

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

Minutes for January 16, 2020

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Margaret Clark, League of California Cities
Jeff Farano, Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries
Gideon Kracov, Los Angeles County Disposal Association
Betsey Landis, Environmental Organization Representative
Mike Mohajer, General Public Representative
Liz Reilly, California League of Cities-Los Angeles Division

COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY OTHERS:

Craig Beck, rep by Charles Tripp, Long Beach Department of Energy
Barbara Ferrer, rep by Dorcas Hanson Lugo, Los Angeles County Public Health
Robert Ferrante, rep by Sam Shammass, Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
Mark Pestrella, rep by Carlos Ruiz, Los Angeles County Public Works
Enrique Zaldivar, rep by Bernadette Halverson, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Jack Hadjinian, League of California Cities-Los Angeles Division
David Kim, City of Los Angeles
Wayne Nastri, South Coast Air Quality Management District
Rafael Prieto, City of Los Angeles

OTHERS PRESENT:

Martins Aiyetiwa, Los Angeles County Public Works
Shari Afshari, Los Angeles County Public Works
Clark Ajwani, Los Angeles County Public Works
Joe Bartolata, Los Angeles County Public Works
Perla Gomez, Los Angeles County Public Works
Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens
Gerald Ley, Los Angeles County Public Works
Meg McNamara, City of Santa Clarita
Carol Oyola, Los Angeles County Public Works
Mark Pestrella, Los Angeles County Public Works
Sarah Solomon, Los Angeles County Public Works
Chris Sheppard, Los Angeles County Public Works
Coby Skye, Los Angeles County Public Works
Kawsar Vazifdar, Los Angeles County Public Works
Jennifer Wallin, CalRecycle
Julia Weissman, Los Angeles County, County Counsel
Curtis Williams, City of Santa Clarita
Jacqueline Wong, Trash Active
Jeffrey Zhu, Los Angeles County Public Works

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Clark called the meeting to order at 1:06 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 21, 2019 MINUTES

Ms. Landis motioned to approve the minutes as corrected. Ms. Reilly seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

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

Mr. Sheppard reported there was a presentation from Ms. Traeacey Anthony of Alternative Resources, Incorporated. She presented on a summary of the activities conducted under a conversion technology (CT) project for the last several years. This existing CT contract will be expiring in February 2020. Mr. Sheppard noted that Public Works will be putting out a Zero Waste Planning contract which is broader than the original CT contract and also focuses on organic waste management, Senate Bill 1383 (SB 1383), zero waste, and achieving the goals of the Los Angeles County Roadmap to a Sustainable Waste Management Future.

Ms. Clark paused Mr. Sheppard's report to allow a brief introduction of Mark Pestrella, Director of Public Works and Task Force Chair. Director Pestrella expressed his acknowledgment and appreciation of the Task Force's work with solid waste management, impacting policies, and meeting State and local standards. Director Pestrella commented that the Task Force is very important and highly influential especially in light of changes with solid waste and State and local regulations. He concluded that Public Works will continue to support the Task Force.

Mr. Sheppard continued with his report from the ATAS. He discussed the work completed under the current CT contract, including the 2016 CT conference and various studies and research. This research included potential CT projects such as organics recycling at Pitchess Detention Center, a potential thermal project, and a potential small digestion project at Public Works Headquarters. He also mentioned that as part of SB 1383 requirements, CalRecycle will conduct a feasibility study of existing capacity for organics waste processing, the need for organic waste facility processing throughout the State, as well as any barriers to organic waste processing. Comments may be submitted to CalRecycle for consideration in their report.

Mr. Sheppard stated the ATAS is working on developing goals and priorities for the year. Members suggested priorities that included identifying outlets for green waste, potential for organic infrastructure, addressing barriers to the development

of biomass conversion and other CT projects under SB 1383 regulations. They also recommended developing specific outreach/education material for legislators.

