

**SUNSHINE CANYON LANDFILL – COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
CITY AND COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA  
MINUTES OF MEETING, Thursday, March 11, 2021**

DRAFT Minutes [to be replaced by “Approved \_[Month]\_ \_[date]\_, 201\_[year]\_”]

In conformity with the Governor’s Executive Order N-29-20 (March 17, 2020) and due to concerns over COVID-19, this meeting was conducted online and telephonically.

Members: Jeanette Capaldi (Vice-Chair), Laine Caspi (Secretary), Richard Fisk, Larry Fleck (Treasurer), Wayde Hunter (Chair & TAC Rep), Debbie Pietraszko (Parliamentarian) and Dr. Donna Zero.

**A. Call to Order, Roll Call by Notetaker, and Approval of January 14, 2021 Minutes (Chair).**

This meeting of the Sunshine Canyon Landfill Community Advisory Committee (SCL-CAC) was called to order at 3:00 p.m. on March 11, 2021 by Chair Wayde Hunter. Roll Call was taken by the Note Taker. Six of the seven Committee Members were present: Laine Caspi, Richard Fisk, Larry Fleck, Wayde Hunter, Debbie Pietraszko and Dr. Donna Zero. Absent: Jeanette Capaldi. A quorum of at least five Committee Members was present. Two Committee Member openings were available. Landfill and government representatives present: BFI/Republic Services: Chris Coyle; SCAQMD (South Coast Air Quality Management District): Larry Israel; SCL-LEA (Sunshine Canyon Landfill - Local Enforcement Agency): Dave Thompson and Dee Hanson-Lugo; L.A. County Public Health Dept.: none; L.A. County Public Works Dept.: Martins Aiyetiwa; L.A. County Regional Planning Dept.: Edgar De La Torre; L.A. County Supervisor Kathryn Barger’s Office: Jason Maruca; L.A. City Councilman John Lee’s Office: Sharon Bronson; L.A. City Planning Dept.: Devon Zatorski; LAUSD District 3: Bill Piazza. Also attended: eight residents and other guests. Members of the public may remain anonymous. A Balance Sheet, Reconciliation Detail and other related SCL-CAC and Landfill documents were available at <https://scl-cac.org/2021/03/scl-cac-virtual-meeting-march-11-2021> and slides were shown.

**MOTION** (by Mr. Fisk, seconded by Dr. Zero): the Sunshine Canyon Landfill – Community Advisory Committee approves the Minutes of its January 14, 2021 Meeting as written.

**MOTION PASSED** unanimously; zero opposed; zero abstained.

**B. Old Business: Discussion and Committee motions & possible action:**

- Outstanding administrative matters (Chair/Vice Chair).

Mr. Hunter indicated that there were none.

- Treasurer’s Report, January 2021 – February 2021 (Treasurer).  
Mr. Fleck reviewed finances. The Business Checking Account for Expenses’ beginning balance was \$9,544.64, and expenditures were \$200.00 for November Minutes, with an ending balance of \$9,344.64. The Business Savings Account for Consultants’ beginning balance was \$107,505.44 with income interest of \$0.82, with an ending balance of \$107,506.26. The Business Checking Account for Consultants at \$4,696.63, the Petty Cash at \$100.00, and the Other Assets at \$682,00 all remained unchanged. The beginning balance was \$122,528.71; the ending balance was \$122,329.53. Note: \$3,400 received from Republic in February was deposited on 3/3/2021 and will be posted for the next meeting.

**MOTION** (by Mr. Hunter, seconded by Mr. Fleck): the Sunshine Canyon Landfill – Community Advisory Committee approves the January 2021 – February 2021 Treasurer’s Report as presented.

**MOTION PASSED** unanimously; zero opposed; zero abstained.

**C. New Business.** Discussion and possible Committee motions and action to address the following:

1. **Browning-Ferris Industries/Republic Services Inc. (BFI/Republic)** to report on any and all Sunshine Canyon Landfill daily activities, state of infrastructure/gas collection system, notable events, current and future disposal operations, including continuing efforts to abate odors.

