

**SUNSHINE CANYON LANDFILL – COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CITY AND COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MINUTES OF HYBRID* MEETING, Thursday, January 11, 2024

at Center for Spiritual Living, 17622 Chatsworth Street, Granada Hills, CA 91344
and online

DRAFT Minutes [to be replaced by “Approved _[Month]_ _[date]_, 202_[year]_”]

Committee Members: Jeanette Capaldi (Vice-Chair), Richard Fisk, Larry Fleck (Treasurer), Wayde Hunter (Chair & TAC Rep), Debbie Pietraszko (Parliamentarian), Keren Waters and Jennifer Yoo.

A. Call to Order, Roll Call by Notetaker, and Approval of November 9, 2023 Minutes (Chair).

This *hybrid (both in-person and online) meeting of the Sunshine Canyon Landfill Community Advisory Committee (SCL-CAC) was called to order at 3:00 p.m. on January 11, 2024 in Granada Hills, California and online by Chair Wayde Hunter. Roll Call was taken by the Note Taker. Five of the seven Committee Members were present: Jeanette Capaldi, Richard Fisk, Wayde Hunter, Debbie Pietraszko and Jennifer Yoo (all in person). Larry Fleck (in person) arrived later. Absent: Keren Waters. Laine Caspi had resigned. A quorum of at least five (there were five) Committee Members was present. Two Committee Member openings were available. Landfill and government representatives present: BFI/Republic Services: Michael Stewart and Gretchen Lowery; SCAQMD (South Coast Air Quality Management District): Gerardo Vergara and Terrance Mann; SCL-LEA (Sunshine Canyon Landfill - Local Enforcement Agency): Dave Thompson and Eugene Tseng; L.A. County Public Health Dept.: Seira Kurian; L.A. County Public Works Dept.: Miki Esposito and Amiko Thompson; L.A. County Regional Planning Dept.: Edgar De La Torre; L.A. County Supervisor Lindsey Horvath’s Office: Aaron Ordower and Sophia Soudani; L.A. County Supervisor Kathryn Barger’s Office: Natalie Vartanian; L.A. City Councilman John Lee’s Office: Sharon Bronson; L.A. City Planning Dept.: Olga Ayala; and LAUSD District 3: Andrew Modugno. Also attended in person and online: approximately 29 residents and other guests. A Balance Sheet, Reconciliation Detail and other related SCL-CAC and Landfill documents were available in person and at www.scl-cac.org.

No corrections or amendments were made to the Minutes.

MOTION (by Mr. Hunter, seconded by Ms. Pietraszko): the Sunshine Canyon Landfill – Community Advisory Committee approves the Minutes of its November 9, 2023 Meeting.

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

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

- Outstanding administrative matters (Chair/Vice Chair).. Schedule officer elections for March meeting.

Mr. Hunter noted the above and that there were two Committee openings.

- **Treasurer's Report, November 2023 - December 2023 (Treasurer).**
Mr. Hunter reviewed the "SCL-CAC FINANCIAL STATEMENT 11/01/2023 - 12/31/2023." The "Business Checking Account (for Expenses) 1234" beginning balance was \$1,426.94. Four checks totaling \$873.70 were written on that account: Total deductions were zero; the ending balance was \$553.24. The "Business Savings Account (for Consultants) 1582" beginning balance was \$61,457.21; \$1.03 in interest was accrued; the ending balance was \$61,458.24. The "Business Checking Account (for Consultants) 9514" beginning and ending balances both were \$36,696.98. There was \$100 in Petty Cash. There was zero in Other Assets. The total beginning balance for all accounts as of November 1, 2023 was \$99,681.13; debits were \$873.70 and deposits were \$1.03; the total ending balance for all accounts was \$98,808.46 as of December 31, 2023 per Mr. Fleck and Mr. Hunter. Mr. Hunter added that \$6,996.98 was transferred from the 9514 account to the 1234 account; it will appear on the next Report.

MOTION (by Ms. Pietraszko, seconded by Ms. Capaldi): the Sunshine Canyon Landfill – Community Advisory Committee approves the November 2023 - December 2023 Treasurer's 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, Fisk, Hunter, Pietraszko and Yoo); zero opposed; zero abstained.

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 including NOVs, current and future disposal operations, including continuing efforts to abate odors.