Mr. Sheppard reported future events:

- Renewable Gas 360 2020, January 22 - 23, 2020, Sacramento, CA
- Verde Xchange Conference 2020, January 26 - 28, 2020, Los Angeles, CA
- Compost 2020, USCC Conference & Tradeshow, January 28 - 21, 2020, Charleston, SC
- Recycling Market Development Workshop in Cali/Baja Corridor for California and the Southwest, early February 2020 (date TBD), Chula Vista, CA
- International Biomass Conference & Expo, February 3 - 5, 2020, Nashville, TN
- Global Waste Management Symposium (GWMS), February 11 - 14, 2020, Indian Wells, CA
- Zero Waste Symposium, February 11, 2020, San Diego, CA (Public Works staff will likely attend)
- NRC Zero Waste Conference, March 18 - 19, 2020, Berkeley, CA
- SWANAPalooza, March 23 - 26, 2020, Atlanta, GA
- SoCal Waste Management Forum Spring Conference, March 24, 2020, Downey CA (Mr. Sheppard highlighted this event)
- Biocycle West Coast 2020, March 30 – April 2, 2020, Sacramento, CA

Mr. Mohajer added there will be a one-hour presentation at the Sempra Energy Research Center event for the SoCal Waste Management Forum Spring Conference, from 8:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. regarding all new legislation and regulations that may be helpful to City Staff and County Staff.

Ms. Landis commented that she would like to see the CT information prepared by the ATAS include a range of information for including the amount of acreage, water use, and tonnage needed for a typical project.

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

Ms. Landis reported an update on the Sunshine Canyon Landfill (Landfill) odor complaints. In December 2019, there were 16 odor complaints on the Air Quality Management District (AQMD) hotline: 2 calls were for the trash, 4 calls were No Field Response, and the rest of the calls were listed as none because when the inspector arrive, there was no smell. As of January 7, 2020, AQMD did not issue any Notice of Violations for December 2019.

The number of complaints received in November 2019 when compared to December, increased from 14 to 16. The number of complaints received in December 2019 decreased in comparison to December 2018, from 36 to 16 complaints. The total number of complaints received in the year 2019 is 350.

Ms. Landis reported that she has asked about a monitoring well that had produced more methane readings above the regulatory threshold and asked about the ownership of the oil wells on the Republic Services property on the Landfill. Republic owns two wells which have been officially abandoned; however, there are 38 oil wells owned by approximately 5 to 10 companies that are within the property lines. There are difficulties monitoring these wells.

The update on the Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL) reported 13 odor complaints in 2019. Ms. Landis mentioned that CCL is involved in two lawsuits against Los Angeles County for various things, such as claiming the land use permit fees are illegal and challenging certain operational conditions of the latest permit.

Ms. Landis mentioned there will be a presentation on the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan 5-Year Review Report later in this meeting.

V. REPORT FROM THE AD HOC GOALS & PRIORITIES SUBCOMMITTEE – 2020 GOALS & PRIORITIES PLAN

Mr. Kracov reported that the 2020 Priorities, Goals & Objectives Report has been finalized and is ready to be publicized online on the Task Force website. Mr. Kracov stated that there are various deadlines to meet within the Report. Mr. Kracov briefly went over some of the tasks that will need to be completed soon including Staff sending letters to agencies to fill their open seats on the Task Force and choosing their respective alternates, a new orientation binder for new members to the Task Force, and a forecast of the planning documents for 2020 which on today's Agenda. Mr. Ruiz commented that clarification may be needed for subcommittees that should take the lead in completing the goals and objectives. Staff will wait to identify the appropriate subcommittees to take the lead, consult with the subcommittees and the designated legislative liaison, and then bring the

feedback on the tentative assignments of the subcommittees. It can then be brought forth to the Task Force committee for consideration.

VI. RECOMMENDATION TO DISSOLVE THE AD HOC GOALS & PRIORITIES SUBCOMMITTEE

Ms. Landis discussed the reason she is recommending to dissolve the Ad Hoc Goals & Priorities Subcommittee (Ad Hoc) is that it has achieved its purpose of assessing and evaluating the improvements needed in the Task Force.

Ms. Landis motioned for the Ad Hoc Goals & Priorities Subcommittee to be dissolved. Ms. Reilly seconded the motion. Discussion ensued.

Ms. Clark commented that if needed, the Ad Hoc Subcommittee could be revived in the future. Ms. Landis stated that there is plenty of work identified by the subcommittee that needs to be worked on.

Mr. Kracov stated the purpose of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee was to improve the Task Force and; subsequently, created the 2020 Priorities, Goals & Objectives Report. He commented that the subcommittee should remain to ensure that the work is being completed, such as filling Task Force vacancies, communication outreach, developing and advocacy strategy, etc. He added that he appreciates and sympathizes that this process is new, but senses there are concerns with this process. The Ad Hoc Subcommittee's role would be to monitor in a procedural way, and not in a substantive way. If the plan is working, then the Ad Hoc Subcommittee can report quarterly to the Task Force on its progress. Mr. Kracov also stated that the work of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee is not complete and that there is more to be done. He is concerned about how the work will be carried out. Another concern Mr. Kracov expressed was that the Task Force may be ready to disband the Ad Hoc Subcommittee without a plan to make sure that the Task Force does meet these objectives.