Chris Coyle, General Manager, BFI/Republic [24-hour Landfill hotline 818-779-9170; main 818-362-2124; [Info@SunshineCanyonLandfill.com](mailto:Info@SunshineCanyonLandfill.com); <http://SunshineCanyonLandfill.com>], gave an SCL “Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Update.” He reported that:

**“Operations:** There have been no changes to our disposal operation or location, and we continue to utilize cell CC-4. We continue to use the Enviro-Cover for ADC, it is performing well, and we continue to monitor its performance daily.

**“Construction:** We received a solid winter storm last couple of days with about  $\frac{3}{4}$ ” (0.71”) of rain for the day and then received some sleet in the afternoon. The site has received 5.67” of rain year to date. We do expect a little bit of rain today but not that much. So far, the forecasts for the rest of March look to be dry. The site held up well. No washouts or major erosions and what little repairs we needed to do have been completed. It looks like Spring is here. Our wet weather preparations paid off. The roads and tipping area held up nicely and we were able to operate normally with normal traffic flows and near normal inbound volume (tonnage) yesterday.

“We have not received any NOV’s for odors year to date and are pleased with our results which Larry (Israel) will talk about later. We continue our increased odor patrols on-site, and in the neighborhood, and are actively managing the working face to reduce or eliminate any potential odors that could impact the

neighborhood. The winds have been challenging . . . seems like it blew from January through the end of February (2021), with unexpected shifts in the winds that were not forecasted making them challenging to clean up from. We have made great strides in cleaning up all the on-site litter however some if it is unsafe areas to collect at this time. It is on site, and we monitor for any off-site migration. We will continuously collect the litter as it is safe to do so. The contracting Team is onsite and has started to enhance our ability to collect landfill gas. Since the beginning of this week, three of the first 45 vertical wells slated for installation during this first phase of construction have been completed. A separate contracting Team has started work on the first phase of horizontal collectors in the active area, CC4 Part 3. This first phase of construction is scheduled to be completed by the end April, weather permitting... so it looks like we will be on track. At that time, the new wells will be evaluated for liquids and outfitted for pumps, if necessary. As usual, we continue to monitor the wells on-site for liquids if the need pumps.

“We continue to move through the permitting process for the installation of Flare 12 which is a long process, with an expected install completion target of 2021, pending approvals. We began filling (placing waste) in the new cell on November 16, 2020. The rains halted our filling (back in December), and we got back in it in January and February (2021), and (after the storm) if it stays dry, we will be back in it again. We continue to work the County on the framework for importation of soil. The County recognizes the site’s need; however, the tonnage will be initially lower than what we asked for. We are working through those details now. Besides the daily soil requirements, the soil is needed for a toe berm and odor control project. The landfill buttressing project (toe berm) has been in the JTD since the inception of the joint City/County Landfill.”

Mr. Hunter stated that he would hold his questions on the soil as we do have a presentation from Mr. Martins Aiyetiwa, from the L.A. County Department of Public Works, under Item 5, and that Mr. Coyle did give us an update two months ago as there was nobody here (from Public Works), and so we hope to get an update coming up. He also had Mr. Coyle confirm that it was unusually blustery the entire two months (January and February 2021), and he opined that it was possibly the worst season living in Granada Hills that he could remember; it was constant and very, very, gusty.

Mike Mohajer (speaking “as a private citizen” representing himself, not any group) inquired whether the Landfill has filed an application with the DTSC (California Department of Toxic Substances Control) to accept treated wood waste. Mr. Coyle reported that BFI/Republic has not asked to receive treated wood waste, nor has it received any. Mr. Mohajer’s second question was “if somebody delivered treated wood to the site at this time, what is the procedure that Republic follows?” Mr. Coyle stated that: “at the November (2020) CAC meeting he outline what they would do, and we have done that. As soon as the first of the year came around, we had treated wood waste identification training for all of our employees,

