

Facility and Plan Review Subcommittee
Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/
Integrated Waste Management Task Force

Minutes of November 19, 2015, Meeting

County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Conference Room C, Headquarters Building
900 South Fremont Avenue
Alhambra, California 91803

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Gerardo Villalobos, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health
Betsey Landis, Environmental Organization Representative
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative
Carlos Ruiz, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Christopher Salomon, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County

OTHERS PRESENT:

Martins Aiyetiwa, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Joe Bartolata, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Russell Bukoff, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Gabriel Esparza, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Anna Gov, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Bahman Hajjialiakbar, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition/Sunshine Canyon Landfill – Community Advisory
Committee
Patrick Kwong, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Jonathan Lee, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Jalaine Madrid, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Karlo Manalo, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Dave Nguyen, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Trishena Robinson, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Rob Sherman, Republic Services, Inc.
Carlos Slythe, County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works
Joe Vitti, Sunshine Canyon Landfill – Community Advisory Committee

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 11:06 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 15, 2015, MEETING MINUTES

A motion to approve the Minutes of the October 15, 2015, meeting was made by Mr. Mike Mohajer, seconded by Mr. Christopher Salomon, and it was unanimously approved.

III. UPDATE ON THE SUNSHINE CANYON CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL

Odor Complaints

Mr. Karlo Manalo provided the Subcommittee with an update on odor complaints at the Sunshine Canyon Landfill (Landfill) for the month of October 2015.

During the month of October 2015, 370 complaints were made to the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) hotline. In comparison with September 2015, the number of complaints received in October 2015 increased by 10 percent (from 337 to 370 complaints). Compared to October 2014, the number of complaints in October 2015 increased by 66 percent (from 223 to 370 complaints).

Mr. Manalo reported that out of the 370 complaints received in October 2015, 49 complaints were called in from nearby schools or from complainants who identified themselves as parents of students attending one of the nearby schools. There were seven Notices of Violations (NOVs) issued to the Landfill by the AQMD in the month of October 2015.

Mr. Manalo also provided the Subcommittee with two sets of charts. The first set of [charts](#), provided by AQMD, show the number of odor complaints attributed to the Landfill, which were reported to the AQMD from 1995 to October 2015. The second set of [charts](#), developed by Staff, shows the number of odor complaints compared with the amount of surface gas exceedances and the amount of leachate collected from January 2009 to October 2015. These charts also include a timeline of noted special occurrences and operational enhancements of the Landfill's environmental protection and control systems. The information provided on these charts was taken from monitoring reports submitted by

Republic Services, Inc. (Republic), to various agencies as well as updates from various meetings involving the Landfill.

Mr. Mike Mohajer expressed the importance of NOVs, requesting that staff provide the Subcommittee with copies of the NOVs at each of its meetings. Mr. Carlos Ruiz stated staff will include the NOVs along with the odor complaints each month.

Sunshine Canyon Landfill Revised Finding of Conformance

Mr. Gabriel Esparza provided the Subcommittee with an update on the status of the Landfill's Revised Finding of Conformance.

At the previous Subcommittee meeting held on October 15, 2015, it was discussed that Republic had implemented the Alternative Daily Cover (ADC) Pilot Program at the Landfill on October 12, 2015, without obtaining a revised Finding of Conformance (FOC) from the Task Force due to the change in operations. On October 15, 2015, staff sent a letter to Republic, titled [Revised Finding of Conformance](#), restating that a revised FOC is necessary. On November 2, 2015, Republic responded to staff with a letter to the Task Force, titled [Task Force Letter Dated 10-15-15 Regarding Revised Finding of Conformance](#), maintaining their assertion that an FOC is not needed. On November 12, 2015, staff responded to Republic with a letter, titled [Revised Finding of Conformance-ADC Pilot Project](#), stating that the Task Force is currently placing a hold on the revision to the existing FOC and will consult with County Counsel on the matter. Staff will notify Republic if an FOC is required within 30 days of the date of the Task Force letter, which is December 12, 2015.

Third Quarter 2015 Vegetation Report

Mr. Russell Bukoff provided the Subcommittee with an update on the [Third Quarter 2015 Vegetation Project Status Report at the Sunshine Canyon City/County Landfill](#), as well as topics that were discussed at the November 10, 2015, quarterly meeting with Republic Services, Architerra Design Group (ADG), John Minch and Associates, the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, the Independent Monitor, and Public Works regarding vegetation efforts at the Landfill.

