

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

Minutes for October 18, 2018

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

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Betsey Landis, Environmental Organization Representative
Mike Mohajer, Chair, General Public Representative
Shakiri Nakagawa-Ota, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health
Carlos Ruiz, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Sam Shammass, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Reyna Pereira, City of Los Angeles

OTHERS PRESENT:

Martins Aiyetiya, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Maria Carlson, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Gabriel Esparza, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Gladys Gallardo, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens
Frank Landis, Public
Kyle Mertens, Waste Management – Antelope Valley Landfill
Dennis Montano, Republic Services
Jayna Morgan, Waste Management – Antelope Valley Landfill
Dave Nguyen, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Margarita Quiroz, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Carol Oyola, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Isaac Reyes Gomez, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Saeid Shirzadegan, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Vu Truong, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Michael Harmon, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Landis called the meeting to order at 11:12 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 20, 2018, MEETING MINUTES

A motion to approve the Minutes from the September 20, 2018, Subcommittee Meeting was made by Mr. Mohajer and seconded by Mr. Ruiz.

Ms. Landis stated Mr. Mohajer wanted to discuss the Consideration of the Antelope Valley Landfill Finding of Conformance as the next item on Agenda.

III. CONSIDERATION OF A FINDING OF CONFORMANCE FOR THE ANTELOPE VALLEY LANDFILL

Mr. Reyes Gomez provided a presentation regarding the Antelope Valley Landfill Finding of Conformance (FOC) and staff's recommendations.

The Antelope Valley Recycling and Disposal Facility is an existing municipal solid waste landfill, also known as the AV Landfill, located in the City of Palmdale. The AV Landfill receives waste from cities of Palmdale and Lancaster as well as the unincorporated areas of the Antelope Valley, and other areas in and out of Los Angeles County. On January 11, 2018, the City of Palmdale Planning Commission, via Resolution No. 2018-002, approved Conditional Use Permit (CUP) No. 98-12 "Major Modification," which took effect on January 24, 2018, allowing AV Landfill to increase its waste disposal tonnage from 1,800 tons per day (tpd) to 3,600 tpd, while increasing the "total" daily intake of solid waste for disposal and beneficial use to 5,548 tpd. The newly approved CUP 98-12 "Major Modification" approved by the City of Palmdale Planning Commission on January 11, 2018, modified the initial CUP 98-12 which was previously granted by the City of Palmdale Planning Commission on June 22, 2011, by increasing the maximum daily intake of solid waste and adding and changing Conditions related to the on-going landfill operations and use.

The Task Force has previously granted an FOC to AV Landfill with a daily disposal limit of 1,800 tpd in November 17, 2011.

Currently, AV Landfill operates under the existing WDRs, Board Order No. R6V-2012-0042 (Attachment B), which was adopted by Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Lahonton Region. According to a determination by the RWQCB, Lahonton Region, a new WDRs is not required since there is no expansion to the existing footprint under the CUP No. 98-12, "Major Modification."

On November 29, 2017, AV Landfill submitted an application to the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) for a revised Solid Waste Facility Permit (SWFP) to increase the Maximum Daily Tonnage for disposal and beneficial uses from 3,564 tpd to 5,548 tpd. The increased tonnage provides for a daily disposal rate of 3,600 tpd and 1,948 tpd of Beneficial Use. The SWFP was approved by CalRecycle on August 13, 2018.

Ms. Landis voiced her concerns on the potential landfill gas migration. She indicated that AV Landfill seems to be very casual with the gas migration concern and only putting a liner as a sole protector which will not last forever and that having a liner as the only mitigation measure is not sufficient. She believed that nothing should be built within 1,000 feet of the landfill.

Mr. Reyes Gomez informed that there are two facilities located within the buffer zone. An SCE substation and a one-story industrial building, and that there are no proposed projects/structures that will be located within the 1,000 feet buffer zone. Condition 85 of the Landfill CUP, which was approved by the City of Palmdale, detailed numerous requirements aimed to protect on-site existing structures and those within 1,000 feet of the landfill footprint against methane intrusion and subsurface landfill gas migration.

