

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

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Sharon Bronson, Republic Services
Jonathan Caruso, Waste Management
Brenda Eels, Rincon
Jocelyn Francis, City of Avalon
David Harich, Geo-Logic Associates
Larry Israel, South Coast Air Quality Management District
Cesar Leon, Tetra Tech
John McMannara, CR&R
Erin Rowland, Long Beach Public Works
Michael Stewart, Republic Services
Joe Bartolata, Los Angeles County Public Works
Lance Cervantes, Los Angeles County Public Works
Anna Gov, Los Angeles County Public Works
Alex Fitchmun, Los Angeles County Public Works
Michael Harmon, 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

Ms. Emiko Thompson called the meeting to order at 11:04 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MAY 15, 2025, SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. Wayde Hunter made a motion to approve the May 15, 2025, minutes, and Mr. Basil Cantu seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

III. PEBBLY BEACH LANDFILL EXPANSION

The presentation was postponed until next month due to the belief that the Task Force would not have a quorum. At next month's meeting, there may be a recommendation from the Subcommittee for the Task Force to send a letter to the City of Avalon (Avalon) regarding the Finding of Conformance (FOC) requirement, under the Los Angeles County Countywide Siting Element.

Ms. Jocelyn Francis, Assistant City Manager for Avalon, introduced herself and the team involved in the Pebbly Beach Landfill (PBLF) expansion project. Ms. Francis informed the Subcommittee that the PBLF has less than two and a half years of landfill capacity left and that the proposed project entails building a 20-foot mechanically stabilized earth wall that will allow an additional 25 to 27 years of landfill capacity.

Mr. Jordan Sisson noticed in the presentation that there was a December 13, 2024, date related to the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and Coastal Development Permit but did not see an action item on the Coastal Commission agenda. He indicated that the Coastal Commission approval would probably be one of the significant interactions for the project. Ms. Francis stated the December date was when the application was submitted to Los Angeles County (County) agencies. The permit applications are still under review.

Mr. Sisson asked where the nearest residential area was located in relation to PBLF. Ms. Francis responded that there is a small residential community that is well beyond 1,000 feet from the landfill. Mr. Sisson asked about alternative methods of disposal, including anaerobic digestion, and believed that ATA (Anaerobic Toxicity Assay) looked at Avalon as a potential site to mitigate disposal. Ms. Francis responded that at that time when the initial study was done on alternatives in 2013, technology was meant for larger landfill sites and the amount of waste coming into that site was not feasible for the cost of building one on the landfill. However, today she believes that technologies have advanced where you

can have something at home that breaks down compost materials in a 24-hour period.

Ms. Francis informed that Avalon is continuously looking at different contractors who could provide technologies to use with food waste and compost. She further added that the landfill site has taken sludge from the wastewater treatment plant and CR&R does collections for Avalon's FOG (fats, oils, and grease) Program that is shipped over to town on the barge with all the recycling materials.

Mr. Sisson asked if Avalon had an operating agreement with a third party and whether or not it was productive. Ms. Francis confirmed the agreement and informed that she has developed a good working relationship with CR&R as they have assisted Avalon with Senate Bill 1383 compliance and other State requirements.

Mr. Sisson asked if the relationship has been productive in terms of Avalon being able to have some control over the landfill, making sure that rates are responsible, and providing long-term stability with rate payers. Ms. Francis explained that COVID stopped the sorting at the landfill, as well as a reduction of visitors for a short time, but they rebounded substantially from COVID impact. The landfill was also a single stream system for a long time but is now a three-stream system. She noted that Avalon has made many improvements since burning trash in the 1990s.

Ms. Thompson inquired about the timeline for the environmental review and CUP process since there is only two and a half years left of landfill capacity. Ms. Francis informed that their target for the start of construction is Fall 2026. In early August 2025, Avalon is planning to have an all-hands meeting with multiple County departments and consultants to review the study and to answer questions about the project.

IV. REQUEST FOR EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST FOR THE MESQUITE PROPERTY AND WASTE-BY-RAIL SYSTEM COMPONENTS

Mr. Sam Shammas provided an update on the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts (LACSD) [Request for Expressions of Interest](#) (REI) for the Mesquite Property and Waste-by-Rail System. The REI was posted on July 3, 2025, with responses due by August 1, 2025. The REI is part of a two-step process which includes 1) an REI to explore the potential interest and uses for sale or lease of the Mesquite Regional Landfill (Mesquite), which is an unbinding step; and 2) determine if the LACSD releases a Request for Proposal (RFP) based on REI findings.

