

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

February 17, 2022

WEB CONFERENCE

Los Angeles County Public Works
900 South Fremont Avenue
Alhambra, CA 91803

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative
Dorcas (Dee) Hanson-Lugo, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health
Patrick Holland, Los Angeles County Public Works
Betsey Landis, Chair, Environmental Organization Representative
Sam Shamma, Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts

OTHERS PRESENT:

Martins Aiyetiwa, Los Angeles County Public Works
Joe Bartolata, Los Angeles County Public Works
Omid Mazdidasni, Los Angeles County Public Works
Steve Cassulo, Waste Management
Chris Coyle, Republic Services
Michael Harmon, Los Angeles County Public Works
Ramon Herman, Los Angeles County Public Works
Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens
Dave Nguyen, Los Angeles County Public Works
Carol Oyola, Los Angeles County Public Works
Trishena Robinson, Los Angeles County Public Works
Gladys Rietze, Los Angeles County Public Works
Aric Rodriguez, Los Angeles County Public Works
Chris Sheppard, Los Angeles County Public Works
Carlos Slythe, Los Angeles County Public Works
Dave Thompson, Sunshine Canyon Landfill-Local Enforcement Agency
Kawsar Vazifdar, Los Angeles County Public Works
Jeffrey Zhu, Los Angeles County Public Works

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Betsey Landis called the meeting to order at 11:07 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 20, 2022 MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Mike Mohajer made a motion to approve the Minutes, as corrected, and Ms. Dee Hanson-Lugo seconded. Motion passed with one abstention.

III. CONSIDERATION OF CONCURRENCE WITH THE FINAL DRAFT REVISED LOS ANGELES COUNTY COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT

Mr. Joe Bartolata, staff to the Task Force, provided an update on the Final Draft Revised Los Angeles County Countywide Siting Element (CSE).

On December 22, 2021, the Task Force sent a letter to Public Works (PW), dated December 22, 2021, transmitting Task Force's comments on the Draft Revised CSE and Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR). PW staff reviewed all comments received and made changes to the Draft Revised CSE, accordingly.

The draft responses to written comments received and the proposed revisions to the document were provided to the Subcommittee for consideration. Staff requested the Subcommittee consider the responses to written comments received and the proposed revisions to the Draft Revised CSE and recommends forwarding to the Task Force for their consideration.

Ms. Landis asked the Subcommittee who had read the entire document with all the edits made. Mr. Mohajer and Mr. Sam Shammas responded they read the document. Ms. Landis noted she had not quite finished reviewing it. Mr. Mohajer suggested the FPRS have another Special Meeting with only the one item on the agenda, which would be to review the comments on the Final Draft CSE since there is not enough time to discuss all the comments and concerns in one hour of a regular FPRS meeting when there are other agenda items to discuss. Mr. Holland concurred that a Special Meeting would be the best solution and to schedule it as quickly as possible in an effort to have all Subcommittee members voice their comments and concerns so that by next month's Task Force meeting, the Subcommittee would be in a position to make recommendation to the Task Force to proceed with the document. The Subcommittee determined that members would be available for a Special Meeting on Friday, February 25, 2022, at 9 a.m., except for Ms. Dee Hanson-Lugo who was a maybe. Ms. Landis encouraged all Subcommittee members to review the document before the meeting. Mr. Shammas complimented PW staff for the good layout in the Final Draft Revised CSE that included links to the exact paragraphs where changes were made. It made the review easier.

A formal motion was made by Mr. Mohajer to have a Special Meeting on February 25, 2022, at 9 a.m. to finalize the Subcommittee's review and comments so to make a decision at next month's FPRS meeting prior to the Task Force meeting, Mr. Holland seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

IV. UPDATE ON SITING CONVERSION TECHNOLOGY FACILITIES

Mr. Chris Sheppard, as staff to the Task Force and Chair of the Alternative Technology and Advisory Subcommittee, provided an update on siting conversion technology (CT) facilities.