so that they could identify treated wood waste and know what questions to ask at the scale house, to identify it there, and to reject it, or to be able to identify it at the working face, and either have the customer remove it themselves or identify it so that we (Republic) could properly handle it. Anybody (customer) that had an active special waste profile for treated wood waste, that profile was suspended and de-activated, so that if they came to the scale with it and tried to dump it, they would not be able to pay for it or get a ticket and they would be turned around. We updated our unpermitted waste training program to include treated wood waste simply by adding it to our list of such items as car batteries, pool chemicals and such. To date we have not identified anything, have not rejected any loads, but we have had inquiries from people asking to bring in railroad ties, but we have told them that we don't accept them." Mr. Mohajer stated "for the record, the reason that he had asked was because the DTSC had said that if treated wood waste is delivered to a lined landfill site, it would be better to accept it, than to have somebody go elsewhere and dump it in some neighborhood or the Antelope Valley. He said that he believed that what Mr. Coyle had said (previously) was that if someone delivered it (treated wood waste), Republic would not accept it and you will not dispose of it. Mr. Coyle stated he had heard the same thing (from the DTSC) and disagreed with Mr. Mohajer's statement, explaining that what he had said was, "if somebody delivered it (treated wood waste) to the scales, we will have them remove it themselves, but that he was silent on what Republic would do if they found it in the wastestream at the working face and they could not find them (the customer)." Mr. Hunter noted that previous Committee Meeting Minutes contains quite a detailed response from Mr. Coyle to your question, which can be found at the scl-cac.org website.

- 2. South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)** to report on odor complaints received and NOVs issued including any year-to-date charts, frequency of Inspector response to reports, and any other matters within their purview.

Larry Israel, Compliance Lead Inspector, SCAQMD [909-396-2370; [LIsrael@aqmd.gov](mailto:LIsrael@aqmd.gov); [www.aqmd.gov](http://www.aqmd.gov)], reported that it would be a very short report and that maybe the wind had something to do with it. In January 2021, there were seven complaints; four were verified on Tuesday, January 12, 2021 that were faint trash odors. In February 2021, there were nine complaints; five faint to distinct trash odors were verified on Monday, February 1, 2021 and one other was verified on Tuesday, February 23, 2021 that was also a faint trash odor. So far in March 2021, there were two complaints, neither verified.

Mr. Hunter stated that his concern was because the past two months had been so windy, that there so few occasions, and the odor reports came in groups, that there must have been "some event" that had caused so many people to call in at the same time. Mr. Coyle opined that he thought that it (the reduction in odor reports) was because they (Republic) were doing a good job. Mr. Hunter laughingly said that he was trying not to give them credit, and noted that "we all know that the propagation of the odors to the community is basically 3 – 4 miles

per hour, and it is probably the best way to move it (odors) from the landfill, and anything higher is having them dissipate... the winds being much higher most of the past two months, and yes, there were some good days in there, and yes, you did not have any odor complaints.”

**3. Sunshine Canyon Landfill-Local Enforcement Agency (SCL-LEA)** to report on any SCL matters within their purview.

Dave Thompson, SCL-LEA Program Manager [213.252.3932; [David.Thompson@lacity.org](mailto:David.Thompson@lacity.org); [www.SCLLEA.org](http://www.SCLLEA.org)] reported that, since the January (14, 2021) CAC meeting, there’ve been no violations; “operations are running very smoothly right now, and they are doing a good job; there were a little bit of litter issues on-site due to the extreme winds, and we are working with Republic right now to address those issues . . . The next [LEA] Board of Directors meeting will probably be at the end of April or end of May.”

