

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

Minutes for July 17, 2018

County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
900 South Fremont Avenue
Alhambra, CA 91803

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Martins Aiyetiwa, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Dorcas Hanson-Lugo, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health
Betsey Landis, Environmental Organization Representative *
Mike Mohajer, Chair, General Public Representative
Carlos Ruiz, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Sam Shammass, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Maurice Pantoja, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health
Reyna Pereira, City of Los Angeles

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jeff Clarin, Waste Connection
Brenda Eells, Jacobs
Isaac Reyes Gomez
Dennis Montano, Sunshine Canyon Landfill
Dave Nguyen, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Carol Oyola, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Saeid Sherzadigan, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works

* Designates participants over the telephone

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Mohajer called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m.

II. CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL - FINDING OF CONFORMANCE (FOC)

Mr. Shirzadegan stated FOC was scheduled for consideration at the June 21, 2018, FPRS Meeting. However, due to time constraints, a special FPRS Meeting was held today to consider the FOC.

- The Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL) is an existing Class III municipal solid waste landfill located within the unincorporated community of Castaic in Los Angeles County. On July 28, 2017, the Board of Supervisors granted the Landfill a new Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The CUP allows the site to receive waste from the Santa Clarita Valley which includes Val Verde, Castaic, Santa Clarita, and the surrounding unincorporated County; the northern San Fernando Valley and the greater Los Angeles Basin.
- There was an existing FOC issued by the Task Force on February 19, 1998. However, since the Landfill underwent an expansion, obtained a new land use permit and is being issued new Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR), a new FOC is required in accordance with the Countywide Siting Element. Additionally, Condition No. 100 of the new CUP required the Landfill to obtain an FOC from the Task Force.
- Currently, the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) and the Regional Water Board are reviewing the applications for a Solid Waste Facility Permit and WDR. These two permits are anticipated to be granted by the end of this year.

Staff reviewed the FOC application for compliance with the requirements for granting of an FOC, as established in the Countywide Siting Element. It is staff's finding that the application meets the requirements, and therefore, recommends granting the FOC subject to the "Conditions of Approval" specified in the Staff Report.

Mr. Shirzadegan asked Ms. Hanson-Lugo for a status on the Solid Waste Facility Permit. Ms. Hanson-Lugo answered that they will be having an informational meeting on August 1, which will push the issuance of the permit to September or October.

Mr. Shirzadegan stated that staff contacted the Regional Water Board about the WDR and they said they will issue the permit potentially by November of this year.

Mr. Shirzadegan gave a presentation displaying a map showing the location of the landfill with boundaries and a land use map, showing existing areas and waste boundaries of the proposed area and also the future development involving mixed use area. He stated the hours of operation at the landfill:

- Upon effective date of the CUP (July 28, 2017) through December 31, 2024, the Facility may receive Solid Waste and Beneficial Use Materials only between the hours of 4:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday.
- Effective January 1, 2025, to 2047, the Facility may receive Solid Waste and Beneficial Use Materials only between the hours of 5:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday.

Mr. Shirzadegan stated the tonnage break down: from 2017 to 2024, landfill can accept 2.8 million tons per year. From 2025 and onward, they can accept 1.8 million tons per year. The type of waste allowed at the landfill are non-hazardous waste, municipal solid waste, green waste, construction and demolition waste, and electronic waste (e-waste).

Mr. Mohajer asked if he could dispose a TV at the facility. Mr. Ruiz answered that the landfill is not meant for disposal of e-waste. Because there is a provision for operating a household hazardous waste facility at this site, e-waste can be received, but not disposed of. Mr. Mohajer stated there needs to be clarification in the FOC that e-waste is not for land disposal, only for recycling. Mr. Mohajer commented he was asked a question about toasters and he was not sure whether a toaster is considered e-waste. Mr. Shammas stated some e-waste collectors do take all corded materials, depending on the firm, but they always take TVs. Mr. Nguyen mentioned that in the CUP, e-waste is for recycling.

Mr. Shirzadegan continued with presentation, stating that staff's recommendation is to grant the FOC, subject to the following conditions: including tonnage capacity, restrictive waste, mitigation measures, subsurface gas migration, odor migration and hours of operation. However, CCL suggested revisions to the FOC conditions on June 19, 2018, mainly due to the current ongoing legal challenges of CUP conditions. Staff recommends FOC conditions to remain as proposed since they were based on the adopted CUP conditions.

