

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

**Minutes for November 21, 2019**

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Margaret Clark, League of California Cities  
Jeff Farano, Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries  
Gideon Kracov, Los Angeles County Disposal Association  
Betsey Landis, Environmental Organization Representative  
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative  
Rafael Prieto, City of Los Angeles  
Liz Reilly, California League of Cities-Los Angeles Division

COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY OTHERS:

Barbara Ferrer, rep by Shikari Nakagaw-Ota, Los Angeles County Public Health  
Robert Ferrante, rep by Sam Shammass, Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County  
Mark Pestrella, rep by Carlos Ruiz, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Enrique Zaldivar, rep by Reina Pereira, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Jack Hadjinian, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division  
David Kim, City of Los Angeles

OTHERS PRESENT:

Cheryl Auger, BAN Single-Use Plastics  
Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens  
Pedro Lorenzo, Nowon  
Carol Oyola, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Lynn Plambeck, Public Attendee  
Carlos Ramos, Nowon  
Jennifer Rodriguez, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Margarita Quiroz, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Chris Sheppard, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Jennifer Wallin, CalRecycle

## **I. CALL TO ORDER**

Ms. Clark called the meeting to order at 1:11 p.m.

## **II. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Ms. Clark moved up the Public Comments agenda item for the constituents who were departing the Task Force committee meeting early. Ms. Lynn Plambeck, a public attendee, commented on the Chiquita Canyon Landfill (Landfill) and its odor issues, requesting monitoring on the air quality. Ms. Plambeck indicated that a lawsuit was filed, but had lost the case, and stressed that air quality must be improved for the Val Verde community. Ms. Plambeck explained that the procedure to file an odor complaint is to call the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) hotline and SCAQMD is to send a representative to the landfill. The Landfill argued that only they may verify the complaints, and that the Landfill's representative will get there at a later time of the day of the complaints. By then, the status air quality would have changed. Ms. Plambeck would like to have her complaints and concerns validated by the Task Force committee. Ms. Plambeck continued that large trucks are coming to the Landfill from as far as San Diego. They are driving on community roads and breaking up the asphalt, and causing diesel odor into the air when the landfill is already experiencing odor and methane concerns. Ms. Plambeck further commented that the Landfill did not want to pay for the road fare fees, but the community is responsible in preparing the roads for the Landfill's trucks to come through their community.

Ms. Cheryl Auger, co-lead of BAN-Single Use Plastics, presented that her organization's mission and objective is to influence state, county, and federal legislation to ban single-use plastics that have no market and raise awareness of the toxicity of plastics, and the increased waste production. Ms. Auger would like Los Angeles County to support the Federal Legislation bill authored by Lowenthal and Udall and to adopt a regulation or ordinance that is similar to the mentioned bill. Ms. Auger mentioned point (G) of the bill *Moratorium on New Plastic Facilities*, that it needs to be understood that there have never been recycling markets for plastics 3,6, and 7 and never had a single after-market for the plastic, and that facilities should not be able to produce plastics that are toxic to the environment. Ms. Auger mentioned that plastics should not be made if they do not have an after-market.

### **III. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 17, 2019 MINUTES**

Ms. Landis motioned to approve the minutes as corrected. Mr. Kracov seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

### **IV. REPORT FROM THE PUBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE (PEIS)**

Mr. Mohajer reported the following articles to be considered for the Fall Edition Newsletter:

- County Sustainability Plan
- Reducing Emission through Building Decarbonizations,
- Update on Senate Bill 1383 Regulations,
- Senate Bill 1383 Draft Environmental Impact Report,
- Countywide Organic Waste Management Annual Report
- Saddleridge Wildfire in Sunshine Canyon Landfill,
- Update on the Woolsey Wildfire Debris Removal Process
- Goals and Priorities Subcommittee

### **V. REPORT FROM THE ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE (ATAS)**

Mr. Chris Sheppard reported there was a presentation by Paul Galindo of Go-Green, who presented on two of the company's projects. They are constructing a \$40 million food waste digester in San Bernardino County to digest fats, oils, and greases (FOGs) and food waste slurries. The facility is not expected to pre-process food waste.

Go-Green is also developing a project with Inland Empire Resource Recovery at the Palmdale Organics Management Energy Center in Palmdale, CA which would pre-process and convert food waste, green waste, and woody waste into electricity, compressed natural gas, diesel, compostable soil amendments, biochar, and liquid fertilizer. The public-private partnership is currently in the planning phases with the City of Palmdale. The facility is expected to accept waste from the and surrounding region.