Mr. Hunter questioned the “little bit of a litter problem” mentioned, and said that he had found it interesting and had learned something he did not know when Mr. Coyle’s had explained (at a previous meeting) the use of the tippers, their wind rating, and the fact that they are going to stop dumping when the wind reaches a certain speed, and he then asked if any of the litter being generated was from the tippers or was it general. Mr. Thompson responded that it was “general” but the rest of his response was garbled in transmission, so Mr. Coyle volunteered to explain, saying that it was “general litter” and that in January and February (2021) that “there were two days when the tippers were shut down.... not because of the wind rating, but because we started losing too much (litter) from the tippers.” There were two days in the last sixty, where we shut down the tippers. In January, we shut the tippers off at 9:30 or 10:00 a.m. and the whole site completely at 11:30 a.m. .... a crazy wind day with winds at 70 miles per hour. In February, we had another wind day where we just shut off the tippers at 9:30 or 10:00 a.m. for the entire day, and we only accepted walking-floor and route trucks for the rest of the day.”

Mr. Hunter asked him to explain “walking-floor” to the public. Mr. Coyle stated that “we disconnect the tractor from the trailer and the whole trailer tips. The trailer has flats (a conveyor system) on the floor of the trailer and it just walks (moves) the trash out of the back door . . . as it walks it out, it keeps it close to the ground so it doesn’t lose a lot of litter . . . when you throw a 53-foot trailer in the air . . . 60 – 70-foot high, you can lose a lot of litter, and that is why the tippers are usually shut off first.”

**4. Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD)** to discuss actions taken to elicit responses to the CAC’s Request for Proposal to Review/Evaluate Air Quality Data from the 11th Annual Ambient Air Monitoring Reports for SCL & Van Gogh School. Motion (if necessary): move to Item F. for further discussion.

Bill Piazza, Environmental Assessment Coordinator, LAUSD Ofc. of Environmental Health & Safety (OHS) [213.241.3926; [Bill.Piazza@lausd.net](mailto:Bill.Piazza@lausd.net)], reported, about a CAC letter sent to the City on January 22, 2021 expressing concern over planned approval of the renewal of the STI contract at planned a TAC Zoom meeting on February 3, 2021, and a subsequent letter sent on February 24, 2021, where the City had asked for CAC comments, “which basically stated that we had wanted them to address the potential health risks from landfill gas emissions, for the installation of an upwind monitoring station, and some clean up language . . . very short. We haven’t heard anything back from the City, but we hope that if they have any objections or concerns, that they will get back to us, and that they will incorporate the revisions/amendments as drafted.” Mr. Hunter reminded those present that a copies of the same have been provided online at [scl-cac.org](http://scl-cac.org) website. He said that Devon Zatorski from the City had graciously offered to review our RFP [Request for Proposal] (issued over a year ago) to see if they could assist us in getting qualified consultants. Mr. Hunter confirmed that he had sent a copy to Devon, and that he was hopeful that movement was occurring and that something could be done. Mr. Piazza also said that, based on the reduction of complaints, the upgrades to the landfill collection system in terms of cover and all the things that they (Republic) have put a lot of time into, that it will only show benefit... that the work done over time was not a fruitless adventure, so that is why the RFP that the CAC is requesting is still relevant.

Ms. Pietraszko stated that she was especially pleased with the wording of the RFP under report preparations that says that it “shall also be provided in a manner to allow the general public to understand the essence of the report . . . that is what we have been asking for in easy to understand English.”

Devon Zatorski, Planner, L.A. City Planning Dept. (818-374-5046; [Devon.Zatorski@LACity.org](mailto:Devon.Zatorski@LACity.org); [www.planning.LACity.org](http://www.planning.LACity.org)), was asked if she would like to comment (rather than wait for her report under Item 8c.). She said that “we are happy to work with the CAC, we got your edits, and we are working on that . . . how we can incorporate that into our new scope of work, and just making sure all of the edits will match the conditions of approval created in the original program.” She also said that she has started a comprehensive list of about 40 firms that would be a good match, and that she hoped to have it available next week. Mr. Hunter asked if the new contract would be presented at a TAC (Technical Advisory Committee) meeting, and that he knew the City did not have to listen to the CAC input but that we would still like an opportunity to review prior to its presentation. Ms. Zatorski assured the Members that the new City RFP be presented to the CAC prior to it being presented to the TAC for approval. Mr. Hunter asked if the CAC needed to make a formal request in writing, but Ms. Zatorski stated that our previous letter was sufficient.

