

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

Minutes for July 16, 2020

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

WEB CONFERENCE

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
Rafael Prieto, City of Los Angeles
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
Robert Ferrante, rep by Sam Shammass, Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
Barbara Ferrer, rep by Shikari Nakagawa-Ota, Los Angeles County Public Health
Mark Pestrella, rep by Carlos Ruiz, Los Angeles County Public Works
Enrique Zaldivar, rep by Reina Pereria, 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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Martins Aiyetiwa, Los Angeles County Public Works
Clark Ajwani, Los Angeles County Public Works
Jennifer Ang, Los Angeles County Public Works
Nam Doan, Los Angeles County Public Works
Charles Darensbourg, Los Angeles County Public Works
Perla Gomez, Los Angeles County Public Works
Michael Harmon, Los Angeles County Public Works
Nan Harrold, Public Attendee
Matt Henigan, California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery
Wayde Hunter, North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens
Gerald Ley, Los Angeles County Public Works
Cara Morgan, California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery
Primitivo Nunez, California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery

Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/
Integrated Waste Management Task Force
Meeting Minutes for July 16, 2020
Page 2 of 16

Adrian Perea, Los Angeles County Public Works
Carol Oyola, 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, California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery
Lena Wiegand, Public Attendee
Elizabeth Zaragoza, Public Works
Jeffrey Zhu, Los Angeles County Public Works

I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 1:05 p.m. by Ms. Clark.

II. APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 18, 2020 MINUTES

Mr. Mohajer motioned to approve the minutes as corrected. Ms. Landis seconded the motion. The motion passed. Mr. Prieto and Ms. Pereira were not present at the time of voting.

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

Mr. Sheppard reported that Mr. Larry Condon and Mr. Bernard Fenner gave a presentation on True North Renewable Energy, a development company which builds and operates waste conversion facilities to produce renewable natural gas (RNG) from organic waste. Mr. Sheppard described the company as "technology agnostic" and that it focuses on high solids anaerobic digestion technology with in-vessel composting. They are planning to build and operate a facility in California in the next few years that will process up to 600,000 tons per year of organic waste and will have multiple receiving points throughout Southern California. They are still deciding the most suitable location for the facility.

Ms. Reilly asked where the company's current locations are. Mr. Sheppard responded that it has worked with many technology providers that have facilities in Europe. Ms. Reilly asked if this will be the company's first United States (U.S.) location. Mr. Sheppard responded that the team members have experience building projects within the U.S., but the company may not have yet built a project within the U.S. Ms. Clark asked how long this technology has been used in Europe. Mr. Sheppard did not have this information, but stated the company has extensive experience with this technology. Ms. Clark mentioned that she would like to request this information.

Mr. Tripp requested the status of a motion the Task Force passed at the June 18, 2020, regarding a letter to the California Department of Resources Recycling & Recovery (CalRecycle) to consider waste-to-energy as a technology that can reduce emissions by diverting organic waste. Mr. Sheppard responded that the letter has been drafted and will be sent to the Task Force members for review before sending it to CalRecycle.

Mr. Sheppard also reported the dates for the upcoming, postponed, and canceled events:

- CRRRA 44th Annual Conference and Trade Show – August 16-20, 2020, as a virtual meeting.
- Waste Conversion Technology Conference – postponed to August 2021 (previously August 2020) in San Diego, CA.
- CEAC Policy Conference – August 19-20, 2020, which will be held virtually.
- Biogas Driving the US Circular Economy Webcast – September 10, 2020. Location of live webcast is in Washington D.C.
- 2020 NetZero Conference – September 15-16, 2020, which will be held virtually. Previously was scheduled to be held in Los Angeles County.
- RNG Works Technical Workshop and Trade Expo – September 30–October 1, 2020, in Nashville, TN. Currently, it is scheduled as an in-person expo, but registration is limited to 250 attendees.
- Annual Southern California Solid Waste Management Forum – November 5, 2020, and will be held virtually.

Mr. Sheppard continued with project updates:

- Jim Osborn from Alternative Resources, Inc. (ARI) stated that ARI reviewed impacts from the residential waste hauler compost and mulch giveaways and how they might help satisfy the Senate Bill (SB 1383) procurement requirement for the County.
- Subconsultant for the conversion technology contract, UltraSystems, reviewed and commented on a health impact analysis for the updated Green Zones Ordinance being developed by Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning.
- ARI also reviewed site area needs for organic waste processing facilities.

