

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

Minutes of May 15, 2014, Meeting

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

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jeanne Biehler, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health
Betsey Landis, Environmental Organization Representative
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative
Carlos Ruiz, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Christopher Salomon, represented by Debra Bogdanoff, County Sanitation
Districts of Los Angeles County

OTHERS PRESENT:

Clark Ajwani, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Joe Bartolata, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Kevin Best, Real Energy, LLC
Stephen Beitz, Real Energy, LLC
Russell Bukoff, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Rainer Globus, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Patrick Holland, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition/Granada Hills North Neighborhood Council
Jason W. Jones, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Karlo Manalo, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Dave Nguyen, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Saeid Shirzadegan, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Bereket Tadele, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Emiko Thompson, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Gerry Villalobos, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 11:10 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF APRIL 17, 2014, MEETING MINUTES

A motion to approve the Minutes of the April 17, 2014, meeting was made and unanimously approved. Mr. Carlos Ruiz seconded the motion.

III. UPDATE ON THE SUNSHINE CANYON CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL

Odor Complaints

Mr. Karlo Manalo provided an update on the Sunshine Canyon City/County Landfill (Sunshine Canyon Landfill) odor complaints for the month of April 2014.

During the month of April, a total of 122 complaints were made to the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) hotline. In comparison with March the number of complaints received in April decreased by 26 percent (from 164 to 122 complaints). Compared to April of 2013 the number of complaints this April increased by 9 percent (112 to 122 complaints).

Of the 122 complaints in April:

- 31 were verified to be trash odors
- 27 were verified to be landfill gas odors
- 4 were verified to be a combination of trash and landfill gas odors
- 26 were called in, but inspectors could not verify the odor upon arrival
- 34 were not responded to by AQMD's staff

Mr. Manalo also provided a summary of some of the key discussions that occurred at the May 8, 2014, meeting of the Sunshine Canyon Landfill Community Advisory Committee (CAC). At that meeting, Republic Services, Inc. (Republic), reported on some of their recent improvements at the Landfill over the last two months, including beginning construction of the bypass road, installation of an additional 14 gas wells, and the hydro-seeding of approximately 60 acres of the Landfill in April. Republic also reported at the CAC meeting that AQMD's consultant, HydroGeoChem, had begun preparation work for the landfill gas generation study at the Landfill.

Mr. Manalo informed the Subcommittee that:

- Republic received their permit for the Sewer Line Project from the City. Construction is anticipated to begin by the end of May.
- AQMD's inspector reported that five Notices of Violation (NOVs) had been issued to the Landfill in April regarding odors. There were no NOV's issued by the Sunshine Canyon Landfill—Local Enforcement Agency (SCL-LEA) during the month of April.
- A motion was passed by the CAC at the meeting to send a letter to the Los Angeles Unified School District Board to bring to their attention the significant number of odor complaints from Van Gogh Elementary School.

Update on Revegetation Efforts

Mr. Russell Bukoff provided a [PowerPoint Presentation](#) summarizing the Sunshine Canyon Landfill First Quarter 2014 Vegetation Report, as well as a summary of the action items resulting from the meeting on revegetation that was held on May 6, 2014, at Public Works Headquarters. The meeting was attended by representatives from Republic, the County Department of Regional Planning, Independent Monitor UltraSystems, Public Works, and Ms. Betsey Landis.

For the update on the County and City sides, hydro-seeding activities were conducted from April 7 to April 18, 2014. Test plots were established to test two methods of hydro-seeding, hydro-seed slurry covered by mulch, and hydro-seed slurry on top of mulch. Future hydro-seeding activities will be based on the results of this test.

No vegetation activities were conducted on any permanent slope. Slopes formerly designated as permanent are being reviewed to determine which of these slopes are, in fact, permanent and require vegetation efforts. Areas designated as "non-permanent" cut slopes will be evaluated to determine if they have been categorized correctly and to identify the type of vegetation appropriate for these areas.

For the update on the County sides, no vegetation activities have been conducted in the first quarter 2014. Soil samples were collected in March 2014. Soil analyses and growth trials are currently underway. Results are expected to be reported in the second quarter 2014 vegetation report.