This topic was presented to the Task Force in November 2021 and January 2022. Staff had provided an overview of PW CT program, which has been evaluating and promoting the development of CTs countywide and throughout the region since 2004. The following are efforts being made:

- Identifying potential sites for new anaerobic digestion and CT facilities.
- Working closely with cities and property owners to list potential sites in the CSE.
- Releasing a request for information to identify organic waste processing facilities.
- Potential solutions for developing alternative technology facilities: including the new Green Zones Ordinance, State funding for infrastructure, and legislative solutions to remove barriers to non-combustion CT facilities.
- Working with County Counsel to finalize the Request for Proposal for the Calabasas Landfill anaerobic digestion facility.
- Working with Tetra Tech to conduct feasibility analysis for additional facilities at closed landfill sites in the County.

Mr. Sheppard provided a high-level overview of the [Conversion Technology Website](#), which has many resources developed over the years.

Ms. Landis provided several comments and questions on the companies that provide small-scale on-site technology and was very interested in electricity generation. Mr. Sheppard clarified the purpose of this information was not for Jurisdictions to meet the organic waste processing requirements, but more for individual sites who may have challenges subscribing to organic waste collection services or who may benefit from processing materials on-site.

Ms. Landis asked when staff would prepare a booklet for larger scale organic waste processing that produce electricity. Mr. Sheppard responded there is no booklet but later shared the functionality on the CT website that has information on various technology capable of electricity generation.

Mr. Sheppard continued his overview of the website, which included developing facility permitting flow charts, the permitting process for gasification and composting

facilities, technical and financial databases, all of which provides information for project developers.

Ms. Landis asked under the technology provider resource and facilities, if it shows the number of kilowatts produced. Mr. Sheppard responded that the information includes a potential energy output, whether gas or electricity. Ms. Landis requested a detailed report on outputs for electricity and ways to produce electricity from solid waste. Mr. Holland reminded the Subcommittee that the focus of the Task Force is on managing solid waste and not trying to diversify its energy portfolio and that the website is used as a guide for project developers. He noted that energy would need to be calculated on a project-by-project basis. Ms. Landis continued expressing concerns about how to handle huge amounts of solid waste which could be used to produce electricity.

Ms. Landis thanked Mr. Sheppard for his presentation and reiterated wanting a brochure detailing ways of producing electricity from solid waste and the output of kilowatts, emissions, and byproducts. She requested the information for the next Subcommittee meeting.

V. UPDATE ON CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL

Mr. Omid Mazdiyasni, as staff to the Task Force, provided an update on Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL) odor complaints, lawsuits and Notice of Violations (NOVs).
Odor Complaints and NOVs

South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) agreed to provide odor complaint data on a quarterly basis. The next update will be available in April 2022.
Update on Lawsuits

CCL filed two different lawsuits against the County.

- The first lawsuit was filed on October 20, 2017, challenging operational conditions and fee conditions of the Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The parties are currently engaged in settlement discussions.
- The second lawsuit was filed on April 13, 2018, challenging a decision by the hearing officer that upheld an NOV issued by Regional Planning on December 11, 2017, for failure to pay Bridge and Thoroughfare Fee, accepting prohibited auto shredder waste, and failure to pay out-of-area fees. The trial date was rescheduled to June 2022.

Task Force Request for CCL to Submit a Report regarding NOVs Received

- CCL submitted their Tenth Monthly Update on February 1, 2022, which was disseminated to the Task Force on February 3, 2022. The update addressed the April 19, 2021 letter's requirements and included updates on implementation

- of Conditions 68 (status of air quality monitoring for surrounding communities), 77 (relocation of the site entrance from Henry Mayo Drive to Wolcott Drive), and 79 (schedule of the Street Improvement project), as well as the Stipulated Order for Abatement from AQMD.
- CCL did not receive any NOVs for January 2022.

VI. UPDATE ON SUNSHINE CANYON CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL

Odor Complaints

Mr. Vu Truong, staff to the Task Force, provided an update on [the odor complaints from the AQMD](#) for the month of January 2022.

- During the month of January 2022, 158 complaints were made to the AQMD hotline. Of those, 64 were classified as Trash, 3 were listed as Landfill Gas, and the rest were listed as No Field Response, Odor from Another Source, and None, which meant the inspector visited the site and did not detect any odor.
- Compared to December 2021, the number of complaints received in January 2022 increased from 83 to 158 complaints.
- Compared to January 2021, the number of complaints for January 2022 increased from 7 to 158 complaints.
- As of February 8, 2022, AQMD issued 5 NOVs related to odor for the month of January 2022.
- According to the AQMD report, the total number of complaints received during 2022 is 158.

