

**SUNSHINE CANYON LANDFILL – COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CITY AND COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
MINUTES OF MEETING, Thursday, July 8, 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 May 13, 2021 Minutes
(Chair).

This meeting of the Sunshine Canyon Landfill Community Advisory Committee (SCL-CAC) was called to order at 3:01 p.m. on July 8, 2021 online by Chair Wayde Hunter. Roll Call was taken by the Note Taker. Five of the seven Committee Members were present: Jeanette Capaldi, Laine Caspi, Richard Fisk, Wayde Hunter and Dr. Donna Zero. Larry Fleck arrived later. Absent: Debbie Pietraszko. 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): Dee Hanson-Lugo; L.A. County Public Health Dept.: Dr. Cyrus Rangan; L.A. County Public Works Dept.: Martins Aiyetiwa and Gabriel Esparza; L.A. County Regional Planning Dept.: Edgar De La Torre and Diana Gonzalez; L.A. County Supervisor Kathryn Barger’s Office: none; L.A. City Councilman John Lee’s Office: Sharon Bronson; L.A. City Planning Dept.: Devon Zatorski; and LAUSD District 3: Bill Piazza. Also attended: at least six residents and other guests. Meeting documents were at <http://SCL-CAC.org>.

MOTION (by Mr. Fisk, seconded by Ms. Capaldi): the Sunshine Canyon Landfill – Community Advisory Committee approves the Minutes of its May 13, 2021 Meeting as written.

MOTION PASSED unanimously by a roll call vote of the five eligible voters present with all five in favor (“Yes” or “Aye”) (Capaldi, Caspi, Fisk, Hunter and Zero); zero opposed; zero abstained.

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

- Outstanding administrative matters (Chair/Vice Chair).
There were none at this time.

- Treasurer’s Report, May 2021 – June 2021 (Treasurer).
Mr. Hunter reviewed finances. Business Checking Account for Expenses ending in #1234, the beginning balance was \$9,124.64, and it remained unchanged.
Business Savings Account for Consultants ending in #1582, the beginning balance

was \$107,508.14, and we accrued interest of \$1.79 and had an ending balance of \$107,509.93. The beginning balance of the Business Checking Account for Consultants ending in #1594 was \$8,096.63 and remained unchanged. Petty Cash remained unchanged at \$100, and Other Assets remained unchanged at \$682 (Legal services retainer). The total beginning balance for all accounts was \$125,511.41 as of May 1, 2021, and with a deposit of \$1.79, the total ending balance for all accounts was \$125,513.20, as of June 30, 2021.

MOTION (by Mr. Hunter, seconded by Ms. Caspi): the Sunshine Canyon Landfill – Community Advisory Committee approves the 5-1-21 - 6-30-21 financial report as presented.

MOTION PASSED unanimously by a voice vote of the five eligible voters present with all five in favor (“Yes” or “Aye”) (Capaldi, Caspi, Fisk, Hunter and Zero); zero opposed; zero abstained.

Committee Member Larry Fleck arrived online by this time (3:07), making six Committee Members present (the SCL-CAC quorum is five).

C. New Business. Discussion and possible Committee motions & 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; <http://SunshineCanyonLandfill.com>], showed slides and gave an SCL “Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Update.”

“Operations

There have been no changes to our disposal operation or location, and we continue to utilize cell CC-4 Part 3 and continue to use CC-4 P4a. We continue to use the Enviro-Cover for ADC and monitor its performance daily, and it has been doing well.

Construction

No rain since we last spoke. We have engaged SWT, the same environmental engineering firm as last year to assist us with preparing the site for the upcoming winter. As you may recall, our Winterization Plan is due to the LEA by October 1st each year, and we will have the majority of that work, if not all, completed by that date. If we don’t have any work completed we will notify the LEA and get that work done expeditiously in October. We have received our grading permits for Phase 1 & 2 of the Toe Berm project. This is an important project to enhance our odor controls on-site as well as reduce the visual impact of looking up the canyon as you drive on the 210 or the 5 (freeways) or live in the Cascades.. At the last

CAC Meeting we discussed the location of the LEA Building. I'll flip to an aerial and show it to you. I did share it with Wayde but just wanted to make sure everybody else gets the answer."

