

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

November 18, 2021

WEB CONFERENCE

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

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative
Dorcas (Dee) Hanson-Lugo, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health
Betsey Landis, Chair, Environmental Organization Representative
Coby Skye, Los Angeles County Public Works
Sam Shammass, Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Reina Pereira, City of Los Angeles

OTHERS PRESENT:

Martins Aiyetiwa, Los Angeles County Public Works
Joe Bartolata, Los Angeles County Public Works
Chris Coyle, Republic Services, Inc.
Brenda Eells, Waste Management
Michael Harmon, Los Angeles County Public Works
Ramon Herman, Los Angeles County Public Works
Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens
Dennis Montano, Republic Services, Inc.
Dave Nguyen, Los Angeles County Public Works
Carol Oyola, Los Angeles County Public Works
Trishena Robinson, Los Angeles County Public Works
Aric Rodriguez, Los Angeles County Public Works
Vu Truong, Los Angeles County Public Works
Jeffrey Zhu, Los Angeles County Public Works

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Betsey Landis called the meeting to order at 11:01 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 21, 2021 MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Mike Mohajer made a motion to approve the minutes and Mr. Coby Skye seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

III. CONSIDERATION OF TASK FORCE COMMENTS ON THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY PRELIMINARY DRAFT REVISED COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT AND DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Mr. Joe Bartolata, staff to the Task Force, provided an update on Task Force comments for the Los Angeles County Preliminary Draft Revised Countywide Siting Element (Draft CSE) and Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR).

On November 9, 2021, the Subcommittee held a Special Meeting to discuss Subcommittee comments on the Draft CSE and DEIR. A motion passed requesting staff to summarize all comments received as of September 15, 2021, and to prepare a draft comment letter from the Task Force to Public Works (PW) transmitting its comments for consideration. A copy of the draft comment letter was provided to all Subcommittee and Task Force members.

The public review period of the Draft CSE and DEIR ended on Monday, November 15, 2021. Staff recommended that the Subcommittee consider the comments received, present those comments to the Task Force for consideration, and to recommend that the Task Force send the comment letter to PW transmitting its comments.

In accordance with State regulations, no later than 105 days after the close of the public review period, PW acting as the lead agency, will review and consider all comments received and provide written responses accordingly. PW will then present all comments received and written responses to the Subcommittee and the Task Force for consideration and will prepare the final Draft CSE and final DEIR.

Ms. Landis commented that at the Special Meeting, a motion was passed for the Draft CSE and DEIR to be rewritten and for the Task Force to send a letter to PW requesting the rewrite. Mr. Chris Coyle of Republic Services, Inc. (Republic), asked what that meant. Ms. Landis answered that PW must rewrite the documents if the Task Force recommends it. Mr. Sam Shammas recalled that the motion was to revise the Draft CSE with the Subcommittee's comments and asked Ms. Carol Oyola, staff to the Task Force, if she had the wording from the Special Meeting. Ms. Oyola responded that she had finished drafting the minutes that were being reviewed by staff and read the motion. Ms. Landis made a motion

to request the Task Force, based on today's meeting comments, to have PW address and revise the Draft CSE and DEIR, accordingly.

Ms. Landis stated that Ms. Oyola had the motion correct and that the Subcommittee asked for revisions based on comments from the Special Meeting. She also mentioned not being certain what the procedure is now since the Subcommittee passed the motion with most members present except for Mr. Mohajer. Mr. Mohajer suggested listening to the recording since he felt what Ms. Landis, Mr. Shammass, and Ms. Oyola said were different. Ms. Landis reiterated that Ms. Oyola had the motion correct and that it corresponded with what Ms. Landis had written in her notes. Ms. Oyola was asked to repeat the motion. Mr. Skye asked Ms. Landis if her point was that the Subcommittee had already passed the motion; therefore, it does not have to be redone. Ms. Landis answered yes because the Special Meeting was official, and most members were present. She also mentioned that she was simply correcting Mr. Bartolata's update on the motion passed, which was a little different and that his report should be accurate. Mr. Mohajer mentioned the importance of Task Force review before the draft documents go out to the public.