Update on County Side Sage Mitigation Area

- Conditions remain unchanged; however, plans will be developed by ADG, Republic's general vegetation consultant, for a trial site in the sage mitigation areas to test new methods to revegetate the site.

Update on City Side Sage Mitigation Area

Middle and Upper Decks:

- There have been no changes to the middle or upper decks. The vegetated areas within the Middle Deck continue to be dominated by non-native species.
- Republic reports that a weed control program on Decks A and B will be implemented along with the mitigation plans for these areas.

Lower Deck (Pilot Sage Mitigation Area):

- Saltbush species dominate the cover and have only slightly increased in number since the second quarter assessment; however, other native species are beginning to flourish as a result of selective pruning of the Saltbush.
- Republic is currently weeding Barnyard Grass and Horseweed to control it before it gets out of control.
- Irrigation has been shut off in October. ADG will evaluate the pilot area at the end of spring 2016 to assess if any irrigation will be needed for future reseeded areas or container plantings.
- ADG recommends soil sampling in areas where vegetation is minimal and areas where vegetation is thriving, which should be implemented winter 2016.

General Information

As the Pilot Project has been going on for several years now, Public Works will be asking Republic to provide a summary in the next

Vegetation Report on the lessons learned so far and a time estimation on how much longer the Pilot Project needs to go on before they take what they have learned and apply it to the rest of the City Sage Mitigation Area and the County Sage Mitigation Area.

Evaluation of the Landfill Odor Problem Report Prepared by Yazdani Consulting for AQMD

Mr. Charles Tupac of AQMD provided the Subcommittee with a presentation on the Evaluation of the Landfill Odor Problem Report prepared by Hydro Geo Chem, Inc. (HGC), and Dr. Ramin Yazdani of Yazdani Consulting.

Mr. Tupac discussed that HGC performed baro-pneumatic tests at several different locations within the Landfill. The tests measured the atmospheric pressure and subsurface pressure within the gas collection control system at various depths and distances from several vertical wells. They also measured the gas quality at each of these sites. The purpose of the testing was to analyze vertical gas permeability of refuse and soil cover, to estimate the Landfill's gas generation and gas quality, and porosity of refuse and soil cover. HGC concluded that the gas permeability of the cover soil was relatively high, which has led to leakage of landfill gas, reduced lateral influence on vertical wells, and the increased the possibility of air and rain intrusion into the cover. HGC also concluded that cover soil would restrict water and landfill gas vertical transport. They believe that addressing the problem by adding more vertical wells could cause further problems through over-pumping of landfill gas.

HGC has also made the following recommendations to address the high permeability of both the intermediate and daily soil cover:

- Thicken and compact the intermediate cover or use soil with lower permeability if available.
- Use spray-on treatment or other means to modify permeability of cover soil.
- Use tarps instead of soil.
- Do not use low permeability soils as cover, which could cause liquid and gas barriers.

- Use degradable ADC, if allowable, with higher permeability and low Volatile Organic Compound when buried.
- Re-assess drainage design to prevent water from reaching the bottom of the Landfill, which will lead to reduced extraction efficiency.
- Divert leachate in intermediate lifts to leachate collection system.
- Install pumps in wells to dewater and reduce water saturation.
- Use trials/field testing to identify problems and increase the frequency by which gas quality is measured at the Landfill.

Mr. Tupac stated that Dr. Yazdani read HGC's report and recommended laboratory testing of cover soil samples to accurately measure the density, porosity, and gas transport properties of the soil. He also stated that the presence of sulfur in the cover soil might be producing odor. Dr. Yazdani also recommended the use of green waste as ADC, if allowed, spray-on products or bio-tarps as cover. In terms of finding out the source of landfill odors, Dr. Yazdani recommended using tracer gas studies to attempt to locate and identify landfill gas emissions.

Mr. Mohajer commented that it will take some time to review the recommendations and noted that the City of Los Angeles prohibits the use of green waste as ADC at the Landfill.

