

**SUNSHINE CANYON LANDFILL – COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CITY AND COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
MINUTES OF MEETING
Thursday, May 5, 2011, 3 p.m.
Knollwood Country Club
12024 Balboa Boulevard, Granada Hills, CA 91344**

- A. The meeting was called to order by Chair, Becky Bendikson, at 3:09 p.m.
Roll call was called by Agnes Lewis.

PRESENT:

SUNSHINE CANYON LANDFILL – COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE Members: Becky Bendikson, Larry Gray, Gale Gundersen, Wayde Hunter; Mary Anna Kienholz, and Joe Vitti.
Absent: Jeanette Capaldi, Michael Hemming. Quorum established with six. Late: Josh Jordahl.

REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE CITY, COUNTY, AND REPUBLIC SERVICES:

SCL-LEA: David Thompson, Gerry Villalobos; SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH'S OFFICE: Millie Jones; BFI/REPUBLIC SERVICES: David Ciple, Rafael Garcia; SCAQMD: David Jones, Larry Israel; CITY COUNCILMEMBER, GREIG SMITH'S OFFICE: Nicole Bernson; LAUSD District 3: Jennifer Brogin; LOS ANGELES COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING: Iris Chi;

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: Ralph Kroy, Mike Mohajer, & Adrene Biondo.

March 3, 2011 Minutes were reviewed, and minor changes made: the correct name of the neutralizer used is Aero4 (SL 5000]. On page two of the BFI report, the name of the project is DTE. **Motion** to approve the March 3, 2011 Minutes as amended (Hunter/Vitti); 5-0-1 abstention.

Ms. Bendikson thanked members of the public for attending. She invited all in attendance to sign the appropriate log, but made it clear that the members of the public may remain anonymous if they so wish.

B. Old Business:

1. Discussion of any outstanding administrative matters (Chair):

Ms. Bendikson contacted the CD12 Office (Councilman Smith) to alert them to the dust blowing on the access road to the landfill, which turned to mud when there was rain, and dust blowing when the road was dry.

- a. A second discussion of replacing the Secretary was initiated, as Mary Wroblewski had resigned, and there were no volunteers at the March 3, 2011 meeting. Ms. Gundersen asked for clarification of the duties. Ms. Bendikson said it involves keeping the CAC documents organized. The duties do not include taking Minutes, as there is a Note Taker (Agnes Lewis), but it does involve organizing documents. Mr. Hunter said it really isn't all that formal, and that he would help. **Ms. Gundersen volunteered** for the position. **Approved** unanimously.

2. **Treasurer's Report (Ms. Kienholz):** The Treasurer's report was distributed. The balance was \$84,487.88. ~~Motion to accept ((Hunter/Vitti); Approved unanimously. Not required~~ – the Treasurer's report was accepted to be filed.
3. **Discussion of Odor Problems:** Mr. Hunter suggested deferring this and discussing this important topic as the various reports are presented. Seeing no objection the request was approved.

C. New Business:

1. **BFI Report:** This was the first visit by the new General Manager of the Sunshine Canyon Landfill, David Cieply. He said he recognizes the critical nature of what they need to do. They recognize the odor problems, and he committed to "make every attempt possible" to fix the issue. There are some spikes now in complaints, but his goal is zero complaints, and he has made that commitment to the LEA and to the local community. "The end result is what counts." They have an odor plan of action, which was submitted to the SCAQMD on May 3rd. They continue to abide by the Order of Abatement, but also continue to enhance it. For example, the 10:00 a.m. routine patrol has increased to 6:00 – 10:00 a.m. Mondays through Saturdays. They are compiling odor information to try to identify and match up all they can. Some could have been event driven. There has been an enormous amount of construction activity, but also lots of weather issues. They cover trash on a daily basis. They're using enhanced odor control systems like the Dust Boss and others.

Question (Hunter): What recent landfills has he (Cieply) worked at, and what was their record of compliance with regulations? Answer: Recently at Texas Itasca Landfill, CSC Landfill, and several others (in Texas). His record is a matter of public record, which he called "impeccable". He wants to look forward and develop a team who has bought into the program and form a nucleus of people with the same values. He's announcing today (May 5th) that he's bringing in Tim Johnson, a Republic employee with a gas background and a business background to really help build SCL into a "5 star facility". He's also looking to staff a myriad of other positions.

