

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

**Minutes for July 15, 2021**

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

**WEB CONFERENCE**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Margaret Clark, League of California Cities  
Eddie De La Riva, California League of Cities  
Betsey Landis, Environmental Organization Representative  
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative  
Rafael Prieto, City of Los Angeles  
Jim Smith, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles City Council 6<sup>th</sup> District

COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY OTHERS:

Robert Ferrante, rep by Sam Shammass, Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County  
Barbara Ferrer, rep by Dorcas (Dee) Hanson-Lugo, Los Angeles County Public Health  
Eric Lopez, rep by Erin Rowland, Long Beach Public Works  
Wayne Nastri, rep by Jack Cheng, South Coast Air Quality Management District  
Mark Pestrella, rep by Coby Skye, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Enrique Zaldivar, rep by Reina Pereira, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Michelle Chambers, California League of Cities  
Jeff Farano, Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries  
Gideon Kracov, Los Angeles County Disposal Association

OTHERS PRESENT:

Martins Aiyetiwa, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Gabriel Esparza, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Charles Darensbourg, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens  
Dave Nguyen, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Carol Oyola, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Carlos Ruiz, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Christopher Sheppard, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Jennifer Wallin, California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery  
Kawsar Vazifdar, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Jeffrey Zhu, Los Angeles County Public Works  
Perla Gomez, Los Angeles County Public Works

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting called to order at 1:02 p.m. by Ms. Margaret Clark.

**II. APPROVAL OF THE MAY 20, AND JUNE 17, 2021 MINUTES**

Mr. Eddie De La Riva made a motion to approve the minutes, and Mr. Coby Skye seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

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

Mr. Christopher Sheppard, ATAS Chair, reported the ATAS received a [presentation](#) by Eugene Tseng, Technical Advisor to the City of Los Angeles Local Enforcement Agency (LEA), on the Senate Bill 1383 (SB 1383) Alternative Recovery Rate Methodology for mixed waste processing. The presentation provided information on the work that the LEA is doing with CalRecycle to clarify the alternative recovery rate methodology, which will be important in supporting the development of additional organic waste processing facilities in Los Angeles County. The methodology was developed at Waste Management's Materials Recovery Facility located in Sun Valley using Anaergia's OREX Press Technology to separate the organic fraction from mixed waste. The project is a collaborative effort by the LEAs for the City of Los Angeles and the County of Los Angeles, Los Angeles City Sanitation, Waste Management, and the solid waste industry. The presentation also showcased the data from Anaergia's waste composition study and the recommended waste characterization classifications.

Tetra Tech is supporting Public Works (PW) in preparing a report to the Board of Supervisors in response to a June 8, 2021 motion to Enhance Countywide Solid Waste Management through Expanded Programs and Infrastructure Investments. The report is due in September 2021. It will include recommendations for waste diversion infrastructure and programs to achieve new State and County climate and waste management goals, particularly the organic waste diversion requirements of SB 1383. The report will include a discussion of conversion technologies (CTs) including the environmental benefits, procurement and incentives for end products, and potential funding sources. The report will also discuss the use of CTs to divert hard to manage materials and organic waste that cannot be feasibly source reduced, recycled, composted, and digested. The report will include recommendations on potential sites for new anaerobic digestion facilities in the County.

There was an update on upcoming CT events and conferences that may also be found in the [Conversion Technology Newsletter](#).

- SoCal SWANA Chapter Workshop: High Diversion Facilities: July 22, 2021, virtual
- Resource Recycling Conference & Trade Show: August 4 – 5, 2021, virtual
- Waste Conversion Technology Conference & Trade Show: August 16 – 18, 2021, San Diego, CA
- California Resource Recovery Association (CRRRA) Conference & Trade Show: August 16 – 19, 2021, virtual
- The International Conference on Thermochemical Conversion Science: September 14 – 16, 2021, Denver, CO
- CEAC Policy Conference: September 15 – 16, 2021, virtual
- Renewable Natural Gas Works Technical Workshop & Trade Expo: September 29 – 30, 2021, Nashville, TN
- Paper and Plastic Recycling Conference: October 20 – 21, 2021, Chicago, IL
- VERGE 2021 Conference: October 25 – 28, 2021, virtual
- WasteCon 2021: November 1 – 4, 2021, Kissimmee, FL
- National Recycling Congress: November 3 – 4, 2021, virtual
- Southern California Waste Management Forum Annual Conference & Exhibit: November 10, 2021, Ontario, CA

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

Mr. Mike Mohajer reported on the FPRS meeting:

