

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

April 17, 2025

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Margaret Clark, League of California Cities
Jim Smith, Teamster Local 396, City of Los Angeles
Jordan R. Sisson, California Waste and Recycling Association

COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY OTHERS:

Robert Ferrante, rep by Sam Shammass, Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Barbara Ferrer, rep by Shikari Nakagawa-Ota, Los Angeles County Public Health
Mark Pestrella, rep by Cid Tesoro, Los Angeles County Public Works
Barbara Romero, rep by Ron Milo, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Jorgel Chavez, League of California Cities
Eddie De La Riva, League of California Cities
Jeff Farano, Sr., Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries
Eric Lopez, Long Beach Public Works
Wayne Nastri, South Coast Air Quality Management District
Rafael Prieto, City of Los Angeles

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jonathan Brazile, Office of County Counsel Los Angeles County
Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens
Siya Araumi, Los Angeles County Public Works
Charles Darensbourg, Los Angeles County Public Works
Perla Gomez, Los Angeles County Public Works
Anna Gov, Los Angeles County Public Works
Shawntelle Phillips, Los Angeles County Public Works
Carol Saucillo, Los Angeles County Public Works
Emiko Thompson, Los Angeles County Public Works
Kawsar Vazifdar, Los Angeles County Public Works
Caleb Yun, Los Angeles County Public Works

I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 1:13 p.m. by Mr. Cid Tesoro who served as Chair, representing Director Mark Pestrella.

II. APPROVAL OF MARCH 20, 2025, MINUTES

There was no quorum, so the approval of the minutes was postponed to the next meeting on May 15, 2025.

III. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

The following was reported by Mr. Siyavash Araumi:

- Legislature's spring recess began on April 10, 2025, and will reconvene on April 21, 2025.
- All bills must be heard and passed by policy committees by May 2, 2025.
- All policy committees must finish reviewing non-fiscal bills by May 9, 2025.
- The last day for policy committees to meet is May 16, 2025.
- Fiscal committees must finish reviewing all bills in their respective houses by May 23, 2025.
- Committees from both houses have until June 6, 2025, to pass bills introduced in their houses.

There were 18 bills on the [Legislative Table](#) relevant to the Task Force.

Ms. Margaret Clark asked what Chiquita Canyon elevated temperature landfill event meant in Assembly Bill (AB) 27. Ms. Emiko Thompson explained it is a chemical reaction that is occurring within the waste mass about 100 feet below the landfill, which is generating leachate and landfill gas and is a rare event. Temperatures are reaching over 200 degrees caused by the chemical reaction. Ms. Clark asked about composting at the landfill. Mr. Sam Shammass responded that ideally, compost is not wanted at the landfill because of wanting the temperatures kept low, without oxygen to generate methane.

The Task Force requested that staff bring back the following bills as part of discussion at next month's Task Force meeting since they relate to each other:

- AB 27 (Schiavo) - Personal Income Tax Law: Corporation Tax Law: Chiquita Canyon elevated temperature landfill event exclusions.
- AB 28 (Schiavo) - Solid waste landfills: subsurface temperatures.

IV. DISCUSS ASSEMBLY BILL 70 (AGUIAR-CURRY) - SOLID WASTE: ORGANIC WASTE: DIVERSION BIOMETHANE

Mr. Araumi explained the content of [AB 70](#), which focuses on solid waste management, specifically addressing the role of pyrolysis and other conversion technologies (CT). Under the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, pyrolysis is not specifically defined. However, AB 70 would define it as the thermal decomposition of material at elevated temperatures in the absence or near absence of oxygen. AB 70 would also require CalRecycle, in collaboration with the California Air Resources Board to amend its regulations by January 1, 2027, and include pipeline biomethane converted exclusively from organic waste. Mr. Araumi noted that the Memo of Findings (MOF) from the County of Los Angeles Legislative Affairs & Intergovernmental Relations (CEO-LAIR) states there is a Board-adopted policy to support proposals that support procedural innovations or alternative methods to support County-led services, and goals.

Mr. Smith inquired about the MOF supporting AB 70 because it also noted that AB 70 may be contrary to the existing Board-adopted policy related to proposals that reduce environmental pollutants. Mr. Araumi explained that AB 70 is still being reviewed by legislators and if there are any amendments, then the MOF may be revisited. Mr. Smith asked why AB 70 may be contrary to the existing Board-policy. Mr. Charles Darensbourg responded that staff are currently inquiring about possible concerns and that typically, it is at a micro-scale with technology being used without emission protections but that defining pyrolysis may be good in leaning towards the sustainable management of waste. Mr. Ron Milo shared his understanding about environmental pollutants, particularly the thermal composition of the materials creating volatile organic compounds (VOC). The main concern is that VOC easily emits into the air and easily dissolves in liquid. Once VOC is released, it can affect the public. Additional concerns were addressed, and he noted that the South Coast Air Quality Management District is currently monitoring VOC at landfills.