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

Ms. Landis reported on the Sunshine Canyon Landfill (SCL) odor complaints from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) for the month of June 2020. During the month of June 2020, 20 complaints were made to the AQMD hotline. Seven of those 20 complaints were classified as trash, eight were listed as "no field response", and the rest were listed as none which means that the inspector visited the site and did not detect any odor.

When compared to May 2020, the number of complaints in June 2020 decreased from 98 to 20 complaints. When compared to June 2019, the number of complaints for June 2020 increased from five to 20 complaints. As of July 7, 2020, AQMD issued one Notice of Violation related to odor for the month of June 2020. According to AQMD, the total number of complaints received in 2020 is 209. Ms. Landis also expressed that there have been concerns that the inspectors

investigate complaints when there are three calls per hour rather than every call. The Sunshine Canyon Landfill – Community Advisory Committee (SCL-CAC) inquired why AQMD follows this procedure, and AQMD's response to the SCL-CAC was that due to budget constraints, the inspectors cannot go to the site for every call.

Ms. Landis reported that the emergency waiver due to COVID-19 for SCL will expire on August 18, 2020. She continued to report that SCL has been receiving 1,500 tons per day of “clean soil” and it was reported by SCL to the FPRS that it was being stockpiled on the active landfilling areas. She mentioned that SCL requested up to import 10,000 tons per day of clean soil sometime in the future which was equated by Mr. Mohajer to approximately 500 trucks per day to bring the soil to the landfill. Discussion ensued.

Ms. Landis proceeded to make a motion to request the Task Force to send a letter to SCL, with copies to relevant authorities, requesting information about current importation of 1,500 tons of clean soil per day and the proposed importation of 10,000 tons of clean soil per day. Ms. Landis stated her opinion that these proposals will have a series of environmental impacts and speculated that an environmental impact report (EIR) should be required. Mr. Kracov mentioned that this is the first he has heard of this project and inquired whether the Task Force should be asking for EIRs and any type of specific environmental clearance. In his opinion, insisting that an EIR be required prior to getting more information about the project is something he would not be able to support. Ms. Landis confirmed that an EIR was not mentioned to be part of the motion. Ms. Reilly, League of California Cities Representative, seconded the motion. The motion passed. Ms. Pereira was not present during the vote.

Ms. Landis mentioned that SCL is working on the semi-annual waste characterization study and would be provided to the FPRS by next month's meeting.

Ms. Landis reported on the Chiquita Canyon Landfill and its current lawsuits in process. Julia Weissman, a representative from County Counsel of Los Angeles County, mentioned that she has prepared a chart that will provide summary of the court's hearing. The table will provide which fee conditions the court upheld, rejected, or remanded back to the Board of Supervisor for further consideration. Ms. Landis mentioned that Ms. Weissman will be sending a chart next month to review what is going on with the lawsuits and that the details will be clarified next month.

V. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Mr. Gerald Ley reported that originally the Legislature was to return from Summer Recess on July 13, 2020. Unfortunately, six legislators and their staff were infected with COVID-19, causing an extension of the Summer Recess. The Legislature is tentatively scheduled to return on Monday, July 27, 2020. Mr. Ley gave a quick update on the revised legislative calendar:

- August 31, 2020 – Pending no further delays, the last day for each house to pass bills.

Mr. Ley continued to report that 14 bills from the previous legislative table died because they had failed to make it out of their house of origin by the deadline. The Task Force had not taken a position on any of those 14 bills.

Mr. Ley reported on the following five bills that the Task Force previously took a position on, and have died:

AB1509 – Solid waste: lithium-ion batteries. Task Force's position was Support.

AB 1839 – Economic, environmental, and social recover: California COVID-19 Recover Deal. Task Force's position was Watch.

AB1840 – Solid waste: lithium-ion batteries. Task Force's position was Watch.

AB 2612 – Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund: recycling: appropriation. Task Force's position was Support.

SB1191 – Organic waste: reduction goals: local jurisdictions: noncompliance and penalties. Task Force's position was Support.

And, two bills that were added to the table that have become relevant to solid waste management:

AB 793 – Recycling: plastic beverage containers: minimum recycled content.

AB 995 – Hazardous Waste.

Mr. Ley reported from the [Legislative Table](#).