Mr. Skye stated that the recommendation to the Task Force may be requested at the Task Force meeting since there is an agenda item pertaining to this subject and that the Task Force may vote on it. Ms. Landis commented that the Subcommittee comments are actions that are being requested by PW to take. Mr. Skye added each comment needed to be addressed and the documents needed revision to reflect the comments. Mr. Mohajer reiterated Ms. Landis' comment that the Subcommittee voted to revise the Draft CSE with the comments from the Special Meeting before the Task Force sends out the final draft to the County. Mr. Skye asked Mr. Martins Aiyetiwa to clarify the process since Mr. Ruiz was in attendance at the Special Meeting representing PW. Mr. Aiyetiwa's understanding of the motion was to direct PW to prepare the draft letter that the Task Force will send to the County transmitting Task Force comments and that Ms. Landis' motion was amended. Ms. Landis concurred the motion was amended, and that the Subcommittee is part of the process to make certain the Draft CSE and DEIR are written well before going out to the public.

Mr. Shammass asked Mr. Skye and Mr. Aiyetiwa if the letter being submitted to revise the documents will include the revised comments being sent to the Task Force for approval. Mr. Skye answered yes. Mr. Mohajer brought up Title 14, Section 18755 of California Code of Regulations regarding policies and procedures of the Task Force developing the CSE. Mr. Skye clarified that everything the Task Force does is public so when the revised version is brought back to the Task Force for review, it will be a public document. He also reassured Ms. Landis that staff was listening to her comments submitted and understood the significant revisions to the document that will include her comments.

Mr. Mohajer commented that he had a very busy schedule and that the e-mail to the Task Force with the draft letter to PW was sent at 6:05 p.m. as a PDF file rather than in Word, which he would prefer. He did not want to receive any documents the night before to review because of the significant burden. He had also asked for the Special Meeting draft minutes and Ms. Landis told him that they were still being worked on. Mr. Skye commented the intent was to move forward with the letter similar to what is done with legislative position letters with comments from the Task Force. Staff finalizes the details with review from those members that are interested, which was typically the Vice-Chair or Mr. Mohajer. After about a week or two of review and receipt of feedback, staff finalizes and sends out. Mr. Skye also noted that the Special Meeting was just last week and with the short week due to the holiday, there was not sufficient time for staff to send the draft letter to the Task Force and Subcommittee or complete the draft Special Meeting minutes for review. Ms. Landis stated wanting to ask the Task Force to incorporate the Special Meeting minutes into the letter because of the detailed comments. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Wayde Hunter of the North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens commented he attended the Special Meeting and made several comments but did not receive a copy of the minutes for that meeting so had no idea of what was included. However, he did see the draft copy of the letter from the Task Force to PW and expressed his gratitude for staff including his comment about identifying all of the photographs in the Draft CSE. However, in Chapter 3 under 3.5 the existing Class III landfills on page 56, it referenced Sunshine Canyon Landfill (SCL) as a major landfill on table 3.1, but on map 3.1 on page 63, it referenced SCL as a minor landfill, and there was no comment on the letter addressing Mr. Hunter's comment from the Special Meeting. Ms. Landis responded that the draft letter included previous comments and not the comments from the Special Meeting since the minutes were not ready, but that his comments should be included as well.

IV. STAFF REPORT ON PROGRESS OF SITING AND BUILDING ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY FACILITIES FOR PROCESSING SOLID WASTE

Mr. Darenbourg provided a brief staff report on the [Progress of Siting and Building Alternate Technology Facilities for Processing Solid Waste](#).

Since 2004 the Southern California Conversion Technology Program (Program) has evaluated and promoted the development of conversion technologies (CT) countywide and throughout the region to divert organic waste and post-recycled solid waste from landfills. The Program is a County initiative spearheaded by PW Environmental Programs Division.

The Task Force and PW have continued their efforts in encouraging alternative technologies. This Program offers the following:

- Provides assistance to project developers regarding, but not limited to, identifying sites, conducting feasibility studies, performing cost analysis, and answering questions regarding permitting, and writing letters of support for grant applications.
- Website with information and resources such as permitting guidelines, a technology vendor database, and a comprehensive greenhouse emission analysis.
- Monthly newsletter published that is sent to over 12,000 subscribers and provides information for upcoming events, grant opportunities, and policy and legislation updates related to CT.
- PW continually evaluates and meets with developers regarding alternative technologies.
- PW hosts monthly Alternative Technology Advisory Subcommittee meetings and invites developers to attend and provide informative presentations.