Michael Stewart, General Manager, BFI/Republic [24-hour Landfill hotline 818-779-9170; main 818-362-2124; Info@SunshineCanyonLandfill.com; <http://SunshineCanyonLandfill.com>] gave an SCL "Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Update" as follows:

"Operations

- We continued to utilize cell CC-4-P4A/B/C. The wet weather deck was utilized (November 15th-20th) and December 17th – Jan. 9th
- We continued to use the Enviro-Cover for ADC and monitor its performance daily.
- During the months of Nov, Dec and the first week of January, a full soil cover was applied every Saturday. ADC was used for cover on weekdays. All trash was covered with either ADC or soil on all days. (i.e. no trash was left exposed at any time)

Construction

- We have received the grading permits for all Phases of the Toe berm project including Phases 3, 4 & 5.
- This is an important project to enhance our odor controls on site as well as reduce the visual impact of looking up the canyon, and to ensure stability for the continued development of the landfill. All of Phases 1 and 2 Construction have been completed with the majority of phase 3 is complete.
- Work is underway on an internal access road through City south which will eventually connect with the full build-out of the berm, and will provide safer, paved access into the landfill. The road modification is expected to be complete by Feb/March 2024.
- Construction of the entirety of the berm project is estimated to be complete in mid-2025.
- Cell construction is planned for 2024; the Cell named CC5 Part A is an approximately- 16.5 acre cell that will be primarily over-liner over the old City South portion of the LF. Construction will start in Feb/March. Disposal operations will continue in the existing remaining constructed airspace until Q3 once cell CC5 Part A construction is complete.
- We continue to move through the permitting process for the installation of Flare 12 with an expected install completion target of 2024, pending approvals.
- The air quality monitoring station in City South has been relocated to the desired location of Sonoma Tech and is fully operational at this time.

Weather update:

The Wet Weather Preparedness Plan regarding odor prevention protocols, pre and post storm inspection timelines and ponding mitigation has been completed and approved by the LEA.

- Since Mid Oct. the site has received approximately 5.76 inches of rain (about 1/10 of 2022-2023 rainy season total)
 - o Oct. 25th 0.03 inches
 - o Nov. 15th, 16th, & 18th 1.07 inches
 - o Dec. 18th through 22nd, & 30th 4.66 inches
- Our Odor Patrol Team is fully staffed, and the patrols are rolling smoothly. The Team is in the neighborhood during the early hours of operations and then moves to spot patrols throughout the day. As they notice odors, they relay that information back to the site and we adjust the operations based on their feedback.
- We are continually modifying the pilot Stationary wet and dry vapor odor neutralizer delivery system on site. We have established a partnership with a consultant developing site-specific neutralizer product and delivery systems, and we continue working with them to improve the on-site systems and tailor the product to our waste stream and finding the best solutions.

Additional Odor control measures:

In Late November and Early Dec. we began the preparation of a new process, which we refer to as a "Laydown Yard". The purpose of the laydown yard is to reduce the potential for odors while tipping activities take place, while still moving

the necessarily volume out of the transfer station network throughout the City of LA.

The idea is to continue to minimize the amount of time the waste remains in the transfer station network.

The overall way the laydown yard process works is tipper loads are delivered and dropped in the yard starting at 6 am when the facility opens, and stored (covered) until later in the day when weather conditions are typically improved and there is less potential for odors during tipping.

Preparation of the Sunshine Canyon Laydown Yard Pilot Program included:

- Delivery of the Empty trailers (14 test units) happened on Dec. 7, 2023, and the program was started on Dec. 8, 2023
 - o Long term we believe this pilot will be successful and we plan to continue to grow the program
- We've been piloting tipping time windows to coincide with more favorable wind conditions, as much as feasible to reduce impacts in the morning hours
- Other odor reduction programs in the works include working with LA County Public works to allow for the replacement of full soil covers on Saturdays and replace it with ADC. We firmly believe this will reduce Monday morning odors following soil peel-back before waste filling begins. In the long term we know that this will improve the internal drainage functions of the landfill by ensuring proper waste to waste contact. This will also reduce the amount of soil and soil trucks needed for import in order operate the facility
- Finally, we will continue to active collaborate with all regulatory stakeholders for the development of new, innovative odor reduction techniques and operations that will last throughout the remaining life of the landfill.”

Ms. Lowery, Area Vice-President of Republic Services in Los Angeles & Orange County, said “the operations are very complex, and we take in almost 9,000 tons daily, but it is extremely important to us to make sure that we are doing that in partnership with our communities that we serve; so while Sunshine Canyon keeps Los Angeles clean and functional we recognize that the complexities of the site are not without their complications. We've heard many of your complaints about odor and about dust, and I guarantee you that we take them very seriously. We are listening, Michael is listening, and we're listening back at our corporate headquarters; we are taking every step possible to really evolve our processes to make sure that the odor issues don't continue to impact our communities.

