900 feet mean sea level (MSL) [Solid Waste Facility Permit (SWFP) Condition 17.B.5]. A survey taken in April 2014 shows a maximum elevation on the County deck to be 1,894 feet, which is within the 1,900 feet MSL elevation limit.

Mr. Mohajer commented that the Landfill operator must comply with the County's Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and the City of Los Angeles' Zoning Ordinance to ensure that all areas of the Landfill are within the permitted elevation limits. Also,

there is a time limit which soil could be stockpiled on site. Beyond that it constitutes closure and requires landscaping measures.

Mr. Carlos Ruiz commented that in some cases with the permission from Public Works, the facility is allowed to stockpile for longer than 180 days to accommodate excavation activities and onsite soil demand.

Mr. Mohajer commented that the Task Force places emphasis in its oversight of the Landfill on the City's Zoning Ordinance and the County's CUP, rather than the SWFP, because the SWFP is less stringent than the City ordinance and the CUP.

As a point of emphasis, Mr. Mohajer added that the Task Force is a separate and distinct entity from Public Works, and that Republic Services should communicate directly with the Task Force regarding questions asked of them by the Task Force, rather than with Public Works.

Beneficial Use Material Reporting:

Ms. Costa reported to the Subcommittee that the Finding of Conformance (FOC) reports accurately report that no beneficial use material was received during the Fourth Quarter 2013 and First Quarter 2014 reporting periods. Ms. Costa added that the majority of beneficial use material received at the Landfill is asphalt, which is used for road base and wet weather decking. No asphalt was accepted during these two reporting periods as there was sufficient material located on site.

IV. INITIAL STUDY FOR THE COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT REVISION

Mr. Patrick Holland provided a [PowerPoint presentation](#) on the Initial Study for the Los Angeles County Countywide Siting Element (CSE) Revision. Mr. Holland informed the Subcommittee that the Initial Study, Notice of Preparation (NOP), and Notice of Scoping Meetings was released on June 16, 2014, to responsible agencies, 88 cities in Los Angeles County, local enforcement agencies, permitting agencies, local associations of government, and the State Clearinghouse. The comment period for the Initial Study and NOP will last through July 28, 2014.

A mass e-mail with the link to the CSE website and website instructions was sent to the State Clearinghouse, responsible agencies, and Task Force members. Additionally, hard copies of the Initial Study, NOP, and website instructions were

mailed out to the 14 Task Force members. Hard copies of the Initial Study and NOP were mailed to 19 libraries, throughout the County, for the public to view the documents. Hard copies of the NOP and website instructions were also mailed to the State Clearinghouse and to the responsible agencies.

Mr. Holland stated that the County's consultant, Tetra Tech BAS, in association with its subconsultant, HDR Engineering, Inc., prepared the Initial Study. The Initial Study concluded that a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would need to be prepared. Mr. Holland commented this would not be a Programmatic EIR. Considering the CSE serves as a planning and policy manual, rather than a specific development program, it will analyze the impact resulting from the contents of the CSE document itself, including the goals and policies and/or the siting criteria. As such, the intent of the environmental analysis is not to provide detailed information on impacts and mitigation measures for specific projects, such as proposed landfill expansions, potential conversion technology facilities, or programs, as they will undergo their own separate California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review. He added that the environmental factors that will not be further analyzed include Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Mineral Resources, Population Housing, Public Services, and Recreation, while all other factors, including Air Quality, Noise, and Transportation/Traffic, will be analyzed further in the Draft EIR.

Mr. Holland directed the attention of the Subcommittee to the home page of the CSE website. The website's home page includes a brief description of the CSE and provides stakeholders with updates regarding the project's status with respect to the project milestones. The home page also lists upcoming events which currently include the six scoping meetings (one in each supervisorial District with the exception to Supervisorial District 5 where there will be two), which will begin in July. The website also contains an Environmental Document page which includes a description of CEQA, a link to where the Initial Study and NOP can be viewed or downloaded, and a link to a separate comment page where users can provide comments electronically.

Both the Preliminary Draft CSE and Draft EIR are anticipated to be released for public review in early 2015. Staff is also considering updating the CSE to change the base year from 2010 to 2013 before the release of the Preliminary Draft CSE and Draft EIR.

Ms. Betsey Landis expressed dissatisfaction with the Initial Study's project description of Los Angeles County, which lacked a thorough description of the geography in the County. For example, the document did not include description

of the major water resources or drainage areas, groundwater resources, various mountain ranges, coastal plains, etc. Mr. Holland responded that staff would ensure that the Draft EIR would include a more thorough description of the physical setting of the County.

