

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

March 21, 2024

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Margaret Clark, League of California Cities
Jorgel Chavez, League of California Cities
Jeff Farano, Sr., Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries
Jim Smith, City of Los Angeles
Jordan R. Sisson, Los Angeles County Disposal Association

COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY OTHERS:

Robert Ferrante, rep by Sam Shammass, Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Barbara Ferrer, rep by Dorcas (Dee Hanson-Lugo), Los Angeles County Public Health
Wayne Nastri, rep by Philip Crabbe, III, South Coast Air Quality Management District
Mark Pestrella, rep by Miki Esposito, Los Angeles County Public Works
Barbara Romero, rep by Ron Milo, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation
Eric Lopez, rep by Erin Rowland, Long Beach Public Works

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Eddie De La Riva, League of California Cities
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative
Rafael Prieto, City of Los Angeles

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jonathan Brazile, Office of County Counsel Los Angeles County
Adylene Gonzalez, California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle)
Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens
Gabriel Arenas, Los Angeles County Public Works
Alexander Fitchmun, Los Angeles County Public Works
Ken Habaradas, Los Angeles County Public Health
Michael Harmon, Los Angeles County Public Works
Darren Kwan, Los Angeles County Public Works
Omar Carrillo Maldonado, Los Angeles County Public Works
Carol Saucillo, Los Angeles County Public Works
Christopher Sheppard, Los Angeles County Public Works
Airon Tee, Los Angeles County Public Works
Emiko Thompson, Los Angeles County Public Works
Kawsar Vazifdar, Los Angeles County Public Works

I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 1:05 p.m. by Ms. Miki Esposito who served as Chair, representing Director Mark Pestrella. Before roll call for quorum was taken, Mr. Wayde Hunter of the North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens raised a Point of Order under Robert's Rule of Order. He asked if everyone had received an [e-mail](#) from Mr. Mike Mohajer, public representative of the Task Force, and proceeded to read item five of the e-mail regarding [County Code 3.67](#) and noted Section 10 of the [Los Angeles County Commission Manual](#). Mr. Hunter stated he objected to Alternate Chair, Ms. Esposito, conducting the meeting instead of Vice-Chair, Ms. Margaret Clark, as elected by Task Force members.

Mr. Jonathan Brazile of County Counsel clarified under Robert's Rule of Order, only members can bring up Points of Order and not the public. Ms. Clark then raised a Point of Order regarding Mr. Hunter's statement. She also requested something in writing if rules were changing regarding the authority of who runs the meeting since the practice had gone on for many years. Mr. Brazile provided clarification that although the Robert's Rule of Order states the Vice-Chair runs the meeting in the absence of the Chair, there had been no rule change in the County Code, which created this commission, and gives the Director, as Chair, the authority to appoint a designee to run the meeting in his absence. Further discussion ensued which reiterated previous information provided to the Task Force regarding the Chair, alternate Chair, and Vice-Chair positions.

II. APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 15, 2024, MINUTES

Mr. Jordan Sisson made a motion to approve the February 15, 2024, minutes as amended, and Mr. Jim Smith seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

III. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

The following was reported by Mr. Charles Darensbourg:

- February 16, 2024, was the last day for new bills to be introduced this year.
- April 26, 2024, is the last day for policy committees to hear and report fiscal bills introduced in their house to fiscal committees.
- On March 8, 2024, CalRecycle opened a 45-day public comment period for Senate Bill 54 (Allen, 2022).

Ms. Clark inquired how long bills must be in print before being amended. Mr. Gabriel Arenas, Public Works Legislative Analyst, explained that no action may

be taken for 30 days on bills which gives everyone time to review and analyze bills. After 30 days, bills can be amended and/or heard. However, a bill can be assigned to a committee prior to the 30-day period.

Mr. Phillip Crabb noted that there were some bills from last year that missed the deadline and some that were signed, listed in the [Legislative Table](#) and asked if it was appropriate to have these bills on the list. Mr. Darenbourg responded that the practice was to take bills off the list once a bill passed or if the bill is dead. Mr. Crabb believed that there were a few dead bills still on the list that was provided to the Task Force members.

