

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

**Minutes of June 16, 2005**

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Paul Alva, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Fernando Berton, California Integrated Waste Management Task Force  
Alex Helou, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation  
Kay Martin, Bioenergy Producers Association  
John McTaggart, Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Task Force  
Mark McDannel, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County  
Mike Mohajer, Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Task Force  
Michael Theroux, Theroux Environmental Consulting  
Ed Wheless, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County  
Jeff Yann, Hacienda Heights Improvement Association

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Chris Mastro, County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services  
Eugene Tseng, Eugene Tseng and Associates

OTHERS PRESENT:

Shapoor Hamid, URS Corporation  
Elizabeth Morris, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Coby Skye, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works

## **I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 9:07 a.m.

## **II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR MARCH 17, APRIL 21 AND MAY 19, 2005**

The minutes of March 17th and April 21st were approved. Approval of minutes for the May 19, 2005 meeting will be considered next meeting date.

## **III. CONTRACTOR UPDATE AND DISCUSSION OF DELIVERABLES-URS**

1. Review of the Technology Section by the Subcommittee Members.
2. URS finalized the Draft "Analysis of the Most Suitable Combinations". This draft was submitted to the County. URS included a comparison table for the most suitable combinations.
3. URS finalized the Draft "Marketing Analysis for Development for Conversion Products." This was submitted to the County on May 12, 2005.
4. URS finalized the Draft "Siting Analysis for Development of a Conversion Facility in Southern California." This was submitted to the County on May 12, 2005.
5. Draft Report
6. Conclusions and Recommendations.

Mr. Hamid provided an update on the above named deliverables. 15 vendors/suppliers were ranked according to the criteria specified by the Subcommittee (Handout). They were subsequently sorted into a three-tiered system respective to thermal conversion technology, bioconversion technology, and waste to green fuel or ethanol/biodiesel (emerging technologies). Each section of the report was outlined by Mr. Hamid including the order of the report, various tables included in the appendices, and respective conclusions. Mr. Hamid stated that all mention of anaerobic digestion was dropped from the final report for a variety of reasons including lack of marketability, commercialization, and cost.

Dr. Martin mentioned that it would be important that the next phase of the project look closer at the economic factors associated with each technology, especially the products (electricity, green fuels, etc.) that result from the individual processes. An important consideration will be how each facility, and their byproducts' marketability will perform in the long run.

Mr. Hamid said that it is difficult to determine the accurate cost factors associated with the development of a conversion facility. He stated that he wanted to drop the economics criteria early, because most of the costs were rough estimates drawn from a questionnaire, and therefore unreliable. He agreed that the next phase of the project should look closer at cost factors.

One of the key issues associated with erecting a conversion facility is potential opposition. The way the facility is advertised tremendously impacts the public's perception toward the project. Mr. Theroux contends that marketing a facility generating green fuel is more acceptable than a facility generating electricity. Dr. Martin added that by promoting the facility as a biorefinery that produces renewable fuels, instead of one that processes solid waste, it would be more palatable to the public.

Mr. Hamid said the next step in the contract is to finalize the draft Report, which will have new conclusions and additions to the technology section, executive summary and the draft report. He requested additional comments so that the full Task Force can formally adopt the Report, so that recommendations can be forwarded to the County and sanitation districts.

One area of concern to the Subcommittee was the analysis of potential MRF locations. A motion was passed in which a recommendation would be made to move forward with the top three MRF locations: Del Norte in Oxnard, Vertec and CR&R Riverside facilities. A potential MRF in Santa Clarita, and two already established MRFs in Los Angeles County, will be considered at a later date as more information about these MRFs is made available. The Task Force's recommendations concerning MRF locations will be put in the section detailing MRF selection within the Report.

#### **IV. NEXT STEPS AND FUTURE CONTRACTS UPDATE – PAUL ALVA/COBY SKYE**

According to Mr. Alva, phase one and phase two of the Report will need a more detailed study in order to ensure that a potential location and chosen technology are a successful combination. It was recommended that a timeline be provided for the coordinated release of the Report, with URS hypothesizing the market for green fuels in Southern California. Mr. Theroux commented that the product derived from a potential conversion facility, and how it is marketed, is an important factor in public outreach.

#### **V. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

There was no legislative update provided.

**VI. WASTE BOARD CONVERSION TECHNOLOGY REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE**

There was no discussion concerning this item.

**VII. CALIFORNIA BIOMASS COLLABORATIVE DRAFT REPORT**

The Biomass Collaborative Draft Report concluded that 100 million tons of biomass is produced in the state annually. Using a wide variety of stakeholder input, this report detailed various recommendations for better utilization of biomass in California, including conversion technologies.

**VIII. NEXT MEETING DATE, TBA**

The next meeting date is scheduled for June 30, 2005 at 10:00 a.m.

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:07 a.m.