

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

Minutes of February 18, 2005

Community Recycling/Resource Recovery Inc.
9189 De Garmo Ave
Sun Valley, CA 91352

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Paul Alva, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Mike Mohajer, Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Task Force
Ed Wheless, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
Jeff Yann, Hacienda Heights Improvement Association

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Fernando Berton, California Integrated Waste Management Board
Alex Helou, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation
Kay Martin, Bioenergy Producers Association
John McTaggart, Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Task Force
Eugene Tseng, Eugene Tseng and Associates
Michael Theroux, Theroux Environmental Consulting
Chris Mastro, County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services

OTHERS PRESENT:

Shapoor Hamid, URS Corporation
Virginia Jauregui, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Dan Predpall, URS Corporation
John Richardson, Community Recycling/Resource Recovery Inc.
Coby Skye, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:13 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 21, 2005 MINUTES

Due to lack of quorum, approval of minutes will be considered at next the next Subcommittee meeting.

III. CONTRACTOR UPDATE

Mr. Shapoor Hamid, from URS Corporation, provided the Subcommittee with an update covering the company's activities for January 2005.

Mr. Hamid addressed the following deliverables (handout):

1. Questionnaire to technology suppliers
2. Draft list of screened and ranked facilities
3. Draft Ranking criteria for evaluation of conversion technologies and suppliers/vendors
4. Draft Public Outreach Plan

According to Mr. Hamid, a revised version of item one was sent out January 26, 2005, to suppliers not covered by the initial questionnaire. These new suppliers were given a new response deadline of February 28, 2005. 40 thermal and 30 were biochemical conversion suppliers were contacted. Of these technologies, 21 thermal conversion proponents said they plan responding to the questionnaire, four declined, and 15 are still considering responding to the questionnaire or haven't yet responded to the initial contact. Of the biochemical suppliers, 12 plan to respond to the questionnaire, 18 would consider responding or did not reply to the initial contact, and none declined. After responses are received, URS will proceed with evaluating these suppliers.

For item two, the draft list of screened and ranked facilities will be modified to include information garnered at the current meeting. Currently, six facilities are willing to partner with the Task Force. Although three facilities have been toured, no further tours are planned. Mr. Hamid stated that the potential facility in Perris is under renovation and therefore no tour is scheduled,

although Paul Relis may provide a presentation at the next Subcommittee meeting. Mr. Alva suggested URS also contact proponents of the proposed Santa Clarita facility to give them an equal opportunity to provide a presentation to the Subcommittee. Recently, the proposed Santa Clarita MRF has been under question. Due to several issues, the Central Los Angeles Recycling Center and Transfer Station will not be toured.

Mr. Hamid further stated that many suppliers are concerned with the demonstration facilities 100-ton per day capacity. Proponents consider this capacity to be too small and uneconomical. Because a potential facility of this size would be financially unsustainable, most are willing to go bigger to make a profit or break even. Furthermore, funding would be difficult to obtain for a facility of this size. Mr. Predpall commented that many emerging technologies lack financial support to make a facility greater than the 100-ton per day minimum. These smaller firms would not be able to contribute or secure funds for the construction of an alternative technology facility. Larger firms, such as those currently operating in Japan and Europe, have the potential to contribute funds or find financial backing to build a Southern California facility. Mr. Mohajer commented that because of current statutes, there is no financial incentive to build an alternative facility because these facilities are currently classified as disposal. Mr. Alva suggested part of URS's final plan should incorporate a strategy to realize a private/public financial partnership. Once the list of suppliers has been reduced, the County can examine the issues of funding in more detail.

For items two and three, Mr. Hamid commented that the draft ranking criteria evaluation has not been approved. Since the deadline for suppliers was extended to February 28th, URS requested approval of the ranking criteria be expedited so URS can begin screening the proposed technologies. Comments on the criteria are due to URS by March 25, 2005.

For item four, Mr. Hamid noted that the Public Outreach Plan has still not been approved. Mr. Alva requested URS to forward the draft Public Outreach Plan to all Subcommittee members and that all comments be provided to URS by February 25, 2005.

The next step is to finalize the ranking criteria for evaluation of alternative technology vendors, evaluate screen and rank technology suppliers/vendors and finalize the Public Outreach Plan.

IV. DISCUSSION ON CONTRACTOR DELIVERABLES AND DEADLINES

Mr. Alva commented that URS Contract ends June 30th. Therefore, the Final Report must be finalized as soon as possible.

V. FINAL REPORT AND OPTIONS

Mr. Hamid commented that a draft of the Final Report would be completed by April 15, with the Final Report expected by late May or early June.

Discussion then ensued related to options the Subcommittee could pursue with MRF facilities. Mr. Alva asked if URS would be able to identify potential partnerships in which the Subcommittee can provide assistance for entities interested in developing alternative technology facilities. URS was asked to cover this topic in their final report. Questions were raised about the possibility of locating multiple alternative technology facilities at one location. URS said such an idea would be too complicated to execute, however such a plan may be done in a series of phases.

VI. DISCUSSION OF POTENTIAL CONTRACTS FOR PUBLIC OUTREACH, FACILITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Skye stated the Draft Public Outreach Plan will be finalized the week of the February 21, 2005. Future funding from County Sanitation Districts is expected to cover partial costs of the plan's implementation, and the County is currently trying to secure additional funds for its realization. It was noted that initial stages of the Public Outreach Plan should begin immediately with the Task Force's approval. The County has begun drafting a scope of work to implement the Public Outreach Plan. When the draft scope of work is completed, it will be forwarded to the Subcommittee for its review and comment.

VII. WASTE BOARD CONVERSION TECHNOLOGY REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE UPDATE

Mr. Alva commented that a workshop will be held in Sacramento concerning the Report to the Legislature on March 4, 2005 and that Mr. Skye will be in attendance. Mr. Alva noted that the Task Force sent a letter on Monday, February 14, 2005, to the Waste Board with report comments and recommendations.

VIII. ASSEMBLY BILL 177

Mr. Mohajer presented an update on AB 177 (Bogh). This Spot Bill is currently being amended with the hope new language will be altered to benefit alternative technologies. Of key concern is language related to diversion credit and its relationship to alternative technologies.

IX. CLARIFICATION OF ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES/COMMUNICATION PROTOCOLS

Clarification of Roles and Responsibilities was postponed until the Task Force could provide necessary direction to the Subcommittee.

X. SUBCOMMITTEE WEBSITE UPDATE

Mr. Skye informed members that the Subcommittee website should be online or in its final stages by the next meeting date. Features of the site would include of an area for submittals, updates, or pending materials of member or public concern. A protected access area will also be included for sensitive materials. Mr. Mohajer added that Subcommittee correspondences with regulatory agencies should be a featured component.

XI. OPEN DISCUSSION

No open discussion took place.

XII. SET NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting date is tentatively scheduled for March 17, 2005 at 10 a.m., depending on the level of presentations.

XIII. ADJORNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:33 p.m.

XIV. COMMUNITY RECYCLING/RESOURCE RECOVERY FACILITY TOUR

John Richardson of Community Recycling/Resource Center presented the Subcommittee with a PowerPoint presentation. No tour took place because of the weather.