Unfortunately, I don't have to tell you that some extreme weather conditions, many of which are unpredictable, can effect landfills across the whole country not just here in LA., and in the past year here in L.A., we haven't been immune from those extreme weather conditions; with early rainfall earlier in the year and then hard to believe, a hurricane in August, which led to some erosion at the landfill and contributed to some of the odor issues you all have spoken about thus far. Of course, we realize that it's likely that extreme weather events may actually continue here in L.A. so we are not just going to chalk them up to unusual year, but we are working hard to make sure that we are adapting our processes to be able to accommodate any weather that comes our way. So, well before the recent LA Times article came out and reported some of these extreme weather impacts,

we were already working to adjust our procedures and plans, and really pulling in our engineering and environmental experts both at our headquarters, and our local teams and our consulting teams and all of our partnerships with our governmental and regulatory entities, so that we could really make sure that we're doing everything we can to move things forward . . . Michael shared some of those things, the laydown lot, we've been doing a lot of work with erosion, we're not stopping we're going to continue to evolve our processes...."

Mr. Fisk stated that "there's always been continual odors, we know that, and you're addressing them with some programs; my question is Mr. Stewart, General Management, if you had unlimited resources at your disposal and had to answer to no one, what would you do differently to improve or change some of the programs you have in place?" Mr. Stewart stated that "the first thing I would do is rewrite the permit (Conditional Use Permit) so we could accept later into the evening and start later in the afternoon, adjust the timing required to that we are open to taking the waste stream; number two, unlimited, I would put a dome over it; obviously can't do that but that but those are some of the ideas that we are trying to look at doing in terms of not necessarily a dome but as we complete the front entrance of the canyon we think we are going to have much better control of the winds that move through there, and the potential for them to whip through and carry odors into the neighborhood...so an odor dome with the construction of the berm, and the vapor system, and adjusting the timing of the permit of taking waste later into the evening."

Ms. Pietraszko asked if Mr. Stewart could describe tipping, and tipping time. He replied that waste comes to the landfill either in residential vehicles or transfer vans; there's two types of transfer vans; ones that offload with floors that move like a conveyor belt and referred to as walking floors; tippers are transfer vans that actually get racked up on a tipping system that move it and dump all the waste from inside the tipper at once.

Mr. Hunter asked, "how did it work out with our last lot of rains, you have everything under control?" Mr. Stewart replied that "it wasn't perfect, but we're really happy how we withstood the amount of rain that we got; the last time I told you we were ready for a 10-inch rain, I think we are ready for a 10-inch rain..... The December event it was approximately close to five inches is basically what Hillary (storm); we had minimal damages, we had to adjust where some of our flow patterns were going with the runoff; there was slight erosion but nothing to the degree that we saw last year.... We didn't have to divert, we didn't have to shut down the landfill, we had no unauthorized discharges, and repairs to the landfill were made once it was dry within three or four days." Ms. Lowery said she is based in Republic's Phoenix office and usually flies out here every week and spends time at the landfill.

Mr. Hunter stated, "Keren Waters is also a Committee member, however, because of the rules under a hybrid meeting, unless she was sick and notified us ahead of time, I can't count her as being present as a Committee member, sitting on this Committee. Keren, I'm glad to see you. Do you have any questions that you

wanted to address?” Ms. Waters said “Michael, Happy New Year, just a question about have you given consideration to what was the number of the tonnage per day?” Mr. Stewart responded that “we’re permitted for 12,000; we take anywhere from eight to 9,000 tons/day normally.” Ms. Waters asked, “have you given consideration to decreasing that tonnage?” Mr. Stewart responded that “we have in the past. We’ve had to in the past; what we have found is in order to properly service the waste stream, the watershed, for the greater Los Angeles County, it’d be the whole County, that in our opinion there is not enough capacity out there should we reduce our tonnage.”

Mr. Hunter stated that “we had a comment from Ms. Mickey Esposito and Ms. Emiko Thompson regarding whether or not there was a problem with capacity, and they assured us that there is not a problem, so I am not sure where you (Mr. Stewart) are going with that statement... There is sufficient capacity in the County of Los Angeles if you did not take 8,400 average tons/day. You could take something less, there is capacity there (in the County) that could absorb the difference.” Guest Mike Mohajer, speaking as a private person not representing any governmental or public agency and solely on behalf of himself, stated that “as far as Mr. Stewart’s statement (that) there is not enough daily capacity as you mentioned and discussed at the last meeting, there is capacity in line to use, so I just want to correct that statement.”

Committee Member Larry Fleck arrived in person at this time (3:16), making six Committee Members present in person (the SCL-CAC quorum is five).

Ms. Lowery described working with agencies regarding operations and weather emergencies. Mr. Stewart said “we’ve had to install a new series of wells and water pumps.” Ms. Lowery said “every single odor complaint . . . we do a deep dive.” Mr. Stewart explained over-liner use. He said “the type of marijuana we’re taking is neither hazardous or medical . . . We’re taking this legally under our Permit.”

- 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 to include any enforcement actions to abate odors.