Ms. Landis responded that the Ad Hoc Subcommittee was to set up goals and priorities for the Task Force, and not to implement them, and that Staff and the Task Force are capable enough to carry out the goals and priorities. The real value of the Committee and the subcommittees are that they are flexible, because of their interest of taking care of the waste in Los Angeles County. Ms. Landis continued that the Ad Hoc Subcommittee is not an implementing subcommittee, but rather was established to see where the Task Force is not well organized. Ms. Landis stated that the 2020 Priorities, Goals & Objectives Report has been approved, and the Task Force and respective Subcommittees will implement it. Mr. Ruiz expressed appreciation of the work the Ad Hoc Subcommittee and the involvement, commitment, and effort of Mr. Kracov as Chair of the subcommittee. Mr. Ruiz commented that the Task Force should have a mechanism to see that the goals and priorities are carried out and that the Ad Hoc Subcommittee would

be a good source. The Ad Hoc Subcommittee could work with Staff on a number of the goals and priorities and review the document to make sure that the goals do not overlap with the other Subcommittees. One of the goals/objectives is to provide a report of the status of the progress of the Task Force and Subcommittees and how they are meeting their respective goals and priorities. The Task Force could decide to keep working with the Ad Hoc Subcommittee by January 2021. Ms. Landis responded that with the report approved, the Subcommittee is not needed. She does not want the Ad Hoc Subcommittee to tell the Task Force or the other Subcommittees what to say, what other things need to be done, or to shorten meeting discussions because they are too long. The Task Force is dealing with very serious issues and flexibility is important. Ms. Landis reiterated that the Ad Hoc Subcommittee was simply to take a look at the Task Force to see what was needed to be more efficient.

Mr. Farano agreed that the Ad Hoc reached its goal, but he also agreed with Mr. Kracov's suggestion of additional goals and things that need to be done. He commented the Ad Hoc Subcommittee could continue on working with Staff on monitoring on a procedural level and not intervening with the Subcommittees in making certain goals are being met.

Mr. Kracov stated that there has to be level of trust in this process and that this has been a flexible process. The Ad Hoc Subcommittee is to try to make the Members' and Staff's work more valuable to the Task Force. He understood Ms. Landis' concerns about the lack of flexibility and that the Ad Hoc Subcommittee would not interfere with the functions of the Task Force, but rather try to assist the Task Force stay on track with the deadlines and objectives.

Ms. Clark suggested that Mr. Kracov could continue to work with Staff to monitor the progress of the Task Force. If it does not work, the Ad Hoc Subcommittee would be revived. Ms. Landis agreed with the compromise. Mr. Kracov asked what would be done if something needed to be discussed. Ms. Landis responded the item would be put in the agenda. Ms. Weissman advised that the agenda is confirmed by the Chair, and a member may request to put an item on the agenda. Mr. Ruiz requested clarification in that the Task Force would designate Mr. Kracov to monitor the progress based on the Report and work with Staff on administrative tasks. Ms. Clark confirmed. This suggestion was added to the original motion. The motion was made by Ms. Landis to dissolve the Ad Hoc Subcommittee, seconded by Ms. Reilly, with the addition to designate Mr. Kracov to monitor the Task Force progress on the Report. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Mohajer expressed his concern that he is not happy with the Staff's support with the Public Education and Information Subcommittee (PEIS). He stated the work is not getting done and requested more effort to get adequate staffing to the PEIS. Mr. Ruiz commented that this is why a mechanism is needed to keep the

momentum going and for Staff to have the motivation to carry through with providing the support needed by the Subcommittees.

Ms. Clark made a request to Staff to request EarthCare to make a presentation at next month's Task Force meeting.

VII. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Mr. Ajwani gave an update on the [Legislative Table](#). He reported that there are currently 17 State bills and 5 Federal bills on the legislative table. He mentioned that staff will continue to track their movement of all bills, with priority bills being SB54/AB 1080 on reducing plastic pollution.

The following bills were presented, with staff recommendation the Task Force support one of the bills and watch the remaining:

AB 1506 (McCarty) – Solid Waste: Commercial and organic waste: Recycling bins
This bill would provide recycling and organics container exemptions for mobile food service facilities within amusement parks and other attractions, however staff's understanding is that these exceptions already exist in current law. – Watch.

