

Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/  
Integrated Waste Management Task Force

**April 16, 2026**

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jorgel Chavez, League of California Cities  
Margaret Clark, League of California Cities  
David Fahrion, California Waste and Recycling Association  
Jim Smith, Teamster Local 396, City of Los Angeles

COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY OTHERS:

Bob Dowell, rep by Erin Rowland, City of Long Beach Energy and Environmental Services Department  
Robert Ferrante, rep by Sam Shammass, Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts  
Barbara Ferrer, rep by Felicia Truong, Los Angeles County Public Health  
Wayne Nastri, rep by Philip Crabbe, III, South Coast Air Quality Management District  
Mark Pestrella, rep by Emiko Thompson, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Barbara Romero, rep by Bernadette Halverson, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Ed Chen, League of California Cities  
Jeff Farano, Sr., Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries  
Rafael Prieto, City of Los Angeles

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jonathan Brazile, Office of County Counsel Los Angeles County  
Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens  
Siya Araumi, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Charles Darensbourg, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Ana Diaz, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Perla Gomez, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Anna Gov, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Darren Kwan, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Aaron Nolan, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Shawntelle Phillips, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Carol Saucillo, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Emiko Thompson, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Kawsar Vazifdar, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Caleb Yun, Los Angeles County Public Works

## **I. CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting called to order at 1:05 p.m. by Ms. Emiko Thompson who served as Chair, representing Director Mark Pestrella. Ms. Thompson immediately announced the revised agenda, updating Item V (Discussion and Possible Action on Bills), to include specific bill numbers. Copies were made available.

## **II. APPROVAL OF MARCH 19, 2026, MINUTES**

Mr. Jorgel Chavez made a motion to approve the [March 19, 2026](#), minutes, and Mr. David Fahrion seconded. Minutes were approved unanimously.

## **III. UPDATED PROCEDURE FOR CONSIDERING LEGISLATION**

Mr. Christopher Sheppard provided an overview of the [Updated Procedure for Considering Legislation](#), subsequent to last month's Task Force meeting.

Mr. Jim Smith inquired whether a formal process exists for a Task Force member to request that Los Angeles County (County) reconsiders its position on bills. Mr. Sheppard explained that if the County has already taken a position on a bill, the Task Force cannot take further action and therefore, using the two-step process is better because the preliminary recommendation on a bill alerts a difference of opinion to the Chief Executive Office – Legislative Affairs and Intergovernmental Relations (CEO-LAIR).

Ms. Margaret Clark requested clarification on the process of changing an established County position on a bill, specifically asking if it requires an emergency amendment. Additionally, she asked if the Task Force may still submit their recommendation if it differs from the CEO-LAIR's position or if the Task Force's recommendation considered null and void. Mr. Sheppard stated that the CEO-LAIR does not hold an independent position, as any position is considered a County position. The CEO-LAIR has some delegated authorities to issue a pursuit of a bill based on the legislative agenda that has been adopted by the County Board of Supervisors (Board). However, some bills need a full Board motion to adopt a policy. Once a County position is established, either through CEO-LAIR pursuit or Board motion, it remains in effect until altered by a formal Board action. Mr. Sheppard indicated that in Step 1 of the process, the CEO-LAIR advises if the Board has taken a position, which is noted in their Memo of Findings (MOF). If the County has not established a position, then the Task Force may vote to send a letter to the Board recommending advocacy. The CEO-LAIR consults with other County departments regarding pending legislation, with final decisions based on

those discussions and the anticipated impacts, which are documented in their MOF.

Ms. Clark asked if the Task Force can alert Public Works (PW) staff to inform the CEO-LAIR when a bill is gutted and amended, allowing for a review before the next Task Force meeting. Mr. Sheppard noted a two-week turnaround for MOF and, while this has not happened recently, perceived that PW staff can inform the CEO-LAIR of the amendments and request a MOF for discussion at the next Task Force meeting. However, the MOF may reflect a revised position by the County due to the amendment. PW staff would then advise Task Force members, and it would still constitute a County adopted position, and no action would be taken by the Task Force.

