

FACILITY AND PLAN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

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

Minutes of March 20, 2003

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

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Albert Avoian, Business/Commerce Representative
John Gulledge, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
Betsey Landis, Environmental Organization Representative
Virginia Maloles, County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services
Michael Miller, Leagues of California Cities-Los Angeles Division

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Rafael Prieto, City of Los Angeles
Ledra Sanchez, City of Gardena

OTHERS PRESENT:

James Aidukas, JTA & Association
Grace Chan, County Sanitation Districts
of Los Angeles County
Dave Edwards, BFI
Mary Edwards, North Valley Coalition
Curt Fujii, BFI
Chris Funk, Weston Firm
Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition
Bernardo Iniguez, City of Bellflower
Frank Kiesler, BFI
Ben Lucha, City of Santa Clarita
Brian McClure, City of La Mirada

John McTaggart, League of California
Cities-Los Angeles Division
Carolyn Meredith, City of Pasadena
Mike Mohajer, County of L.A. DPW
Phil Moralez, CIWMB
Michelle Nicholls, SCS Engineers
Doris Powell, City of Commerce
Paul Ryan, PERA
Esther Simmons, LASER
Susannah Turney, City of Arcadia
Enrique Zaldivar, City of Los Angeles

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 11:38 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 20, 2003

The minutes of February 20, 2003, were approved unanimously.

III. CONSIDERATION OF A FINDING OF CONFORMANCE FOR SUNSHINE CANYON LANDFILL

Mr. Carlos Ruiz from the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works reviewed the staff report (see attached) on the requested Finding of Conformance for Sunshine Canyon Landfill. He specified that BFI is requesting an FOC for Phase I of the City Landfill, Unit 2 only. The proposed Phase I disposal site will be located within the portion of the BFI-owned property that is within the City of Los Angeles. This proposed Unit 2 landfill covers 194 acres, which will be developed in two phases. Phase I will consist of about 84 acres of initial development and Phase II will cover an additional 110 acres, and will partially overlay the Phase I areas. Phase I of the City Landfill, Unit 2 will consist of five years of operation with a capacity that will not exceed 16 million tons. According to the City's zoning ordinance, BFI is required to obtain City approval before development of Phase II. A third Phase might occur following review of the Landfill's operating history by the City Director of Planning.

Mr. Ruiz stated staff has reviewed the proposal and finds that the proposed project is in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the City's General Plan. Staff also finds the project consistent with the County Integrated Waste Management Plan and the goals and policies delineated in the siting criteria of the Countywide Siting Element.

Mr. Ruiz explained some of the conditions that have been included in the FOC. Condition No. 1 would limit the landfilling operations to Phase I of the City Landfill. Condition No. 5 states the vertical height of the Landfill cannot exceed 2,000 feet above sea level. Condition No. 6 stipulates the FOC would terminate if the City prohibits the operation of the Landfill. Condition No. 10 specifies the Landfill operator must work with the Task Force to promote conversion technologies and also specifies the types of activities that are expected from the Landfill operator as a result of this Condition. Condition No. 15 would require the

operator to comply with all the mitigation necessary listed in Attachment D of the staff report in order to be in compliance with the Siting Criteria (see Attachment D). Condition No. 16 would require that all buildings and enclosed structures onsite that are within 1,000 feet of disposal areas be protected from migrating landfill gas.

Mr. Dave Edwards, Project Director for Sunshine Canyon Landfill, made a presentation on BFI's proposal for Phase I of City Landfill Unit 2. He began with a brief project overview and stated that BFI intends to implement the same programs in the proposed City portion of the Landfill that are conducted in the County portion. These include: a drop off/buy back center for source-separated waste oil or recyclables, source-separated green waste for use onsite as well as for sending offsite, and accepting and separating clean loads of soil, rock, concrete, and asphalt.

Mr. Edwards also detailed how BFI's proposed landfill meets all FOC requirements. The proposed capacity will not exceed 5,500 tons per day, with a maximum weekly capacity of 30,000 tons. The landfill will also accept up to 3,000 tons per week of inert/exempt materials. The proposal includes the implementation of a load checking program to include driver interviews, visual inspections, remote TV monitors, portable and fixed radiation detection devices, and portable VOC sensors. Mr. Edwards explained leachate will be collected, stored, and treated for either discharge into the City sewer system or for use onsite. Landfill gas will be collected and treated in a landfill gas management system and incinerated in flare stations located throughout the Landfill. The planned end use for the proposed Landfill is open space and parkland that is consistent with the City's General Plan and zoning requirements.

Mr. Edwards' presentation focused mostly on how the proposed project complies with the Siting Criteria in the CSE. He explained the residential community living south of the Landfill will be protected by a 100-acre open space visual and noise buffer. Over 1,000 acres of parkland will be dedicated to providing an additional buffer between the Landfill and the surrounding community.

Mr. Edwards also added that the groundwater below the proposed Landfill is non-potable. There are no groundwater extraction wells within a one-mile radius of the Landfill. The proposed Landfill will be underlain by Towsley Formation bedrock and liner systems with subdrains.