AB 1567 (Aguilar-Curry and Mathis) –Organic Waste: scoping plan
This is a similar bill that died last year (AB 144), requiring the Strategic Growth Council to develop an organic waste scoping plan. The bill has spot bill language at this time and it is unclear how this will work given SB 1383 regulations. – Watch.

AB 1839 (Bonta, Chiu, Kalra, Reyes, and Weber) – Climate Change: California Green New Deal
This bill would create the California Green New Deal Council to create a Green New Deal plan for the state. It is unclear of bill impacts on solid waste at this time. – Watch.

AB 1840 (Ting) – Recycling: Reports
This is a spot bill, with intent to improve Beverage Container Recycling Program. – Watch.

SB 372 (Wieckoski) Beverage Container Recycling Act of 2020
This bill would create an extended producer responsibility (EPR) program for beverage containers and creation of a stewardship organization to develop and submit a plan for the recovery of beverage containers. This is a backup bill to SB54/AB 1080 unknown if this bill will move forward. Mr. Kracov commented to Staff to please keep a close eye on this bill, and that the processor payment part of the CRV program is important to watch given China Sword impacts. Many MRF's would be underwater if they did not receive CRV payments from the bottle bill. – Watch.

Federal Legislation:

HR 5115 (Cardenas) – Realizing the Economic Opportunities and Value of Expanding Recycling Act (RECOVER)

This bill would allocate \$500 Million in grants over five years to support recycling infrastructure and education. Staff recommendation is Support as recycling infrastructure is a significant priority for the Task Force.

Support position motioned by Mr. Mohajer, seconded by Mr. Kracov. Motion passed unanimously.

S 2941 (Portman) Recycling Enhancements to Collection and Yield through Consumer Learning and Education Act of 2019 (RECYCLE)

This bill would provide grant assistance of \$15 Million per year over five years for outreach and education of recycling programs. Staff recommends to watch the bill for now while comparing to Task Force other priority bills similar to this one.

VIII. SB 1383 FINAL ENVIRONMENT IMPACT REPORT

Ms. Vazifdar provided an update on the Senate Bill 1383 (SB 1383) Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR). She stated that SB 1383 was signed into law in 2016. She stated that SB 1383 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to implement the short-lived climate pollutant strategy to reduce statewide methane emissions by 40 percent. She stated that because organic waste decomposing in landfills is a significant source of methane emissions, the law requires CalRecycle to develop regulations to:

- Reduce organic waste landfill disposal 50 percent below the 2014 level by the year 2020
- Reduce organic waste landfill disposal 75 percent below the 2014 level by the year 2025
- Recover 20 percent of edible food currently being disposed of in landfills for human consumption by the year 2025

Ms. Vazifdar reported that CalRecycle expects to adopt the regulations and transmit the regulatory package to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) by January 18, 2020. She stated that after the OAL receives the package, the OAL has 30 working days to conduct a review of the rulemaking records to ensure CalRecycle has satisfied all requirements. After the OAL approves the rulemaking action, it will be filed with the Secretary of State by February 28, 2020 and will become effective on January 1, 2022.

Ms. Landis asked if there is any opportunity to make public comments on the regulations. Ms. Vazifdar responded that there are currently no open public comment periods, but she believes that anyone that would like to make comments could submit a comment letter to the OAL. Mr. Ruiz stated if any stakeholder

believes that either CalRecycle did not follow the rulemaking process or the proposed regulations conflict with existing law or state regulations, they could comment to the OAL. Ms. Landis asked if there would be any future public workshops or public comment periods. Ms. Vazifdar responded that CalRecycle released the regulations for an initial 45-day comment period and then released two subsequent versions of the regulations for 15-day comment periods in accordance with the formal rulemaking process. She added that the Task Force submitted comment letters during each of the public comment periods.

Ms. Vazifdar continued that, as the lead agency developing the SB 1383 regulations, CalRecycle is required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to prepare an EIR to determine if the implementation of the regulations will potentially have significant adverse impacts on the physical environment. She stated that CalRecycle released the Draft EIR for public review and comment after they released the first two formal drafts of the regulations in July 2019. She stated that, in August 2019, CalRecycle hosted a public meeting in Sacramento to discuss the Draft EIR and received comments. The Task Force submitted comments to CalRecycle on the Draft EIR in September 2019 and CalRecycle released the third formal draft of the regulations in October 2019. In December 2019, CalRecycle released the Final EIR. She stated that although the Final EIR includes CalRecycle's formal responses to all comments they received from all stakeholders, CalRecycle did not address most of these comments by making significant changes.