Gerardo Vergara, Air Quality Inspector 2, SCAQMD [909-396-2370; GVergara@aqmd.gov; www.aqmd.gov], reported. In December 2023 we (AQMD) received 113 odor complaints with zero dust complaints; four notices of violation (NOVs) for public nuisance on December 6th, December 18th, December 21st, and December 31st. For January 2024, this month alone to today, this will be new information, we have received 47 odor complaints, zero dust complaints, and two notices of violations (NOVs) for public nuisances on January 9th and January 10th.

Mr. Hunter stated that “November Odor Reports were not available the last time we met; that the report included in their package indicated 1721 odor reports for

2023. That is the second worst year we have had. Back in 2015, there were 1795 odor reports.. just a little short of the worst year ever. We've been regressing; if you look at the chart, you see that back in 2005, 2008 less than 52 complaints, and then it just went up from there, and when the odor abatements took effect and they were made to do things (change hours, stop long hauls to 9 a.m.), a real decrease, where they came down to 2008, but since that time, we have just continued to go up.”

Resident Eric Pfefferman said that “he was wondering what plan is in place right now to increasing response because these complaints in December and January should both be higher because; quite often inspectors don't show up until two or three hours after residents have started submitting complaints to the AQMD. In speaking to one the inspectors who came out, he mentioned that the AQMD acknowledges that they are short-staffed during the holidays, which we agree everyone should be able spend time away from work with their families, but we don't get spared that on Christmas Eve, when I went out to get Christmas cookies that my neighbor dropped off, I get hit in the face with the smell of rotting trash; I didn't get a call back on Christmas Eve, it wasn't until over 48 hours on December 26th that someone from AQMD called... .. just wondering what the AQMD response is going to be moving forward...wondering what the Executive response is going to be.”

Terrance Mann, Deputy Executive Officer Compliance and Enforcement, said “he can definitely address the Executive response; ... We're doing the best we can, and we're going to go out as often as we can; a single complaint may come in after hours or a very small number , we don't have a chance to get to it until the next business day we're going to go out as often as we can; my understanding is, is that we were out on Christmas Day; we have two landfills (Sunshine & Chiquita Cyn) that we're dealing with up, so we are doing our best to support all of the communities that are being impacted, but there are simply going to be times when we don't have the resources to do it.” He described resource implementation to detect odors and said “delayed tipping could help... ..we're taking resources from elsewhere and putting them in this community... try to make improvements...focused only on surrounding communities, especially the school (Van Gogh Elementary) and students..”

Mr. Pfefferman stated that “the last time you attended the CAC you said that all solutions were on the table, which included an Order for Abatement, yet since that CAC we have had 11 more NOVs, 13 more including the two for January; so we are trending in the direction that any of us want to be, so where are we then moving forward with the Order for Abatement that you said was on the table?” Mr. Mann responded “the abatement that you said was on the table right, is on the table, it will remain on the table until the issue is complete; what I said at the last meeting was that I was in negotiations with the landfill, and that I, as for the agency asked for very specific things to be done including delaying of tipping that you heard discuss earlier (see C1.) ; my staff who's been here since, Larry (Israel) and others, who have been here for many years, well before the prior Hearing action...we believed that, that was one of the key drivers out of all the different

solutions that addressed odor issues, delay of tipping was perhaps the most impactful; we approached the landfill and they agreed, and they went through their process and came back with a very detailed plan they shared with LA County Public Works and other government partners and they have been implementing that plan; you know if we suspected games being played, I would recommend to our department to immediately go to Hearing if that happened;

Mr. Pfefferman noted that "...now we are robbing Peter to pay Paul, and now we are getting odors in the evening..." Mr. Mann replied that "I don't think anyone is being robbed, there are two separate issues: the trash that that deal with tipping and delivery of refuse, and there's landfill gas system issues." He added that past problems were related to structural problems with the landfill gas system, and that he doesn't believe there is any consensus as to what the solution is today; further, they went to a Hearing today, that unless there were specific things to address the problem, that Republic would just be ordered to do a study, and that would take another 6-months and that is not what the AQMD wants.

Mr. Mohajer stated that "I get disturbed when I hear that you are doing the best you can; the AQMD is to monitor and protect the citizens against the odors, and they issued a permit under Title 5, and those permits don't say that we're going to do our best regardless of what the permit requires; this type of response is really disturbing to me; as a government employee, as a public employee, we are getting paid to protect the citizen's health and safety, and this issue has been going on for too long, and saying we really don't know what to do, this is your conclusion that we don't know what to do with this. Let me ask you this question, are all the extraction wells at that site, have (they) all been provided with a pump to discharge leachate, or some do and some don't..." Mr. Mann responded by saying that "...this is a scientific (unintelligible) process; we develop hypothesis, we evaluate, we conduct monitoring, all of these things and we develop a plan to address it, simply maximum effort; I don't see that as a problem, I don't see that as a weakness... ... when things happen like unprecedented rains, that things that no one has ever seen before we understand that there will be surprising results.... ...It was impossible/very hard to confirm NOVs at schools because it was hard to have people (teacher administrators, other adults), we worked with our legal department to change that rule, and all we need now is one (1) person; at Van Gogh School, one teacher, one administrator to make a complaint, we confirm (the odor) and that one person serves as a proxy for all the children."

