

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

August 21, 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
Sam Shammass, Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Jordan Sisson, California Waste and Recycling Association
Felicia Truong, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health
Emiko Thompson, Los Angeles County Public Works

OTHERS PRESENT:

Sharon Bronson, Republic Services
Brenda Eels, Rincon
Jocelyn Francis, City of Avalon
David Harich, Geo-Logic Associates
John McMannara, CR&R
Joe Bartolata, Los Angeles County Public Works
Anna Gov, Los Angeles County Public Works
Alex Fitchmun, Los Angeles County Public Works
Karlo Manalo, Los Angeles County Public Works
Dave Nguyen, Los Angeles County Public Works
Carol Saucillo, Los Angeles County Public Works
Caleb Yun, Los Angeles County Public Works

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Dave Nguyen called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JULY 17, 2025, SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. Basil Cantu made a motion to approve the July 17, 2025, minutes, and Mr. Wayde Hunter. Motion passed unanimously.

III. PEBBLY BEACH LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Joe Bartolata, staff to the Task Force, provided a brief overview regarding the Pebbly Beach Landfill (PBL) Expansion Project. The City of Avalon (Avalon) submitted a Draft Initial Study and findings for environmental documents on the expansion of PBL. The Landfill Operator, Avalon Environmental Services, submitted a proposal for the expansion of PBL and an application for an extension to PBL Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to the Department of Regional Planning (DRP). The current PBL CUP was approved by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors on November 29, 1984, and is set to expire on July 29, 2028.

Ms. Jocelyn Francis, Assistant City Manager for Avalon, provided a [presentation](#) on their PBL Expansion Project.

Mr. Jordan Sisson asked if Task Force authority was strictly on the Finding of Conformance (FOC) with future condition approval. Mr. Nguyen confirmed the discussion with County Counsel and that the Task Force limitation is only for the FOC and that the land use entitlement (issuance of the Conditional Use Permit) is under the Department of Regional Planning (DRP).

Mr. Sisson indicated his understanding was that approval from the Los Angeles County (County) Board of Supervisors or DRP is soon approaching, and he believed the Subcommittee could make a recommendation to the Task Force contingent on final approval. Mr. Nguyen clarified that the process path is for DRP to approve the project first and then Avalon would come back to the Task Force with the FOC application for consideration.

Mr. Sisson mentioned that at last month's brief project overview to the Subcommittee, it was mentioned that Avalon was working with the Coastal Commission and submitted documents on December 24, 2024, and asked Avalon what the comments from the Coastal Commission were since he did not see a hearing on it. Ms. Brenda Eells, with Rincon, responded that Avalon is

waiting for comments from the County on the Initial Study as the County has the jurisdiction to approve and she believes that the Coastal Commission only has the authority to appeal. Mr. Sisson then asked if there is a certified Local Coastal Program for Avalon on which was confirmed by Ms. Francis.

Mr. Sisson further asked if the landfill had a landfill gas system on which Mr. David Harich, with Geo-Logic & Associates, responded there was no landfill gas system as the landfill was built in the 1900s and was a burnt facility until 1999. He informed that the bottom 30 feet of the landfill consisted of ash and the current bales are sitting on top of them. Mr. Harich further added that the bales have very little organics since the operation pulls the organic content out as much as possible. He also informed that PBL has a South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) permit for surface monitoring.

Mr. Hunter asked what the current cost was for Avalon to dispose a ton of waste on which Ms. Francis did not have the available information with her to provide. Mr. Hunter further asked what the increase in cost would be to use alternative technologies. Ms. Francis noted the alternative technologies that she has seen use a lot of water, and that Catalina Island is salt contained as far as water. She added that Avalon went through significant water rationing several years ago which required more power and that they use diesel generators through Southern California Edison (SCE).

Ms. Francis further informed that the use of alternative technologies is not impossible, but noted Avalon is significantly limited given the use of what is coming into the landfill and limitations on power, water, and gas. However, she believes Avalon is a perfect test for a company because SCE, the wastewater treatment plant, and landfill are in close proximity.

Mr. John McMannara, with CR&R, mentioned his working on this project since 1999 when they permitted the project to go from incinerating to bail fill and recycling off the island. Since 2012, work had been done for about six to eight years looking into alternative technologies. Since then, CR&R has been very active in seeking alternative technologies and has an anaerobic digestion (AD) facility in Perris, as well as other diversion projects that typically cost more. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Cantu asked what Avalon's diversion rates are and what type of education they have for residents and tourists. Ms. Francis responded that the average diversion rate is about 40 to 45 percent of material being barged off the island. Avalon also has public outreach, which includes their *What Goes Where Wednesday* campaign that can be found on Avalon's social media pages. They are also pushing out their Zero Waste campaign and have added green waste reciprocals. Additionally,

Code Enforcement Officers inspect every non-transient rental establishment monthly to ensure compliance with their Green Bag Program. She admitted that this effort is very challenging, especially with Avalon having over 300 vacation rentals and that vacationers do not want to wash dishes but rather purchase single-use items. However, she also advised that Avalon has done well with educating on-island residents.

Mr. Bartolata concluded that Avalon is proposing the expansion of an existing facility in accordance and Chapter 10 of the County's Countywide Siting Element that requires the existing facility must obtain a FOC with the CSE granted by the Task Force. The first step to this process is that staff recommends to the Subcommittee to request to the Task Force to send a letter to the Landfill Operator, notifying them and DRP of the requirement to submit a proposal application for a new FOC for consideration based on the proposed PBL expansion. Once the FOC application is submitted, the Task Force has 90 days to review and transmit comments to Avalon. Once the FOC application is deemed complete, the Task Force will notify DRP and Avalon that the FOC has been granted and will provide a copy of the Final FOC to DRP, the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA), CalRecycle, and Avalon.