Mr. Mohajer commented that a deadline for submitting comments should have been included in the distribution cover letter sent to the stakeholders. He also commented on the document's list of references, citing the document should be more appropriately identified as the "Preliminary Draft Countywide Siting Element", and that the Task Force needs to be referenced as the CSE is being prepared under its authority.

Mr. Mohajer also discussed that he found errors on the FAQ page of the website, including, among other things, the incorrect naming the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County as the County of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation Districts, the inconsistent use of the term solid waste/solid waste disposal facilities, and the need for a clarification of the adoption of the preliminary draft CSE. He added that the document also needs to include more detailed discussion on Assembly Bill 1126, as it would pertain to Engineered Municipal Solid Waste (EMSW), to provide clear guidelines to County jurisdictions on the appropriate process in proposing new EMSW facilities. Mr. Mohajer will be meeting with staff to provide his comments regarding the Initial Study.

V. PROPOSED SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT REVISION FOR THE AZUSA LAND RECLAMATION FACILITY

Ms. Anna Gov provided a [PowerPoint Presentation](#) on the proposed SWFP Revision for the Azusa Land Reclamation Facility (ALR). The facility is owned and operated by Azusa Land Reclamation Company, Inc., a subsidiary of Waste Management, Inc. The facility is located at 1211 Gladstone Street within the City of Azusa's West End Industrial District. The land use designation for the site is Landfill.

Ms. Gov stated that ALR is divided into five zones of operation. Zone I previously accepted municipal solid waste (MSW) from 1960 to 1996. This zone will be brought up to the final design grades for closure by the placement of inert material along with the rest of the Landfill. Zone II currently accepts inert waste, although MSW was accepted in the zone from 1989 to 1991. Zone III accepts tires and other inert waste. Zone IV includes disposal of tires and other inert waste and ongoing mining operations. Zone V is currently undergoing mining

operations by Cemex Company and is proposed to be reclaimed using engineered fill. The total permitted disposal footprint of the revised SWFP is 266 acres.

Ms. Gov. reported that Azusa Land Reclamation Company, Inc., submitted an updated application for a revised SWFP in response to the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA)'s 5-year permit review in December 2012. According to the LEA, the agency will complete its review of the permit revision application and make a determination of the completion of the permit package. Within 60 days of reviewing the application, the LEA will submit its recommendation to CalRecycle for concurrence. Once CalRecycle concurs with the recommendation, the revised permit may be issued.

The following documents were used by the LEA in making their determination: (1) May 2014 Initial Study, (2) Joint Technical Document Volumes 1 and 2 dated December 2012, and (3) the 1988 Negative Declaration dated September 25, 1997. Ms. Gov commented that, according to the LEA, the May 2014 Initial Study may be subject to change and will only be finalized once the SWFP is issued.

Ms. Gov reported to the Subcommittee that ALR is currently operating under the SWFP No. 19-AA-0013 to accept 6,500 tons per day (tpd) of non-hazardous refuse and is open to the public Monday through Saturday from the hours of 6 am to 8 pm. The Landfill was initially permitted as a Class III MSW Landfill. However, as a result of Water Quality regulatory actions (No. 96-14) on October 1996, ALR was only allowed to accept non-hazardous special waste, asbestos, and unclassified inert waste. The maximum final elevation of the fill areas is 580 feet above MSL.

Based on the May 2014 Initial Study, the proposed revision of the SWFP for ALR will provide clarification on the following items:

- Tonnage to match historical levels of operations at ALR
- Acreage of the Landfill
- Types of inert and beneficial use materials
- Disposal operations of waste tires and inerts
- Base grades for Zones 3, 4, and 5
- Remaining estimated site capacity and site life

Ms. Gov stated that the Landfill's current SWFP allows it to accept 6,500 tpd of non-hazardous refuse, but does not address beneficial use materials.

The revision will clarify the Landfill's ability to continue accepting up to 6,500 total tpd of inert waste with a peak daily waste throughput of 8,000 tpd and a maximum of 39,000 tons per week. Soil for cover and fill, and other diverted materials used for beneficial reuse, are included in these limits. Daily tonnage for cover and fill, and beneficial reuse, can be accepted on a sliding scale dependent upon the amount of waste accepted for disposal up to the total peak throughput of 8,000 tpd. In other words, the facility could receive a maximum of 6,500 tpd of inert waste plus 1,500 tpd of beneficial reuse for a total of 8,000 tpd.

Ms. Gov continued to report that according to the May 2014 Initial Study, the proposed tonnage revision is based on the following factors:

1. The Landfill had previously realized this level of operation in the past, nearly 8,000 tpd, which resulted in up to 852 truck trips per the attachment A, which was provided with the Initial Study document.
2. The 1988 Negative Declaration analyzed 1,200 trucks per day and impacts on the surrounding community.