Resident Meg Volk said "I have a question regarding this graph here (displayed a AQMD chart of Odors on cell phone). I was around when the Order of Abatement was in effect in 2018 and you look at the drop in complaints, it obviously had an effect; nothing's changed at that time - they were putting in horizontal collectors, dewatering wells, trying ADC, trying soil, all these different things; so something must have worked because at that point it got down to 208 complaints in 2018; like Wayne mentioned 1721 complaints in 2023; I know the Order of Abatement is not a silver bullet but it certainly did something to change the operations to maybe try different things to determine what the problems were, add other measures because it has been worse in the last 3 years than ever before; so I just you I'm

not happy with the fact that this has been put on the table the Order of Abatement; it did make a difference, it really did; you can ask any member of the community that it did change things, absolutely.” Mr. Mann replied “I agree, I absolutely agree, I wholeheartedly agree, that is an excellent point; it did make a real change, and part of that was that massive changes were made to the landfill at that time relating to gas collection and other systems; so now we’re in a place where those changes have already been done; we’re not going to go back and do the same thing; we need to know what the next generation of changes are. That last action lasted for years; I don’t have the data in front (of me), I thought it was 3 years or something like that... No one is saying that it is not going to happen, that may be the only way to approach this, but as of right now we are working together with multiple government agencies, a working group, put in place by LA County Board of Supervisors with support from City officials as well, and our goal is to cut-to-the-chase, get to year two, but do it in a few weeks from now or a month from now as opposed to having to wait through all that; if we reach a point where this group isn’t able to come up with that solution or if the landfill is able to propose it . . it is not (unintelligible) this is government only, but you know they have an obligation, and they need to step up in proposing additional answers to this problem..... So far, based on what we saw, I guess in March and April and then also last month, the last 6 weeks we saw a willing partner with the landfill.

Mr. Hunter expressed concern over the amount of time taken on this item so far, that he needed to cut it short, and reminded those present that we have an agenda and that we need to stay on track.

Resident Ralph Kroy asked “what is the threshold before we get to the Hearing Board, because in the past we’ve had the Hearing Board thing, and fining companies does answer the question; in yesteryear New York found out if they sent Executives to prison it was very effective; you could pass that along.” Mr. Hunter interrupted, saying that Mr. Kroy had made that exact same point at the last meeting. Mr. Kroy then repeated his question. Mr. Mann replied that “there isn’t a hard rule or policy or anything like that, that says when you reach this many complaints or this many violations it goes to the Hearing Board; it really more of a matter of you have ongoing compliance, and you have particular solutions on the table ;| you know they have a facility, they have a process unit, they need to replace /upgrade or do something that process unit...they refuse to do it, we go to the Hearing Board..... ”

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; www.SCLLEA.org], “one of the things I have been asked to do is how our agency is put together; since the Landfill is located half in the City and half in the County, it cannot fall into the jurisdiction of the City or the County Local Enforcement Agency, so we had to come up with a Joint Powers Agreement.. ..that formed the Sunshine Canyon Landfill Local Enforcement Agency, and is “staffed by City and County LEA Inspectors, and Managers; each

year I am Co-Program Manager with Dee Lugo, and each calendar year we switch as to who is officially in charge (City odd, County even years) . . . Since the last CAC meeting, we've not had any violations at the site; the Solid Waste Regulations found in Title 14 and Title 27 of the California code of Regulations, and we report to the State with these (inspection) findings; all of our inspections are online if you go to our website www.sclelea.org; at the last one (CAC meeting) we talked about have a wet weather plan that was due November 10th, it was submitted to us, the LEA has reviewed it and the approved plan is located on our website. We had the rains during the winter, over the holidays,, and the site held up fairly well; they had a couple of little issues with some erosion, but with this plan they were able to get it corrected right away... Overall, the site performed really well during the rain." Mr. Hunter pointed out that the entire LEA budget comes from Republic and not the City or County and that if the public had gone to the website earlier they would only have found the original Wet Weather Plan and not the Revised Wet Weather Plan on the website, and that has now been corrected.

Mr. Modugno said that "he had looked at the Wet Weather Plan but was wondering about the Quarterly Report (Ambient Air Quality) that usually done by December." Mr. Hunter replied that he would expect it to be posted on about January 15th or 15 days after the close of the quarter. Note: the Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Report can be found on the planning.lacity.gov website not the LEA's sclelea.org website.

