

Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/
Integrated Waste Management Task Force

Minutes of November 17, 2005

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Albert Avoian, Business/Commerce Representative
Margaret Clark, League of California Cities—Los Angeles Division
Betsy Landis, Environmental Organization Representative
Joe Massey, Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries
Michael Miller, League of California Cities—Los Angeles Division
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative
Ron Saldana, Los Angeles County Disposal Association

COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY OTHERS:

Thomas Garthwaite, rep. by Ken Murray, County of L.A. Dept. of Health Services
Jim Stahl, rep. by Charles Boehmke, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
Barry Wallerstein, rep. by Jay Chen, South Coast Air Quality Management District
Don Wolfe, rep. by Carlos Ruiz, County of L.A. Dept. of Public Works
Ben Wong, rep. by John McTaggart, League of California Cities—Los Angeles Division

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Christine F. Andersen, City of Long Beach
David Kim, City of Los Angeles Appointee
Gerry Miller, City of Los Angeles
Rita Robinson, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation

OTHERS PRESENT:

Chuk Agu, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Martin Aiyetiwa, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Paul Alva, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
James Armijo, City of Arcadia
Hossam Banna, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Toyasha Black, City of Arcadia
George De La O, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Eric Herbert, Athens Services
Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition
Ben Lucha, City of Santa Clarita
Mary Ann Lutz, Task Force Alternate
Carolyn Meredith, City of Pasadena
Duane McDonald, Athens Services
Joshua Rosenbaum, City of Signal Hill
Steven L. Samaniego, City of West Covina
Coby Skye, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Heather Stotland, City of Calabasas
Steve Uselton, California Integrated Waste Management Board

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 1 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 20, 2005

A motion was made to approve the minutes of October 2005. The motion passed with two abstentions.

III. REPORT FROM THE PUBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. Mike Mohajer stated the Subcommittee considered four articles for the Inside Solid Waste newsletter. He stated these articles came from the cities of Calabasas, Commerce, Pasadena, and the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works. Mr. Mohajer stated there would also be an update on AB 939 Diversion Measurement Compliance System and the November 19, meeting of the Assembly Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. Mohajer made a recommendation for the Task Force to send a letter to all city managers and mayors, requesting submittal of stories for the Inside Solid Waste newsletter. A motion was made to send the letter and passed unanimously.

IV. REPORT FROM THE ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. Coby Skye stated that the Subcommittee met and discussed funding for the pilot conversion technology facility along with the two scopes of work and the Assembly Natural Resources Committee AB 1090 hearing. The Subcommittee is working with the County Sanitation Districts (CSD) to define the role CSD will take in the development of the pilot facility. Based on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) of the Puente Hills Landfill, the CSD must consider providing funding for a pilot scale facility, but there is some uncertainty regarding the definition of "pilot scale". Also, the Subcommittee discussed the two scopes of work which are now being finalized. The two requests for proposals are now being prepared.

Lastly, the Subcommittee voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to send a letter to the Assembly Natural Resources Committee to clarify misconceptions with regard to conversion technology raised at their meeting on November 16, 2005, and request to move AB 1090 forward.

Mr. Michael Miller stated he had an outline of comments that summarize the Task Force's position on the issue and would forward it to staff to use as a basis for the letter. A motion was made to send the letter to the Assembly Natural Resources Committee and passed unanimously.

V. UPDATE ON CONVERSION TECHNOLOGIES AND AB 1090

Mr. Mohajer stated that he attended the City of Los Angeles ad hoc committee meeting last Tuesday, where they were considering adopting a resolution in support of AB 1090 (attached). Mr. Mohajer stated he provided comments on his own behalf. The City Council later adopted the resolution.

In regards to the Assembly Natural Resources Committee meeting on November 16, 2005, Mr. Mohajer commented that he had expressed concerns that Waste Board staff made no mention of the study on conversion technology developed for AB 2770. He also stated there were concerns raised by the Chair of the Committee regarding conversion technology facilities in reference to the California Environment Quality Act (CEQA) requirements. Mr. Mohajer stated he addressed those concerns and added that CEQA should not be used to oppose conversion technologies.