Question (Mr. Vitti): There was an existing plan of action – what changes have been made? Has Mr. Cieply run into this kind of situation before? Answer: Not to this degree, but odor is a common problem. He's had to do a plan of action before, which was successful. They're increasing patrols and enhancing their systems. He has named a corporate guy to go look at other landfills throughout the county and see how they're handling the issue. Comment (Mr. Hunter): One of the biggest problems is that the CAC does not get all the documentation that it's supposed to get. The Conditional Use Permit says the CAC should be cc'd on every communication with the agencies, and it is not happening. For example, the CAC did not get either the preliminary or the final of this plan (Odor Action Plan). Answer (David Jones, SCAQMD): The one submitted to the AQMD is not finalized yet; there have been comments back and forth between the operator and the AQMD. This cannot be released yet.

Mr. Hunter commented that the letter cited a "final" plan, and that it (BFI's letter) also asked for the release of the names and other information of people who have made complaints.

Mr. Jones reiterated that the plan is not finalized yet. Mr. Hunter commented that when the

plan is “finalized”, that it means the public will then have no chance for input. They need to be able to submit comments. He has already called Mr. Sanchez. The community disagrees with what’s in this odor plan. Question (Ms. Mann): Mr. Cieply said “enhanced perimeter”, and there is concern about adding new chemicals. Answer: Most of it is water.

Comment (Mr. Gray): he has been a member of the CAC for a very long time, and has never seen a spike like this in the number of complaints. What is being done differently? Answer (Mr. Thompson, LEA): Some may be due to gas collection. Also in the past, inert material was a larger part of the mix of solid waste. Now there are more concentrated organics.

Weather, rain, slides, etc. also can have a big influence. Many agencies are involved, and everyone wants to see the odors go away. The SCL-LEA is upping its participation, and having extra training in handling odors. Question (Ms. Mann): Why are there odors on Sundays, when the landfill is presumably not working? Answer (Mr. Cieply): They don’t know. The working face is covered daily. They’re working diligently to determine whether some of the gas is causing problems. Question (Ms. Mann): Does he live in the area? Answer: yes, at least temporarily.

- 2. SCAQMD Report:** (Mr. Israel): In March there were 7 NOVs and 221 odor complaints. In April there were 99 odor complaints and 2 NOVs on April 5th and April 11th. In May there were 49 as of May 5th. Probably half the NOVs are for evening hours. There were also several new complainants, who said they had noticed odors before but had not known whom to call. In the mornings there were several complaints from the school. Descriptions from these various hours were all over the map, most about “moderate to strong sour trash odor”. Some evening complaints cited “sour to sweet rotting trash”. He is trying to get a refined description from the teachers at the school; “trash” as a description doesn’t help. He is getting complaints on weekends, which is puzzling because the landfill stops accepting trash by Saturday at 2:00 p.m. so that by 4:00 – 5:00 p.m. there is no further activity. He has noticed a sweet odor Sunday mornings, which may be gas. Last Sunday [end of April] there were 4-5 complaints in the evening. He gathered samples of undiluted neutralizer for analysis. The last two weeks before this meeting were relatively free of odor complaints, which might be weather related.

Comment (Mr. Hunter): The number of complaints usually decreases in the summer, partially because school is out and those complaints stop. It’s particularly troubling that in a time when complaints generally decrease, they are now increasing. Question (Vitti): noted there were 10 days without complaints. What changed during that time? Was the trash from a different area? Is there some clue? Answer (Mr. Israel): March may have been affected by landslides. SCL was also doing installations of horizontal gas collectors, and they were possibly not drawing as much gas as they should have, during the process. The real puzzle is the number of complaints in the evenings and on Sundays.

Comment (Mr. Jones): At transfer stations, trash is moved from smaller collector trucks to bigger ones for transport to the landfill; this can cause transient odors. They analyzed botanical neutralizers as applied, without results. They then looked at concentrated samples: there were no toxic materials. 55-65% was propylene glycol, about 30 - 40% water, and

about 1 - 3% fragrances. On the Order of Abatement, the studies are still ongoing. The meteorology one (report) is due tomorrow (May 6th); the one (report) on transfer stations on May 11th; on the working face, they have the preliminary and may get some further good data. They had a hard time getting contactors to bid on the one on odor capture, so there has been a 90-day extension. These are all mandated by the Hearing Board and stipulated by the operator. They may suspend any of the conditions temporarily in order to study the effect.

Question (Mr. Hunter): What will the AQMD do if they *cannot* control the odor? Answer: They are committed to solving the problem. They have the authority to use any means necessary.

Question (Vitti): What year did the landfill start accepting trash from transfer stations? Answer (Mr. Garcia): about 2009.