Architerra Design Group (Architerra), Republic's consultant, will also be evaluating the County sage mitigation area for the need for creation of benches, use of soil amendments, re-seeding and container planting, among other things.

For the update on the City Side, re-seeding of the pilot project area will be assessed and planned for winter 2015. Quadrat and Point Intercept survey methods will be employed to assist in determining success or failure of the pilot project. There is no schedule proposed yet for the implementation of mitigation activities on the middle and upper decks.

In discussing the first quarter vegetation report, at the May 6 meeting, the group commented that Republic is making good revegetation efforts; however, they requested that Republic include timelines and milestones for completing the action items, where appropriate.

Specific comments included the following:

- Indicating all interim areas on Figure 1, not only the areas hydro-seeded, and to indicate the reason for choosing these areas and how the site was prepared.
- Seek acceptance of Venturan Sage Scrub species by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (California Fish and Wild).
- Provide a schedule for the sampling of species in the Pilot Sage Mitigation Area.
- Continue to review the 2008 Sage Mitigation and Interim Cover Revegetation Plan to develop a new plan for City and County areas.
- Include specific timelines, where appropriate, and specific actions needed to implement the actions listed on Recommendation Tables 1, 2, and 3 of the Report. Not enough data is currently provided for the Vegetation Committee to determine the progress of vegetation activities.

Mr. Bukoff stated that staff will continue to meet quarterly to reassess vegetation efforts at the Landfill.

Mr. Wayne Hunter commented that he has expressed concern at the May CAC meeting that much of the vegetation on the southern portion of the upper deck on the City-side Sage Mitigation Area (as shown in the First Quarter 2014 Vegetation Report) had been cleared to allow for the installation of a new pipeline. He asked if the County can look into this issue and determine what type of pipeline will be installed in this area and whether the clearing of vegetation are required prior to installation.

Mr. Hunter also mentioned at the CAC meeting that a large stockpile of soil on the northwest County-side of the Landfill had been removed and filled with municipal solid waste by Republic. Mr. Hunter was concerned if Public Works was notified of this activity by Republic, and whether Republic has been complying with the approved fill sequencing and grading plans by Public Works while not exceeding the permitted maximum elevation for the Landfill. After some discussion, Mr. Ruiz asked staff to look into whether the area that has been filled with trash is consistent with the fill sequencing plans approved by Public Works.

IV. AB 1126 – CALRECYCLE IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS

Mr. Mike Mohajer reported that the Task Force and Public Works corresponded with CalRecycle on the regulations and guidelines for the implementation of AB 1126, which provides for the development of engineered municipal solid waste technology facilities. Mr. Mohajer will present more information on this at the Task Force meeting, and he will be asking County Counsel to provide more in depth information at next month's Task Force meeting.

Mr. Kevin Best, Real Energy, LLC, asked if the Los Angeles County Countywide Siting Element (CSE) will be exempt from this legislation, and Mr. Mohajer stated that County Counsel will need to make a determination regarding this issue.

V. UPDATE ON INITIAL STUDY FOR THE COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT

Mr. Patrick Holland provided an update on the Draft Initial Study for the County CSE and stated that the County's consultant, Tetra Tech BAS, has prepared the draft Initial Study. Staff has reviewed the Draft Initial Study and provided comments to Tetra Tech, along with County Counsel's recommendations and guidance.

Mr. Holland reported that staff tentatively plans to release the Draft Initial Study along with the Notice of Preparation next month, to the responsible agencies.

These agencies include each of the 88 cities, all applicable State agencies, the State Clearinghouse, and local associations of government. Staff will also submit the Draft Initial Study to the Task Force for review and comment.

In order to be able to send the Draft Initial Study to the appropriate city personnel, staff sent letters on May 8, 2014, to the city managers of the 88 cities in the County requesting them to provide a contact person to correspond with through the CSE approval process. To date, staff received responses from 20 cities. After the Draft Initial Study is released, staff will discuss the details and findings of the document at an upcoming Subcommittee meeting.

