

Alternative Technology Advisory Subcommittee
Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/
Integrated Waste Management Task Force

Minutes of May 19, 2005

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Paul Alva, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
John McTaggart, Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Task Force
Mark McDannel, standing in for Ed Wheless, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles
County

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Fernando Berton, California Integrated Waste Management Task Force
Alex Helou, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation
Kay Martin, Bioenergy Producers Association
Chris Mastro, County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services
Mike Mohajer, Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Task Force
Michael Theroux, Theroux Environmental Consulting
Eugene Tseng, Eugene Tseng and Associates
Jeff Yann, Hacienda Heights Improvement Association

OTHERS PRESENT:

Shapoor Hamid, URS Corporation
Virginia Jauregui, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Coby Skye, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Due to the lack of quorum, approval of minutes will be considered at the next Subcommittee meeting.

III. CONTRACTOR UPDATE

Mr. Shapoor Hamid from URS Corporation provided the Subcommittee with an update covering the company's activities for April 2005.

IV. DISCUSSION ON CONTRACTOR DELIVERABLES, INCLUDING FINAL REPORT - URS

Mr. Hamid reported that URS had submitted the following draft deliverables:

1. "Analysis of Screened and Ranked Technologies" - submitted to the County on May 10, 2005.
2. "Analysis of the Most Suitable Combinations" - submitted to the County on May 12, 2005.
3. "Siting Analysis for Development of Conversion Products" - submitted to the County on May 12, 2005.
4. "Siting Analysis for Development of a Conversion Facility in Southern California" - submitted to the County on May 12, 2005.

URS is requesting the Subcommittee's prompt review and comments due to contract limits and time constraints. Mr. Alva suggested that in order to address and work through the remaining deliverables and the Report, a teleconference call should be scheduled for the following four Thursdays. A teleconference was tentatively scheduled for the following Thursday at 9:30 a.m.

Mr. Skye discussed the tentative conversion technology facility ranking criteria and the scoring of the conversion technology suppliers. Of the top tier of

suppliers, Interstate Waste Technologies scored the highest. This supplier currently operates pyrolysis/gasification facilities throughout Europe and Japan, which are capable of processing MSW at an acceptable rate. The tipping fee IWT is estimating is 130 dollars, however URS believes these costs are based on estimates of expenditures outside the United States, and therefore may be lower in actuality in the U.S.

Most of the vendors who scored highest on the ranking criteria are technologies employing an anaerobic digestion or gasification process. Mr. Alva requested that additional information about environmental issues and cost per tonnage be included in a table to help clarify the costs and benefits of the individual technologies. Following discussion, Mr. Alva asked that URS provide more information about the technologies in the top tier. Mr. Skye suggested URS develop three categories of technologies and rank the top supplier in relation to their category of technology, and for URS to come up with the most promising combinations between each best individual technology and the top three MRF sites.

One of the key issues that the Subcommittee is considering is the potential location for the conversion facility. Mr. Alva suggested that the table should highlight the features of each location, including space available, their ranking in relation to other MRFs, operational statistics, and if each MRF is in negotiations with any particular technology. The Subcommittee is requesting that URS rank these MRF facilities and provide a scientific/political evaluation for each site selection including an analysis of the community and political representatives.

V. NEXT STEPS AND FUTURE CONTRACTS UPDATE

Mr. Skye told the Subcommittee that a Scope of Work based on the Public Outreach plan would most likely be ready by the July meeting date.

VI. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

There was no legislative updated provided to the Subcommittee. At present, there is no scheduled hearing date for AB 1090, which is the most critical legislative proposal the Subcommittee is following.

VII. WASTE BOARD CONVERSION TECHNOLOGY REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

As a result from pressure of various proponents of the March 15th version of the Conversion Technology Report to the Legislature, the Waste Board voted to retain all of the information that was removed from the Report at their April meeting. This information would instead be developed as a separate document, and would be made available at any legislator's request, and subsequently posted on the Waste Board's website.

The Subcommittee highly recommended that the Task Force acquire a copy of the Waste Board report once it is finalized, and forward this document to various legislators and the AQMD. Mr. McTaggart recommended that the Task Force distribute the final Report with the attached document to cities with a letter that can be forwarded to their respective legislators.

VIII. CALIFORNIA BIOMASS COLLABORATIVE DRAFT REPORT

Due to a lack of time and quorum, the California Biomass Collaborative Draft Report will be discussed at next meeting date.

IX. OPEN DISCUSSION

No open discussion ensued.

X. NEXT MEETING DATE, TBA

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled as a teleconference to be held at Public Works, May 26, 2005 at 9:30 a.m.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m.