Mr. Ruiz commented that the Siting Element generally recommend a buffer zone of 1,000 feet or more, and there may be close structures within the landfill property that still need to be protected against potential intrusion. From what he saw, the report did not show any residential properties. He also added that one of the policies in the Siting Element is to encourage cities to discourage incompatible uses near the landfills, including sensitive uses within 1,000 feet of the landfill footprint.

As the presentation progressed, discussion took place amongst the members of the Subcommittee on the inconsistency in the volumetric capacity in which the daily capacity changed from 1,800 tpd to 3,600 tpd but the estimated remaining life will be longer and closure date will be later, and yet, there is no expansion.

Mr. Kyle Mertens from WM explained that the AV Landfill composed of landfill 1, landfill 2, and the middle bridge area. He stated the two fill areas were combined in 2011, and that the remaining capacity listed in the SWFP (from 2011 to 2016) is 20.4 million cubic yards, but with the landfill's expansion in 2011, the landfill has the total capacity of 30.2 million cubic yards.

Mr. Mohajer asked if the 10 million cubic yards of additional air space came from the basis that the old calculations were wrong. Mr. Mertens responded that the calculations have always been accurate and that the misunderstanding came from not having the remaining of 20.4 million cubic yards that were mentioned.

Upon further discussion, Mr. Mohajer indicated that the Task Force has granted an FOC to the landfill in 2011 for the expansion. With the recently approved SWPF for AV Landfill, the footprint and the maximum elevation values remain the same. therefore, he is not concerned on the change of the density of disposal. The critical thing is that the horizontal values remain the same based on the existing FOC.

Ms. Landis then expressed her concern regarding the height of the litter fence and how the litter could be controlled during high wind. Mr. Mertens responded that the fence will be in the middle of the property to screen out litters resulting from the wind that comes from west to east, which is about 80 percent of the winds that they have now. If the wind comes from different direction, Waste Management have litter pickers to address the problem.

Mr. Mohajer inquired if perimeter monitoring wells are spaced approximately 1,000 feet and their depths. Mr. Mertens responded that the well's depths ranged from 12 feet to about 50 feet. Mr. Mohajer added that the well depth requirement for the well is typically about 150 percent of the depth of the landfill.

Mr. Reyes Gomez continued with his presentation and indicated that staff reviewed the FOC application for compliance with the requirements for granting of an FOC as established in the Countywide Siting Element and it is staff's finding that the application meets the requirements. Mr. Reyes Gomez then recommended the Task Force to grant the FOC subject to the "Conditions of Approval" specified in the Staff Report.

Mr. Mohajer then introduced a motion to grant the FOC, subject to the revision of Conditions Nos. 8 and 17 and adding a new Condition No. 22. Mr. Ruiz seconded the motion.

Ms. Landis commented that the maps submitted with the FOC application were poorly made and did not clearly depict symbols, nor showing distances. She also had issue with boundaries on the map of landfill not showing clearly and that the landfill risk operating outside of its boundary. Ms. Morgan responded that the facility has the complete Joint Technical Document with the maps that are created on a large scale and when reproduced or shrunk, they can lose some of their information. She assured that the Landfill has a condition in the CUP in which they do annual surveys and provide them to City staff to ensure that they are not going outside the permitted boundaries. Also, there are conditions in the 2011 CUP that requires the Landfill to do annual surveys and document the boundaries in relation to the approved limits.

Ms. Landis mentioned that she has concerns about AV Landfill being close to the San Andreas Fault and that she is not certain how comprehensive the AV Landfill's Emergency Program is pertaining to. Mr. Mertens responded they have monthly

training, semi-annual evacuations, fire and earthquake drills, meetings and locations set aside, and meeting rallies. All employees are aware of where to go in the event of an earthquake or an emergency occurs. Ms. Morgan further elaborated that there are concerns about the impacts that might affect the groundwater, and that AV Landfill had to obtain WDR from the Water Board. She mentioned that the EIR that was done in 2014 for the AV Landfill had studied this matter.