Mr. Coyle showed an aerial view slide and where the LEA and the Administration buildings were, and where they were moving to (old City North (closed) Landfill), indicating that the LEA building is not there yet, and that the current Shop Operations and noted that they will be moving later this year. Using a drawing (site plan) of where things are, he stated that they had replaced the temporary LEA building with a permanent trailer and had added another double-wide (trailer) to their existing trailer for their Administration in order to bring six employees who were working from Lyons Avenue to the site. He further noted that the other building in the site plan was the relocated employee locker room and that there was ample parking available. Mr. Hunter commented that the public could find all the documents including the aerial and the site plan on the scl-cac.org website.

Mr. Coyle continued, "As for odor complaints, June wasn't as good as May, but we still had a good month. Larry (Israel) will provide you with an update. We continue our increased odor patrols on a daily basis, including Saturdays and Sundays, and we are actively managing the working face to reduce or eliminate the potential for odors that impact the neighborhood. Today was already a rough day, but we had an odor patrol stand-down here just a half-hour before the CAC meeting to make sure that we double, triple, quintuple check all of our odor controls as this heat continues. We are delayed by the holidays so the trash is sitting on the curb for one extra day in some places, and we want to make sure everybody (residents) has a nice quiet weekend with no odors disturbing them after our little hiccup today. The winds continue to mostly blow favorably daily which definitely helps with preventing odors in the neighborhood. The forecast nine times out of 10 says they are blowing straight north, but when we get in at 5:30 in the morning they are dancing between north and south, so we are definitely on high alert to manage the incoming waste to minimize any potential odor impacts to the neighborhood."

"Landfill Gas Construction: - Since the beginning of this year, a total of 50 vertical landfill gas wells have been installed throughout the site, including some larger 10" wells to increase our flow. Usually, we do a 6" or 8" well, but with a 10" well, we get to pull out more gas from the fresh trash thus preventing odors. We have seven more vertical wells to be installed this month, weather permitting. On days like today when the winds are not being favorable or it is really hot, we will just skip drilling and tell the guys (drilling crew) to just park it we are not going to drill today, to just prevent and minimize any odors. Horizontal collectors, we have also upgraded those as well as the header that have been installed in the active area, CC4 Part 3. Construction of new/upgraded headers along the west perimeter, that's the side closest to the neighborhood, will continue over the coming months, weather permitting. That will give us a bigger pipe and ensure that we can have plenty of flow through that pipe to make sure we are collecting plenty of gas, if not all, if possible. We continue to move through the permitting process with the AQMD for the installation of Flare 12 with an expected install completion target of

sometime in 2022, pending approvals. We began placing waste in the new cell (CC4) Part 4a on 11/16/2020. We have been back in the new cell for the last couple of weeks and are aggressively filling it. We have covered both gabions (cubes) down there, and that will allow us to have sufficient gas collection immediately in the new cell.”

“We have been approved by the County to import 2,500 tons/day of soil for daily cover. We began importing on June 28th. As a reminder, the customer must submit a soil analysis to us which is then reviewed by our Corporate Office Functional Experts to make sure the soil is free of contaminants and that it is acceptable per our permit, so that it is safe and uncontaminated.”

“Last but not least, I am proud to announce we have come to an agreement with the City of LA to accept their waste for the next ten years. This contract has some great benefits for the residents of the City... There is no disposal price increase for the first year, understanding that the pandemic has impacted everybody everywhere, financially especially. So that is a concession that we gave to the City and keeping rates low for the residents. We will ensure that the City has priority access for both the little green route trucks as well as the transfer trucks with a dedicated tipper for their use, reducing emissions for waiting in line... there is no tonnage commitment... only a Zone commitment, so anything in the black bin material in the five Zones has to come to Sunshine, and anything taken out of the black bin (to blue or green bins) that has all been diverted, there will be no need for the City to use Sunshine . . . and lastly, this will ensure that over \$2 million annually will be paid into the General Fund in Franchise Fees to the City. There is an Alternative to Landfill Fee that we won't pay the first couple of years, but we will pay the last couple of years of the 10-Year Agreement, that the City can use to develop alternatives to landfills and recycling processes.”