- Discussion regarding the Draft Revised Countywide Siting Element released for a 45-day comment period.
- Discussion regarding Chiquita Canyon Landfill - subsurface landfill migration and structures outside of the landfill that are within 1,000 feet.
- Discussion regarding the Sunshine Canyon Landfill (SCL) – Load Checking Program that was modified by the LEA to be only visual due to the pandemic, with no written record of the modification.
- Report on the odor Sunshine Canyon Landfill. There were 31 odor complaints for SCL in June 2021 of which 8 were classified as “trash”, 1 was classified as “landfill gas”, and the rest were listed as “no field response”. Air Quality Management District issued no Notice of Violations for June 2021. The total number of odor complaints received in 2021 is 77.
- There were no Finding of Conformance reports to be discussed during this reporting period.

Mr. Wayde Hunter, of the North Valley of Coalition of Concerned Citizens, informed the Subcommittee that in 2017 odor complaints were at 1,028 and with the improvements SCL made in 2018, odor complaints went down to 208 for that year. However, since 2018, odor complaints have been steadily rising with 350 in 2019 and 580 in 2020.

## V. CALIFORNIA BEVERAGE RECYCLING PROGRAM

Mr. Sheppard provided an overview on the [California Beverage Container Recycling Program and Related Legislation](#) and some of the concerns associated with the beverage bill, as well highlighting various bills that are currently in legislature attempting to revise the current Bottle Bill.

Mr. Sheppard gave a brief history of the bottle bill that originated in the 1950s and 1960s due to throwaway beverage containers creating much more waste. The [California Beverage Container Recycling and Litter Reduction Act \(Assembly Bill 2020\)](#) passed in 1986 to provide self-funding and to encourage consumers to recycle their beverage containers.

CalRecycle currently administers the Beverage Container Recycling Program and manages the Beverage Container Recycling Fund. The deposit system of the program, what a beverage container was defined as, the CRV fees/deposits and refund, and ways to recycle beverage containers were all explained and illustrated, including showing graphs of the 2019 sales and returns of various types of containers, 2019 expenditures from the beverage container recycling fund, and the yearly redemption rates for beverage containers that were returned for a refund. Some concerns were noted such as the large decline in recycling centers in California due to the increase in processing cost and reduced values of recyclables and the contamination in collection when mixing different types of recyclable materials together. Various legislative revisions to the bottle bill include, but not limited to, requiring retailers to redeem CRV containers, creating a market-based system where beverage distributors are responsible for running programs, and including wine/spirits in the CRV program. The following 6 pieces of legislation related to the bottle bill were briefly detailed:

- AB 962: California Beverage Container Recycling and Litter Reduction Act: Returnable Beverage Containers.
- AB 1311: Recycling: Beverage Containers.
- AB 1454: California Beverage Container and Litter Reduction Act
- SB 38: Beverage Containers
- AB 1067: Beverage Containers
- SB 451: Beverage Containers Recycling: pilot

Ms. Clark asked what "being crushed" meant regarding AB 962. Mr. Sheppard responded that the redeemed cans and bottles must be crushed or shredded by certified centers in order to be canceled from the CRV program.

With regards to the bag drop program, Ms. Clark is familiar with recycling centers having consumers empty their bags/containers and pour them into a big bin to be weighed. She asked if AB 1311 will stipulate that consumers use the bag drop program and if they will be paid immediately upon dropping off the bag. Mr. Sheppard believed that the bag would simply just be dropped off and consumers would get refunded later since an account must be established and bags would have ID tags. Ms. Clark asked if the new process would be mandatory instead of consumers doing what they are accustomed to do. Mr. Sheppard responded it was optional.

## **VI. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Mr. Sheppard noted the following key dates:

- July 14, 2021 was the last day for policy committees to meet and report bills prior to the summer recess.
- The legislature will be on recess from July 16, 2021, to August 16, 2021.
- September 10, 2021 will be the last day for bills to be passed by the legislature.
- October 10, 2021 will be the last day for the Governor to sign or veto bills.

The following 2 bills that the Task Force took a support position on were signed by the Governor on July 9, 2021.

- AB 246 related to illegal dumping.
- AB 504 related to organic waste recycling bins.

There were 83 bills on the [Legislative Table](#). Mr. Sheppard highlighted 1 bill on the cover page:

- AB 38 (Weickowski) – Beverage Containers. Mr. Skye made a motion to send a letter of concern to the author, and Ms. Clark seconded. Motion passed with 1 abstention.