Mr. Mohajer asked to go over the proposed conditions. Ms. Eells said CCL made some proposed revisions to the conditions, some due to the ongoing legal challenge. She stated the FOC needs to change if the conditions change. Mr. Mohajer concurred and stated that the Task Force recognizes the lawsuit and if the conditions of CUP change, depending in court decision, then the Task Force will review the FOC for revisions.

Following are the review of Conditions:

- **Condition No. 15**, Ms. Eells said condition deals with CCL submitting monthly waste disposal quantities by jurisdiction of origin. However, the timing through SWIMS portal is different than the timing described in condition. The request is for consistency with both. Mr. Ruiz stated there needs to be clarification according to the schedule. Staff can draft the language and share with Ms. Eells for comment so to be ready for Thursday. Mr. Mohajer suggested, if possible, that the language be consistent with AB 901. Ms. Landis also added that the reporting inconsistency is not helpful to the locals in the area.
- **Condition No. 18**, Ms. Eells said zero landfill gas migration beyond the property line is not consistent with Title 27. Mr. Mohajer said it is the Task Force that puts down the siting criteria. It is what the Task Force requires and the Building Code, and not Title 27. Mr. Mohajer indicated the landfill is very dynamic with everyday disposal area boundary changes and the type of development that may be done. The condition states zero emissions at the property line unless approved otherwise by Public Works. This language makes it very flexible. Because of local surroundings and school, Mr. Mohajer stated being specific about wanting site maps to show old and new portions of the landfill within 1000-feet from the disposal boundary to know what is there and the conditions. Mr. Mohajer said the condition is zero emissions at the property line and subject to review, modification, revision, or elimination by Public Works. Ms. Landis mentioned it being extremely important for CCL, with all the development and structures being so close to the boundary line, to maintain the area. Ms. Landis asked about the U.S. Postal Service being within the boundary. Mr. Mohajer answered that the landfill owner and Public Works can work to see what kind of gas control system they have and what kind of monitoring wells they have. It would be a case-by-case review.

Mr. Ruiz stated the requirements in Title 27 do not recognize the potential for accumulation of methane gas in an enclosed structure. Mr. Ruiz also stated that Public Works oversees the implementation of collection systems and protection systems of structures in unincorporated areas near landfills and that Public Works is familiar with a lot of systems to protect structures, depending on the conditions that are proposed. Ms. Landis agreed with zero emissions at the property line, but to also make it clear to Regional Planning that if they allow residential buildings and structures near the property line, they are required to have monitoring at those buildings. Mr. Mohajer said this is something that Public Works, as the building official for the County of Los Angeles, has to make the decision as to whether those new residents or schools have a monitoring system at the building. Mr. Ruiz added Public Works tries to cover all basis. On the one hand, having the landfill make every effort to prevent the migration of the gas beyond the property boundary. Public Works would also

comment on new development, seeking to avoid incompatible land uses, such as with schools and hospitals within 1000 feet of the landfill and being able to protect them against intrusion.

- **Condition No. 20**, Ms. Eells stated per the requirements of the CUP, CCL will provide closure and post-closure maintenance plans, including financial assurance demonstrations within 60 days of approval of FOC. Though the closure and post-closure maintenance plan and the financial assurance demonstrations are in the Joint Technical Document (JTD), CCL does not have the control over the timing. It may be that they do not have approval of JTD within the 60 days of the approval of the FOC. Therefore, it is suggested CCL provide the information within 60 days of approval by CalRecycle. Mr. Mohajer asked Public Works staff if they want to see the closure and post-closure and give it to CalRecycle knowing that things may change. Mr. Aiyetiwa responded that it is not one of Public Works' requirements and that the County has financial security for landfill operator. Mr. Ruiz asked in terms of the timing for the proof of financial assurance, if this was consistent with the requirements of the CUP. Mr. Aiyetiwa answered it is not a requirement of the CUP. Mr. Ruiz recommended the language be revised to indicate CCL shall maintain and show proof of financial assurance in compliance with the state and the County. Mr. Aiyetiwa added the change to reflect within 60 days of approval by CalRecycle.
- **Condition No. 21**, Ms. Eells stated CCL wants to add specificity to which permits, licenses, and approvals they provide proof of and that all permits, licenses and other approvals require for the operation or maintenance of the landfill. This is a fairly broad category. She also commented that the FOC applications have a fairly extensive list of permits and approvals; federal, state, local, and county. It was suggested by Mr. Aiyetiwa that we consider the suggestion from the landfill that they provide Public Works with the copies of the permits that are listed in the FOC application. Ultimately, this suggestion was accepted.
- **Condition No. 22**, Ms. Eells stated this condition is for CCL to submit any NOV received to the Task Force within five days. CCL's concern is that most NOVs are mailed to them and they receive them after the five days of issuance. Time may need to be modified to perhaps 15 days. Mr. Aiyetiwa commented that County Code requires NOVs must be delivered by certified mail. It was agreed that suggested change would be from five days to 10 business days of receipt of NOV by certified mail since it is documented.