Mr. Pfefferman asked, "how does the LEA evaluate how effective the Wet Weather Plan that is submitted to your office, whether or not it's actually effective; I know you are saying it (the landfill) held up very well yet boots on the ground in the neighborhood, it doesn't seem like the plan is holding up very well." Mr. Thompson replied that "we are looking at to what's under our jurisdiction which is the regulations in Title 27 which talks about erosion control, ponding, traffic control on-site; basically those type of things; my Inspectors observed the wet weather deck was operating fine, trucks were driving in and out, they were able to dump the trash and cover it each night as required; they were able to eliminate any ponding within the 48 hours." In response to a part of Mr. Pfefferman's regarding boots on the ground in the neighborhood, Mr. Thompson asked him "did the neighborhood experience any problems with flooding from the landfill or trash washing out, those are the types of things we would look for." Mr. Pfefferman did not respond but argued that the landfill had said erosion had contributed to the odor to which Mr. Thompson pointed out that compared to early 2023 the problems from erosion were minor, and that the areas of erosion and ponding had been corrected. He further commented that problems could be encountered in the future due to the differential settlement of up to 25% of the landfill." Mr. Hunter said that both he and Mr. Pfefferman had commented on the Wet Weather Plan to County Public Works and that in turn was folded into the Revised Wet Weather Plan.

- 4. Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD)** to report on any SCL matters within their purview.

Andrew Modugno, Environmental Assessment Coordinator, LAUSD Ofc. of Environmental Health & Safety (OEHS) [213-241-3926; Andrew.Modugno@lausd.net], reported that “four NOVs were issued (in relation to the Van Gogh School) since November 9th on (to date); the trailer on the site (school) is working properly; I looked at it today, and they are still only measuring the PM10, black carbon, and the wind on it; I’m hoping that we can get the City or the County who also has the permit to add more things with Republic; maybe we can get methane or something on that website so that we can see different parameters other than just the basic three. There was a complaint at the school January 8th but staff went around, and they did not smell the odors; they have to be the ones to initiate a (call to AQMD for) NOV.”

Mr. Pfefferman indicated that he had a child attending Van Gogh and wanted to know why the school isn’t being monitored for other chemicals. Mr. Modugno pointed out that it is the City, County and Republic’s thing, not the LAUSD as they only provide a location. Mr. Stewart interjected that “it’s not our program, we (Republic) just fund the program” in response to Mr. Pfefferman assertion that Republic had chosen not to monitor for additional chemicals. Mr. Hunter pointed out that Republic only pays for gathering the data (independent consultant under a City contract), and if the City doesn’t request it, it is not going to happen. More discussion ensued, and Mr. Hunter stated that if we wish to get additional testing done, it has to be taken up with the City Planning Department.

- 5. County Public Works** to report on any SCL matters within their purview to include update of any enforcement actions to enforce compliance since recession of NOVs for Exceedances of Daily Tonnage.

Mr. Hunter stated that “the County Public Works representative has taken issue with the fact that we included that statement (regarding enforcement compliance.....Daily Tonnage) beyond “SCL matters within their purview,” but they said if anybody had any questions, ask it as a question, but not as a part of the (written) agenda, which I don’t agree with, however, it is what it is, so I am going to allow them to make their presentation.”

Miki Esposito, Assistant Director of Public Works, L.A. County Department of Public Works Environmental Programs Division, [MEsposito@dpw.LACounty.gov], stated that she is “happy to answer any questions you might have on that issue, and thank you for having us tonight. We do have a technical update for you and typically who provides that is Emiko Thompson from EPD, so it kind of atypical for me to be here but I’m trying to be very committed to this community because the County really has been finding ways to organize itself around odor issues in particular to landfills. The last time I attended we talked about how we had done so with the Chiquita (Canyon) Landfill, and what we thought was a working solution going forward for Sunshine Canyon (Landfill); that is what we are trying to do. I think Mr. Mann was trying to help shape that conversation around the efforts we have done since we last met. Since we met, Supervisor Horvath has commissioned a working group of City, County, and State officials in order to

establish regular communications around our regulatory authorities which are incredibly complex. It is a very complicated issue in of itself, getting the mitigation efforts to result in odor reduction. The technical of that is very difficult but also the regulatory framework and context is really complicated as well. So if we can be working together more closely, communicating more regularly, then we can do a better job for the community, and that is our hope and our goal, but ultimately the goal is to get the odor resolved... ..meeting in a weekly rhythm.... ..we have had regular meetings with Republic.. ...not just those folks on the ground at the landfill but also the executive team, and to be honest, I think people have been pleased with the level of engagement we've had from the executive level down to the General Manager, and the landfill staff, and we want that to continue....”