Mr. Coyle said the “hiccup . . . was just hot; he was not sure exactly... the people on-site were not catching the odors with the winds flipping, and they were not in sync with where the winds were going.... they (have) added additional resources for . . . Saturday, and Sunday's morning patrol, and personnel can stay in their designated areas, and they (also) did pause or stop the operations at least a dozen times today... the tipper stopped, the litter trucks stopped dumping, the walker stopped dumping . . . we do all of that to stop the odors from accumulating and getting into a cloud and getting into the neighborhood.... I reiterated on a call today that odors are our number one priority, drop everything, call in all the resources you need, do not hesitate, shut it down and leave it shut down, we have got to take care of the neighborhood.... And I reiterated from my level of management all the way down to Amy and Will who you guys see out in the neighborhood every single day.”

Mike Mohajer (speaking “as a private citizen” representing himself, not any group), stated that he “did not represent any governmental or public agency” and asked if, based on what Mr. Coyle had previously said about the 10-Year Contract with the City of LA, would the lowest favored nation state be given to the unincorporated

communities as well? Mr. Coyle said that “if they would bring us like volumes, then it might be considered, but that is business, and not anything that is regulatory or really anything that the CAC is privy to. How we negotiate what rates people pay when they come into the landfill, that is entirely up to us, that’s not a public discussion.” Mr. Mohajer said that “he felt it was important because it was the unincorporated counties that allowed you (Republic) to develop a portion of the landfill... a combined landfill. And I see that as critical that something needs to be discussed with LA Public Works, Martins (Aiyetewa) or the County Board of Supervisors, and the County Planning Department.” Mr. Coyle summarized by saying that the City of LA in their contract has a favored nation clause which means that the City gets the best rate for like volumes . . . so, it is really the City’s privy and benefit to do that... they bring me about 900,000 tons per year and that’s the rate that I give them. If there was a customer that approached me with like volumes they would probably get a rate close to what the City of LA is getting.... this is not a quid pro quo issue here. We already have our entitlement.... This was completely negotiated as a business deal. It was an RFP process where Waste Management, Athens, and CR&R also bid on the contract, and we were the successful bidder. I would like to remind the group of the things that we do for the County. We have a Quarterly Cleanup, a dump day for the County where they can come in and dump their loads for free once a year. In Kagel Canyon, at the Supervisor’s request, we do a cleanup in that neighborhood.”

Mr. Mohajer stated that “in reference to my next question . . . the 2,500 tons of clean soil is a part of the 12,100 tons per day limitation”; he requested that Mr. Hunter make the appropriate changes. He wanted Agenda Item #C.5. to include “and imported soil,” as a part of the 12,100 tons per day limit. Mr. Hunter said that Mr. Mohajer’s point was well taken but that he could not issue a correction to the Agenda. He said that it was his intent to include that information, but that we have the letter (of approval) from County Public Works that was included on the scl-cac.org website. Mr. Hunter indicated that he put the County on the Agenda so that people would know what was in their approval letter, and would explain that within the 12,100 tons per day, that they are going to import 2,500 tons per day; any conditions they put on it to protect the public. He suggested that, if there were any issues, they be addressed in Item #C. 5. by Mr. Aiyetewa. Mr. Coyle concurred that “the County letter was the be all, end all document. It is the record that defines what we can accept, and yes, it needs to be within 12,500 tons.” Mr. Mohajer stated that he “understood that, but for the record, my concern was that all documents (available to the public) are saying the same thing and that in the future there could be complications if somebody picked up the Agenda and saw a different date of July 8 rather than June 15, 2021. They should all reflect the same information.” Mr. Coyle stated that, “we operate the Landfill by official communications from our regulatory agencies, not by the Minutes of the SCL-CAC meeting. Whatever we get from the regulatory agencies would supersede any type of potential error or potential miscommunication in the CAC’s Agenda or Minutes. I want to reassure everyone of that, that by no means would we take a miscommunication in the Agenda or Minutes and try to use that to our advantage.