Mr. Carlos Ruiz commented on the permeability of cover soil and stated that porous soils placed on top of compacted trash aid in the flow of gas collection. He asked for the conclusion that the study has drawn when a porous soil is laid down over compacted trash, which is more porous than the anticipated standard soil to be used. Mr. Tupac replied that the report was merely a summary and acknowledged that there were some dualities in the physical property of the soil when it is laid on top of the Landfill as opposed to the soil being buried. Mr. Tupac also stated that when the soil is laid on top, it has a certain moisture content, but when it is buried it takes on more moisture due to the surroundings and lets the landfill gas go through.

Ms. Betsey Landis stated that the issue with the odor at the Landfill comes down to the construction of the gas collection system and its efficiency. As waste is being placed deeper into the Landfill, compaction will cause lower permeability regardless of moisture content, thus the well system should be built to properly handle the collection of moisture. She also said that it is not a good idea to fill leachate collection pipes with rocks as they will need to be cleaned once the pipes fill up with leachate.

Mr. Mohajer stated the conclusion that a porous cover soil is impeding gas flow in the Landfill is technically flawed for the reason that if the cover soil is more porous than the soil over the gas collection pipes above Landfill's liner system, gas will not be drawn into the gas collection system and only water is pumped out of the extraction wells.

Mr. Christopher Salomon stated that in terms of technical design of a composite liner system, the layers that are typically put on top of the liner itself are intended to be of high permeability in order to make sure leachate collected does not make it out of the landfill and is properly collected. He stated that it may be speculative to conclude that the permeability of the cover material has a higher permeability than the material placed over the gas collection pipes.

Ms. Landis questioned some of the conclusions made by HGC and Yazdani Consulting, stating the conclusions were equivocal since one conclusion states that the high permeability of cover soil leads to gas leakage, reduces lateral influence and an increase in air/rain intrusion, while the other conclusion states that landfill cover restricts water and landfill gas vertical transport, not lateral transport. However, she stated that she believes it is a good idea to collect intermediate cover soil core samples and perform more tests to gather definitive and useful data.

Mr. Sherman added that people can interpret different things from the report, and for him, he interprets that the report says the Landfill gas collection system is adequate. However, the Landfill is working with the LEA on testing intermediate soil cover for its effectiveness in the vertical transport of gas.

The Subcommittee agreed that as there are conflicting statements in the report, there is a need for more soil testing in order to draw a proper conclusion. Mr. Wayne Hunter asked what is the AQMD's schedule and method of delivering its final recommendations to the Landfill. Mr. Tupac stated he did not have an

answer for this question at this time, but he would relay this question to the management staff at AQMD for a response to be provided at the next Subcommittee meeting.

IV. REVIEW OF THE PRELIMINARY DRAFT COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT

Mr. Joe Bartolata provided the Subcommittee a [presentation](#) summarizing the revisions to the Preliminary Draft Countywide Siting Element (CSE).

On June 16, 2014, Public Works released the Initial Study and Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the CSE to the 180 responsible agencies for review. Six public scoping meetings were held throughout the County. Comments on the Initial Study and NOP were received from the Task Force as well as nine responsible agencies. At the Task Force meeting held on October 16, 2014, staff provided an update on the status of revisions to the CSE. It was also reported that the document would be revised to update the base year and reflect the recent changes in State law. Public Works advised the consultant to hold off on the preparation of the Draft EIR until the revision was completed.

The Subcommittee members were provided with copies of the proposed revisions to the CSE. Also included in the package were other sections such as the Acknowledgement, the List of Acronyms, and the Glossary of Terms. The Executive Summary was not included in the package as it will be revised based on comments received from individual chapters. The following are key revisions and changes that were made throughout the document:

- Updated the base year to 2014, including updates to disposal data and solid waste facilities information.
- Considered the impacts of current legislation on the countywide diversion and disposal quantities, such as mandatory commercial recycling (AB 341), diversion of organic waste from landfills through organic recycling programs (AB 1826) and the prohibition on local disposal limits (AB 845). The CSE was also updated to include information regarding engineered municipal solid waste (EMSW) or EMSW conversion and facilities (AB 1126).
- Revised definitions of terms based on recent changes in state law.

Mr. Bartolata discussed the changes made to CSE Chapters 2, 4, 5, and 9, which have the most significant revisions throughout the document.

Chapter 2

Due to current changes in legislation, the following revisions were made in Chapter 2, which establishes the Goals and Policies of the CSE:

- Goal No. 4 was revised to include recycling of organic materials from the waste stream.
- Policy No. 4.3 was added for developing a countywide organics management plan.
- Policy No. 4.5 was revised based on AB 1594 regarding the use of green material as alternative daily cover.
- Policy No. 5.1 was added for developing a regional operational area mass debris removal plan.