AB 70, AB 1153, and Senate Bill 45 will be agendaized at next month's meeting due to no quorum.

V. DISCUSS ASSEMBLY BILL 1153 (BONTA) - SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL AND CODISPOSAL SITE CLEANUP

Mr. Araumi explained the content of [AB 1153](#), which proposes to abate illegal disposal sites and will provide public entities with grant funding for the removal and disposal of recreational vehicles, development of enforcement strategies, establishment of loan enforcement teams and illegal dumping enforcement officers. The bill would have CalRecycle initiate a cleanup program funded through

the Solid Waste Disposal Site Cleanup Trust fund. AB 1153 aims to address the limitation of the current Illegal and Abandoned Disposal Site Program. Mr. Araumi noted that the MOF from the CEO-LAIR states there is a Board-adopted policy related to proposals that 1) support alternative funding mechanisms to support County-led projects, services, construction, risk mitigation, and goals; and 2) secure funding and expand resources for the development, deployment, improvement, or maintenance of public services.

VI. DISCUSS SENATE BILL 45 (PADILLA AND BLAKESPEAR) - RECYCLING BEVERAGE CONTAINERS: TETHERED PLASTIC CAPS

Mr. Araumi explained the content of [Senate Bill \(SB\) 45](#), which states that beginning January 1, 2027, most plastic beverage bottles with plastic caps must have caps that stay attached to the bottle. If a type of bottle already gets recycled over 70 percent of the time, based on 2022 and 2023 data, it does not have to follow the attached-cap rule until 2028. Certain types of bottles are excluded. At last month's meeting, Task Force members asked the following two questions concerning SB 45:

- 1) Does SB 45 eliminate [California Redemption Value \(CRV\)](#)? No, the CRV remains intact. The bill proposes eliminating the Quality Incentive Payment (QIP) program for thermoform plastic containers but does not impact the CRV program.
- 2) Why does SB 45 not require both bottles and caps to be made with the same material? SB 45 is not required because its focus is more on recyclability and process rather than mandated material and uniformity across all packaging components. Having both bottles and caps made of the same material may also compromise functionality and/or safety.

Mr. Araumi noted that the MOF from the CEO-LAIR states there is a Board-adopted policy related to proposals that mitigate the effects of climate change and reduce environmental pollutants.

Ms. Clark asked when recycling at a materials recovery facility (MRF), if caps will have to be removed and placed in a separate processor. Mr. Araumi responded that it was his understanding because there are different materials which require different machines and different processes. Ms. Clark asked how much it would cost for the MRF to remove caps from bottles, which she felt would be more costly. Ms. Clark asked for a copy of the reasons Mr. Araumi expressed regarding SB 45.

Mr. Shammass asked what the reason was for eliminating the QIP. Mr. Araumi's understanding was that participation in the QIP was very low, at under two percent,

and that the funds previously allocated to QIP, would be reallocated within the same program.

Mr. Sisson mentioned that at last month's meeting there were many questions from two Task Force members, one of which was not present today, and asked if the information provided today adequately addressed the issues so action could be taken at the next meeting. Mr. Milo shared his concern about the plastic cap being attached to the bottle, indicating it would be better to have the same material because the recycler could easily place them in one bin and then they are recycled as one material. Currently, the MRF is separating caps and bottles manually and they put them onto the conveyor with caps going to one bin and bottles going to another since they are isolated materials. The problem lies when the attached caps and bottles go to the recycler because there will be an additional process to separate them, and Mr. Milo anticipates there will be adjustments in the recycling process which would increase rates. Discussion of potential processes and concerns ensued.

Ms. Shikari Nakagawa-Ota commented reiterated from last month's meeting that SB 45 was not intended for recycling purposes, but rather to prevent the caps from being littered at the beach. She noted that SB 45 does sort of explain the lower rate of recycling caps versus bottles, as caps end up on the beach. Ms. Nakagawa-Ota recommended reviewing SB 45 from the standpoint of littering.

Mr. Wayne Hunter of the North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens agreed with Ms. Nakagawa-Ota about the bill aiming to prevent litter but also suggested that the bottle and cap should not only be of the same material, but also the same color.