Ms. Thompson asked if there was ever a situation where the County took a support position on a bill, and the Task Force also supported the bill, but if amended. Mr. Sheppard was uncertain how to communicate the Task Force's differing interpretation of a bill to the CEO-LAIR after receiving the MOF with the County's position. He reiterated that the first step of the two-step process allows the Task Force to submit recommendations to the CEO-LAIR, enabling them to evaluate potential "what-if" scenarios.

#### **IV. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Mr. Siya Araumi provided the following State Legislative Update:

- The Legislature reconvened from spring recess on April 6, 2026.
- All bills must pass their respective policy committees before advancing to the fiscal or floor stages.
- April 24, 2026, is the hard deadline for policy committees to hear and report bills with a fiscal tag to the appropriation committee. Fiscal bills that fail to clear the policy committee by the deadline are effectively dead for the remainder of the 2026 season.
- May 1, 2026, is the deadline for policy committees to hear and report non-fiscal bills that do not have a significant state cost, to the floor of their house of origin.
- Budget subcommittees are continuing their budget hearings to review the Governor's January proposal. Final budget negotiations are in June 2026.

Since the Legislature reconvening after the spring break, there has been minimal activity or change in status on the nine bills currently on the [Legislative Table](#).

**V. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON ASSEMBLY BILLS [1606 \(NGUYEN\)](#) AND [2462 \(PELLERIN\)](#), AND SENATE BILLS [501 \(ALLEN\)](#) AND [936 \(BLACKSPEAR AND UMBERG\)](#)**

Mr. Araumi facilitated the discussion on the agenda bills for which the County has not taken a position. He also confirmed that the agenda bills, including AB 1606 that is currently in the Suspense file, were actionable by the Task Force:

- AB 1606 (Nguyen) – Personal Income Tax Law: Corporation Tax Law: credits: cleanup costs. Mr. Fahrion made a motion to send a recommendation for advocacy to support AB 1606 to the Board, and Ms. Clark seconded the motion. Motion passed with eight voting yes (Mr. Fahrion, Ms. Clark, Mr. Chavez, Ms. Bernadette Halverson, Mr. Sam Shammass, Mr. Smith, Ms. Thompson, and Ms. Felicia Truong) and two abstaining (Mr. Philip Crabbe, III and Ms. Erin Rowland).
- AB 2462 (Pellerin) Unsafe products: disposal: penalties. Mr. Smith made a motion to send a recommendation for advocacy to support AB 2462 to the Board, and Mr. Fahrion seconded the motion. Motion passed with eight voting yes (Mr. Smith, Mr. Fahrion, Mr. Chavez, Ms. Clark, Ms. Halverson, Mr. Shammass, Ms. Thompson, and Ms. Truong) and two abstaining (Mr. Crabbe, III and Ms. Rowland).

Mr. Wayne Hunter of the North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens asked what Product Recall Penalty Account was and how it was utilized. Mr. Shammass noted from the Legislative Website that [AB 2462](#) allocates funds to the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) for activities related to collection and recycling of products, grants, administration, and enforcement.

Ms. Rowland asked if the legislation provides a definition of unsafe products since it is broad term and felt there was a lot of ambiguity with funding, which is why she preferred to watch the bill. Mr. Sheppard noted that unsafe products in AB 2462 are directly linked to officially recalled products that have already been determined to be unsafe and should be properly managed and disposed of. Funding from AB 2462 enables the Department of Toxic Substances Control to determine whether a product is hazardous, requiring specialized disposal.

- SB 501 (Allen) – Responsible Battery Recycling Act of 2022: covered batteries. Ms. Clark made a motion to send a recommendation for advocacy to support SB 501 to the Board, and Mr. Fahrion seconded the motion. Motion passed

with nine voting yes (Ms. Clark, Mr. Fahrion, Mr. Chavez, Ms. Halverson, Ms. Rowland, Mr. Shammass, Ms. Thompson, and Ms. Truong) and one abstaining (Mr. Crabbe, III).