IV. LEGISLATION FOR CONSIDERATION OF TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATION

Mr. Darenbourg provided the following update:

Public Works staff worked closely with the Chief Executive Office (CEO) and there were 39 bills on the [Legislative Table](#). The following two bills align with County policy and were voted on:

- AB 2346 (Lee), introduced 2/12/22: Organic waste reduction regulations: procurement of recovered organic waste products. Motion was made by Mr. Jordan Sisson and seconded by Mr. Jorgel Chavez to recommend to the CEO to support AB 2346, with amendments addressing concerns regarding procurement target dates based on local jurisdiction population. Motion passed with one abstention.
- SB 1143 (Allen), amended 3/18/24: Household hazardous waste: producer responsibility. Motion was made by Mr. Sisson and seconded by Ms. Erin Rowland to track SB 1143 and for staff to provide an update at next month's Task Force meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Sisson suggested for staff to note on the agenda which bills will be discussed by the Task Force so the Task Force may be adequately prepared at meetings. Mr. Sisson also requested that SB 1426 be added to the Legislative Table for future discussion.

Mr. Hunter asked what "other specified criteria" meant in SB 1143. Mr. Darenbourg responded it was defined in Section 2521(a) of the Health and Safety Code. Mr. Hunter shared his concerns of the bill not specifying exactly what criteria entails. Mr. Darenbourg responded staff would look into Section 2521(a) of the Health and Safety Code which clarifies "other specified criteria".

The floor was then open to Task Force members on legislative updates and Task Force members were informed that staff will rely on their guidance and expertise for prioritizing and identifying bills that they want the CEO to review, as well as bills to be placed on the Task Force agenda for discussion. Mr. Darensbourg indicated that he would seek approval from the CEO to place SB 1426 on the next agenda. He indicated that once a bill is placed on the agenda, the Task Force may discuss and make a motion to make a recommendation to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. The Task Force was also informed that they do not have to wait until the next Task Force meeting to request staff to send a bill to the CEO's Legislative Office for review.

Ms. Esposito suggested having a top sheet on the Legislative Table with directions of the process for the Task Force recommending bills. Ms. Clark stated it sounded as if the Task Force is only acting on bills after the CEO has reviewed them to determine if they align with the County, and then the Task Force is permitted. Mr. Darensbourg responded that the two bills the Task Force just voted on align with existing County policy, so the County went through the process of pursuing a support position. There is a possibility that a bill does not have a County policy, then there would be a pursuit of findings initiated by the CEO that could come back to the Task Force for discussion. Ms. Clark responded that in the past staff would review bills introduced in January that the Task Force may want to review, and the Task Force could weigh in on them. Now, it seems the Task Force must wait until the CEO reviews all the bills so they may decide which ones align with their policy. Ms. Clark had a problem with the protocol since three members on the Task Force represent the League of Cities and many issues are important which they can give input from their respective constituent concerns. Ms. Clark shared her concern that in representing their cities, they can also inform other city colleagues what bills to look into. She felt things were now backwards in waiting on what the CEO likes or dislikes and stated that legislation moves through Sacramento very quickly. Ms. Esposito responded that the Task Force needs clarification on staff's involvement with the CEO and how they are working together and formulating the list of bills. Mr. Gabriel Arenas responded that this process had always been in place, but that this legislative body had not abided by it and that the existing rule is to maintain coordination with Public Works, the Task Force, and the County's position for a coordinated voice.

Mr. Crabb asked how the Legislative Table is generated and put before the Task Force. Mr. Darensbourg responded that bills are analyzed internally and that Task Force meetings are a forum for members to voice insights on what they need. He indicated the primary change is that the bills to be analyzed on behalf of the Task Force are the ones most salient and important to Task Force members' respective agencies. Mr. Darensbourg suggested to the Chair that perhaps staff

could go over the 39 bills with pros and cons at the next meeting. However, he also indicated the limited amount of time for bills that can be analyzed as they move through legislation. Mr. Crabb asked how specific bills are identified to put into consideration for the Task Force. Mr. Darenbourg responded by use of a consultant and artificial intelligence searching for solid waste management, extended producer responsibility, organic waste, and any other bills related to Task Force priorities. Ms. Esposito noted if there was no policy articulated by the Board, this legislative body could still bring forth items for consideration and discussion and the Task Force can make recommendations to the CEO.