Mr. Miller stated there were also concerns that conversion technology would upset the existing recycled materials market. Mr. Miller stated Senator Roberti did a good job of clarifying the issue of our current treatment of recycled materials and these materials are not always treated in an environmentally sound manner. Mr. Miller further stated that Councilmember Greig Smith did an outstanding job of outlining the City of Los Angeles' position on the issue of conversion technology.

Mr. Skye added that copies of the Subcommittee's conversion technology report press release and brochures were made available at the meeting.

VI. ECO TECHNOLOGY INCORPORATED, ZORTECH BIOSOLID DRYING SYSTEM

Mr. Harry Reninger gave a PowerPoint presentation on the ZorTech Biosolid Drying System (attached). Mr. Reninger gave a general overview of the drying process and technology to convert biosolid sludge into energy. Mr. Reninger stated their thermal drying process was given a patent in July 2001. Afterward, they opened their facility in Philadelphia.

Mr. Reninger stated EcoTechnology facility's current production has reached the goal of processing ten tons of biosolids per hour. They reduce 90 percent

of the solid matter through controlled combustion into thermal energy. The end product is a fly ash that can be used in a variety of materials. Other benefits from this system include a reduction in the quantity and frequency of transportation to dispose of biosolids, a reduction in the usage of landfills, and reduced cost as compared to composting.

The existing facility in Philadelphia is approximately 100 feet by 50 feet, about the size of a basketball court. A unique facility design manages the drying process and is responsible for the ten ton per hour drying rate. A streamlined facility design means it could become operational in as little as ten months.

A discussion ensued and Mr. Reninger agreed to forward additional information on the technology behind the system to the Task Force members.

VII. ATHENS MATERIALS RECOVERY FACILITY

Mr. Eric Herbert and Mr. Duane McDonald gave a presentation on the expansion plans for Athens Materials Recovery Facility (MRF). Mr. McDonald stated that Athens MRF has been in operation since 1997 in the County unincorporated area near the City of Industry. It has a CUP to accept up to 1,920 tons per day. Mr. McDonald stated the facility has been able to maintain a 25 percent recovery rate since that time.

A new CUP includes several changes. It allows for both commercial and residential solid waste, includes an increase in capacity to 5,000 tons per day, and expands the tipping floor to roughly twice its current size. The CUP became effective in October 2005. Other changes included in the CUP are increased mitigation measures for noise and odor, a new misting system with odor neutralizing enzymes, and a change in conveyor configuration. Changes will come in three phases:

- a. Phase one will be no change in daily tonnage intake capacity, but implementation of onsite mitigation measures will be introduced. These onsite mitigation measures include noise surveys and changes in facility operations that assist in mitigating odors.
- b. Phase two will increase the daily intake to 4,000 tons.
- c. Phase three will increase the daily intake to 5,000 tons. Phase three also includes a new exhaust ventilation system to mitigate odors.

Once all three phases are complete, this facility will house the largest tipping floor in the State.

VIII. UPDATE ON DTSC'S UNIVERSAL WASTE REGULATIONS

Mr. Hossam Banna stated that the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) conducted a series of workshops in October 2005, regarding the sunset of exemptions for the disposal of universal waste. Mr. Banna stated that under the exemption certain low hazardous waste items such as household batteries, lamps, mercury thermostats, and electronic devices commonly used, were allowed to be disposed as municipal solid waste. The exemptions were intended to provide jurisdictions with enough time to develop recycling programs and infrastructure to deal with these items. The exemptions will end on February 8, 2006.