Mr. Hunter commented that the timeframe for responses to the RFP was very short because of all the information and limitations that need to be analyzed. He then asked if the LACSD had received any responses to its RFP. Mr. Shammass responded that the main thing to note is that the REI is not a complete RFP. LACSD does not expect someone to do a deep analysis. The REI is merely to explore ideas and usage for the property.

Mr. Hunter further expressed displeasure that the LACSD was going this route since he believed Mesquite was showing some very advanced planning by the County and city in addressing the upcoming waste problem. He acknowledged that tipping fees would not be competitive and would be expensive to use the waste-by-rail system. However, at that time, landfills will reach their full capacity and there will be no other landfill site available in the County.

Mr. Shammass reiterated that the LACSD is looking at all options, including leasing of the property which may just entail someone wanting to build a solar array or some other kind of facility on the property or even use the railyard for other usages.

Mr. Sisson asked if the REI was originally going to be released as an RFP two months ago. Mr. Shammass responded that the initial intention was an RFP, but the LACSD Board of Directors (BOD) and management decided on a two-step process.

Mr. Sisson asked if the 78 communities/cities that LACSD serves were represented by the BOD, which was confirmed by Mr. Shammass. Mr. Sisson commented that it was remarkable to see the objective of the REI because it looks very narrowly tailored with maximized economic benefit.

Mr. Sisson asked what the cost would be to operate Mesquite since LACSD has owned the property for 50 years. Mr. Shammass did not have the exact amount; however, noted it was a large cost. Mr. Sisson asked how the 78 cities could determine the maximum value if they do not know the full cost. Mr. Shammass responded that the cost is known, but that he did not know what it was. Mr. Sisson then asked what the cost is to simply keep the site as it is. Mr. Shammass responded he was not in the operations group, but that he could inquire and let him know.

Mr. Sisson further noted that the REI specified \$2.2 million annually from McKinney Trucking for the rent of the Puente Hills intermodal facility and another \$1 million from Western Mesquite Mines for the mining and ore dock piling at Mesquite. Mr. Shammass stated it was important to know that stockpiling uses airspace at Mesquite. The idea is to use that stockpiled material for cover of refuse; providing a future benefit.

Mr. Sisson then asked what fees were for ecology, who is responsible for the trucks. Mr. Shammass responded the amount was very minimal because they have not found many uses.

Mr. Sisson asked what the annual lease amount was for Athens at the Puente Hills Material Recovery Facility (MRF) and if it was similar to what they are paying to Dart, which was about \$150,000. Mr. Shammass did not know the amount off hand, but stated it was less because Athens is only leasing the sorting lines and the LACSD still operates the transfer station.

Discussion ensued about the timeline and the lack of waste commitment that the LACSD is concerned with because of liability being given to the LACSD should a third-party operator leave.

Ms. Thompson commented that Public Works is concerned about ensuring adequate disposal capacity and asked whether it would be viable to come up with a mechanism to plan for County waste and asked if there is anything in the proposal that may allow the County to do so. Mr. Shammass responded that the REI does mention the possibility which is in the appendix.

Ms. Thompson asked if there would be opportunities for negotiation. Mr. Shammass stated that the REI does not commit the LACSD or anyone to any course of action. Once REIs are submitted and reviewed, there will be discussions with the BOD, LACSD management, and proposers on what the final idea will be, so there will be opportunity for public comment.

Mr. Shammass stated he would pass the information noted at today's discussion on to his management. He reiterated that LACSD was also looking into leases and not just the sale of the facility.

V. 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 [Fiftieth Monthly Update](#), dated July 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 12 NOVs in June 2025 related to air quality from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD), compared to the 10 NOVs received in May 2025 and the 17 NOVs received in June 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. The modified SOA will be submitted to the Subcommittee once it becomes available.
- On June 26, 2025, Public Works issued CCL three NOVs for three different Assessor's IDs alleging violations of the Los Angeles County Building Codes for grading work performed without a permit or inspection and for grading work obstructing a drainage course, respectively:
 - [Notice of Building Code Violations \(Case #BENF2025004495\)](#)
 - [Notice of Building Code Violations \(Case #BENF2025004497\)](#)
 - [Notice of Building Code Violations \(Case #BENF2025004491\)](#)

Mr. Hunter asked if the relocation of the entrance to the landfill is still being considered now that the landfill is closed as he felt it was an expense that is not necessary. Mr. Manalo responded that both CCL and Public Works are reviewing the impact of the operations since the current operational changes and will determine if the relocation is still needed. Mr. Sisson concurred with Mr. Hunter, stating if CCL is closed, then those funds would be better used for other activities to relieve the current odor situation.