Emiko Thompson, Assistant Deputy Director, L.A. County Department of Public Works Environmental Programs Division, [626-458-5163; ETHomp@dpw.LACounty.gov; www.dpw.LACounty.gov], explained that “one of the things that Miki asked the regulatory agencies to do is to reiterate what our roles are; there’s many agencies represented here today and it would be beneficial for us to have a clear understanding of who oversees what; so for Public Works primarily, our role is to ensure that structures and other engineering features conform to County standards. For example, drainage and grading conform to civil engineering standards for safety purposes. Also, Public Works assists other regulatory agencies to provide technical comments; so we heard already a lot of talk about the Wet Weather Plan, so the LEA asked us to take a look at the plan (and) we did provide some comments which I understand were incorporated into the plan which predominately had to do with wet loads, and other particularly odorous loads. We recently looked at providing comments on the Joint Technical Document which I understand the LEA is currently finalizing as well in order to do a five-year update to make sure all operational features are up-to-date and sufficient to continue to provide services at the landfill... It came up earlier about capacity, so Public Works also collects various disposal data throughout the County and purely from a numbers perspective, our numbers show that there is a sufficient disposal capacity in the region should waste not be taken to Sunshine Canyon Landfill; but also to note that even if the numbers say that, there are other real implications should that happen... .. there are contracts in place, there are processes and jurisdictions who currently take trash to Sunshine Canyon (Landfill); there would be disruption to services, so that is just something to bear in mind, not that that would be the ultimate deterrent for not taking any disposal tonnages, but that there would be maybe short-term and even some minor long-term disruptions.”

Mr. Hunter asked if the City was onboard with this delayed tipping, and what time they’re now starting the tipping. A discussion ensued with Ms. Esposito who felt City Planning should answer, although Mr. Hunter pointed out that they did not have a representative present, and the reason that he had asked the question was that the last time they (the landfill) delayed tipping (Order of Abatement condition), the City objected as they like to pick up (trash curbside) at six or 7:00 in the morning. He then asked Mr. Stewart, who responded that the City is still dumping early. Mr. Hunter then addressed both Ms. Esposito and Ms. Thompson

and said that earlier he was trying to make a point that we've been told in the past, this is from the City of Los Angeles, that if we didn't have an item on an agenda that we couldn't really talk about it... Do we have anything to report on the recission of the NOVs for exceeding their tonnage? Ms. Esposito responded that we had asked and answered that question last, at last meeting, and so it was redundant showing up again. "Do you have a question? Mr. Hunter responded "Yes, has there been any change since our last meeting which was two months ago." Ms. Esposito responded that "there's been no change."

Mr. Pfefferman stated that he wanted some clarity on this because we have asked about solid waste streams being redirected, especially during rain events. We've been told by BFI/Republic that there's nowhere else for the trash to go, yet we're being told right now that there is capacity at other facilities that service LA County; so there is other solid waste facilities that could accept tonnage if Sunshine Canyon Landfill is having a hard time processing its own solid waste streams and is impacting our neighborhood; is that correct?" Ms. Thompson responded "yes, that is correct," and that it doesn't take into consideration who owns what landfills, whose trucks are taking trash to their own landfills versus others; this is purely numbers. Mr. Pfefferman stated that we've been told a number of times at these CAC meetings that there's nowhere else for the trash to go, so this is great information to have right now which contradicts information that has been presented to us by BFI/Republic."

Mr. Mohajer said that he wanted to expand on what Ms. Thompson indicated saying that "another agency in Los Angeles County that is involved with the design and processing is the Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Task Force; it has the membership of Public Works, AQMD, Public Health as well as City of Los Angeles; two appointees of the President of the City Council, two representatives appointed by the County Board of Supervisors; this Task Force pretty much acts as an entity that everybody can if they have a concern, they raise the issue with the Task Force, so the Task Force can go and find the answer and go to the right person... and report back..." He went on to describe how the Task Force works and some of their other responsibilities such as underground tanks and drainage maintenance within the Sunshine Canyon Landfill property because of the Flood Control Districts outside, and issuing an Industrial Waste Permit for controlling the leachate. The Task Force meets once a month on the third Thursday at the Public Works Headquarters in Alhambra.

6. County Regional Planning Department to report on any 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>], stated that they (CPW) "wanted us to give a brief explanation of our role. Our role is to manage the compliance of the Conditional Use Permit (CUP). It takes a lot of co-ordination work with all our technical agencies as you've all seen... we do have some provisions we monitor but a lot of it is technical.....we work closely with County Public Works, Public Health,

AQMD and all the other regulatory agencies; that they meet monthly with other agencies; that they put together a list of State Agencies, with contact information, who to report types of issues or concerns; it is also on the County Planning website.”