Mr. Ruiz's commented that in his recollection, the Landfill has expanded and has had various changes in the FOC going from 800 tpd to 1,300 tpd and so forth. Staff has looked at environmental documentations and the landfill has been analyzed many times. This request does not require any modification to what has already been approved.

Mr. Mohajer made a motion to approve the AV Landfill FOC with conditions noted. Motion passed with one abstention from Mr. Shammas and one opposition from Ms. Landis.

IV. UPDATE ON SUNSHINE CANYON CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL

Odor Complaints

Mr. Truong provided an update on the Sunshine Canyon Landfill (SCL) odor complaints from South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) for the month of September 2018 ([Link](#)).

- During the month of September, a total of 33 complaints were made to the AQMD hotline and 16 of them were categorized as No Field Response.
- In comparison with August 2018, the number of complaints received in September increased from 6 to 33 complaints.
- Compared to September of last year, the number of complaints this September decreased from 44 to 33 complaints.
- The total number of complaints received by AQMD since 2009, was 11,150 and the total number of complaints received this year was 149.
- The total number of Notices of Violation (NOVs) issued by AQMD since 2009, was 214. As of October 5, 2018, AQMD issued zero Odor Complaint NOVs to SCL for the month of September 2018.

Update on the Alternative Daily Cover Pilot Project

Ms. Carlson provided an update on the Alternative Daily Cover (ADC) Pilot Project at SCL for the month of September 2018. She mentioned staff received the monthly report from Republic Services (Republic) on October 15, 2018, for the month of September 2018.

Republic reported that site operations personnel are ensuring additional ballast material is placed along the edges of the ADC as noted on the daily inspection reports. The amount of geosynthetic panel product used for September 2018 was 28.5 rolls. It was reported that during this period, there were no maintenance issues, and one minor scavenging from birds on a Monday morning where there was soil cover. No observations of fires, vectors, or blowing litter at the working face related to the use of the ADC material were reported for the month of September 2018.

Additionally, Republic submitted an Evaluation Report on September 21, 2018, for the third year of the ADC Pilot Project, which is under review by Public Works. Upon completion of Public Works' review, Staff will provide an update at a subsequent FPRS meeting.

Update on the Intermediate Cover Enhancement Project

Ms. Gallardo provided an update on the Intermediate Cover Enhancement (ICE) Project, for the use of Posi-Shell material at the SCL.

On March 2, 2017, Republic initiated the six-month ICE Demonstration Project, which entailed the placement of Posi-Shell on approximately 47.7 acres of preapproved intermediate slope.

Public Works received Republic's ICE Demonstration Project Final Evaluation Report for review. After subsequent comments, revisions and clarifications, Republic concluded on their final response that:

- "It is difficult to quantify the effectiveness of the Posi-Shell during this time due to the significant number of variables...such as installation of new vertical gas wells and gas conveyance infrastructure."
- Republic's report went on to state that "in regards to abating fugitive odors and surface emissions, Posi-Shell was only the precursor step of the true solution. The true solution to preventive fugitive odors and surface emissions is the [landfill's gas collection and control system]" and lastly,
- "At this time, Republic does not have any specific plans for continued use of Posi-Shell" at the SCL.

As mentioned at the September FPRS meeting, according to Republic, other intermediate cover enhancements such as closure turf and vegetative cover will continue to be utilized at the site. Currently, Public Works is finalizing its response letter to Republic.

Mr. Mohajer mentioned that during the last months FPRS meeting, it was said that Republic was no longer using the Posi-Shell material. He proposed to send a letter to Republic requesting the official findings on the use of Posi-Shell. Ms. Landis added that the report should address the discontinued use of Posi-Shell.