The objectives of the DTSC workshops were to discuss the impact of the disposal exemptions and alternatives, and whether or not to allow the exemptions to sunset. The DTSC has quoted a 2002 Waste Board report which states that one to four percent of all household hazardous waste (HHW) collected at HHW events came from the items in question. The DTSC maintains that allowing exemptions to sunset is the best approach to solving the universal waste issue. They understand there are concerns that need to be addressed, like funding, but they don't believe extending the exemptions will address these concerns.

Mr. Banna stated that the County has been proactive in its approach to the issue of e-waste, through its HHW Collection Program. He stated that during the 2004-05 fiscal year, e-waste collected made up approximately 1.5 percent of all HHW collected. These figures coincide with the data presented by the DTSC. However, the County is still in need of additional funding for collection of this additional waste.

Mr. Banna recommended the Task Force send a letter to the DTSC to strongly oppose allowing the existing disposal exemption for universal waste to sunset on February 8, 2006. The Task Force should request that DTSC extend the exemption until such time as the State can identify proper disposal mechanisms, make manufacturers responsible for their products, and provide reimbursement to local governments for managing these wastes since these costs would be significant and further strain limited local resources.

A motion to send a letter to the DTSC was made. The motion passed unanimously.

IX. UPDATE ON NEWLY ADOPTED DISPOSAL REPORTING SYSTEM REGULATIONS

Mr. Martin Aiyetiwa gave a PowerPoint presentation to update the Task Force on the newly adopted Disposal Reporting System regulations (attached).

Mr. Aiyetiwa stated these regulations will go into effect on January 1, 2006, and are designed to assist jurisdictions in complying with AB 939.

Mr. Aiyetiwa stated there would be several new requirements beginning in January 2006:

- All transfer stations and waste haulers would be required to keep records, submit quarterly reports, and provide jurisdictions with information upon request.
 - Facility operators must respond within ten days of a request for information by a jurisdiction—a rule that will apply statewide jurisdictions except for rural counties.
- Facilities would be required to post signs indicating that State law requires that each driver must inform the weigh station where waste originates from.
- All transfer stations and landfills would be required to have a scale at their facilities by January 2007.
- Waste haulers must track jurisdiction of origin on a daily basis for all loads based on dispatch records.
- All solid waste facilities and transfer stations must report jurisdiction of origin on a daily basis.
- All solid waste facilities must submit annual reports in accordance with the disposal-reporting matrix.
 - This information will be submitted to the County and the County will then submit the information to the State.

Mr. Aiyetiwa added that annual reports will allow the Waste Board to collect information from landfills, give the Waste Board an idea of how waste is being reported, and also give the Waste Board an idea of a landfill's estimated in-place density or the airspace utilization factor.

The new regulations also contain certain noncompliance requirements. If a facility is noncompliant, it must be reported to the County who would then forward the information to the State. The Los Angeles County Disposal Reporting System will be expanded to allow all solid waste enterprises including waste haulers and transfer station operators to submit reports to the County online. The system will then compile the information, sort it, and

forward required information to the State. The new system is currently under development and should be available by April 1, 2006.

X. CIWMB'S PROPOSED REGULATIONS FOR PERMIT IMPLEMENTATION REGULATIONS

Mr. Martin Aiyetiwa gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Waste Board's Permit Implementation Regulations, in an effort to simplify the permitting process of solid waste facilities as mandated by AB 1497 (attached). Mr. Aiyetiwa stated there are six-key issues in these regulations:

- 1) what is considered "significant change" in the permitting process
- 2) public notices and hearing requirements
- 3) the relationship between solid waste permits to local land use
- 4) tracking community outreach efforts
- 5) five-year permit review noticing
- 6) surprise random inspections

Mr. Aiyetiwa stated that under the current regulations, there is no definition for "significant change." AB 1497 requires the Waste Board to clarify this. Mr. Aiyetiwa stated the Waste Board is adopting a decision tree that would help to determine what is a "significant change."