Mr. Sisson asked if the Task Force can be provided with a list of bills that the CEO is processing, so the Task Force can be aware. Ms. Clark reiterated her concern that the Board and CEO decide whether the Task Force makes recommendations on bills as she believes there is a lot they do not know about solid waste due to its complexity. Ms. Esposito responded that they have already taken a pre-position on some themes and can pursue bills in that realm. There are also bills that are in the Task Force's purview but beyond the County's pre-approved themes. The Task Force may bring those bills forward. Ms. Clark stated the value of this commission was that staff would present a list of bills because members may not have the resources to research and present bills for discussion. Mr. Crabbe suggested that members bring up any categories of bills that seem to be missing so staff are aware of the Task Force's interest in those categories. Ms. Clark noted the importance of the bills for respective cities and the importance of staff to continue informing the Task Force of bills. Mr. Christopher Sheppard commented that the process of the Legislative Table will remain the same, using a consultant and state databases with search words such as recycling and plastics and then placing bills on the Legislative Table for Task Force review and consideration. The only change is that the Task Force is no longer taking a position on bills. Mr. Sheppard encouraged the Task Force to bring bills that staff may not have seen. Ms. Clark asked what the next step was if the Task Force was interested in making a recommendation on a bill. Mr. Sheppard responded that staff would notify the CEO to confirm if there is a County policy standpoint on that bill and the Task Force could then weigh in on that bill and an agenda item could be included for the next meeting for this commission to officially make a recommendation on a bill. Mr. Arenas added that if there is already a County policy, CEO has the discretion to initiate a pursuit. For bills without a clear policy, CEO will provide response to the staff and the Task Force body can generate an official recommendation with the CEO's response which will go to the Board of Supervisors. If the Board of Supervisors agrees with the recommendation, CEO will prepare and submit letters to Sacramento Legislature. Ms. Rowland appreciated the direction the Task Force is taking with the legislation process which aligns with the process she must abide by for the City of Long Beach, as

she is unable to recommend policy for her department unless it is approved by her legislative affairs team. Mr. Jorgel Chavez, as a city representative, agreed with Ms. Clark stating things have changed and now the Task Force is working backwards with decisions already being made. His concern was that the voice of the Task Force would not be heard in instances where the Task Force does not agree with the County on legislation.

V. SENATE BILL 1383 IMPLEMENTATION BY JURISDICTIONS IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Mr. Darensbourg provided a high-level [update](#) on Jurisdiction's compliance and implementation of SB 1383 (Lara, 2016) and how to navigate CalRecycle's website to acquire information.

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

Mr. Darensbourg reported the following from the ATAS meeting:

Carbotura provided a [presentation](#) on their Regenesys technology that uses non-combustion thermal conversion to turn various types of waste into graphene and other commodities.

Tetra Tech provided an overview of the following work. Tetra Tech:

- Is performing a Countywide siting analysis for the development of an anaerobic digestion (AD) and/or thermal conversion technologies (CT) facilities within the unincorporated County areas and 88 jurisdictions in the County.
- Is preparing a work plan to perform a detailed feasibility evaluation of three closed landfill sites that will investigate land availability and land use compatibility.
- Submitted for review a Draft Long-Term Solid Waste Disposal Needs Study for the Antelope Valley, in compliance with Lancaster Landfill Conditional Use Permit, Condition 92, which includes a high-level review of economic, environmental, and technical considerations for CT facility options.
- Is preparing a memorandum in response to Environmental Programs Division staff and County Counsel regarding the viability of AD facilities and the industry.

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

Ms. Clark asked if there are other states using CTs. Ms. Kawsar Vazifdar responded that staff was working on a Fact Sheet that would be disseminated to the Task Force within the next week or two.

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

Ms. Emiko Thompson provided the following report to the Task Force due to the absence of the temporary FPRS Chair:

Chiquita Canyon Landfill

- Chemical reaction causing large volumes of leachate and landfill gas generated.
- In February 2024, the South Coast Air Quality Maintenance District (AQMD) issued 17 Notices of Violation (NOVs) in February 2024 related to odor and one NOV issued for alleged dust emissions.
- In February 2024, the Department of Toxic Substances Control issued a violation for disposing of hazardous waste contained in the leachate and sent to an off-site facility that was not permitted to receive the hazardous waste.
- In February 2024, US Environmental Protection Agency issued a Unilateral Administrative Order for the disposal of hazard waste at an off-site facility, and leachate management constituting a threat to public health and environment.
- Since August 2023, various regulatory agencies have met routinely to address odor mitigation measures.