- 5. County Public Works** to report on the status of Republic’s ongoing and changing request(s) to import up to 10,000 tons/day of soil for the next 18 years in addition

to their approved 12,100 tons/day of MSW and recyclables, and any SCL matters within their purview.

Martins Aiyetiwa, Civil Engineer, L.A. County Department of Public Works [626-458-3553; [MAiyet@dpw.LACounty.gov](mailto:MAiyet@dpw.LACounty.gov)] reported Republic had initially requested importing 10,000 tons/day of additional soil to the site. "Public Works has had a couple of meetings with Republic, and they (Republic) have revised that submittal. The last submittal that we have was for 5,000 tons/day, and we are waiting for them to submit another request . . . Republic is expected to reduce that request (as well), and we are waiting for that written request . . . however, with respect to the whether the tonnage will be in addition to the 12,100 tons/day that is permitted under the current CUP (Conditional Use Permit), the Department of Public Works does not have the authority to increase the daily tonnage at the site . . . any increase in daily tonnage, the request has to go to the (County) Regional Planning, and our understanding is that only the Board of Supervisors or the Regional Planning can increase that tonnage. However, the Department of Public Works is authorized to issue such an approval (if it is within the 12,100 tons/day that is currently permitted), and that is the approval that we are going to issue based on the authority that is granted to Public Works."

Mr. Hunter stated that "the last communication that we had seen was December 22, 2020, that included about an eleven-page dissertation from their attorney opining on what their rights were, which I obviously disagreed with . . . now you say they are down to 5000 tons/day . . . is this in writing or is it just in verbal discussions?" Mr. Aiyetiwa replied that "it is a formal request, but that 5,000 tons/day is not supported . . . we continue to have discussions about tonnage that we (Public Works) are authorized to approve, and which need to be supported by engineering studies, and that is the only thing we are waiting for . . . Republic has approvals from the LEA (Local Enforcement Agency), approval from the City, so the only approval they are waiting for, is from Public Works . . . we do have the ability to approve the request providing that it meets the requirements established under the CUP, and that it is consistent with the engineering studies that is provided to us."

Mr. Coyle said that this may help (clear things up), and that BFI/Republic is "in the process of revising the request . . . we just don't know what we are revising it to yet . . . we need to do a lot of math, check some boxes, and talk to the County (Public Works) who have been supportive in guiding us in the process . . . so we are in the process of revising that request, and once we revise the request and submit that to the County, the County will then respond to that latest request . . . the initial request will be deemed null and void . . . so you can put that one aside (5000 tons/day), and wait until we resubmit."

Mr. Hunter stated that "it was hard to keep track of, and I know that you guys (Republic & PW) are talking, and Mr. Aiyetiwa has given us some additional information, and that I didn't know that Regional Planning was involved . . . and

from what he told us, if Regional Planning is saying that it is OK to exceed the 12,100 tons/day.” Mr. Aiyetiwa stated that “at this time, Regional Planning is not involved in this because the request submitted to us is still within the authority of Public Works.” Mr. Coyle stated that “what Martins (Aiyetewa) is saying that if we wanted to increase our tonnage beyond 12,100 tons/day we would have to go to Regional Planning for that approval.... Right now, what we are asking for is under the purview of Public Works.”

Mr. Hunter stated that “one of the things that got him when he looked at the documentation (December 22, 2020 letter to Public Works), was that Republic’s attorney was talking about trucks, and about truck traffic counts, saying that we are doing only so many trucks per day and that is less trucks . . . those trucks carry 20 tons of dirt, and count as more than one vehicle (in a traffic study) . . . so we are looking at apples and oranges, and the count really was not correct, and he (Republic’s attorney) was (also) attempting to bifurcate the property into City and County again . . . we have gone beyond that . . . it is a City/County landfill, period . . . and knowing that the truck traffic in the past was not treated as cumulative, because when the analysis (for the County) was done, you turned around and subtracted what was already in the City . . . the impacts that were analyzed were not cumulative . . . when the attorney was comparing trucks and saying we only have 500 trucks . . . they are mostly long-haul, so that counts for two trucks . . . there is a thousand right there, and these trucks that you are bringing are 20 tons and they are not a single truck . . . if you are doing a traffic study that is (the equivalent of) 2-1/2 trucks . . . so, the impact to the community is what I am concerned about.”