Mr. Mohajer made a motion to write a letter to Republic asking for information including the findings and justification on the use of Posi-Shell. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ruiz. Motion passed unanimously.

Water Board Response letter regarding leachate and gas condensate disposal

Ms. Gallardo gave a summary of the Water Boards' response letter, dated September 13, 2018, regarding clarification on leachate and gas condensate disposal requirements at SCL requested by the Task Force.

In summary, the Water Board responded that:

- Regarding quantifiable thresholds that need to be met before resorting to direct disposal of leachate or gas condensate back into the Landfill, no quantifiable thresholds, maximum quantities, or allowable chemical quantities for the direct return of landfill liquids are specified in the Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs), and reintroduction of landfill liquids has not been practiced at the Landfill to the knowledge of Regional Board staff.
- With respect to the sample monthly LEA report that appeared to indicate disposal of leachate or gas condensate to the landfill's waste mass, the Water Board clarified that the report indicated there were no free-liquids to clean up during those occurrences and the released landfill liquids were all absorbed by interim cover soil. Also, the WDR does not prohibit such wastes to be disposed of at the Landfill, provided that the wastes contain no less than 50 percent of solids.
- In response to the question asking if the untreated leachate or gas condensate generated by SCL was considered hazardous waste, the Water Board stated that the leachate or gas condensate generated from Class III landfills are not classified as hazardous wastes. Furthermore, Section J.2 of the WDR requires, that in part, any leachate determined to be hazardous shall be transported by a licensed hazardous waste hauler to an approved treatment or disposal facility. To date, Regional Board staff has not found any leachate at SCL to be hazardous.

Mr. Mohajer expressed his concern about the Water Boards' determination of hazardous waste. Mr. Ruiz clarified that on the Water Boards' letter, hazardous waste was defined as waste exhibiting the characteristics of toxicity, as provided

in Section 66261.24 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations. Discussion ensued. Mr. Ruiz clarified that on the Water Boards' letter, hazardous waste was defined as waste exhibiting the characteristics of toxicity, as provided in Section 66261.24 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations.

Update on DPH NOV recommendation based on Order to Abate dated November 9, 2016

In regards to the letter from Department of Regional Planning to the Task Force concerning routine updates, Mr. Esparza stated there was no new update to report. Also, no update was provided by DPH.

2nd Quarter Vegetation Update

The subcommittee requested the 2nd Quarter Vegetation update be presented during the next FPRS meeting.

Update on DPH's analysis of Dr. Nordella's Aliso Canyon/Porter Ranch Health Study presented on October 13, 2017

Mr. Harmon gave an update on the request made from the Task Force to Los Angeles County Public Health (DPH) regarding DPH's assessment of Dr. Nordella's health study. He mentioned that staff received a letter dated September 27, 2018, from Dr. Muntu Davis, Los Angeles County Health Officer. In the letter DPH responded that since November 2017, multiple requests have been sent to Dr. Nordella requesting him to submit his study protocols and results to DPH. Dr. Nordella has declined the request, including a request to reconsider. As a result, DPH is not able to evaluate Dr. Nordella's findings.

In that same letter, Dr. Davis stated that for the comprehensive long-term health study on the Aliso Canyon communities, the duration, scope, and objectives of the study will be developed and overseen by a scientific panel of experts and DPH will be seeking input from the community to ensure that the goals and health needs of the community are met. DPH anticipates the first component to begin in early 2019.

Update on Scholl Canyon Landfill Project

Ms. Carlson gave an update on the various Scholl Canyon Landfill Projects.

Scholl Canyon Landfill Expansion Project – The City of Glendale initially considered to expand this landfill and has circulated the CEQA document in April 2014. However, it was put on hold. On May 9, 2018, the City notified the County that it has withdrawn the proposed Scholl Canyon Landfill Expansion

Project. The City also requested that the expansion will no longer be included in the draft revised Countywide Siting Element Document.