Comment (Mr. Vitti): the complaints started to go up markedly in 2009. Comment (Mr. Hunter): When you take all the recyclables out, what you're left with is the smelliest trash.

- 3. SCL-LEA Report** (Mr. Thompson): In March and April there were 3 incidents resulting in violations. On March 11, an NOV for disposal site records, and issues with gas systems that the LEA was not notified on. Now has instituted weekly meetings with the landfill manager, to redefine what constitutes a "special occurrence". This is now resolved, he believes. Any problem is now a "special occurrence". The second issue was landfill gas, when perimeter probes at 241 and 242 on the north side registered concentration greater than 5%. These were down in April to 4.2 and 1.3%, respectively. They want to find out if the odor is from natural gas or from the landfill. Fifty-one or fifty-two gas wells that were off-line are now on-line. SCL is getting excavation permits from SCAQMD to put in more gas collection lines. In April they were in compliance.

The storm of March 19th brought 6 - 8 inches of rain to the site. LEA requested they get a rain gauge to measure future rainfall. There was a problem with the drainage on site. The water from the east side is supposed to go down a chute into a basin, but the water was running off the liner and eroding into slopes, exposing trash across the landfill. There was also mud down on Balboa (sic) Note: should be San Fernando Road. There were grading issues on top; the slope is supposed to be at greater than 3% to control runoff. The LEA is happy with the response from the operator. They re-directed water that afternoon, and by the next day they had filled in and compacted problem areas. Another storm later in the week caused water to flow to the haul road at the entrance instead of the V-ditch that was supposed to channel it. This is now repaired with temporary plaster. There is a three-part plan to fix this permanently. The Water Board people came out, and also City Sanitation Watershed Protection, all working with SCL. As of now they're in compliance.

There will be a Board of SCL-LEA meeting June 2nd at City Hall. People can request to be notified by email, at SCLLEA.org; this new website has inspection reports, announcements, presentations, pictures, all downloadable. Comment (Hunter): About the

problem and the grading plan – noted that the existing East perimeter is now just a V-ditch with plastic lining. This goes over the City’s closed landfill portion and over to the County side, all concrete. Why was the drainage system not completed for the east perimeter? It is against the law to drain over closed landfill areas. This is supposed to be designed for a 500-year storm. This event did not even qualify as a 10-year storm. In the meantime, all agencies must go back and take a **serious** look at the plan for CC-2 and CC-3. There was a joint document generated, and suddenly it became the defining document. All the facilities are jammed into the entrance. People can see the trucks going into the landfill; this is not acceptable. The public did not get to review the document.

4. City and County Planning Departments: (Ly Lam, City Planning): **City/County TAC meeting 2 PM at City Hall**, for selection of new consultant and discuss selection criteria.

Question (Anne Ziliak): What can the public do about the things that Mr. Hunter mentioned?

Answer (Hunter): Supervisors Yarovslasky, Antonovich, Councilman Alarcon, and Smith were all sold a bill-of-goods. The plan did say that the drainage would have some concrete and some plastic parts, in the “Joint Technical Document”, which is just a giant wish list by Sunshine Canyon Landfill, with no public comment. None of the agencies, not one, caught that in the interim they would not meet County standards. The LEA is looking at the grading issue. Mr. Hunter has not received any documentation on this yet.

Comment (Vitti): The SCL-CAC should take a position on this. Answer (Hunter): at the last meeting we sent a letter that requested immediate action on odors. Mr. Hunter made a **Motion**, seconded by Ms. Kienholz:

That the CAC express our concerns regarding the use of the Joint Technical Document, which was not vetted by the people and is not a public document. The public should review the actual design of the landfill and the environmental documents that supported the expansion drainage and design.

Question (David Thompson): offered a clarification: this document details the solid waste permitting process, so it is public. For environmental concerns, rely on the EIR.

The Chair called for the vote on the Motion, which **carried** 6-0-1.

5. Other Persons Representing City, County, or State: Millie Jones, Deputy, from the office of County Supervisor Antonovich: The Public Works Department and the LEA are working with the landfill operator, and provided a fact sheet to the Supervisor’s office. She reminded everyone of the 1-800-CUT-SMOG phone number to report odors.