Mr. Aiyetewa indicated that they had looked at 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020 . . . their traffic is way below what was analyzed. Mr. Hunter interjected, saying “that is because they were doing 8,400 tons per day average . . . They are not doing 12,100 tons/day . . . if they got an increase in tonnage then they would be much higher . . . so if you keep the traffic and tonnage down below 12,100 tons per day then it is not an issue, but if that exceeds 12,100 (tpd) including dirt they are bringing in, then that’s a problem because that means additional trucks that are not studied, and you have no guarantee that they’re not going to turn around and increase their MSW (Municipal Solid Waste) . . . you know that . . . there is nothing fixed about their MSW coming in . . . if they get a new customer, they are going to take their trash . . . God forbid, we should have another whatever (Emergency Waiver of Standards), and suddenly trash starts pouring in, they will be taking it along with this dirt but under no circumstances should they exceed 12,100 tons per day.”

Mr. Coyle stated that “to clarify what that attorney had written was that he had asked for an opinion to document what are our entitlements . . . that can be argued until the cows come home . . . you can have your opinion, our attorney can have ours . . . that is for the County to consider . . . Don’t know if it is going to be in the next submittal . . . You have to keep in mind that the landfill is a community

asset . . . if something happens to the community, and the community needs to be taken care of, we are going to be here for them, and agencies like the DPW, the City of LA, maybe even Santa Clarita, maybe others in the County need us... it will only be temporary for that condition . . . 12,100 tons per day . . . we may get a temporary extension at some point like we did with the fire debris, but we never exceeded the 12,100 tons but we did that just in case the community needed us.”

Mr. Hunter stated that his “concern still went to the truck traffic, and again a truck is not a car, it’s not a SUV . . . it’s a truck and it is 2 to 2-1/2 times or 3 times even of a passenger vehicle, so for every truck that you put out there, that is carrying dirt, it is really impacting our community . . . you have had 8,400 (tpd) for three years, why didn’t you start importing some soil in at the time . . . clean soil and stockpiling it.” Mr. Coyle stated that “when you have odor problems you don’t press your luck... it was common sense, you have to fix the odors first.”

Mr. Hunter stated that “Republic’s attorney, who he has had years of experience with, does not tread lightly, he is in your face with everything . . . and I look at the claims in there, and I look at how they are analyzed . . . he is even parsing beneficial soil . . . the soil that is coming in is being stockpiled, so therefore it must be beneficial . . . you can’t treat it as not beneficial because you are importing it, and there is a limit on how much beneficial you can bring in.” “This community is always second, you guys get your way about everything . . . We have had that landfill for so long... it has not been a good neighbor . . . not saying you’re not trying to be a good neighbor, but we have a history.” Mr. Coyle responded asking if Mr. Hunter knew how many tons were in this landfill from the Northridge Earthquake, and “to tell him that we are not a good neighbor.” Mr. Hunter replied that he could actually tell him because he had those stats (statistics) if anybody wanted to know, and from the San Fernando (Earthquake) in 1971... the material that comes in doesn’t mean anything . . . it’s everybody else’s trash, not Granada Hills. Mr. Coyle questioned why he was talking that way when we are in the middle of a pandemic to which Mr. Hunter responded “what does that have to do with anything? This community has had to put up with the landfill.” Mr. Coyle asked what it would be like if all the trash was not picked up, to which Mr. Hunter responded that “it would be like this community.”