We are going to operate under the Conditions our regulators provide, which is in the letter that the County provides.”

Guest Glenn Bailey asked Mr. Coyle regarding “the material that the City will be bringing to the landfill, specifically green waste in green bins for use as alternative daily cover (ADC) or by chance any of the blue bin recyclables.” Mr. Coyle replied “no, the contract is for MSW only, we are not changing any of our operations... we cannot use ADC and have no intention of trying to do that. SB 1383 wants that out of the landfill anyway. We are not going to bring anything into the site that is going to be a potential additional odor generator beside the MSW. So, there is no plan to bring in green waste or recyclables except if there is a processing failure, and it would be a short-term emergency type condition where there is no outlet... very, very extreme conditions... for example, we landfilled some green waste and recyclables when there was a shutdown early in the pandemic (COVID)... the contract is really only for black bin material.”

- 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; www.aqmd.gov], reported that, “starting with May 2021, the District received only four complaints toward the end of May, and none of those were verified but there was a complaint from somebody brand new who has never complained before and on a street that have not been to before... on Orna Drive... June was a bit different with approximately 31 complaints received, but I am only going to talk about June 15th. I was not the Inspector investigating odor complaints that day, but it was Inspector Gerardo Herrera.” He verified eight of the 13 complaints occurring between 7:10 a.m. and 11:30 a.m., though no Notice of Violation was issued. “The location of those complaints that day encompassed quite a large area. There were no complaints received from the condominium complex in Sylmar, in fact we have not received any complaints from there since before May of the eight complaints only four were verified with residents. Our policy is to verify complaints with the residents, not so much at the residence but with the residents (themselves) and so there was no Violation issued. There were no complaints for the month of July, until this morning beginning at 6:49 a.m. and lasting until 10:16 a.m. we received 14 complaints. Of that fourteen, six were verified. Chris was correct, the winds had picked up (increased), so I was detecting odors more toward Nannette Street, Lissette Street and Jimeno, more than I was over toward Canyon Ridge, Mission Tierra... we certainly heard from a lot of angry people. The odors that I detected were a trash, more of a sour trash odor... the winds were up to seven, eight, nine miles per hour in the community at times, and then as low as 2-1/2 miles per hour. Presently, the odor complaints that were verified this morning were located on Constable Avenue, Nannette Street, Lissette Street, Jimeno Avenue, and Orozco Place. There was one verified on Whistler, but that resident was not at home, so I wasn’t sure what they were

smelling, but that person is a brand new (complainant). There was another complaint received earlier from Daryl Avenue from another new complainant, and that was not verified; it was the one that came in a 6:49 a.m. We did complete our Title 5 Inspections at the gas plant and at the landfill as well, with no issues or Violations.” Mr. Coyle asked if there was an NOV issued today, to which Mr. Israel replied that there was not, since he had only verified five residents’ complaints, even though he had verified (odors) at six locations.

Mr. Hunter stated that “looking at the report our hearts sink when we see the number of odors being reported . . . going up. We look forward to it being an occasional, once in a while thing, and unfortunately it has not gone away. Personally, this is my opinion, I don’t think it is going to get better.” Mr. Coyle stated “that he sort of agreed, that it is an ongoing battle every day... some days we do better than others... today we had a rough day. I want to put distance between those days.” Mr. Hunter said that he understood, but that it (the Landfill) is coming back, moving eastward into the community once more. “My concern is that it is going to become beyond your control, because the things that impacted, (things) that you were talking about, the winds, the atmospheric conditions, whatever, you really can’t control them. The trash is coming in, and how it comes in, you have to deal with it, and I know you do your best, but the point is to me, the Landfill is in the wrong location.”

