

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

April 17, 2025

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

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Basil Cantu, City of Long Beach Public Works
Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens
Shikari Nakagawa-Ota, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health
Sam Shammass, Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Jordan Sisson, California Waste and Recycling Association
Emiko Thompson, Los Angeles County Public Works

OTHERS PRESENT:

Brenda Eels, Waste Connections
Larry Israel, South Coast Air Quality Management District
Eugene Tseng, UCLA Solid Waste Program
Alex Fitchmun, Los Angeles County Public Works
Anna Gov, Los Angeles County Public Works
Michael Harmon, Los Angeles County Public Works
Dennis Lee, Los Angeles County Public Works
Karlo Manalo, Los Angeles County Public Works
Dave Nguyen, Los Angeles County Public Works
Paul Nguyen, Los Angeles County Public Works
Carol Saucillo, Los Angeles County Public Works
Caleb Yun, Los Angeles County Public Works
Kawsar Vazifdar, Los Angeles County Public Works

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Emiko Thompson called the meeting to order at 11:02 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 20, 2025, SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. Wayde Hunter made a motion to approve the March 20, 2025, minutes and Mr. Sam Shammass seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

III. CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL

Mr. Karlo Manalo, staff to the Task Force, reported on Chiquita Canyon Landfill's (CCL) Notices of Violation (NOVs):

- The Landfill Operator submitted their [Forty-Seventh Monthly Update](#), dated April 1, 2025, in accordance with the [April 19, 2021, Task Force letter](#) requirements and subsequent request for additional updates on NOVs issued and mitigation measures imposed by various regulatory agencies.
- CCL received 7 NOVs in March 2025 related to air quality from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD), compared to the 8 in February 2025.
- CCL entered into a Stipulated Order for Abatement (SOA) with AQMD that was last modified on April 16, 2025, to address and abate the odors resulting from the reaction at CCL through continuous implementation of mitigation measures in the SOA.
- The Local Enforcement Agency (LEA), with recommendations from CalRecycle, required CCL in 2023 to implement mitigation measures to address the reaction and ongoing odors.
- On June 6, 2024, the LEA issued CCL a [Compliance Order](#) imposing additional reporting requirements to CCL.
- CCL continues to implement mitigation measures required by AQMD and the LEA and provides periodic reports to various agencies, which are accessible through CCL's [odor mitigation website](#).
- On April 1, 2025, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) issued a [Summary of Violations](#) to CCL which requires them to submit a written statement in 30 days of issuance, documenting how the facility is complying with the requirements as detailed.

Mr. Hunter inquired about the new entrance relocation project now that the landfill was closed and if the landfill still has remaining capacity. Mr. Manalo responded that staff would need to follow up with CCL, but that his understanding is that there are currently no plans to proceed with relocating the entrance. However, it may be

verified once the annual compliance report by CCL is released in June or July of this year. He further informed that there is still remaining disposal capacity when the landfill closed. His understanding is that CCL is still maintaining the site as they still have environmental control systems that need to be operated and monitored.

Mr. Larry Israel with AQMD offered to give an update on CCL stating that the entrance on Wolcott Way was being considered, but he does not know if it still is. Mr. Israel indicated that at the April 16, 2025, AQMD hearing, the Landfill Operator and their attorney stated that the landfill is permanently closed, and they are not anticipating reopening it. He informed that AQMD inspectors have not seen any development of any future cells at CCL, but have noticed them relocating frac tanks from the tank farms, where the leachate is being stored, to a holding area designated as Canyon D. Mr. Israel indicated that he is not aware of discussions with DTSC and CalRecycle about relocating the treatment for the leachate offsite. One location being considered is at the intersection of Wolcott Way and Highway 126, which is a visibly open area. However, during the hearing, they were also considering putting it in cell 8B, which is directly southeast of the last cell that they were operating in until December 31, 2024.

Mr. Israel informed that there were 6 NOVs and 788 odor complaints for March 2025 and as of today, over 1,900 odor complaints. He noted that the recent April 16, 2025, AQMD hearing was a bridged status hearing in which they adopted a set of additional modifications to the existing SOA that will be continued to June 4 and June 17, 2025, tentatively. Two dates are being considered due to the number of witnesses. Those dates will be more of a full status hearing. Mr. Israel described conditions adopted in the modified April 16, 2025, SOA. During the next inspection, AQMD inspectors plan on doing Title V with additional areas that have not been previously addressed.

Mr. Hunter asked if the AQMD is only dealing with the existing management of CCL. Mr. Israel responded that there was a reaction committee that the AQMD had them put in place with the initial SOA a year and a half ago. AQMD meets with the reaction committee regularly, which includes consultants and SCS Engineers.

Mr. Basil Cantu asked if the 900 odor complaints reported in the first three months included this month, which was confirmed by Mr. Israel. He informed that as of April 17, 2025, there have been 290 odor complaints received and five nuisance violations.

IV. SUNSHINE CANYON CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL

Mr. Alex Fitchmun, staff to the Task Force, provided an update on the [odor complaints from AQMD for March 2025](#) at Sunshine Canyon Landfill (SCL):

Odor Complaints and Notices of Violation

- During the month of March 2025, 304 complaints were made to the AQMD hotline. Of those, 44 were classified as Trash, 150 were listed as No Field Response, 30 were listed as Landfill Gas Odor, and 80 were classified as None, which meant the inspector visited the site and did not detect any odor.
- Compared to February 2025, the number of complaints received for March 2025, decreased from 340 to 304 complaints.
- Compared to March 2024, the number of complaints for March 2025 increased from 272 to 304 complaints.
- AQMD issued 9 NOVs related to odor for the month of March 2025.
- The total number of NOVs issued this calendar year is 24.