Biogas Renewable Generation Project – The Biogas Renewable Generation Project’s Mitigated Negative Declaration was completed on March 9, 2018, and submitted to the City’s planning Commission for approval. The Planning Commissioner subsequently voted to deny the project from moving forward on March 22, 2018. The City Staff made an appeal to the City Council. The City Council subsequently directed staff to go beyond the recently completed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the proposed project and prepare an Environmental Impact Report for the project. Currently, the City will be solicitating for a CEQA consultant to work on the EIR.

Ms. Carlson lastly mentioned that we have some update information on Anaerobic Digestion Facility and Repowering Grayson Project at the Grayson Power which will be provided upon request.

Discussion of FOC Reports

Mr. Reyes Gomez mentioned staff did not receive any FOC reports for this period. Staff will provide any updates on the FOC reports at the next FPRS meeting.

Mr. Reyes Gomez also gave an update that was requested from the subcommittee members during the previous FPRS meeting on the efforts by WM (Lancaster Landfill), Republic (SCL) and Waste Connection (Chiquita Canyon Landfill) to promote conversion technologies (CT). Staff contacted the respective Landfill Operators, and the following are provided:

Sunshine Canyon Landfill

Mr. Reyes Gomez stated that SCL actively supported the following CT related legislation:

- SB 1440 - Biomethane Procurement Program.
- AB 3187 - Biomethane: gas corporations: rates: interconnection.

Additionally, SCL supports all goals that the Coalition for Renewable Natural Gas Coalition sponsors.

Mr. Reyes Gomez further mentioned that SCL worked closely with a broad coalition of local government and other stakeholders and obtained \$25 Million for CalRecycle’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) Grant Program. The GGRF funding is meant for Organics Diversion Programs.

Mr. Reyes Gomez stated that SCL regularly participates in regulatory and administrative activities at CARB to promote renewable fuels.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill

Mr. Reyes Gomez stated that this landfill has a requirement in the CUP to submit to Public Works for review a comment quarterly report providing detailed status of the selection of the type of CT and progress of the development. The operator submitted a proposal to develop a CT at the site. Public Works completed the review and found that the proposal did not meet the requirements stipulated in CUP Condition 118; therefore, it was not approved. Chiquita Canyon Landfill is working with Fulcrum BioEnergy, Inc. Fulcrum uses a technology that converts MSW into low carbon jet and diesel fuel.

Mr. Reyes Gomez further mentioned that Fulcrum is looking to develop a facility in the Los Angeles area that could significantly diverts tons of MSW every year from CCL. Waste Connections is looking into supplying Fulcrum with 100,000 tons of MSW every year. Mr. Reyes Gomez stated that CCL did not provide any information on any legislative support.

Lancaster Landfill

Mr. Reyes Gomez stated that WM did not provide any feedbacks on any legislative support. WM currently supports conversion technology efforts through a number of conditions contained within the FOC and CUP for the Lancaster Landfill as well as through the operation of a number of organics facilities throughout California. WM is currently working to permit two organic processing facilities:

- Sun Valley Recycling Park – located in the Los Angeles County of Los Angeles
- Palmdale Landfill Facilities

Mr. Reyes Gomez further mentioned that he LCL has a requirement in their permit to provide updates to Public Works in quarterly basis on their efforts to support legislation and CT. However, in March 2017, WM informed us that they are no longer proceeding with the large-scale anaerobic digestion and composting operation, referred to as the Lancaster Advanced Recycling for Greenwaste and Organics project also known as LARGO. At the March 2017 FPRS meeting, staff recommended the CT for Lancaster Landfill item to be removed from future FPRS Agendas. This request was granted by FPRS.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Wayde stated that the Fire Department filed a lawsuit against gas company for Aliso Canyon.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:59 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 15, 2018, at 11:00 a.m., in Conference Room B.

mq:cs0