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

Dee Hanson-Lugo, SCL-LEA Program Manager [213.252.3932; DLugo@ph.LACounty.gov; www.SCLLEA.org], reported that “it is the LEA’s role to inspect the landfill pursuant to California Code of Regulations Title 14 & 27. Since the last CAC meeting the LEA has not issued any Violations to the Landfill operator. On May 27 (2021) the SCL-LEA Board of Directors had their first meeting of the year, and there will be another meeting close to the end of the year.”

Mr. Hunter asked, “within the reports that are delivered to the LEA (by Republic), it includes a copy from the LEA of a “Disposal Inspection Facility Report,” and on that one (report) consistently, there is always a comment about the load checks... it says “load checks conducted during this inspection period were consistent with the program described in the Joint Technical Document.” I have been making a case for a year that it hasn’t been, and we asked for a comment ... We asked somebody to address this and make a point that it wasn’t for an entire year... and I want to know why the LEA hasn’t put something in to correct that?” Ms. Hanson-Lugo stated that “during the last inspection report it indicated that load checks had been conducted” and that she had spoken to David (Thompson) about what is on the JTD (Joint Technical Document); “it just indicates that a load check is going to be conducted; it may say how many load checks will be conducted, but it doesn’t say... everybody has to follow the health and safety protocols for conducting a load check, that’s a standard for everybody... the LEA does not dictate how they

should do it... so if a Landfill had a set of protocols of how it does a load checking program, by observation or by digging through the trash or anything like that, that's their program plan. We just want to make sure that they actually do load checking and that they follow all the health and safety requirements."

Mr. Hunter stated that "now that would have been a good argument, but for the fact that if you look at the load check, you see that there is electronics, hazardous waste... if I go back a year before that you see all kinds of things being found...if I go back this past year you find nothing, zero, zip... So you know the checks are not producing results that were being produced before... there has been a substantial change in operations that prevented them from locating hazardous waste, electronics, and other things that they were finding before... and I took exception to the fact that you (the LEA) continued to put [that] the checks were continuing to be conducted the way that they were, when they weren't, and there should have been somewhere in this record... I don't care who puts it in, Republic or the LEA, that the load checks were not being conducted the way that they were, and the numbers (of electronic, hazardous waste etc.) that we were seeing was not correct... I need to get that done (record corrected), and it doesn't seem to be happening."

Ms. Hanson-Lugo responded that she did "not think that it was going to happen... how is the LEA going to say "well, you did not find this certain amount of hazardous waste during your load checking" . . . all that we know is that they are conducting a load check, they are separating the vehicles, and they are doing whatever they are supposed to do but to go into the area to verify how many of the certain hazardous waste or universal waste was removed." Mr. Hunter questioned whether or not they (LEA) read the reports submitted to them by Republic, and if the load check figures went to zero, why the LEA did not question that, and that all he wanted was for somebody (Republic or LEA) to put into the record why there was a load check discrepancy for a year. Ms. Hanson-Lugo said that she would speak to Dave (Thompson) and Chris (Coyle) about it. Mr. Hunter asked if it would be helpful if the SCL-CAC wrote a letter asking for a correction to which Ms. Hanson-Lugo stated that "I don't think we are going to correct the record, but we will look into it." Mr. Hunter then asked for the LEA to come back at the next CAC meeting and let us know what action they had taken and the reasons why.

Mr. Mike Mohajer stated "if I understand the issue correctly, Mr. Hunter was indicating that the inspection... because of COVID, that instead of looking at the dumped loads, that basically they just observed, and they didn't go through it (the trash) and the report that you have been getting from the LEA, that they (Republic) just observed it" and Mr. Hunter wants that clarification. Mr. Hunter agreed with his characterization and again restated his position and reasons to correct the record.