Ms. Betsey Landis asked what kind of liner the inactive City Landfill has currently and whether BFI plans to replace the liner. Mr. Edwards stated that BFI plans to use a waste-to-waste liner system. A plastic liner will be placed on top of the inactive City Landfill, separating the old Landfill from the new Landfill. Ms. Landis

asked if there are any leachate or migration problems in the inactive Landfill. Mr. Edwards replied they do not have a leachate problem that has been identified in the existing or inactive Landfill.

Ms. Landis stated that she is concerned about mitigations because offsite mitigations are mentioned frequently in the proposal. She stated that one of the mentioned mitigations is replacing the oak trees that were removed from the inactive City Landfill and asked if it has been vegetated yet. Mr. Edwards explained BFI is currently going through a formal closure process for the inactive City Landfill.

Ms. Landis stated that she is concerned because BFI's proposal states mitigation money will be used outside of the surrounding community in locations such as San Fernando Valley. She is also concerned about the way the Joint Powers Agreement is written because she would like to see more County representation in the JPA.

Mr. Chris Funk, attorney for BFI, stated a JPA has not been established yet because the City and County Landfills have not been combined yet. In order to establish a JPA, the City and the County would need to agree upon the terms of the agreement. Mr. Funk stated that is not the part of the City Landfill that is being discussed presently. Mr. Mike Mohajer reminded the Task Force members that the FOC they are considering is for Phase I of the City Landfill, Unit 2 only.

Mr. Avoian asked if anyone in the audience would like to make any comments. Mr. Enrique Zaldivar from the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation provided comments to the Task Force members. He stated the City of Los Angeles has a self-imposed 70 percent waste diversion requirement and anything that has the potential to provide more diversion is of special interest to the City. Mr. Zaldivar stated he would like more clarification on what BFI will be willing to do with respect to alternative technologies that will increase diversion.

Mr. Zaldivar also stated that one of the goals of the CSE is the implementation of more diversion operations within the facility. He stated he would like more clarification about what that might entail. He explained he believes more can be done in the interest of increased diversion.

Mr. Zaldivar also commented on the sequence of approval with respect to the Waste Discharge Requirements. He stated that in the past, the Task Force has waited for approval of the WDR before acting. He asked the Task Force to consider waiting for approval of the WDR in this case, too.

Ms. Mary Edwards from the North Valley Coalition also provided comments to the Task Force members. She stated BFI has received over 80 citations during the last few years and that BFI is in violation of CEQA in several ways. Ms. Edwards stated the document the public received outlined certain operations such as recycling to be done onsite within 24 hours, but that there would not be heavy recycling operations. However, the Joint Technical Document contains plans for expanded operations such as a proposal for a construction and demolition operation that the public never had the opportunity to contemplate.

The Joint Technical Document also refers to other materials that could be used as alternative daily cover even though the only materials mentioned in the environmental impact report were greenwaste, dirt, and tarps. The Joint Technical Document states that BFI plans to use contaminated sediment as alternative daily cover and stockpile it for 180 days. Ms. Edwards stated the public was not informed of these plans.

Ms. Edwards also stated the inactive City Landfill closed its doors in 1991, but the Landfill has never been formally closed. She stated that BFI did not want to close the Landfill so they could establish an infrastructure for their Landfill expansion plans. According to Ms. Edwards, BFI put a retroactive gas collection system in the inactive City Landfill that can only collect 50 percent of the Landfill gas that is produced.

She stated residents have had respiratory problems and have been sick frequently as a result of the lack of proper closure of the inactive City Landfill. Ms. Edwards explained that the focus should be on promoting a policy that would require the whole waste stream to be sent to a materials recovery facility first instead of trying to expand landfills.

Mr. Wayne Hunter from the North Valley Coalition also provided comments to the Task Force members. Mr. Hunter stated the Task Force should continue reviewing other information that has been provided by the public before making an FOC decision. He stated there are many things that Public Works staff and Task Force members did not know that should be considered before making a decision.

Ms. Esther Simmons of LASER also provided comments to the Task Force members. She explained the clarifier that takes the leachate and condensate from the Landfill to the sewer system is located in the buffer zone. Ms. Simmons stated that sporadic odor problems began in the neighborhood in 2001 and correlate with the leachate discharges. She stated she would like these problems addressed before BFI is allowed to continue with their construction plans.

Task Force members discussed the issues that were mentioned by the public. Mr. Mohajer stated the issues mentioned by the public are not within the jurisdiction of the Task Force. He stated the Task Force is only reviewing the siting criteria identified in the CSE. He explained the FOC is contingent on whether BFI attains all necessary permits and the problems that were mentioned by the public are within the jurisdiction of the agencies that issue those permits.

A motion was made to recommend to the Task Force that the FOC be granted to BFI. The motion passed with one Task Force member opposing.

IV. OPEN DISCUSSION/PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no open discussions or public comments made during the meeting.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:25 p.m.