Mr. Kracov requested the presentation be made available to the Task Force Members.

Mr. Sheppard also reported on the following upcoming events:

- Renewable Natural Gas Conference, December 2 – 5, 2019, Dana Point, CA

- Recycling Market Development Workshop, February 2020 (exact date to be determined), Cali/Baja Corridor, CA
- International Biomass Conference and Expo, February 3 – 5, 2020, in Nashville, TN
- Global Waste Management Symposium, February 11 – 20, 2020, in Palm Springs, CA
- Zero Waste Symposium, February 11, 2020, in San Diego, CA

#### **VI. REPORT FROM THE FACILITY AND PLAN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE (FPRS)**

Ms. Landis reported on Sunshine Canyon Landfill (SCL) AQMD hotline complaints. The number of complaints received in October 2019 when compared with the previous month decreased from 95 to 82. The number of complaints received in October 2019, increased from 21 to 82 because of the Saddleridge Wildfire.

On November 12, 2019, AQMD issued two Odor Complaint Notices of Violation (NOVs) for the month of October 2019. The NOVs were for complaints received on October 21 and 26, 2019, because of the Saddleridge Wildfire that began on October 11, 2019. The wildfire burned flare controls and pipes. Ms. Landis commented that Mr. Josh Mills from Republic Services gave an update on SCL and the impact during the Saddleridge Wildfire, with 30 percent of Area C of the Landfill being burned and 122 wells going offline. The wells are now back online, one month ahead of schedule.

Ms. Landis reported on complaints received at the Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL). There were eight complaints; one NOV in October 2019 and seven in November 2019. Mr. Ruiz mentioned that there are two lawsuits filed by the CCL operator challenging operational as well as some fee conditions. There is a CCL monitoring well that had emanated over five percent methane and may have been the reason for the NOVs. The last recorded emissions for the well was zero percent.

Ms. Landis noted the subcommittee discussed the Countywide Organic Waste Management Plan Annual Report and Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan 5-Year Review Report. Ms. Landis requested Staff to research how each jurisdiction handles their waste and to research universities that have their own solid waste systems.

#### **VII. REPORT FROM THE AD HOC GOALS & PRIORITIES SUBCOMMITTEE – 2020 GOALS & PRIORITIES PLAN**

Mr. Gideon Kracov provided a brief summary of the format of the report. He reported that the Subcommittee Members are himself, Ms. Clark, Mr. Ruiz, Ms. Pereira, and Mr. Hadjinian; the members have met multiple times discussing the report. Mr. Kracov continued that the purpose of the document is to provide a clear and easy to follow roadmap for the Task Force committee in 2020. Mr. Ruiz

believes that this report could enhance the Task Force's internal operations and be more effective in carrying out its mission and focus in assisting cities and citizens.

Mr. Kracov reported the objective of the draft document is to be easily read and followed. The report contains a table of contents on page 2. Mr. Kracov briefly summarized the introduction on page 3 and stated the report's plan for the Task Force committee: identifying opportunities, challenges, goals, objectives, timelines, and a commitment to monitor the committee's progress and inviting all stakeholders to participate in the effort. Page 4 is a drafted mission statement to identify what the Task Force does. Mr. Kracov further explained the heading "Primary Responsibilities" is a distillation of the County Code as well as State law, regulation, talking about legislative work, planning requirements, and more. Page 6 of the report identifies the subcommittees and their work. Mr. Kracov briefly reviewed the Task Force priorities on Page 7: enhancing the administration of the Task Force including member participation, efficient meetings, functioning of the subcommittees and budget; statutory responsibilities; legislative regulatory and outreach efforts, such as organics infrastructure, funding and capacity; alternative technologies and renewable fuels; CalRecycle enforcement policies; plastic and recycling capacity; and the external goal of legislative and regulatory efforts through increased focus on priorities and improving outreach.

Page 8 is the external goals and objectives page. Mr. Kracov explained that he would like to see the Task Force prioritize its bills and develop an advocacy strategy to be effective in prioritizing the bills. He continued that he would like to improve communication with our local jurisdictions. Mr. Kracov questioned whether Inside Solid Waste Newsletter and letters emailed to every city manager in the County is the most effective way to communicate. He added that the objective is to evaluate and report on effectiveness and inspiring ways to improve Task Force communication with local jurisdictions and external stakeholders and having the newsletter under review. Mr. Kracov would like the Task Force to be the "go to" voice for Los Angeles waste management recycling policy and engage with Task Force members and agencies.