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], was unable to attend. Mr. Hunter reported that “while many of you expressed frustration with the 40+ consultants supplied by the City, I am in contact with Bill (Piazza) and we have a plan. We plan to send out a generic email to the list provided and we are currently working on composing our email verbiage. I am currently updating the cover letter to include the City’s letter of introduction, and also updating the RFP dates because this has been going on since 2020 at least and before that... I hope to get that out in the next week or so, we have a 45-day response time, and assuming that we get some replies back it is going to take a little bit of time to evaluate, to put it on a spreadsheet for you, and we will bring it back to you for approval of a consultant... ..the September meeting is only two months away and the November meeting is probably the more likely date that we could have everything done by.”

Mr. Fisk stated that “at the last (CAC) meeting the STI contract, the long-term one, would take six–eight months to review and sign, which means they (the City) are definitely working on it right now. Do we have any assurances that what we asked for is in that report?” Mr. Hunter responded that we don’t and called on Devon Zatorski, Planner, L.A. City Planning Dept. (818-374-5046; Devon.Zatorski@LACity.org; www.planning.LACity.org), to answer the question. Ms. Zatorski reported that they had not yet released the RFP and are “aiming for the end of this month, and we have the CAC comments that we have to add in. We are working with the County and the AQMD to rework the scope, but we will share that information with you and let you know what has been added in. We are not sure that the new contract will be with STI, it could be with anyone who bids on the RFP.” Mr. Fisk asked if any of the 40 consultants on the list that Ms. Zatorski gave the CAC work for the DWP, to which she replied she was not sure because she believed that the DWP does not use the same bidding platform as the City. She stated that she would be happy to help find a contact.

- 5. County Public Works** to report on the June 15, 2021, acceptance of Republic’s latest request to import up to 2,500 tons/day of soil for the next five years not to exceed 12,100 tons/day of MSW and recyclables, and the conditions imposed to protect the public, including any other SCL matters within their purview.

Martins Aiyetiwa, Civil Engineer, L.A. County Department of Public Works [626-458-3553; MAiyet@dpw.LACounty.gov], reported that DPW provided a copy of their June 15th letter to the CAC, that it is available to anyone, and that there is a copy available on the CAC website. He stated that “the approval that we (CPW) gave did not give Republic any new entitlements. We gave them 2,500 tons per day, that is within the 12,100 (tons/day) that Republic is already entitled to. The approval is a temporary approval for a period of five years because (County) Public Works is not authorized to issue any permanent approval. We can issue a

temporary approval to address a specific need of the Landfill that is within their entitlement” Mr. Hunter stated that “I had wanted the CPW to have the opportunity to tell the public of the conditions they had put in to protect the public”; he then read them from the letter. Mr. Coyle said that Republic wants those things as it would protect them, too, and that they would comply with all of the conditions. Mr. Hunter concluded with “kudos to County Public Works for a job well done.”

Mr. Mohajer restated that the initial request was not for 2,500 tons but 12,100 tons and that is why he wanted to make sure, as he had spoken about it in Item #C. 1., that the record reflect that. He also noted conditions at the Puente Hills Landfill limiting the hours that soil could be imported from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. in order to minimize impacts on the Pomona Freeway and 605 Freeway, and that by limiting Republic to their CUP (days, hours) and everything, that it was consistent with that.

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; <http://planning.LACounty.gov>], reported that there was no update, and that they continue to do their monthly inspections. The legal issue between the County and Republic “has been remanded back to the Hearing Officer.”

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

Dr. Cyrus Rangan, Director, Bureau of Toxicology and Environmental Assessment, L.A. County Public Health Dept. [213-738-3220; CRangan@ph.LACounty.gov; <http://publichealth.LACounty.gov/eh/TEA/aboutTEA.htm>], reported that “we (CPH) were made aware of the recent report that was done on the air monitoring, and that was given to 5th District and then to me for my review... The report itself is fairly well done, a comprehensive report, and they did do a lot of very good sort of technical work on this document. But what I found, that was sort of lacking from the document, was some form of assessment of what does this data actually mean for the community in terms of risk. I am a medical Toxicologist, and I’m reading it several times, in order to try and come up with my own interpretation of that, and it is fairly difficult for me to come up with an interpretation just by reading it. So, what I advise is that as we do future monitoring, that we look into the feasibility of doing something a little bit more than just simply reporting monitoring data on a bunch of tables and try and see if we can work towards getting enough data to actually perform a human health risk assessment. That way we can look at the data, see what it actually means in terms of potential exposure to the public, and then we can make a better assessment from a public health standpoint as to what the data actually means. So, we have started discussions with the relevant parties to try to see if we can do that for future monitoring.”