6. Report from Sunshine Gas Producers (Lou Wilkinson, VP of Project Development): He gave out copies of a presentation discussing a project to capture landfill gas and use it to drive turbines that would create electricity. He said he represents the largest group involved in converting landfill gas to energy. They would build a 20-megawatt facility that would provide enough electricity for 13,000 homes. The equipment presently is made by Caterpillar and is used by several landfills in California. It meets all SCAQMD regulations. The site is moved from the ridge to a lower spot where it would be less visible, though it would still be visible from Highway 5. The State has Renewal Portfolio Standards, and this project would help them to achieve their RPS. The AQMD release a supplemental EIR, around 500 pages, which address factors during construction and operation. At all receptors there is no significant impact (of

those the AQMD tracks), and none at all for areas outside the landfill. The study concluded that basically there would be no impact.

Question (Ms. Kienholz): Why is this a “good” project if the emissions are the same? Answer: Because of the 20-megawatts generated without additional emissions.

Question (Ms. Kienholz): What is the impact on odors? Answer: None. No odors will be generated as a result.

Question (Ms. Bernson): What about increases in CO₂? Answer: This is now running at 10% of the maximum, and burns cleaner than flaring the gas. The permit will require that this amount be lowered. In response to other questions, it transpired that the facility will cost approximately \$70 million; it will start in the early fall and go on for 8 months; the EIR will be published next week; and that some carbon monoxide will be produced as a result of running at the efficiency permitted.

There was some strong reaction voiced from the audience (unidentified) on the matter of particulates, especially the PM 2.5, or those particulates that are small (2.5 microns) and therefore difficult for lungs to clear.

7. Bull Creek Restoration: Due to lack of time, discussion and report were deferred to the next meeting.

D. Public Comment: There was none.

E. Special Overtime Budget Discussion:

Ms. Bendikson talked about the project of buying a copier to mitigate the costs of making hard copies for the meetings, which can sometimes run as high as \$200. Generally the cost per meeting is \$125. Mr. Hunter said there is no quote yet on the copier. He would like, however, to get approval to update aerial photos of the landfill. Photos the CAC has are far out of date with the many changes at the landfill. He has checked for satellite photos, but those are also outdated. The firm that used to provide the aerial views, Curtis, has changed its name to Burbank Aerial. They would have to fly it, then put the various photos together. The CAC would get a CD and own a copyright for the images which would be in sufficient resolution to get a 40x40 harp view. The cost would be \$3750. Prints would be about \$700 apiece. They would also label the major streets. The total cost would be around \$5500. This would be about four shots from 20,000 feet, stitched together.

Comment (Mr. Gray): The City of Los Angeles has maps up to about 2008. How often does Mr. Hunter want the information updated? Answer (Mr. Hunter): Just once. Changes at the landfill right now are pretty dramatic. Perhaps the CAC could go to one of the satellite companies and purchase this at lower cost.

Comment (Mr. Gray): Curtis (Burbank Aerial) is pretty well known for high-quality work; they do practically all the aerial work for topographic maps, subdivisions, and the like. Satellite images are not nearly as good. **Motion:** (Kienholz/Hunter): *To approve purchasing aerial photos of the landfill from Burbank Aerial for up to \$5500. Carried 5-0-2.*

On the matter of an **RFQ for the website**: this has been written using a template, but is not complete. It should be ready by the next meeting. The CAC is asking for something turnkey, so that all technical issues are addressed by the vendor. It is proving difficult to estimate things like the volume of users. It would be important to also link to other websites. All of this should be shifted to the category of “consultants”. Ms. Bendikson noted that the CAC had already voted to approve the website; the discussion should be on what should go into the RFQ.

On the topic of a **reimbursement policy**: The most-often used figure by other organizations is 50 cents per mile. For reference, a round trip to Alhambra would be about 77 miles. The policy would allow reimbursement for attending meetings in the greater Los Angeles area of any agencies that oversee the landfill, or any that are related to municipal solid waste. This would apply to any CAC member, but carpooling would be strongly encouraged. For any possible meetings outside the greater Los Angeles area, the participant would need the prior approval of the Chair. Parking would be reimbursed, but meals would not. Anything out of the ordinary would require prior approval of the Chair. **Motion** (Kienholz/Jordahl): *To approve a travel reimbursement policy that would pay 50-cents per mile and parking fees for attending meetings in the greater Los Angeles area of agencies that oversee the landfill, or any related to municipal solid waste. Carried 5-0-2.*

There followed a review of how the CAC gets its funding: there was a one-time settlement with Republic for \$80,000 to fund consultants plus \$6,000 for administrative expenses. Annually the consultant fund is replenished by the amount spent, up to \$20,000. The administrative fund is replenished annually by \$6,000.

F. **Adjourned at 6:06 p.m.**

Minutes by Agnes Lewis.