Ms. Landis asked Mr. Kracov who he thinks the external stakeholders are. Mr. Kracov responded that it could be the members of the community, environmental community, and industry community. Ms. Landis commented for that reason she invites the public and representatives of other agencies and committees to attend Task Force meetings to inform the members of any issues or concerns.

Mr. Kracov continued to go over the draft report summarizing the internal goals and objectives on page 9: To have all vacancies of the Task Force committee and the subcommittees filled by March 1, 2020, and obtain a quorum at all committee and subcommittee meetings; training and orientation – to have an efficient

orientation binder for new members by February 1, 2020; enhance agenda procedures with specifics so meetings move efficiently and productively. Mr. Kracov would like the agenda to be drafted 10 days before the meetings so both the Committee and Subcommittee Chairs can engage in giving feedback and assist in finalizing the agenda. Providing the agenda packet materials to members for both main committee and subcommittee meetings, the objective should be one week before the meeting or in all cases to be emailed 48 hours before the meeting, and providing more details on the action items. Ms. Landis mentioned subcommittees exist to filter important information to pass on to the main committee. It is the reason why the sentence “may take action or recommendations from subcommittees” is on the agenda for flexibility.

Mr. Kracov stated the Chair should be allowed to structure the agenda and to control the timing of the meetings to ensure priority matters are acted on and that the meetings are efficient and short. The Chair should feel comfortable moving things around if necessary, as long as the important issues are addressed. Mr. Kracov mentioned concerns regarding the length of the meetings, participation, and wants to make sure the Chair has the support of others in structuring the agenda and controlling the timing of the meetings. Mr. Kracov suggested that Staff prepare a forecast by February 1, 2020, to list which documents and other planning reports that will be presented to the Task Force so the members have a sense of what to expect for the course of the year.

Mr. Kracov read from the draft report that the subcommittees are to provide a report regarding an evaluation of their jurisdictions, define what their duties and priorities are, and perhaps provide feedback and suggestions to the subcommittees and to present to the Task Force in the second quarter of the year by April 1, 2020. Ms. Landis suggested waiting a couple years to implement because her subcommittee (FPRS) reviews the plans of the 88 city jurisdictions within Los Angeles County and cannot guarantee that her meetings could be shortened.

Mr. Kracov spoke of Task Force ensuring a budget. He mentioned that organizations are driven by the budget and sometimes the budget drives the priorities. Mr. Kracov requested a report to see the Task Force’s budget, resource opportunities, and constraints and budget priorities. Staff will prepare by March 1, 2020.

The last point of the draft is to monitor and report on progress on goals and objectives. By January 31, 2021, an update will be given on the status of how the

Task Force and subcommittees are progressing utilizing the 2020 Priorities, Goals, & Objectives Report.

#### **VIII. UPDATE OF THE 2020 PRIORITIES, GOALS, & OBJECTIVES REPORT**

Ms. Reilly asked if an additional agency-member could participate in the Task Force, such as California Contract Cities Association, because they would represent the cities that have outside waste haulers. Mr. Kracov responded that the membership is set according to County Code 3.67. Mr. Ruiz added that any changes in membership would need to be approved by a majority of the cities and according to Assembly Bill 939. Ms. Clark suggested that Ms. Reilly be on the Board of League of Cities. Ms. Reilly could then suggest to the Board the Task Force would like to get a representative from California Contract Cities Association to apply through the League of Cities.

Mr. Mohajer commented that he would like to see a commitment to the budget from the Public Works. Mr. Ruiz commented that the primary expense for the budget has been for labor and within the resources of the monthly budget that strives to provide the resources of what needs to be done. There has not been a set limit. Although initial establishment of the solid waste management fees (tipping fees) included a specific budget that was established setting the fee to include estimated amounts of labor cost for the Task Force with respective duties performed. Mr. Mohajer expressed he would like to see support and commitment to the Task Force from Administration on the 12<sup>th</sup> Floor. Mr. Ruiz commented that the Public Works Director has expressed his interest recently in solid waste and will participate in the Task Force meetings. Mr. Ruiz mentioned there is support to make the Task Force meetings continue to function in the best way it can and that Administration is in support. Staff has provided additional support, such as providing comprehensive reports that are needed in tight deadlines to the Task Force.