There was no discussion on this item.

VI. DISPOSAL OF ORGANICS AT LANDFILLS BASED ON WASTE CHARACTERIZATION STUDIES

Mr. Manalo provided a presentation on five Waste Characterization reports from various County landfills and compared them against the 2008 California Statewide Waste Characterization Study (2008 State Study). The presentation included a [bar graph](#) comparing data from the 2008 State Study against the following five landfills: Sunshine Canyon Landfill; Chiquita Canyon Landfill; Lancaster Landfill; Antelope Valley Recycling and Disposal Facility; and Puente Hills Landfill.

Mr. Manalo stated that, as part of their Finding of Conformance (FOC) requirements, these landfills each submitted Waste Characterization forms to the Task Force on a biannual basis. He added that Chiquita Canyon Landfill is required by its Waste Plan Conformance Agreement to submit a Waste Characterization form to Public Works on a biannual basis.

These waste characterization forms provide representative samples of the waste stream characteristics received at the landfills during the reporting week. A certain percentage of loads was sampled throughout a one-week period, once during the spring, and once during the fall. The data from the two weeks (in both spring and fall) were then combined, reflecting a two-week period. Mr. Manalo's presentation focused on the results of the waste characterization studies from these landfills and then compared them against the 2008 State Study.

Mr. Manalo reported that in the 2008 State Study, CalRecycle categorized the waste stream by material type and included the respective percentages for each

of the material types to show the composition of California's overall disposal waste stream. Data was gathered from 751 waste samples sorted at 27 solid waste facilities (including landfills and transfer stations) over the course of four seasons. Whenever possible, a randomized process was used to select participating solid waste facilities, dates for field work, vehicles carrying waste, and multifamily dwellings. This study showed that in 2008, approximately 74 percent of waste collected in California was comprised of organics.

Mr. Manalo also indicated the bar graph showed percentages of the various types of organics – paper, plastic, yard waste, other organics, and total organics at each of the five landfills. He also mentioned that the graph included the weighted average of organics for the five landfills as they may be considered representative of the County's overall disposal waste stream, and the data from the 2008 State Study.

Mr. Manalo concluded that the distribution of organics based on the studies conducted at the five landfills, collectively, was consistent with the 2008 State Study for each of the organics categories.

Mr. Mohajer commented that it is important to distinguish the difference between compostable organics and non-compostable organics disposed of at Landfills. He mentioned that, currently, CalRecycle defines organics as any waste material that is carbon-based.

Mr. Ruiz commented that, considering the results of the 2008 State Study are comparable with the weighted averages of organics for the five County landfills, the 2008 State Study could be used as a strong indicator of the general waste stream at landfills for the County. However, Ms. Landis added that State averages can be misleading when describing the diverse waste stream in the County and should be cautiously used. Mr. Ruiz added that State averages are useful in determining broad impacts of legislation, such as AB 1826, on the County; however, each jurisdiction would need to look at its own particular waste stream in developing its own waste diversion programs.

VII. DISCUSSION ON FINDING OF CONFORMANCE QUARTERLY REPORTS

Mr. Saeid Shirzadegan discussed several Finding of Conformance quarterly monitoring progress reports for the first quarter of 2014.

2014 Spring Waste Characterization Report for Antelope Valley Recycling and Disposal Facility

This report provides a breakdown of specific material types and categories for the incoming waste stream, such as paper, plastics, glass, metals, and yard waste. These materials were listed for each residential, commercial, and industrial source. This waste characterization report revealed that, in comparison with last year's report, there was about 16 percent less plastics and 15 percent more yard waste that entered the Antelope Valley Recycling and Disposal facility.

2014 Semiannual Waste Characterization for Sunshine Canyon Landfill

This report provides the breakdown of specific material types and categories for the incoming waste stream. In comparison with last year's report, there was about ten percent more paper and nine percent fewer organics that were received at the Sunshine Canyon Landfill.