Mr. Skye thanked Mr. Sheppard and his team for the presentation and history of the CRV programs and the significant challenges throughout the state including it being much harder to get CRV payments back, which has led to discussions regarding the entire program as being more of a tax rather than a deposit system. Mr. Skye noted that this program is one of the most amended programs in the

California legislature because of constraints that are written into law and continued adjustments that are made.

Ms. Erin Rowland and Mr. Jim Smith voiced their concerns of supporting SB 38 as written. Staff will compile all concerns into one letter to the author of SB 38. Ms. Clark requested that the proposed letter be sent to all Task Force members for their review and/or suggestions.

## **VII. NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY FOR THE PRELIMINARY DRAFT REVISED COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT**

Mr. Martins Aiyetiwa provided a [presentation](#) regarding the Notice of Availability of the Draft Revised Countywide Siting Element (Revised CSE) that PW worked on and released on local newspapers on July 1, 2021, as well as on PW's website. The notice included six virtual public information meetings for each of the Supervisorial Districts scheduled for August 2021. The public review period is from July 1 through August 16, 2021.

The purpose of this long-term planning and policy document is to establish goals and policies on a variety of solid waste management issues, identifying solid waste disposal facilities in the County, and providing analysis on remaining disposal capacities for the planning period which is a 15-year period. The existing Siting Element was approved in 1998. PW, with assistance from the Task Force, previously prepared a Preliminary Draft Countywide Siting Element and a Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR). Mr. Aiyetiwa detailed the current Revised CSE revisions recently prepared by PW.

Ms. Clark asked with a majority of cities involved, if the City of Los Angeles could approve without the other cities approving. Mr. Skye responded that the City of Los Angeles nearly has a veto if they disapprove because of the majority of the population in Los Angeles. However, the intent is that smaller cities do not overrule larger cities or vice versa. There must be at least 45 cities approving and those cities must contain a majority of the total population in the incorporated areas, and then the Board of Supervisors must approve. Mr. Mohajer commented that it takes both the Cities of Los Angeles and Long Beach to veto, not just the City of Los Angeles. There are 2 requirements: the majority of cities and the majority of the cities' population.

Ms. Reina Pereira asked if a formal extension of review needs to be made or is there consideration by the County that the 45-day review period will be extended. Mr. Skye responded that extended review should be part of respective comments with how much additional time is needed for the review. No decision has been

made yet to extend the review period, but if cities are requesting additional time, then it will be considered. Mr. Mohajer also commented that the review period during the original preparation cycle, was continuously extended by the Board of Supervisors and ended up with 270 days. Discussion ensued about the very strict formal process and the extended time allotted to review.

Ms. Reina Pereira made a motion to extend the 45-day public review period of the Draft Revised CSE for an additional 45-days, and Ms. Clark seconded. The motion passed with 1 abstention.

#### **VIII. RULEMAKING TO ADOPT BIOMETHANE STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS, PIPELINE OPEN ACCESS**

Mr. Sheppard provided an overview of the [California Public Utilities Commission Renewable Natural Gas Phase 4 Staff Proposal](#). He stated that there was an upcoming deadline to submit comments on the proposal, but that Public Works is not a party to the proceeding and cannot provide comments. Mr. Mohajer commented that he is a party to the proceeding and that the Task Force may send comments to him.

Ms. Clark asked why the Bioenergy Association of California (BAC) recommends limiting procurement of biomethane from landfill gas when it would be better for the environment than fossil natural gas. Mr. Sheppard responded that the purpose of the recommendation is to promote the use of other sources of biogas.

#### **IX. CALRECYCLE UPDATE**

Ms. Wallin reported the following from CalRecycle:

- There is a new webpage geared towards elected officials with high level information.
- The 2020 Electronic Annual Report was released and is due on August 2, 2021. The recording of the webinar on the report was posted.
- The Tire Incentive Program Grant application is due July 29, 2021.
- The Farm and Ranch Cleanup Grant application is due August 12, 2021.
- The Tire-Derived Aggregate Grant application is due August 18, 2021.
- The Rate Determination Survey of Methodology Workshop is on July 28, 2021.

Ms. Clark asked if CalRecycle will send out guidelines in other languages to the general public when SB 1383 goes into effect. The scenario raised was if paper does not go into a recycle bin, but rather into a plastic bag, would the paper not be recycled. Ms. Wallen responded that it may depend on the hauler and the

jurisdiction and that additional guidance will be provided to residents. Currently in development is a statewide education-related contract.

**X. PUBLIC COMMENT**

No public comment.

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 2:42 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled to be held remotely on Thursday, August 19, 2021, at 1 p.m.