Chapter 4

The scenario analysis described in Chapter 4 was updated to quantify the current disposal rate and assessment of disposal capacity needs.

Seven scenarios were presented, which considered the following strategies: (1) the use of existing permitted in-County disposal capacity, (2) an increase in diversion rate, (3) proposed in-County Class III landfill expansions, (4) the use of alternative technology capacity, and (5) exports to out-of-County landfills.

In addition, the scenario analysis also considered the implications of CalRecycle's State of Disposal in California and State of Recycling in California reports on the countywide diversion rate and disposal quantities.

Chapter 5

Revisions to Chapter 5, which describes Alternative Technologies, included the following changes on Biomass Conversion (SB 498):

- Provided an update and clarification on the alternative technology processes, such as the distinction between diversion and/or disposal.
- Included the City of Los Angeles' Solid Waste Integrated Resource Plan.

Chapter 9

Eagle Mountain Landfill was removed from the list of proposed new out-of-County landfills from Chapter 9, which describes out-of-County disposal.

Mr. Bartolata stated that by the end of December 2015, staff would like to receive comments from the Subcommittee on the CSE. He asked that all comments be directed to Mr. Martins Aiyetiwa. Staff will incorporate these comments and present them at the next Subcommittee meeting. Upon the Subcommittee's consideration, staff will present the CSE to the Task Force. After the Task Force's concurrence, staff will advise the consultant to resume the preparation of the Draft EIR. Once the Draft EIR and the graphic design of the CSE are completed, Public Works will release both documents for public, city, and agency review. Public Works is also preparing the countywide organics management plan as a supplement to the CSE.

Mr. Mohajer inquired about the specific revisions to Policy No. 4.3 in Chapter 2 regarding the development of a countywide organics management plan and how it will affect the approval of the CSE. Mr. Ruiz stated that the State of California recently passed AB 876 that requires each county in its annual report to provide an estimate of the amount of organic waste that will be generated in the county over a 15-year period, an estimate of the additional organic waste recycling facility capacity needed, and areas identified by the county as locations for new or expanded organic waste recycling facilities capable of safely meeting the additional need. This policy was added to satisfy State requirements and to provide useful information to jurisdictions for their planning purposes.

Discussion ensued and Mr. Salomon stated that the countywide organics management plan would be more suitable for addition to the County's Source Reduction and Recycling Element, rather than the CSE. Mr. Martins Aiyetiwa added that the recycling of materials, as it relates to the management of solid waste over a 15-year period, is consistent with the goals of the CSE. Mr. Mohajer insisted that it would be difficult to obtain approval of the CSE from

jurisdictions if the organics management plan sites facilities in cities that would not want to have them identified. He stated the CSE should only address disposal; however, Mr. Ruiz assured the Subcommittee that the organics management plan would only be referenced in the CSE – no programs would be developed. After additional discussion, the Subcommittee suggested that Policy No. 4.3 should be oriented towards developing a goal and policy of the County and various cities within the County to develop an adequate organics management plan that would be compliant with the law and regulations in effect.

V. AB 901 SUMMARY AND IMPACT ON SWIMS

Mr. Patrick Kwong provided the Subcommittee with a summary of Assembly Bill (AB) 901 and its impact on the County of Los Angeles' Solid Waste Information Management System (SWIMS).

AB 901 was approved and signed by Governor Jerry Brown on October 10, 2015. AB 901 was filed with the Secretary of the State also on October 10, 2015, and becomes effective on January 1, 2016.

AB 901 revises some of the reporting requirement in the Public Resources Code. Currently, disposal facilities are required to submit their disposal tonnages by jurisdiction to the county in which they are located. With AB 901 in effect, these disposal facilities will be required to submit their disposal tonnages directly to CalRecycle and to the counties that request the information. Another change is that recycling and composting operations and facilities will be required to send information, such as material types and quantities disposed, sold or processed directly to CalRecycle instead of sending this information to the County. CalRecycle may provide this information to jurisdictions aggregated by company upon request. Exporters, brokers, and transporters of recyclables or compost will also have to submit this material types and quantities information to CalRecycle.