Mr. Smith asked if the County has a position on SB 501 since the Legislative Table indicated it did. Mr. Sheppard noted that at the time the pursuit of support by the County was issued, the bill was under the previous version, Household Hazardous Waste Extended Producer Responsibility, and has since been amended to Responsible Battery Recycling Act of 2022: covered batteries. Mr. Sheppard recommended updating the Legislated Table to clearly differentiate between bill versions to reduce confusion.

- SB 936 (Alanis) – Nitrous oxide: sales. Ms. Clark made a motion to send a recommendation for advocacy to support SB 936 to the Board, and Mr. Smith seconded the motion. Motion passed with nine voting yes (Ms. Clark, Mr. Smith, Chavez, Mr. Fahrion, Ms. Halverson, Ms. Rowland, Mr. Shammass, Ms. Thompson, and Ms. Truong) and one abstaining (Mr. Crabbe, III).

Mr. Smith requested that AB 762 be agendized for the next meeting.

## **VI. REPORT FROM THE ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE (ATAS)**

Mr. Araumi reported the following from the ATAS meeting:

The Subcommittee received a presentation from [Earthia Bio](#) on feedstock variability, system performance, and opportunities to better integrate feedstock intelligence into planning and permitting.

Tetra Tech provided an update on their continued conversion technology (CT) project development work.

Ms. Rowland asked whether Tetra Tech's report is a general overview of technology or a County-specific evaluation. Mr. Araumi responded that Tetra Tech is evaluating any kind of CT that can provide additional options for managing solid waste in compliance with Conditional Use Permit, Condition 92.

## **VII. REPORT FROM THE FACILITY AND PLAN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE (FPRS)**

Ms. Emiko Thompson reported the following from the FPRS meeting:

#### Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL)

- In March 2026, CCL received 12 Notices of Violation (NOVs) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD), related to odor, compared to the 4 NOVs reported in February 2026.
- CCL continues to be under the Stipulated Order for Abatement, last modified in December 2025. The next status hearing is scheduled for May 2026.
- The Department of Regional Planning shared information on their inspection process at landfills.

#### Sunshine Canyon Landfill (SCL)

- In March 2026, there were 486 odor complaints reported to AQMD for SCL, a decrease from the 568 odor complaints reported in February 2026.
- In March, AQMD issued 11 NOVs related to odor.
- To date in April 2026, AQMD issued 1 NOV.
- The next AQMD hearing is scheduled for April 30, 2026.

#### NDFE – Non-disposal Facility Element

- Two non-disposal facilities in the unincorporated County area were discussed:
  - KORE Demonstration – a proposed biomass CT facility at the Lancaster Landfill, which will deploy a non-combustion thermal process that uses source separated organic waste to produce renewable natural gas and biochar.
  - Lang Station – a proposed large volume composting facility in the Santa Clarita Valley

#### Finding of Conformance

- Waste Characterization Studies conducted at the Antelope Valley and Lancaster Landfills were discussed. The data reflected a one-week sampling period in Spring 2026.
  - Antelope Valley Landfill – Organics increased from 54 percent to 72 percent and plastics decreased from 35 percent to 17 percent since the Fall 2025 study.
  - Lancaster Landfill – Organics decreased from 50 percent to 29 percent and plastics increased from 45 percent to 59 percent since the Fall 2025 study.

Ms. Thompson noted that percentage fluctuations may be partly due to the limited one-week data sample, variable implementation of SB 1383, and shifting consumer behavior habits.

Mr. Hunter noted that, in addition to the 11 NOVs that SCL received in March 2026, there were also two NOVs related to dirt tracking from the facility entrance on to public street. Ms. Thompson explained that a trackout occurs when hauling trucks leaving the landfill carry dirt and debris onto adjacent public roadway. She also noted that it is accumulative number. For example, if the Conditional Use Permit or AQMD Rule prohibits trackout extending beyond 25 feet, and there are two separate locations with 10 feet and 15 feet of trackout respectively, the combined total may constitute a single NOV.

#### **VIII. CALRECYCLE UPDATE**

CalRecycle Representatives were unable to attend the meeting, but an [update](#) was provided to PW staff, which was linked to the [agenda](#).

#### **IX. PUBLIC COMMENT**

No public comments.

#### **X. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 1:56 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled to be held on Thursday, May 21, 2026, at 1 p.m.