Ms. Landis expressed concerns about leachate collection at CCL. The maps she received did not show Santa Clara River, which is a very important river because it feeds the farms in Ventura County. Mr. Clarin stated they have leachate

collection facilities and that the leachate goes to a tank and then is taken to a publicly-owned treatment plant. Everything is done offsite. Mr. Clarin also stated they have groundwater monitoring. Ms. Landis shared her concern with the EIR that CCL put together, asking if there was any discussion of wildfire hazards or wind problems because the Santa Clara River valley acts as a wind channel. Ms. Landis asked if CCL had any fire problems. Mr. Clarin answered that in the JTD, there is a non-corrective fund which includes wildfires. Ms. Eells commented that the Los Angeles County Fire Department addressed many of those concerns in their conditions of approval for the CUP and there are many requirements for CCL to get approval from the Fire Department for their facilities, for keeping vegetation away from structures, speed bumps to not impede fire trucks, clearance for roads, and many other conditions. Ms. Landis also asked where all the debris goes after a fire and if it goes to CCL. Mr. Clarin said it depends on who is cleaning it up and they have to make a request of where it is to be taken. It would be up to the generator. Ms. Landis asked who the generator was. Mr. Ruiz commented it depends on the agency. If debris is within road right of way, then road crews would remove. If it is in private property, then the property owner is responsible. If it is collected as a part of a mass debris management during a major disaster, then it would be coordinated so that property owner puts in within the road right of way and then a contractor hired by the local agency, either the city or county, would remove and take to the nearest disposal site. Mr. Clarin stated under Title 27, there are provisions to be able to accept additional waste due to disaster, provided it is not hazardous waste.

Mr. Mohajer asked if there is any place in the FOC that mentions component of the landfill gas control system having vertical extraction wells or horizontal monitoring wells. The system should be specified. Mr. Shammass stated AQMD has all the permits and they show the vertical and horizontal wells. Mr. Mohajer commented that the concern is the subsurface landfill gas migration and there needs to be specifics in the condition of approval that the landfill operator will install gas extraction, well system, horizontal trenches, monitoring wells, and have the landfill encapsulated with a liner system approved by the Regional Water Board. Mr. Mohajer adds this FOC is responsible for making certain there is no subsurface gas migration beyond property line unless it is determined otherwise by Public Works and this needs to be specified. It was agreed that a sentence would be added to include four components; extraction valves, horizontal trenches, monitoring wells, and liner system.

Ms. Landis suggested a booklet be created, which would be helpful to all residential and industrial developments explaining what is being collected and monitored with drawings depicting what vertical and horizontal pipes are used for and extraction wells. Booklets could be given to neighbors so they can monitor their own property and get their own wells.

The final condition was reviewed:

- **Condition No. 12**, was brought up by Ms. Eells. Mr. Mohajer stated this was the standard language developed for the Puente Hills Landfill and it will remain with all landfills. It was the best way to get the landfill operators to promote emerging technologies. The language supports and promotes legislation and was discussed with the Board of Supervisors. Ms. Eells commented the Board of Supervisors removed the conversion technology (CT) facility designated area and the CUP does not permit CCL to develop the CT facility at the landfill site. Mr. Ruiz agreed the provision was removed.

Ms. Hanson-Lugo asked if an enclosed composting facility is in the future for CCL. Ms. Eells stated under Condition No. 2, CCL has it noted. The recommendation to CCL is to revise the word “closed” to read “enclosed.” The enclosed composting facility has not been developed yet. Mr. Ruiz commented that the permit allows for the development, but it is CCL’s decision when to develop.

Mr. Mohajer stated he will make editorial changes to FOC, but with no changes to what has been discussed. Mr. Mohajer made a motion to recommend to the Task Force to grant FOC to the CCL, with the changes to the staff recommendations worked out with the applicant and finalized. Mr. Ruiz seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.