The decision tree will also determine what permitting process is applicable. A Report of Facility Information (RFI) Amendment Process would be for facility changes that meet the following:

- 1) consistent with existing CEQA
- 2) consistent with statutes and regulations
- 3) consistent with permit terms and conditions

A Modified Permit process would be for facility changes that

- 1) do not change design and operation
- 2) are non-material
- 3) will not require new terms and conditions

A Revised Permit Process would apply for any significant change that does not fall into the RFI Amendment Process or Modified Permit Process categories.

Mr. Aiyetiwa stated public notices and hearing requirements would also be addressed. In order to issue a solid waste permit to be approved, it has to go through certain public notices and hearings. He stated the objective is to

establish a level of hearing notices and hearings based on permit type. For example, a report of facility information amendment process only requires basic noticing while a modified process requires notices, hearings, and public information meetings.

Mr. Aiyetiwa stated the Waste Board is attempting to clarify the level of consistent statewide standard for the Local Enforcement Agency's (LEA) review of the local land use permit. When the operator of a facility submits a permit application to the LEA, the LEA is required not to look at the content of the land use permit. Mr. Aiyetiwa believes this falls short of the requirement that solid waste permit applications be "complete and correct".

Mr. Aiyetiwa stated the concern for Public Works is that language proposed by the Waste Board may inadvertently encourage landfill operators to propose projects which are inconsistent with local land use permits. He stated the Waste Board has asked Public Works staff to submit alternative language to address these concerns.

Mr. Aiyetiwa stated there is no system for tracking community outreach efforts for a facility or project. He stated the Waste Board objective is to clarify how and by whom tracking of community outreach efforts should be accomplished. The Waste Board would like to have the LEA be responsible for noticing five-year review of permits.

Mr. Aiyetiwa stated the Waste Board would also like to introduce surprise random inspections for solid waste facilities. The language that is being proposed would allow them to do this.

Mr. Aiyetiwa made a recommendation that the Task Force send a letter to the Waste Board to address the concerns about the proposed language definition of "correct" which may impact local land use permit process. A discussion ensued, and the Task Force voted unanimously to draft a letter to the Waste Board and have that draft available for Task Force review at the next Task Force meeting.

XI. REPORT FROM THE CIWMB AND UPDATE ON AB 939 DIVERSION MEASUREMENT COMPLIANCE SYSTEM

Mr. Phil Moralez stated the Waste Board had received comments from local jurisdictions regarding the proposed changes to AB 939 Diversion Compliance System. Mr. Moralez stated some jurisdictions had concerns that changing the system would adversely impact their diversion figures. He stated that Waste Board staff had attempted to produce a more simplified

compliance system, although the comment period had ended, there would be more opportunities to comment on the proposed changes once the legislative process get underway. Mr. Moralez stated that comments and letters received would be forwarded to the legislators to review as they consider adoption of the proposed changes.

Mr. Moralez commented Mr. Gary Peterson was at the Waste Board meeting this month and will be welcomed formally at the January 2006, Board meeting. Mr. Mohajer also commended Mr. Moralez for being instrumental in bringing to the attention of Waste Board, the issue of how to incorporate growth in the proposed changes for the Compliance System.

XII. COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT UPDATE

Mr. Chuck Agu stated that a survey was conducted of all solid waste disposal facilities in the County. The information will be used to update the fact sheets in the Siting Element.

Mr. Agu stated landfill visits were conducted and generational information was gathered for the Siting Element. Aside from local landfills, out-of-County and out-of-State landfills are being reviewed for viability.

Mr. Agu stated the next chapter of the Siting Element would be available for review at a later time.

XIII. NOMINATIONS FOR TASK FORCE VICE CHAIR

Mr. Michael Miller opened the floor for nominations for Vice Chair of the Task Force. Mr. Mohajer nominated Task Force member Ms. Margaret Clark. Ms. Clark's nomination was seconded, after which the nominations were closed. Ms. Clark's nomination was approved unanimously.

XIV. NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for December 15, 2005, at 1 p.m.

XV. OPEN DISCUSSION/PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

The meeting adjourned at 3:23 p.m.