Therefore, since the actual truck trips of nearly 8,000 tpd is well within the 1,200 truck trips analyzed in the 1988 Negative Declaration, the May 2014 Initial Study concluded that preparation of an Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration would be appropriate to comply with CEQA for purposes of the SWFP revision.

Ms. Gov reported that ALR's current SWFP specifies 283 acres be used for both total acres and disposal acres. This number was previously reported incorrectly and will be revised to reflect the Landfill's total acres of 302 and disposal acres of 266.

The Landfill's current SWFP allows the facility to take in 6,500 tpd of non-hazardous refuse. However, it does not specify what materials constitute non-hazardous refuse. Under the revised SWFP, ALR would continue accepting inert and beneficial reuse materials. The inert waste would continue to include asbestos, waste tires, and other waste as defined in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, and non-hazardous soil (used for cover and fill) and other diverted materials able to be used for beneficial reuse, up to a maximum of 8,000 tpd.

The current SWFP does not specifically mention the disposal operations for the co-disposal of waste tires and inerts. The revised SWFP will clarify this in the

permit or reference the Joint Technical Document, which specifies compliance with state and local fire department requirements. The SWFP revision will also include Revision of the base grades for Zone III, IV, and V based on the continuing mining operations in order to reflect the ongoing disposal of inert wastes.

ALR's Waste Discharge Requirement, Order Number 89-17, required that no waste, including MSW, tires, or asphalt be placed below 355 feet above MSL in all zones. Since some zones were excavated below 355 feet, due to mining operations, only inert material will be placed in these zones until an elevation of 355 feet is reached. After that level is reached, solid waste can be placed in the Landfill. The current SWFP only specified a maximum depth elevation of 355 feet. The revised permit will specify the base grade for Zone 3 at 330 feet, Zone 4 at 305 feet, and Zone 5 at 230 feet.

The Initial Study specifies that there is no proposed expansion of the Landfill disposal footprint or change to the maximum final elevation. The LEA is currently working with the operator to recalculate the closure date to reflect closure of the Landfill based on remaining proposed capacity and anticipated disposal rate.

Ms. Gov stated that, according to Section 10.4 of the CSE, existing solid waste disposal facilities that institute a significant change to their operation must obtain a FOC granted by the Task Force and a revision is defined as a significant change. As such, staff recommends the Task Force send a letter to the Landfill operator stating that a FOC is required and to submit an application for a FOC to the Task Force.

Ms. Landis inquired if there is a deadline for public comment on the Initial Study and was informed by Ms. Gov that there is no deadline since this Initial Study/Addendum is not required to be circulated for comment. Mr. Salomon commented that regulations within the CEQA pertaining to addendums state that if an addendum is not made available for public comment then the lead agency will take action on the addendum. The lead agency, which is the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health (Public Health), would then post the addendum appropriately for legal challenge. If the addendum is not challenged within a 30 day period the addendum would then go into effect.

Mr. Mohajer made a motion recommending the Task Force send a letter to Public Health requesting a deadline by which comments on the May 2014 Initial Study would be due. Ms. Landis seconded the motion, and it passed with Mr. Salomon opposing.

Mr. Mohajer made a second motion recommending the Task Force to send a letter to ALR, indicating the facility is required to obtain an FOC from the Task Force for their proposed SWFP Revision. Mr. Ruiz seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Mohajer inquired if there were any areas of the facility where it would be allowed to dispose of MSW above the permitted elevation of 355 feet MSL, citing concerns over water contamination. Mr. Ruiz commented that the facility had previously accepted MSW above this elevation; however, the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board later intervened and informed the facility that this was not an acceptable practice, and the facility complied.

Ms. Landis commented that MSW is mentioned in multiple sections within the document, adding concerns over possible major flooding at the facility causing contaminated water flow into the San Gabriel River.

VI. DISCUSSION ON FINDING OF CONFORMANCE QUARTERLY REPORTS

Due to time constraints, this item was postponed to a future Subcommittee meeting.

VII. OPEN DISCUSSION PUBLIC COMMENT

At the previous Subcommittee meeting, Ms. Landis commented that approximately one million (previously stated as two million) gallons of water were used for irrigation and dust control at Chiquita Canyon Landfill every month and inquired if the water is obtained from processed leachate or fresh water, as she was concerned that runoff from this Landfill would drain into the Santa Clara River. Ms. Biehler commented that the leachate is not treated on site and the Landfill uses water from a well across the SR-126 for irrigation and dust control. Ms. Landis inquired if Sunshine Canyon Landfill uses as much water as Chiquita Canyon Landfill does, and Mr. Rob Sherman responded that he would look into this.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.