First Quarter 2014 Monitoring Report for Chiquita Canyon Landfill

This report provides detailed information of incoming disposal tonnages broken down by various sources (residential and commercial) as well as material types (refuse; construction and demolition debris; and green waste) during first quarter of 2014. Based on the report, the Chiquita Canyon Landfill received 455,000 tons in the first quarter of 2014. This amount was comparable to the first quarter of 2013 during which the total tonnage received at the Landfill was 420,000 tons. The total tonnage diverted for recycling such as shredded green waste, MRF fines, rubber, concrete, and asphalt during the first quarter of 2014 was about 90,100 tons which was similar to 87,000 tons that were received in the first quarter of 2013.

First Quarter 2014 Monitoring Report for Commerce Refuse-to-Energy

This report provides the number of loads and tonnages of refuse received for combustion, as well as the amount of energy produced, and the treated ash tonnages during the first quarter of 2014. Based on the report, the Commerce Refuse-to-Energy facility received approximately 30,500 tons during the first

quarter of 2014, which was comparable to the first quarter of 2013, during which the facility received about 29,200 tons. During the first quarter of 2014, the facility produced a total of approximately 22,000 Megawatt-hours of energy and 6,900 tons of ash. This was comparable to the first Quarter of 2013.

The Quarterly Report for Sunshine Canyon City Landfill

This report provides information on the incoming disposal tonnages broken down by various sources such as residential and commercial, as well as material types such as refuse; construction and demolition debris; and green waste, during the first quarter of 2014. Based on the report, Sunshine Canyon Landfill disposed of about 540,000 tons of materials, which was comparable to the first quarter of 2013, during which nearly 544,000 tons were disposed of. During the first quarter of 2014, the Landfill received no beneficial use material, in comparison to the first quarter of 2013, during which about 33,800 tons of beneficial use materials were received.

The Quarterly Monitoring Report for Lancaster Landfill's Conversion Technology Development

This report provides an update on the Landfill's efforts to implement a conversion technology facility as part of their Conditional Use Permit. Mr. Shirzadegan informed the subcommittee that the Landfill is currently exploring options for implementing conversion technology.

Mr. Mohajer inquired if any reports on the Reclaimable Anaerobic Composting (RAC) facility at Lancaster Landfill have been received. Mr. Gerry Villalobos said he will check to see if the reports required to be submitted for the RAC to the LEA have been submitted, and Mr. Ruiz indicated that staff will check into the status of the RAC.

Ms. Landis noted that Commerce Refuse-to-Energy Facility sends ash to El Sobrante and La Paz Landfills and inquired if this waste is considered hazardous. Mr. Ruiz commented that, as El Sobrante is a solid waste landfill, the ash is probably not hazardous. Ms. Debra Bogdanoff added that before the closure of Puente Hills Landfill the ash was bound in concrete to be used as winter deck at the Landfill but would have to see if this is still the case. She noted that ash bound for La Paz Landfill is shipped as is to the Landfill.

On Chiquita Canyon Landfill, Ms. Landis commented that approximately two million gallons of water were used for irrigation and dust control at the

Landfill every month and inquired if the water is obtained from the leachate or fresh water, as runoff from this Landfill would drain into the Santa Clara River. Mr. Ruiz stated that the Landfill does not treat leachate at the site and has to truck it offsite for treatment. Mr. Villalobos added that well water is used, and that he will verify the type of water used and what happens to the leachate.

Regarding this Landfill, Ms. Landis asked if contaminated soil was used as alternative daily cover. Mr. Villalobos said that treated contaminated soil is allowed to be used as alternative daily cover. Mr. Shirzadegan added that the treated contaminated soil is also used as road base or other beneficial uses.

Mr. Hunter commented that he noticed there has been no recycling or beneficial use reported by Sunshine Canyon Landfill on their reports. Mr. Ruiz indicated staff will look into this as the Landfill has agreed to take in certain materials, such as tires, per its Waste Plan Conformance Agreement to encourage recycling.

VIII. OPEN DISCUSSION/PUBLIC DISCUSSION

Ms. Landis requested a discussion on the Azusa Land Reclamation Facility's Proposed Solid Waste Facility Permit Revision be added to the agenda of the next subcommittee meeting on June 19, 2014.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.