Mr. Hunter asked if Dr. Rangan was basically confirming that what the CAC had said about the STI report being a data dump was correct, and he agreed, saying that he believed that the extra step that needs to be done is to see how we can assimilate that data into some form of risk assessment. He concluded by saying that “whether there is enough data in the current report to do that I don’t know, we’ll have to check and see, but I just wanted to make sure we put the ball in motion, that any future monitoring should always be the goal to make sure we get enough data to do an actual risk assessment and determine what is the risk to the public.” Dr. Rangan responded positively to Mr. Hunter’s question as to whether or not County Public Health was now a part of the process (to develop a new RFP), and further stated that he or a designated person would be in attendance at future CAC meetings. Resident Brian Allen stated that “based on his past experience with DPS (in Aliso Canyon) he would recommend highly that any information taken or recorded for analysis be confirmed by an independent organization. He stated that “we have seen a lot of smoke and mirrors from DPH, and I am not sure that you are going to get solid information out of them.”

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

Mr. Hunter confirmed that Ms. Zatorski had given her report in Item #C.4. However, she did add that “City Planning had a meeting with County Public Health and Supervisor Barger’s office, District 5, and we are bound by the parameters of the Ordinance and the CUP and in the updated RFP that they will be putting out we have made it clear that we will not be putting a health assessment in, but work with the CAC to make sure that the language and narrative for the community to understand. The data dump... we definitely agree with the CAC, more than just the data, but the health assessment that was the reason that we gave the CAC the consultants, so the CAC could do that and do an RFP. I want to make it clear that we are not going to be adding a full health assessment into the air quality monitoring contract because that is beyond the scope of our conditions and what we are bound by.”

9. SCL-CAC discussion on the new City 17+ year trash contract with BFI/Republic and the lack of outreach by CD12 and City Sanitation and a failure to include clauses to protect the community in the future.

Mr. Hunter said that he had added it to the agenda because he had only found out about the contract third hand. The contract extends to the day the Landfill is scheduled to close in 2037. He said the SCL-CAC was not notified of such meetings. Mr. Hunter said that City Councilmember John Lee said that he (Mr. Lee) “thought there was outreach.to the community.” Mr. Hunter said that “none of the organizations around here that would have any interest in what was going on” was notified. Because of the past bad history of the Landfill, he felt that at the very least, penalty conditions could have been included, such as not using the Landfill or a 50% reduction in fees if they once again became a public nuisance. Mr. Coyle said that “there’s been no change in the land use . . . all we did was re-up

the contract . . . it does not change our Conditional Use Permit . . . or involve CEQA . . . or anything else . . . there is no operational change . . . there's been no change in what the City is bringing to us.” He noted that filling the Landfill will close it sooner.

MOTION (by Mr. Hunter, seconded by Ms. Capaldi): the Sunshine Canyon Landfill – Community Advisory Committee will write a letter to CD12 and City Sanitation expressing our and the Community's disappointment that they did not keep us informed of any proposals, hearings and Council meetings relating to the City trash contract.

MOTION FAILED by a voice vote of the six eligible voters present with three in favor (“Yes” or “Aye”) (Capaldi, Hunter and Zero); two opposed (“No” or “Nay”) (Fisk and Fleck); one abstained (Caspi).

10. 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.

There were no Committee Member or public comments at this time.

E. Set next meeting date (Sept 9, 2021) & adjourn at 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Hunter announced that the next Meeting will be either online or at Knollwood Country Club on September 9, 2021 at 3:00 p.m. Mr. Hunter declared and the Committee agreed to **ADJOURN** the Meeting at 5:02 p.m.

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

Mr. Hunter indicated that there was no more discussion.

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>.