Ms. Landis asked if PW was emphasizing the need for more locally produced electricity due to the problems with climate change that have affected the power grid. She also reviewed the list of sites on the Draft CSE that noted the Santa Monica Pier, Santa Monica Airport, and Santa Monica Recycling Center as potential locations for development of alternative technology facilities, which she considered a major problem. Ms. Landis expressed several concerns and indicated that most of the sites listed were not usable and that local electricity is not being emphasized, which is what she is pushing for. She thanked Mr. Darensbourg for his presentation and noted moving forward due to time constraints.

Mr. Mohajer asked if he understood correctly that the La Verne City Dump was being considered as a potential site. Mr. Darensbourg confirmed it was being considered. Mr. Mohajer asked where the site was located. Mr. Skye clarified that there is no plan or proposal or consideration for any disposal sites and that the CSE did not recommend any new landfills. What is being discussed is alternative technologies and that some CTs might be required to be permitted as disposal facilities, even though they are non-combustion technologies, could be a very small in scale, and would be fully enclosed, not disposing anything at any of the sites. Mr. Mohajer commented that his question was for the location of the La Verne City Dump. Mr. Skye responded that staff would send Mr. Mohajer that information and did not want to overstate the analysis that was being conducted, but that staff had evaluated all existing closed and operating solid waste facilities for the potential to develop a CT facility at those sites since they already have some type of solid waste facility permit and it could facilitate the development of CT in the future. Ms. Landis reminded everyone that the ocean level was rising and that no sites near the coast should be considered since they may be under water in 15 years and that many things were not considered in the Draft CSE.

V. UPDATE ON CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL

Subsurface Landfill Gas Migration

Mr. Ramon Herman, staff to the Task Force, provided an update on Landfill Gas Migration at Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL). At the October 21, 2021 meeting, the Subcommittee requested Waste Connections to provide an updated Perimeter Gas Monitoring Well map certified by a professional civil engineer.

On November 1, 2021, Waste Connections submitted an updated landfill perimeter gas monitoring network map for CCL with information requested by the Subcommittee, which was disseminated to all members.

Mr. Mohajer commented that he had received a monthly update letter from CCL dated October 29, 2021. Mr. Mohajer asked for the Regional Planning website provided in the letter regarding CCL's update to the Community Advisory Committee. Ms. Landis asked that Mr. Herman provide the Subcommittee the link to Regional Planning. Mr. Mohajer also thanked staff for providing the updated landfill perimeter gas monitoring network map that was large enough to see all the probes.

Status of Lawsuit, NOVs, and Odor Complaints

Mr. Michael Harmon, staff to the Task Force, provided the following information:

Updates on Odor Complaints and NOVs related to odor complaints

- South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) agreed to provide odor complaint data on a quarterly basis.
- The third quarter report was presented at the previous Subcommittee meeting.
- The next odor complaint update will be given at January's Subcommittee meeting.
- There were no NOVs issued for the month of October 2021.

Lawsuit Update

CCL filed 2 separate lawsuits against the County:

- The first lawsuit was filed on October 20, 2017, challenging operational conditions and fee conditions of the CUP. In July 2020, the trial court issued a decision in the County's favor on some conditions and in CCL's favor on other conditions. The parties are currently engaged in settlement discussions.
- The second lawsuit was filed on April 13, 2018, challenging a decision by the hearing officer that upheld an NOV issued by Regional Planning on December 11, 2017, for failure to pay Bridge and Thoroughfare Fee, accepting prohibited auto shredder waste, and failure to pay out-of-area fees. The trial

date was previously scheduled for January 18, 2022 and has been rescheduled to June 2022.

NOVs that CCL has received from any Regulatory Agencies

- On April 19, 2021, the Task Force sent a letter to CCL regarding the NOV issued by Regional Planning.
- In response, CCL submitted their seventh monthly update on October 30, 2021, that was disseminated to the Task Force on November 16, 2021. The update addressed the following April 19, 2021, requirements:
 - CCL is currently in negotiations with the County for Conditions 68 (air quality monitoring in surrounding areas), 77 (relocation of the site entrance from Henry Mayo Drive to Wolcott Drive), and 79 (schedule of the Street Improvement Project). CCL continues to provide updates on the status of implementation activities for compliance during meetings of the Community Advisory Committee.