At last month's Subcommittee meeting, staff was notified that the AQMD report for November 2021 was incorrect. Staff received confirmation from AQMD that the data on the report was correct.

Mr. Hunter confirmed with AQMD that the totals were correct, but the month they posted on their website for the month of November, was incorrect. Mr. Hunter also alleged that on January 19, 2022, and January 31, 2022, SCL exceeded their total allowed tonnage for trash which would constitute a violation of their permitted daily tonnage of trash. He asked if PW is monitoring daily tonnage that is being brought into the landfill.

Mr. Chris Coyle of SCL commented that the report Mr. Hunter is referring to only lists total gross tons for the facility and does not include the imported soil. SCL receives about 8,500 tons a day of trash Monday through Friday, with about 3,000 tons on Saturday, which is no increase. Mr. Coyle stated SCL is complying with the CUP requirement.

Mr. Coyle further stated that January was a challenging month with heavy rainfall in late December that impacted equipment at the landfill which may have led to increased odor complaints. Mr. Hunter responded that SCL was running their trucks into the landfill before 9 a.m. and parking them on the road is a problem for the community because of the odors emitted. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Mohajer made a motion for staff to check the allowable daily tonnages for municipal solid waste and beneficial use that SCL may receive as stated in the FOC and CUP.

Ms. Landis believed a motion was not necessary, that the Subcommittee could request staff to verify the tonnages and if SCL is in violation, then the Subcommittee could suggest to the Task Force to send a letter to Republic Services.

Sunshine Canyon Landfill – Local Enforcement Agency

Ms. Gladys Rietze, staff to the Task Force, provided a report on the Sunshine Canyon Landfill – Local Enforcement Agency's (SCL-LEA) regulatory role and revenue process as requested by the Subcommittee at last month's FPRS meeting.

Regulatory Role

- On February 6, 2007, the Board of Supervisors adopted the CUP for SCL which allowed for the City and County Landfills to operate as one joint Landfill.
- The SCL Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement (JPA) was adopted by the City and the County on May 13, 2008, to create the SCL-LEA for the combined City and County Landfill.
- Per the JPA, the SCL-LEA is the primary local entity to provide regulatory permitting, enforcement of state laws and regulations, and operational compliance oversight for the California Environmental Protection Agency's CalRecycle. The SCL-LEA's authority is limited to the State's minimum standards and the Solid Waste Facility Permit conditions and its duties are outlined in the JPA.
- The SCL-LEA ensures compliance with Condition 17.B.1. of the Solid Waste Facility Permit, which requires the operator to establish Operational Controls to preclude the receipt and disposal of hazardous and prohibited wastes. The specific requirements are outlined in the Solid Waste Facility Permit.

SCL-LEA Revenue Process

- The SCL-LEA's revenue process and how they fund all operating costs incurred by the SCL-LEA, per the JPA, the budget is independent from the budget of the City and County. Staff reviewed the JPA and there is no provision for the SCL-LEA to draw revenue from the County CUP or City Zoning Variance.
- The SCL-LEA provides oversight and recuperates its expenses through the 0.41 cent/ton fee authorized under County Code Section 20.64.110 for landfills

- located in the unincorporated County area. However, since SCL operates as a joint City/County Landfill, the SCL-LEA does not draw revenue from this fee.
- In accordance with the JPA, to recover the costs associated with SCL-LEA activities, the SCL-LEA invoices the operator on a quarterly basis through the County's Auditor Controller to recuperate all costs incurred by the SCL-LEA during the Fiscal Year. In accordance with the JPA, the Los Angeles County Auditor-Controller and County Treasurer are designated as the Auditor Controller and Treasurer of the SCL-LEA.
 - On an annual basis, the SCL-LEA submits its annual budget for approval by its governing Board of Directors.
 - The SCL-LEA provides a fulltime inspector at the landfill during operating hours and enforces the State's minimum requirements. The SCL-LEA does not enforce the Land Use Permits, including the County or City Conditions, during their routine inspections. If the SCL-LEA inspector observes any land use compliance issues, the inspector refers the issues to the appropriate regulatory agencies.

Ms. Rietze stated that questions regarding the SCL-LEA's role and budgeting can be directed to the attention of the SCL-LEA Board of Directors.

VII. DISCUSSION OF FOC REPORTS

Due to time constraints, the update on FOC reports was not presented.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comment.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for March 17, 2022, at 11 a.m.