As requested by the Subcommittee at its March meeting, Mr. Lance Cervantes, staff to the Task Force, provided a [presentation](#) on 2024 Disposal Capacity and Impacts to Disposal Waste Flow, which only reflects 2024 data. Though the presentation does not reflect the disposal impacts from the CCL closure or wildfires that happened in January 2025, an analysis was provided which showed the potential impacts to waste flow due to CCL's tonnage reduction in mid-2024. Data for the first and second quarters of 2025 will not be available on [CalRecycle's Recycling and Disposal Reporting System](#) (RDRS) until Fall 2025.

Mr. Shammass commented that the presentation shows that Puente Hills (MRF) receives 182 tons per day when it receives about 1,000 tons per day. He recommended staff verify the amount.

Mr. Sisson asked when the 2024 disposal report will be available since he just received the 2023 disposal report and asked when the first and second quarter reports for 2025 will be available on the RDRS. Mr. Cervantes confirmed that CalRecycle will post the data by Fall 2025.

Mr. Hunter stated that Athens has Crown Recycling Services and asked about other facilities since he was aware that Republic Services owns about six MRFs and asked if other facilities, such as Universal Waste Systems, are independently

owned and not part of any large waste company. Mr. Sisson confirmed that Universal Waste Systems is independently owned.

Tipping Fees and Disposal Capacity after Closure of CCL

Mr. Manalo provided an update on the tipping fees for municipal solid waste (MSW) after closure of disposal operations of CCL and also summarized a [table](#) that outlined the tipping fee rates for MSW over the past three years. With the exceptions of Calabasas, Scholl Canyon and Simi-Valley Landfills, some landfills have had increases in their tipping fee rates for MSW from 2024 to 2025, which are not considered unusual and are within their respective normal ranges. While tipping fee increases generally happen for a variety of reasons, it is difficult to ascertain whether the recent increases in landfill MSW fees are related to the closure of disposal operations at CCL.

Mr. Hunter asked for a copy of the [table](#) and Mr. Manalo responded he made hard copies and would hand them out.

Mr. Sisson commented that most of his independent haulers have experienced a 20 to almost 40 percent increase in tipping fees immediately after the closure of CCL. He also mentioned reading the May 27, 2025, staff report from the City of Santa Clarita involving Burrtec Waste Management Industries in which they had a massive rate increase for their residents in response to the closure of CCL since they had to find alternative disposal facilities. They were paying \$37.50 per ton for tipping fees to CCL and now tipping fees are over \$90 per ton at other locations. In response, Mr. Manalo clarified that the rates per tonnage shown on the table are based on rates posted on respective landfill websites and represent general gate fee rates. Staff do not have information on confidential hauling contracted agreements with respective landfill operators.

Mr. Sisson noted that City of Santa Clarita residents now pay anywhere from 14 percent to 25 percent more. Therefore, when tipping fees increase, they get passed on to the rate payers and will have consequences. Discussion ensued.

VI. SUNSHINE CANYON CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL

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

Odor Complaints and Notices of Violation

- During the month of June 2025, 46 complaints were made to the AQMD hotline. Of those, 3 were classified as Trash, 18 were listed as No Field Response, 5 were listed as Landfill Gas Odors, 20 were classified as None, which meant the inspector visited the site and did not detect odors.
- Compared to May 2025, the number of complaints received in June 2025 decreased from 129 to 46 complaints.
- Compared to June 2024, the number of complaints for June 2025 increased from 31 to 46 complaints.
- AQMD issued 0 NOVs related to odor for the month of June 2025.
- The total number of NOVs issued this calendar year is 34.

Mr. Sisson commented that it looked as if SCL diligently worked on reducing odors this last month. Ms. Thompson's understanding is that odors are seasonal as they tend to reduce in the summer months and increase in the fall months.

Mr. Hunter suggested Mr. Eugene Tseng, consultant for the SCL-Local Enforcement Agency, make a presentation to the Subcommittee since he has been working on an Abatement Order at SCL. Mr. Tseng provided a presentation to the SCL-Community Advisory Committee on July 10, 2025. The community believes the Abatement Order should work as odors have been reduced from thousands being reported to 208 being reported in one year.

Ms. Thompson agreed it was a good suggestion. She also recommended since there will be a robust discussion next month regarding the PBLF expansion project, she believed it was better to have Mr. Tseng present at the September Subcommittee meeting, especially with trend conditions returning in the fall.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comment.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for August 21, 2025, at 11 a.m.