Mr. Mohajer requested a copy of the last report that CCL provided to the Community Advisory Committee, on October 18, 2021. He also inquired regarding the status of the Community Air Monitoring Program. Mr. Mohajer also commented the CCL reports are duplicative each month. Ms. Landis concurred and asked if a motion should be made for staff to follow up with CCL on what is needed. The Subcommittee recommended staff to follow up with CCL instead of requesting updates from the facility by way of a Task Force letter. Ms. Landis requested that Mr. Harmon figure out a way to get the appropriate reports for CCL.

VI. UPDATE ON SUNSHINE CANYON CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL

Odor Complaints

Mr. Vu Truong, staff to the Task Force, provided an update on the [odor complaints from the AQMD](#) for the month of October 2021.

- During the month of October 2021, 74 complaints were made to the AQMD hotline. Of those, 31 were classified as Trash and the rest were listed as No Field Response and None, which meant the inspector visited the site and did not detect any odor.
- Compared to September 2021, the number of complaints received in October 2021 increased from 55 to 74 complaints.
- Compared to October 2020, the number of complaints for October 2021 decreased from 121 to 74 complaints.
- As of November 5, 2021, AQMD issued 2 NOVs related to odor for the month of October 2021.

- According to the AQMD report, the total number of complaints received during 2021 is 304.

Mr. Mohajer commented odors were a common problem in early October 2021 until PW found out that Republic was using an alternative daily cover (ADC) to cover the trash from Saturday afternoon to Monday, which caused the odor problem. Republic had been in violation of PW requirements for the use of ADC at the landfill. Mr. Mohajer commented that the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) should be present daily at SCL. Lastly, he commented that the issue was not in the staff report considering that Public Works approved the use of the ADC. Ms. Landis agreed, and stated PW needed to look into the issue and provide the Subcommittee a response.

Mr. Aiyetiwa responded to the Subcommittee that the issue was brought to the County's attention with the letter received from Mr. Hunter and that PW investigated and spoke with Republic. Republic acknowledged that they were in violation. Republic disagreed that the cause of odor was due to not covering the trash. However, Republic agreed moving forward that they would use soil to cover the trash on weekends. Since then, Republic submitted a request to PW requesting the use of ADC on the weekends. PW is currently reviewing the request. Mr. Mohajer stated that Republic is required to comply with what PW approved and asked why PW had not requested Regional Planning to issue a NOV to Republic. Mr. Aiyetiwa responded that, consistent with the County's due process procedures, when a violation occurs PW notifies the landfill operator of the violation and if the operator complies, then no further action is needed. He added that the due process begins when the County officially acknowledges the violation. Ms. Landis asked if Republic is currently covering the trash at the landfill on Saturdays with something other than soil. Mr. Aiyetiwa responded that Republic submitted a request to PW for the use of ADC on Saturdays, but that they have been covering the working face with soil during the past few weekends, so no action for enforcement was needed.

Mr. Mohajer inquired regarding the fees collected and services provided by the SCL-LEA and Public Health. Ms. Dee Hanson-Lugo stated the SCL-LEA is responsible for oversight of the landfill and that the LEA does not receive tipping fees from Republic. Mr. Mohajer asked for Public Health to provide the LEA's budget in regards to SCL. Ms. Landis requested reports for next month's Subcommittee meeting from the SCL-LEA and Public Health.

Sunshine Canyon Landfill Q3 Vegetation Report

Mr. Harmon provided the update on the Third Quarter 2021 SCL Vegetation Report and advised that a vegetation meeting will be scheduled at some point. The landfill operator suggested meeting after the Fourth Quarter Report at which time they will also have an annual tree survey available to discuss. The Fourth Quarter Report

is due the end of January 2022. Nothing further was discussed due to time constraints.

VII. DISCUSSION OF FOC REPORTS

Mr. Mohajer requested Mr. Herman to disseminate an e-mail to the Subcommittee with copies of the submitted Semi-Annual Characterization Reports provided on the Task Force's Biannual Solid Waste Monitoring and Reporting Form.

VIII. DECEMBER SUBCOMITTEE MEETING

Mr. Mohajer made a motion to cancel the December Subcommittee meeting if the Task Force votes on cancelling their December Task Force meeting. Mr. Shammass seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comment.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m. The next meeting is to be determined by the outcome of the main Task Force voting on whether to have a December meeting.