VII. REPORT FROM THE ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE (ATAS)

Mr. Araumi reported the following from the ATAS meeting:

Clean Energy Fuels provided a [presentation](#) on the newly expanded renewable natural gas (RNG) fueling station that opened at the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts (LACSD) Warren Water Resource Facility in Carson, which provides RNG fuel created from sewage sludge and food waste.

Tetra Tech provided an update on their continued CT project development work.

Staff provided an update on upcoming CT events and conferences that may be found in the [Conversion Technology Newsletter](#).

VIII. REPORT FROM THE FACILITY AND PLAN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE (FPRS)

Ms. Emiko Thompson reported the following from the FPRS meeting:

Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL)

- In March 2025, CCL received seven Notices of Violation (NOVs) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) related to air quality, compared to the eight NOVs reported in February 2025.
- CCL continues to be under a Stipulated Order for Abatement with AQMD. The next AQMD hearing is scheduled for June 4, 2025.
- On April 1, 2025, the Department of Toxic Substances Control issued a [Summary of Violations](#) to CCL.

Sunshine Canyon Landfill (SCL)

- In March 2025, there were 304 odor complaints from the AQMD, compared to the 340 odor complaints in February 2025.
- In March 2025, SCL received nine NOVs from the AQMD, compared to 12 NOVs in February 2025.
- On March 19, 2025, the AQMD Hearing Board approved an Order for Abatement regarding SCL, with 18 mitigation measures to be completed.
- The next AQMD hearing is scheduled for September 2025.

Waste by Rail System (WRS) Update

- Mr. Shammas provided the WRS update, noting major components such as the Materials Recovery Facility in the City of Industry, intermodal facilities, the rail transport, and Mesquite Regional Landfill (Mesquite) located in Imperial County.
- WRS startup requires purchasing equipment, hiring/training staff, and updating service agreements with Union Pacific, which is anticipated to take one to two years before operations begin.
- In the next few months, the LACSD will likely begin to solicit interest in parties wishing to buy or lease components of the WRS.

Finding of Conformance

- Update on the Waste Characterization Study for Antelope Valley Recycling and Disposal Facility, which reflects the incoming waste stream at the landfill during a five-day period.

- Samples were taken in March 2025 and were very similar to the waste characterization completed in Fall 2024 with 62 percent organics, 29 percent plastics, 3 percent glass, and other materials.

Mr. Milo commented that the WRS would be the best solution for municipalities because it eliminates some of the trucks and pollution to maintain air quality. Mr. Milo asked if there would be a compaction process to be made. Mr. Shammass responded that most likely, but it depended. For example, if you are using a facility, such as the Puente Hills MRF, that has a dedicated private road to a nearby intermodal facility, you can then use heavier than street legal loads for a more efficient system, so it would probably use compactors. However, if someone goes over public roads to reach an intermodal facility, then an analysis would have to be completed to see if compactors are needed or if regular packing would reach road legal limits.

Mr. Sisson commented that assuming the WRS happens and notwithstanding the request for proposal (RFP) that is soon to be released to sell or lease some components, the WRS may not come to fruition. Mr. Shammass stated that it was more expensive to do WRS than local facilities so a firm commitment to significant tonnage for a long period is needed before transporting to Mesquite, which is the challenge because nobody is willing to commit to paying the higher rates. Trucking to nearby landfills is cheaper than trucking or by WRS to Mesquite.

Mr. Hunter felt that the RFP to buy or lease components of the WRS implies that they are abandoning waste by rail. He commented that parts of facilities cannot be sold if the plan is to utilize them in the future. He stated that the WRS has been included in the future ability of the County to handle waste at some point, and believed the "buy" of the RFP should be omitted. Mr. Shammass indicated that LACSD is currently open to all options as they may lease or someone may want to operate the entire system; therefore, all options are being evaluated. Discussion ensued.

IX. CALRECYCLE UPDATE

Ms. Adylene Gonzalez was unable to attend the meeting, but provided CalRecycle's [update](#) to staff.

X. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Tesoro informed Task Force members that this year's Juneteenth holiday lands on the third Thursday of June, the day of the Task Force meeting. After discussion, and under the Chair's authority, the Task Force and Subcommittee meetings were

canceled for June unless staff confirm there are urgent matters that should be brought to the attention of the Task Force.

Mr. Milo extended an invitation to Earth Day LA on Saturday, April 26, 2025, at Norman Houston Park, from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m., and would provide the information to staff for dissemination to the Task Force.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled to be held on Thursday, May 15, 2025, at 1 p.m.