Ms. Plambeck commented she would like to see a mention of “waste reduction” in the mission. Mr. Kracov does not support “waste reduction” in the statement and prefers a broader term that encompasses “waste reduction” and prefers the terms “sustainability”, which falls under the topic of “waste reduction”. Mr. Farano commented that the purpose of the Task Force is not mentioned in the Task Force’s mission, such as the Statutory or County Code. Ms. Reilly commented that the mission is what the Task Force wants to do, and the “Statutory Authority” are responsibilities assigned to the committee, since she considers them

separate. Mr. Kracov suggested to change the heading from “Mission” to “Mission Statement”. No oppositions.

Page 5 heading change, “Primary Responsibilities” will be changed to “Statutory Responsibilities”.

Ms. Clark commented on the bullet point regarding budget and if it should be revisited. Mr. Kracov suggested to tether the budget to this plan report. Ms. Clark asked if the committee has been denied anything due to finances. Mr. Ruiz responded no, but there were times when Staff needed to depend on other internal services. Ms. Landis commented that there cannot be a budget based on priorities since problems dealing with solid waste are unknown. Mr. Prieto commented to possibly rephrase the bullet point somehow as “a report on the Task Force priorities and associated support” and come back with a workplan and agree on the tasks to determine the cost of those tasks. Ms. Landis disagreed because the Task Force is a flexible committee that is not aware how to develop budget priorities, other than refreshments. Ms. Clark suggested adding budget item to the agenda to discuss, before making it a goal. Ms. Landis motioned to omit the bullet point goal “Ensure an appropriate Task Force budget.” Mr. Mohajer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Kracov brought up the objective bullet point “Provide more detail in regular meeting agendas on possible action items, including action items from subcommittees”. Ms. Landis commented the second clause should be deleted, and that the phrase “May take action on recommendations from Subcommittee” on the current agenda under the subcommittee is the reason why action items can be discussed in the main committee. Mr. Kracov expressed his disagreement and commented that if a topic is known, it would be good for the public to know as much detail as possible. Mr. Kracov suggested to replace the second clause with “if practicable”. Mr. Ruiz commented that agendas do abide by the Brown Act. However, nothing prevents the Task Force from inserting additional information, especially for key items that benefit the members and the public. It is the Task Force’s decision, provided it complies with the Brown Act.

Ms. Reilly called for cutting off discussion. Ms. Clark took a vote for calling off the discussion. It was a unanimous agreement with no oppositions. Mr. Mohajer motioned to remove the clause within the objectives point “...including action items from subcommittees.” Mr. Kracov substituted a motion to end the clause with “if



practicable”. Ms. Reilly seconded the motion. The motion passed, opposed by Ms. Landis and Ms. Clark.

Mr. Kracov motioned the approval for the 2020 Priorities, Goals & Objectives Report with corrections. Mr. Mohajer seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

#### **IX. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Ms. Clark skipped the item due to time constraints.

#### **X. ECONWARD TECH'S NOWON OPERATION PRESENTATION**

Mr. Carlos Ramos, the president of operations, gave a [presentation](#) of the company Nowon that was founded in 2016, with its United States (US) based operation of Econward located in Azusa, California, and its headquarters in Spain. The main focus of Nowon is to market and distribute technology in the US, starting in California, that was developed to process organic waste. Nowon has labs at their Azusa location which has allowed the company to sample various types of organic wastes and determine different possibilities for the offtake of those samplings. The technology uses an autoclave system, containing four chambers and works with pressurized saturated steam. The technology is compatible with material recovery facilities (MRFs) and mechanical biological treatment (MBT) facilities as well as any other processing equipment or technologies for organic materials. It is a scalable and modular system so there can be as many units added to the system, as needed, depending on the capacity. The residence time, the time that the material goes through the system, is 20 minutes, and total time for the waste to be processed is almost 40 minutes. The modules have a footprint of approximately 3,000ft<sup>2</sup>. The capacity per unit is 6.6 tons per hour or 52,000 tons per year and its operational time is 330 days per year, 24 hours a day. In the lab, Nowon actively tests different types of organic waste and they have been able to determine the following uses for the offtake: accelerated compost, fertilizers, organic soil amendments, building materials, biomethanation and biofuels.