Sunshine Canyon Landfill

- There were 474 odor complaints made to the AQMD hotline and 17 NOVs issued in February 2024.
- Compared to January 2024, the number of complaints received in February 2024 increased from 204 to 474 odor complaints.
- Various regulatory agencies continue to work together on addressing odor mitigation measures.

Ms. Esposito commented on the importance of the Task Force's work in relation to the two landfills and through County Code 3.67, taking appropriate action to implement programs delineated in a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan. The Task Force has the responsibility to maintain and update the Plan as required by CalRecycle. Currently, the County has mapped about 15 years of landfill capacity. Ms. Thompson noted the Countywide Siting Element that the Task Force was involved with was approved in November 2023, and was for a 15-year planning period. The Task Force would play an influential role in

facilitating the diversification of waste management opportunities. Mr. Sisson also shared his concern of 15 years of landfill capacity and recommended having a quarterly report update on landfill capacity.

VIII. UPDATE ON 2020 GOALS & PRIORITIES REPORT; CLARIFY ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND PROCESSES

Mr. Sheppard informed the Task Force that staff had made some recommendations and revisions to the 2020 Goals & Priorities Report (Report). The track changes in the Report were disseminated to the Task Force on February 27, 2024, for comment. Staff received comments from three Task Force members, which were compiled and distributed to the Task Force. Additional time is being provided for Task Force members to provide comments. An item will be included on the April 18, 2024, agenda to discuss written comments and to provide an opportunity for members to provide verbal comments at the meeting. If there is consensus to adopt the policies, there will be an item on the May agenda to consider adopting the Report.

Mr. Sheppard mentioned that there was a request to add an item on the agenda about roles and responsibilities, which was addressed earlier in this meeting regarding the roles of the Chair and Vice-Chair and the legislative process. He added that there will be a period of learning on this new legislative process.

Since Task Force responsibilities are enumerated, Ms. Clark requested clarification at the next meeting, in writing, of how monitoring and reviewing legislative bills, and proposing legislation bills as needed, was removed from [County Code 3.67](#). Mr. Sisson shared his opinion of being satisfied with the discussions about legislation and recommended a vote from the Task Force may be in order if something in writing was being requested from County Counsel or Public Works. Ms. Esposito gave Ms. Clark the opportunity to either make a motion or consider making a motion at a later time. Ms. Clark responded she would think about it.

Mr. Hunter's public comment was noting Mr. Mohajer's comments on his March 11, 2024, e-mail that was not distributed as requested by Mr. Mohajer until yesterday and was also not distributed 72-hours before the Task Force meeting as required under the Brown Act. Mr. Hunter indicated that Mr. Mohajer was currently in Sacramento working on and reviewing bills that may be of interest to the Task Force.

IX. APPOINTMENTS

Ms. Esposito discussed the current vacancies including the business commerce and environmental organization representatives, which are Board appointed. Staff was tasked with communicating the need to Board Deputies. The Task Force was also informed of the Executive Office's on-line portal for individuals to submit their applications for Task Force membership. The Task Force also has the flexibility to select a Subcommittee Chair and fill vacancies on Subcommittees or may choose to utilize the on-line portal to vet candidates. Staff would forward the link to the Task Force.

Ms. Clark mentioned she would like to nominate Mr. Mohajer for FPRS Subcommittee Chair because of his knowledge. Ms. Esposito responded perhaps at the next Task Force meeting if members are prepared, the Task Force can entertain respective nominations. She added that an e-mail can be provided to the Task Force with information on vacant positions and the link to the on-line portal.

Mr. Hunter's comment was noted regarding Mr. Mohajer's nomination of Mr. Hunter filling the vacancy on the FPRS, as an environmental representative, at the January Task Force meeting.

X. CALRECYCLE UPDATE

As requested, CalRecycle provided a brief presentation on County compliance with AB 341, AB 939, and SB 1383 that will be disseminated to the Task Force once provided to staff. Staff also disseminated the monthly [update](#) to the Task Force.

XI. AGENDA ITEMS

Ms. Esposito advised that Task Force members may refer to the [Los Angeles County Commission Manual](#) regarding how commissioners may request agenda items to be placed on the agenda, which is essentially a request to the Chair and staff, who will collectively work together, and if needed the commissioner requesting the agenda item may be contacted to clarify an item.

XII. PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:16 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled to be held on Thursday, April 18, 2024, at 1 p.m.