Ms. Caspi, who was hosting the meeting for the CAC, quelled the disagreement, and Mr. Hunter apologized to everybody. Mr. Coyle also apologized during Item C9. saying “that he is passionate about the landfill and what we do, that it has been a long year for us, but that does not excuse the behavior I just exhibited . . . Wayne and I have had a great relationship over the last 3 years, and I want to embrace that relationship, and the relationship with the community . . . and my sincerest apologies to everybody, I know better than that.” Mr. Hunter thanked him and said, “I know better than that too, and sometimes (like) you said, you get passionate, and it just gets away from you, and I do believe I apologized to everybody for carrying on.”

- 6. County Regional Planning Department** to report SCL matters within their purview.

Edgar De La Torre, Zoning Enforcement Planner, L.A. County Regional Planning Dept. [213-974-6453; [EDeLaTorre@planning.LACounty.gov](mailto:EDeLaTorre@planning.LACounty.gov); <http://planning.LACounty.gov>], stated that he and Environmental had been out to inspect the site, and everything looked good, and that the litter control which had already been discussed was the only ding (problem), and that they are working with the LEA, noting that during the last two months, that there had been high winds.

- 7. County Public Health Department** to report on any SCL matters within their purview.

Jason Maruca, Assistant Field Deputy for L.A. County District Five Supervisor Kathryn Barger [office 818-993-5170; [JMaruca@bos.LACounty.gov](mailto:JMaruca@bos.LACounty.gov); <https://www.lacounty.gov/government/supervisors/kathryn-barger>], reported that Katie Butler, Environmental Toxicologist, no longer works for the L.A. County Public Health Dept. [<http://publichealth.LACounty.gov>], and now works for Supervisor Janice Hahn. He said he could reach out to Public Health to see if they could get someone assigned to cover the CAC. Ms. Hansen-Lugo reminded Mr. Hunter that she had notified him via email regarding Katie which he apparently had forgotten. She will forward Charlene Contreras' [Director, Toxicology & Environmental Assessment Branch] email address to Mr. Hunter, who will work to find a replacement representative to report to the Committee.

- 8. City Planning Department** to report on any SCL matters within their purview.

Devon Zatorski, Planner, L.A. City Planning Dept. (818-374-5046; [Devon.Zatorski@LACity.org](mailto:Devon.Zatorski@LACity.org); [www.planning.LACity.org](http://www.planning.LACity.org)). Devon who had already given her report previously under C.4., added as an update, that at the TAC meeting in January, we are executing a final contract extension option with STI [Sonoma Technologies Inc.] to do air quality monitoring for one more year, and until we get the new RFP, we will be continuing under that contract.

- 9. Other persons representing the City, County or State** who wish to report any additional information or subject matter relating to SCL that is within their purview that has not been agendized for this meeting. If necessary, discussion and action will be agendized for another meeting.

There were no other reports at this time.

**D. Committee Member and Public comments on items NOT on the Agenda.**

Mr. Mohajer noted that, County Public Works Staff to County Task Force “Progress of Anaerobic Digestion (AD) in the European Union vs. the United States (U.S.),”

report that is posted under Item 2 on the Committee's website [<https://scl-cac.org/2021/03/scl-cac-virtual-meeting-march-11-2021>] "has been pulled back after [he] raised issues at the County ATAS and Task Force meetings last month"; it was confusing and Public Works agreed to take it back and update it. He believed it to be "not accurate" since the comparison of the number of facilities did not take into account the tonnages of each facility in the EU, and that Los Angeles County data was being used to represent the U.S., resulting in an "apples to oranges" comparison. Mr. Hunter stated that he would try to get it pulled from the website.

**E. Set next meeting date** (May 13, 2021) & adjourn at 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Hunter noted the above; "assume that it will be a Zoom meeting."

**F. Special Overtime Discussion of Budget, Banking & Financial Matters.** Potential budget items FY 2021.

Mr. Hunter indicated that there was no more discussion.

Mr. Hunter declared, and the Committee agreed to **ADJOURN** the Meeting at 4:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David Levin, Note Taker (Minutes Writer). Edited by SCL-CAC. *The first paragraph of some Items, Motions/Resolutions and other wording may have been directly copied from the Agenda.* The SCL-CAC Meeting Minutes page is <http://scl-cac.org/agendas-minutes>.