Mr. Israel informed that SCL had 187 odor complaints and 6 additional nuisance violations thus far for the month of April. For the year as of today, SCL had 951 odor complaints and 30 nuisance violations. He noted AQMD had a SOA hearing on March 18, 2025, and that he did not attend it.

Mr. Hunter mentioned that he was not receiving a copy of the SOA from the County and requested that a copy be distributed for the next FPRS meeting. Mr. Israel responded that he had not received a copy either but that the many conditions were stipulated and that there will be a status hearing sometime in the beginning of September.

Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Eugene Tseng for a status update since he is involved with the mitigation measures. Mr. Tseng, as an independent contractor to the LEA, stated that the SOA was the work product by Public Works, AQMD, and the LEA, which began in October or November of 2024. There were many mitigation measures that were put into the SOA, which was approved on March 19, 2025, the date of the SOA hearing. Mr. Tseng mentioned there was a meeting last week between AQMD, the LEA, and SCL and about 16 attendees were at the meeting to lay out the schedule and approach. He stated that SCL hired another full-time environmental engineer to deal with SOA. There is a lot of data planning being shared between regulatory agencies, which will all be posted on the website ([Sunshine Canyon Landfill LEA](#)) for transparency.

V. WASTE BY RAIL SYSTEM UPDATE

Mr. Shammas provided a high-level [overview](#) of the Waste by Rail System (WRS).

Mr. Hunter shared his concern that the Los Angeles County Sanitation District (LACSD) will likely solicit interest in parties wishing to buy or lease components of the WRS and asked if the LACSD was abandoning the WRS. Mr. Shammas responded that the LACSD is currently looking at all options because someone may say they want to put in a solar panel facility or an anaerobic digestion at Mesquite Regional Landfill (Mesquite). Options may involve selling Mesquite and someone taking it over to operate it as a landfill or it could involve just a lease for other purposes. Mr. Shammas reiterated that the LACSD is looking at all options because nobody has offered a waste commitment to the LACSD to operate the system. Therefore, Mesquite is sitting out there and costing the public and rate payers money to maintain.

Mr. Hunter stated that buying and selling are two different things and allowing someone to buy is basically abandoning the WRS. Mr. Shammas stated purchase and operation of the WRS by another party remains a potential outcome and is dependent upon the response of the request for proposal (RFP). He also noted that the LACSD does not control the hauling, which is state law and is part of the challenge. Discussion ensued.

Ms. Thompson asked if there was an estimate of the types of waste commitments that would make the WRS financially viable. Mr. Shammas responded it could vary based on changes in the economy and depending on what the Union Pacific charges for its rates, but the LACSD was thinking about 8,000 to 12,000 tons per week, which is very preliminary due to the uncertainties.

Mr. Tseng mentioned one of the original land use conditions for the railway was that the waste to be disposed of had to be processed. He was unsure if that condition still holds. Mr. Shammas confirmed that the black bin waste had to be processed, and the waste had to go through a materials recovery facility (MRF) to get containerized.

Mr. Sisson asked what components are in the RFP. Mr. Shammas responded that the RFP has not been finalized yet and is being reviewed by LACSD management and is subject to change, but the Mesquite Landfill and intermodal facility and the Puente Hills Intermodal Facility in Los Angeles are currently included. Mr. Sisson asked what the approximate timeline was. Mr. Shammas responded that the RFP is under review and will likely be released in the next few months.

Mr. Shammass further informed that in terms of the waste commitment of 8,000 to 12,000 tons per week, Mr. Sisson asked if the amount would roughly be around \$180 per ton. Mr. Shammass stated that the range could be anywhere from \$125 to \$175 for containerized waste delivered to the Puente Hills Intermodal Facility, but that does not include MRF and transportation costs to the intermodal facility, so the total would be above \$200. Mr. Sisson mentioned that Avenal Landfill seems like the most feasible and asked if that was standard for all the other locations that the County is sending their waste to. His understanding is that Orange County, who is doing an RFP, is looking for about 100 tons.

Mr. Sisson asked what it was two years ago. Mr. Shammass responded that LACSD is paying about \$33 from out of County under contract but that LACSD is going to El Sobrante Landfill (ELS), and the rates are about 44 percent higher. Mr. Sisson asked what Orange County was looking for, which Mr. Shammass did not know.

With the rise in the cost of local disposal, Mr. Sisson mentioned that the alternative was the WRS. With the cost of local disposal doubling every two to three years, regional disposal costs may approach waste by rail costs. He asked if increases are likely to change, which Mr. Shammass indicated that it probably would not but waste by rail costs will likely also increase. Mr. Sisson asked if ELS and other locations will likely increase. Mr. Shammass stated it was hard to tell, but most likely prices will increase.

Mr. Sisson stated that something needs to be done with the WRS otherwise a change would need to be made in the Countywide Siting Element indicating that it is too expensive to use the WRS.

VI. FINDING OF CONFORMANCE

Mr. Dennis Lee, as staff to the Task Force, provided an [update](#) on the Finding of Conformance Waste Characterization Studies for Antelope Valley Recycling and Disposal Facility.

Mr. Sisson asked what the margin of error was in these reports. Mr. Lee could not say but explained that this sample type was at 0.1 percent, and they sampled over 120 tons in the sampled week. He noted that during the study time, they received about 16,560 tons which was 0.1 percent.

Mr. Sisson indicated that he understood there was a very large margin but noticed that organics are increasing even with the newer organic regulations and bills the state passed. However, he believed it may be well within the margin of error and that the increase of organics may not be indicative of what is really happening.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comments.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12 p.m. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for May 15, 2025, at 11 a.m.