Mr. Mohajer believed that there'd been revisions that significantly revised the CUP in October 2022 which impacts the Finding of Conformance which was issued by the Integrated Waste Management Task Force, so the question is, is the Revised Conditional Use Permit posted on the website? Mr. De La Torre replied “there has been no revision to the Conditional Use Permit; nothing that has been done since the approval of the CUP.” Mr. De La Torre and Mr. Mohajer continued to disagree, and Mr. Hunter asked if Mr. De La Torre could investigate and come back with an answer.

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

Seira Kurian, of the L.A. County Public Health Dept. [626.430.9821; <http://publichealth.LACounty.gov>], noted “how important we feel this issue is, and we’re collaborating together (with other agencies) to address these issues...”
..The role of Public Health is to really track and respond to any health concerns that may be reported to us as it relates to the issues at Sunshine Canyon (Landfill)... we do have a email address that folks can reach us and let us know of any issue that you have, and that is tox@ph.LACounty.gov and we also have a phone number, 626-430-9821... That information is also on the resource sheet Mr. De La Torre spoke about.”

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

Olga Ayala, Planner, L.A. City Planning Dept. (818-374-9911; Olga.Ayala@LACity.org; www.planning.LACity.org), introduced herself and said that she did not have any updates, and encouraged contacting Tim Fargo [Planner; Tim.Fargo@LACity.org]. Mr. Hunter asked if she knew who Nick Hendricks had been replaced by; she replied that she was not aware but noted that she was one of three new Planners.

Mr. Thompson stated that “they have a Technical Advisory Committee and that is a group with City Planning, (County) Regional Planning, Public Health, LEA, and will be having a meeting on February 23, 2024 that is chaired by the heads of the two Planning Agencies. One of the items on that agenda will be a report from a consultant called STI and they are the ones doing the monitoring at the school and at the landfill. They are the ones that produce a report, so I think that would be a good opportunity to be able to ask about what exactly is monitored. I know there was a change in the contract recently, so I don’t know what is being monitored...”

Resident Eric Pfefferman requested, and Ms. Ayala agreed to report back regarding why the additional monitoring capabilities were not turned on; Mr. Hunter will contact Mr. Fargo.

- 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.

Aaron Ordower, Environmental Deputy for L.A. County Supervisor Lindsey Horvath, reported that they've started a monthly coordination meeting of multi-agency staff to address physical and regulatory issues. CPW has "also had regular meetings with Republic . . . They're coming up with corrective measures . . . We want to know if the mitigation efforts produce results . . . We'll continue those efforts." Later, he reported that the Supervisor toured the Landfill.

Sharon Bronson, a Field Deputy for L.A. City District 12 Councilman John Lee (818-882-1212; Sharon.Bronson@LACity.org; www.CD12.org), reported that "Councilman Lee takes this very seriously"; he toured the Landfill. She promised to report back. She soon added that "we are looking into" the San Fernando Rd. condition.

Natalie Vartanian, Field & Legislative Deputy for L.A. County Supervisor Kathryn Barger, reported that they share the Sunshine Canyon Landfill with Supervisor Horvath, and she and Mr. Ordower are very closely working on this issue.

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

Mr. Fisk asked how San Fernando Rd. can be fixed by the City or County; between Balboa Blvd. and the Landfill, it is almost inoperable. Ms. Vartanian said they are looking at the signal. Mr. Hunter said that it is the state of the roads itself, it's falling apart; those trucks are 10 tons, plus the long-hauls are even more. Ms. Vartanian responded that yes, the roads are a part of what they are looking at.

Mr. Hunter adjourned the meeting for the benefit of the City and County employees present as he had a 5:00 p.m. hard stop for the meeting. He apologized to Mr. Bailey for cutting him off and recognized him for public comment.

After Adjournment, Guest Glenn Bailey stated that he "appreciated the fact that we are holding hybrid meetings because he did plan to attend in person but something came up; that he would recommend if there's a possibility that of any member of the Committee joining virtually under the restrictions of AB 2449, it does require Board action either in advance or at the day of the meeting so that needs to be on your agenda so that you can be able to do that, please check with LA City Attorney or LA County Council for advice on that; I'm not an attorney. I want to thank you for putting the contact list . . . into chat; that was one of my areas of concern. I think it would be very helpful if you could put on the agenda each of these different entities, government agencies, BFI, the names of the expected speakers. I realize they may

not show up or someone else may, but just having the name and the spelling would be much appreciated, and if multiple people show up put both names down... and, if you have more room, an email address, but I think that a contact list might serve that purpose.”

E. Set next meeting date (March 14, 2024).

Mr. Hunter announced that the next Meeting will be here and online March 14, 2024 at 3:00 p.m. Mr. Hunter declared and the Committee agreed to **ADJOURN** the Meeting at 5:00 p.m.

F. Special Overtime Discussion of Budget, Banking & Financial Matters (if needed).

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>.