Mr. Hunter made a motion for the Subcommittee to recommend to the Task Force that they send a letter to the Landfill Operator, notifying them and DRP of the requirement to submit a proposal application for a new FOC for consideration based on the proposed PBL expansion. Mr. Sisson seconded with an amendment that if the recommendation cannot be voted upon by the Task Force today, then Avalon representatives may attend next month's Task Force meeting remotely. Motion, as amended, was approved unanimously.

IV. 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 [Fifty-First Monthly Update](#), dated August 5, 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 5 NOVs in July 2025 related to air quality from AQMD, compared to the 12 NOVs received in June 2025 and the 16 NOVs received in July 2024.
- CCL entered into a Stipulated Order for Abatement (SOA) with AQMD on September 2, 2023, that was last modified on June 24, 2025, to address and abate the odors resulting from the reaction at CCL through continuous

implementation of mitigation measures in the SOA. Once available, a copy of the modified SOA will be submitted to the Subcommittee.

- On July 14, 2025, DRP issued a [NOV](#) alleging violations of its CUP for failure to cease development or activity not in compliance with any law, statute, ordinance, or regulation; failure to comply with Public Works' grading requirements; and failure to ensure development structures and activities conformed to Public Works' requirements.

V. SUNSHINE CANYON CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL

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

Odor Complaints and Notices of Violation

- During the month of July 2025, 101 complaints were made to the AQMD hotline. Of those, 16 were classified as Trash, 39 were listed as No Field Response, 20 were listed as Landfill Gas Odors, 26 were classified as None, which meant the inspector visited the site and did not detect odors.
- Compared to June 2025, the number of complaints received in July 2025 increased from 46 to 101 complaints.
- Compared to July 2024, the number of complaints for July 2025 increased from 47 to 101 complaints.
- AQMD issued 2 NOVs related to odor for the month of July 2025.
- The total number of NOVs issued this calendar year is 36.

Mr. Hunter asked if SCL gave a reason for the increase in odors. Mr. Fitchmun responded they did not. Mr. Hunter then commented that odors are typically reduced at this time of the year, and he was aware that SCL had a death and that the drilling schedule was delayed by a month. However, SCL has three rigs that are drilling into the wells in an effort to play catchup with the drilling schedule.

Mr. Hunter also noted that SCL has a SOA with a hearing scheduled for September 3, 2025, regarding the status of compliance and he questioned why the Subcommittee is not receiving the same type of detailed information for SCL as they do for CCL. He then inquired if Public Works staff can provide detail information on the progress of the SOA for SCL.

Mr. Sisson asked if there were any trace elements or odors of benzene in the landfill gas and if there was any fence side monitoring at SCL. Mr. Fitchmun responded he did not have that information available but stated staff could investigate it.

Mr. Sisson then asked if SCL had landfill gas operations running, which Mr. Fitchmun confirmed yes.

Mr. Sisson wondered what the effect would be on capacity if SCL went down for a week. Mr. Nguyen noted Mr. Sisson's very important questions and stated that staff would investigate and perhaps have answers for him before the future Subcommittee meetings.

Mr. Hunter noted there is typically one landfill gas well per acre on a normal landfill and he believes SCL has three landfill gas wells per acre. He commented that although SCL has triple the amount of landfill gas wells per acre and yet it still not able to contain the gas.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Manalo provided a brief update on the [heat map](#) that was provided by Mr. Sisson at the July 17, 2025, Subcommittee meeting. Staff understood that the map may have derived from [NASA FIRMS](#), a website that provides access to near real time wildfire activity data. In looking into the County landfills marked on the map, NASA FIRMS database, and FAQ page. It is staff's understanding that a pixel mark on the real time map indicates an active fire and, in most cases, represents vegetation fires. However, it is sometimes a volcanic eruption or a flare from a gas well. There are also different types of thermal anomalies that are not currently attributed in the NASA FIRMS database.

Mr. Manalo noted that aside from CCL that closed in January 2025 partly due to elevated temperatures, the other two landfills shown on the map (SCL and Scholl Landfill) are not impacted and remain open.

Mr. Sisson asked for confirmation on the elevated temperatures at El Sobrante Landfill. Mr. Manalo responded that staff do not have much information on other county landfills.

Mr. Sisson mentioned that there are public reports indicating that there are at least two other landfills experiencing the same anomalous heat level and noticed that there are some facilities that are doing very well. He suggests Public Works look into it, especially at any facilities that the County is contingent on using it for their disposal capacity.

Mr. Shammass clarified that the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts (LACSD) spoke to the LEA and there was no indication of fire at Scholl Landfill. The LACSD

had suspected the flare because Glendale is not running their gas to power facility as they are currently building a gas plant at the facility.

Mr. Hunter asked if there were any updates on the Request for Expressions of Interest for Mesquite Property. Mr. Shammass stated that the LACSD extended the deadline to August 15, 2025, and has received some responses.

Mr. Sisson noted reviewing the waste window rates from last month's Subcommittee meeting and found it interesting that the three public landfills (Calabasas, Scholl and Whittier Landfills) are still charging under \$100 per ton, which is significantly less than private landfills. His understanding is that the cost is about \$180 per ton, which is what Mesquite is looking at. Extrapolating that amount by three percent over a period of time and looking at the rates at current facilities,

Mr. Sisson indicated Antelope Valley being in parity before 2030 and Antelope Valley in parity by 2035, which does not include landfill closures. Mr. Shammass noted that private landfill operators offer steep discounts on private contracts and that the LACSD does not have access to see those rates. Initial thoughts are that Mesquite rates are higher than \$180 per ton, but the LACSD does not have a definite number without specific contracts. Discussion of rates and capacity ensued.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:58 p.m. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for September 18, 2025, at 11 a.m.