Ms. Vazifdar briefly reviewed a summary of the comments the Task Force submitted on the Draft EIR that were not addressed in the Final EIR:

- The EIR only analyzed the development of composting and anaerobic digestion facilities but did not analyze biomass conversion, non-combustion thermal conversion technologies, or any other technologies that would be needed to divert organic waste.
- The EIR assumed that all organic waste will be collected using a three-bin system with food waste mixed with green waste in the green bin, and did not analyze variations in environmental impacts resulting from other collection methods.
- The EIR did not quantify the increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) resulting from the regulations.
- Although the EIR considers alternative to the regulations, it does not consider amending the regulations to be less prescriptive and following a "good faith effort" model, which may allow local jurisdictions to minimize the impacts of the regulations based on local conditions.
- Because the EIR is intended to analyze impacts to the physical environment, it did not include a cost analysis. The cost impacts may be overly burdensome

and significantly delay local jurisdictions' compliance with the regulations and prevent the state from achieving the methane emission reduction target.

Ms. Landis suggested the Task Force submit a comment letter on the regulations to the OAL. Mr. Mohajer responded that the Task Force should not submit a letter until CalRecycle submits the regulations to the OAL. After further discussion, Ms. Landis made a motion that the Task Force send a letter commenting on the inadequacies of the SB 1383 regulations to the OAL once CalRecycle submits them. Mr. Mohajer seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

IX. WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANNING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS FORECAST FOR 2020

Mr. Ley reported the current forecast of planning documents and reports that Staff is anticipating bringing to the Task Force for the year of 2020. There are five separate planning documents and reports:

(1) Five-Year Review of the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (Plan): State law and regulation requires each County to review its Integrated Waste Management Plan at least once every five years to correct any deficiencies in the Plan and to revise it if necessary. The Task Force reviews the draft Five-Year Review Report (Report) and submits its comments to the County and CalRecycle. The County then finalizes the Report and submits copies to CalRecycle and to the Task Force. Staff is also currently working with the FPRS on the Plan document. After completion, the Subcommittee will bring the document to the Task Force for consideration. The estimated completion time of these tasks is two to three months away.

(2) Countywide Siting Element Revision and the associated EIR: The Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 required the County to prepare a Countywide Siting Element to identify disposal sites and describe how the County, and the cities within the County, plan to manage the disposal of their solid waste for a 15-year planning period. The County's existing Siting Element was approved in 1998 and there is an ongoing effort to revise the document. A draft revised Siting Element and EIR have been prepared with revised goals, policies, and strategies which were developed in concert with the Task Force and subcommittees. We expect to release the Draft Revised Siting Element and EIR to the public by summer of this year. Once public comments have been received, Staff will continue to work with the Task Force on the final draft of the document which should be later this year.

(3) SB 1383 Compliance Strategy: The proposed SB 1383 regulations will require the County to work in collaboration with each of the 88 cities for Organic Waste Recycling Capacity Planning and Reporting. The proposed regulations require consultation with the local Task Force for certain planning efforts. In November, staff presented the findings of the Countywide Organic Waste Management Plan Annual update, dated 2019, to the FPRS. Since that time, staff has continued work to develop a strategy for compliance with the planning and reporting requirement of SB 1383. The next step is for Public Works to present its SB 1383 compliance strategy to the FPRS and Task Force. Staff anticipates this item to be on next month's FPRS agenda.

(4) Countywide Siting Element and Summary Plan Annual Report: State law requires the County to submit a report to CalRecycle summarizing the adequacy of the Siting Element and the Summary Plan. The report discusses changes in disposal capacity, facilities, and other relevant issues. To comply with this requirement, Public Works submits this information each year in its Electronic Annual Report on August 1. In addition, Public Works publishes a print version of its Siting Element and Summary Plan Annual Report which contains an analyses of the County's disposal capacity needs and strategies for maintaining adequate capacity through a 15-year period. Task Force review of the Siting Element and Summary Plan Annual Report is not required by state law or regulation. Regardless, staff anticipates bringing the draft report for this year to the Task Force for feedback in the late summer.