To streamline reporting, AB 901 eliminates the requirement for recycling facilities to identify the county of origin for the recycled material they handle. AB 901 also eliminates the requirement for counties to submit periodic reports to CalRecycle and to the cities within their county.

AB 901 also provides CalRecycle with the authority to conduct audits, inspections, observe facilities, investigate recordkeeping, and enforce monetary penalties to ensure reporting is accurate. In addition to CalRecycle, an

employee of a government entity may, at the disposal facility, inspect and copy records related to tonnages received at the facility on or after July 1, 2015, and originate within the government entity's geographic jurisdiction.

AB 901 allows CalRecycle to impose penalties of \$500 to \$5,000 on any person who refuses or fails to submit the required information. CalRecycle can also impose penalties of \$500 to \$10,000 on any person who knowingly files a false report, refuses to permit CalRecycle to inspect their records, fails to keep records for inspection, or falsifies records. These fines are for each violation or for continuing violations for each day that the violation continues. CalRecycle may pursue these fines through civil action, or impose them administratively.

Mr. Kwong continued by giving a brief background on SWIMS and examining AB 901's impact on SWIMS. SWIMS is a website located at www.LACountySWIMS.org and is used by solid waste facility operators and waste haulers to submit their required information, such as solid waste origin, tonnages, etc. electronically to the County. The data from the submitted forms are aggregated by SWIMS, organized into various reports, and made available to CalRecycle and jurisdictions on a quarterly basis.

Under AB 901, disposal facilities would only be required to submit disposal tonnages to counties that request the information. The County will have to request disposal facility operators to continue to provide their disposal tonnages via SWIMS. Under AB 901, recycling and composting facilities are only required to submit periodic materials information to CalRecycle. CalRecycle may provide this information aggregated by company upon request to the County. The County will have to request CalRecycle to provide us with the information from the recycling and composting facilities. The County will also have to import the provided data into SWIMS in order to generate the respective SWIMS reports.

In turn, the County is no longer required to provide disposal reports to CalRecycle and cities within Los Angeles County. Since it is no longer required to provide these reports, the County may deactivate or remove some SWIMS reports. CalRecycle will be scheduling workshops soon, but they have yet to begin developing regulations to implement the law.

Mr. Ruiz expressed his concern that with the implementation of AB 901, information will now be sent one way to CalRecycle, and they alone will control access to disposal information. Ms. Landis also expressed her concern on the

amount of resources in staff and dollars CalRecycle will need to properly manage the new disposal reporting system.

VI. STATUS UPDATE ON THE APPLICATION FOR A FINDING OF CONFORMANCE FOR THE AZUSA LAND RECLAMATION LANDFILL

Ms. Anna Gov provided the Subcommittee with a status update on the Azusa Land Reclamation Inc. (ALR) application for an FOC.

ALR submitted an application on July 29, 2014, to the Task Force for an FOC. On November 12, 2014, Public Health acting as the Local Enforcement Agency issued the revised Solid Waste Facility Permit (SWFP), the Initial Study/Environmental Checklist, and Addendum to the 1988 Negative Declaration that was certified and filed on November 18, 2014.

During the course of review, staff also determined that a portion of Zones III and IV (of the Landfill) is located in the City of Irwindale, and that the Irwindale land use permit (LUP) has expired and there is currently no active permit for the portions in the City of Irwindale. To ensure the FOC application is fully complete, staff has contacted the facility operator to address the LUP issue. On October 28, 2015, the facility operator acknowledged the expired Irwindale CUP, but also confirmed that there are no active operations in this area, mining, or reclamation. The operator indicated that they would obtain the required entitlements prior to the commencement of work in that area. The operator will continue to keep the Task Force informed of any new developments.

After further discussion, the Subcommittee requested Staff to send a letter previously approved by the Task Force to ALR requesting that the Landfill revise the FOC application by updating the site plan to include only those portions where the landfill has a current land use entitlement or permit and thus removing the City of Irwindale portions. Mr. Villalobos shared his concern that if the City of Irwindale's portion is removed from the site plan, this action might negate the recently issued revised Solid Waste Facility Permit and trigger another revision to the Landfill's SWFP. Mr. Mohajer responded that the responsibility falls on the Facility Operator.

VII. DISCUSSION OF FINDING OF CONFORMANCE REPORTS

There was no discussion on this item.

VIII. OPEN DISCUSSION/PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:47 p.m.