Mr. Pedro Lorenzo continued with the presentation. Nowon provides a link between the feedstock and the end processors by producing an intermediate pathogen-free biomass that is, according to Mr. Lorenzo, a better feedstock for processors while improving cost-efficiency for them. Nowon's technology is able to transform many different waste streams, like food waste, green waste, MRF fines, residuals from MBT plants, and improve efficiency for technologies, such as anaerobic digestion.

Nowon's technology works as a pretreatment to help improve the anaerobic digestion process. Hydrolyzed material is a benefit for digester feeding. The material comes out "uniform" which means it improves digester operation without

pretreatments. It is free of pathogens which helps methanogenic bacteria to colonize the material faster. It is chemically degraded so most complex molecules break down to a simpler form and is easier to break.

The output benefits of the anaerobic digestion are increased biogas production, increased gas production performance, and combined heat and power. With combined heat and power, there is cost-effectiveness in the smaller digester designs.

Accelerated compost benefit means the thermal hydrolysis process takes the biomass to the end of the cooling stage in 20 minutes so the maturation stage can achieve a high-quality compost. Composting time and atmospheric emissions are reduced. The technology allows processors to be in compliance with composting regulations and other regulations such as Senate Bill 1383.

Another alternative for this technology is the production of California Department Food and Agriculture (CDFA) approved soil amendments such as bulk soil amendments, packaged soil amendments, and commercial/specialty fertilizers that comply with the composting regulations as well.

The technology is able to produce pelletized, pathogen-free material as a biofuel for waste-to-energy plants or gasification plants. Nowon can treat any type of material and prepare different recipes that allow for the compliance with air emission standards. Mr. Kracov asked if the company has any users for the pellets or have contracts for them. Mr. Lorenzo responded that there are no users in the US. Mr. Kracov then asked if the pellets could be combusted in California. Mr. Ramos answered yes and added that Nowon is currently working with two end-users and has provided them with the volume of pellets that can be produced from the lab. He continued that the next step is to provide a larger volume to those end users.

The overall benefits are that the technology treats the organic fraction of municipal solid waste (MSW) and it is a fully automated plant which ensures safety, while reducing the carbon footprint on operations, greenhouse gas emissions, and the time of processing for composting and other operations. It is modular and the capacity starts from 50,000 tons a year and overall the technology closes the loop because it provides tools to handle the residual.

Mr. Farano asked about the financial model on the feedstock and if they pay for it themselves. Mr. Ramos responded that the financial models that they have done are all charged on tipping fees. Mr. Farano asked if there needs to be any pre-sorting of green waste, food waste, and other wastes before the process

begins. Mr. Ramos responded yes, that it needs to be pre-sorted through a different facility.

Mr. Ramos and Mr. Lorenzo then played a video which explained the process in far more detail.

Mr. Farano asked how much water usage is in their facility. Mr. Ramos responded that it uses about 64 gallons per ton in the process and recovers about 45 percent of back from the system. Mr. Farano asked what happens to the plastic that is mixed into their waste they process. Mr. Ramos responded that the plastics tend to shrivel and be pulled out with a magnet. Ms. Landis commented that gravel can be mixed into the waste that is being processed and what would be the procedure to remove it. Mr. Ramos responded in the back-end there are systems to pull out certain sizes of gravel and a densiometric gravity table to remove even the smallest of particles.

Mr. Ruiz asked if the lab offers tours. Mr. Ramos responded that the facility does offer tours.

#### **XI. 2018 COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN ANNUAL REPORT**

Mr. Carlos Slythe gave a [presentation](#) on the 2018 Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan Annual Report (Plan). In 2018, the County disposed more than 10 million tons of solid waste (almost 5.4 millions tons in-County and exported over 5 million tons of solid waste). Between 2007 and 2012, disposal of solid waste had declined. In 2014, there was an increase in disposal of solid waste.

Mr. Kracov asked where the 65 percent diversion value came from. Mr. Slythe responded that it was an estimate. Mr. Ruiz contributed that it was an evaluation from all jurisdictions and based on approved submittals.

Mr. Slythe was not able to complete the presentation during the meeting. Ms. Clark requested to have this agenda item again for the next Task Force meeting to review it thoroughly.

#### **XII. CALRECYCLE UPDATE**

CalRecycle representative was not present during this item.

#### **XIII. DECEMBER TASK FORCE MEETING**

Voted unanimously to cancel the December 19, 2019 Task Force meeting, unless an urgent matter arises.

#### **XIV. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m. The next meeting date is tentatively scheduled for Thursday, January 16, 2020, in Conference Room B of Public Works Headquarters.