(5) Los Angeles County Roadmap to a Sustainable Waste Management Future: The Roadmap was adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors in 2014. It lays out the general framework for the strategies and initiatives that the County can implement including at a Regional/Countywide level to divert waste from disposal and decrease reliance on landfills. The Roadmap established aggressive waste reduction goals to ultimately achieve more than 95 plus percent diversion from landfills by 2045. Public Works is currently taking steps to update the Roadmap for 2020 and has been engaging with stakeholders to gather input. The Roadmap document is not required by any State law or regulation and likewise, review of the Roadmap 2020 is not required. Nevertheless, Public Works anticipates bringing the item before the Task Force for feedback by early Fall of this year.

Mr. Kracov requested a one-page description of the forecast Mr. Ley reported and to circulate it to the Task Force members.

X. 2018 COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. Bartolata gave a [presentation](#) regarding the 2018 Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan Annual Report (Annual Report). The purpose of the Annual Report is to provide an annual update to the Los Angeles County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan which includes the Summary Plan (approved in 1999) and the Siting Element (approved in 1998) assessments., During the calendar year of 2018, Los Angeles County has disposed of over 5 million tons of solid waste at in-county solid waste facilities and exported 5.1 million tons of waste outside of Los Angeles County such as Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties.

Mr. Bartolata presented various strategies in maintaining adequate disposal capacity which includes: (1) the continued waste diversion efforts by jurisdictions; (2) potential expansions (if any) of existing in-County landfills to the extent that it can be done in a technically feasible and environmentally safe manner; (3) the continued operations of Southeast Resource Recovery Facilities (or equivalent) until 2024 or greater alternative technology capacity; and (4) the continued waste exports to out-of-County landfills.

Mr. Bartolata highlighted a few scenarios contained in the Annual Report. For example, Scenario I assumes the use of only existing permitted in-County disposal capacities, that would mean no exports to out-of-County landfills. Based on this assumption, reliance on existing permitted in-County disposal capacity alone, would be insufficient in meeting long-term needs.

Scenario II (Status-quo) assumes the following: (1) diversion rate remains at 65 percent, (2) continued operations of the waste-to-energy facility, and (3) exports would continue at its current rate. Based on these assumptions, existing permitted in-County disposal capacity alone would be insufficient to meet the disposal needs. However, if it is coupled with the level of waste exports in 2018, that may be sufficient in meeting the County's needs for the next 15 years. Mr. Kracov asked where the 65 percent diversion rate came from. Mr. Bartolata explained the use of CalRecycle's last approved countywide diversion rate of 58 percent in 2006 as the base year and adjustment methodology which factored in the projections in population, employment, and taxable sales from the UCLA Long-term Anderson Forecast for Los Angeles County. As a result, a 65 percent diversion rate in 2018 is assumed in the analysis.

Along with the assumptions in Scenario II, Scenario IV satisfies the requirements of SB 1383 that would reduce the landfill disposal of organic waste by 50 percent reduction in the level of the statewide disposal of organic waste from the 2014 level by 2020 and 75 percent reduction in the level of statewide disposal of organic waste from the 2014 level by 2025. No disposal capacity shortfall would be

expected to occur during the planning period. Mr. Mohajer asked if the scenario considers organic waste under the proposed SB 1383 regulation or as defined under AB 1826. Mr. Bartolata confirmed it is under SB 1383 regulation.

Scenario VII assumes that all solid waste management options considered in the previous scenarios become available throughout the planning period which includes additional disposal capacity of 4,000 tons per day using the waste-by-rail system. This scenario also assumes all jurisdiction in Los Angeles County would comply with all the requirements of state law resulting in a countywide diversion rate of 75 percent by 2020. Therefore, no disposal capacity shortfall would be expected to occur during the planning period.

Mr. Bartolata mentioned a copy of this report is available online at LACountySWIMS.org.

XI. CALRECYCLE UPDATE

Ms. Wallin, representative of CalRecycle, reported future public meetings/events and application due dates:

- 2020 Annual Rulemaking Calendar – January 21, 2020
- Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) Monthly Public Meeting – January 21, 2020
- Public Meeting Notice: Pharmaceutical and Sharps Waste Stewardship (SB212) Formal Rulemaking Public Hearing – February 19, 2020
- Tire-Derived Aggregate Grant Program - Application Due Date – January 30, 2020
- Farm and Ranch Solid Waste Cleanup and Abatement Program – Application Due Date: February 6, 2020
- Illegal Disposal Site and LF Cleanup Remediation Grant Program – Application Due Date: February 17, 2020
- Beverage Container Recycling City/County Payment Program – Application Due Date: March 2, 2020.

XII. PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m. The next meeting date is tentatively scheduled for Thursday, February 20, 2020, at 1:00 p.m., in Conference Room A of Public Works Headquarters.