AB 2959 – Solid Waste: Byproducts from the Processing of Food or Beverages – Staff recommendation: pending discussion. Ms. Reilly asked if the only change was to add the wine growers and the branding manufacturers, the only substantive change to the bill. Mr. Kracov responded that is correct. Mr. Ruiz asked if it is adding or subtracting from the proposed authority of the local jurisdictions. Mr. Kracov responded that it would be subtracting authority. Ms. Reilly, League of California Cities Representative, motioned to support as amended. Mr. Kracov, seconded. Motion passed with two abstentions, by Mr. Shammas and Ms. Landis.

VI. UPDATE ON THE TASK FORCE'S 2020 PRIORITIES, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES

Mr. Ruiz reported on the update of the priorities, goals, and objectives. The 2020 Priorities, Goals and Objectives Report, which has been approved by the Task Force members in November 2019, had identified four priorities. The priorities that are being currently focused on now are:

1. Enhance the administration of the Task Force including member participation, efficient meetings, functioning of subcommittees, and budget.
2. Ensure the Task Force adheres to its statutory responsibilities including, but not limited to, development and/or reviews of the CSP, CSE, Five-Year Reviews of the CSP and CSE, etc.
3. Focus the Task Force's legislative, regulatory and outreach efforts on the following substantive priorities:
 - A. Organics and SB 1383 infrastructure, funding, and capacity
 - B. Alternative technologies and renewable fuels
 - C. CalRecycle enforcement policies
 - D. Plastics legislation and recycling capacity
4. Enhance the Task Force's legislative and regulatory efforts through increased focus on priorities, more robust member participation, and improved outreach.

Mr. Ruiz mentioned that the past couple of months, the Task Force has been focusing more on CalRecycle enforcement policies, organics, legislation, and SB 1383 regulations. The County and Public Works have worked on sponsoring legislation that would provide funding for organic waste recycling projects and other recycling projects. Assembly Bill 2612 called for \$100 million to be allocated

for these objectives. Mr. Ruiz mentioned that the objectives that Staff was determined to meet was during the time the COVID-19 pandemic occurred. Staff is working and offering a proposed lead on each of the objectives, along with a new proposed target date, to be approved by the Task Force. Mr. Ruiz said that he would e-mail the members a document that displays this information for members to review and to add this item to next month's agenda.

Mr. Mohajer commented on some issues. He mentioned the formation of the recycling and market developing commission and as part of the state law requirement, it is addressing the recycling infrastructures. The report is supposed to be out in January and July 2021. It is going to be an issue that needs to be looked at closely. The other issue is that Public Works and other cities as a group, address the infrastructures. He would like the members to keep these issues in mind while reviewing the priorities and goals. Ms. Landis commented that one of the major things about the Task Force is that it is flexible and listens to everyone. That the whole problem of the solid waste and recovery of useful material is that it is complex with these cities and the county. She mentioned that each city has a different report and it is very important to review.

VII. "TRACKING DISPOSED RECYCLABLES DUE TO COVID-19" SUMMARY

Mr. Darensbourg reported on the June 16, 2020 "Tracking Disposed Recyclables due to COVID-19" from CalRecycle to jurisdictions. This letter provided 2020 annual guidance on how to report recyclables that were not able to be diverted because of the COVID-19 state of emergency and some processing facilities were closed. Recyclables that are being disposed of due to the COVID-19 state of emergency cannot be reported as disaster debris by facilities in the recycling disposal reporting system because these recyclables are not from a clean-up and repair of a declared disaster area. Recyclables should be reported by the recyclables jurisdiction of origin and by facilities in the Recycling & Disposal Reporting System (RDRS) as they are being sent by material type. Jurisdictions that saw an increase in disposal tonnage type due to COVID-19 State of Emergency will need to complete and submit a disposal modification request in the 2020 electronic annual report that will be submitted in August. Jurisdictions must provide tonnage information and supporting documents of the tonnage being claimed for the deduction. They must describe the diversion programs implemented to maximize diversion of COVID-19 solid waste and explain why the recyclables had to be disposed of and could not be diverted. Mr. Darensbourg asked what the potential issues raised by these guidelines could be. Public Works Staff has conducted surveys of solid waste facilities for COVID-19 impacts and obtained the following information: after the Public Health orders were issued, many of the transfer processing facilities closed their facility operations due to

health concerns, resulting in an increase in recyclable materials being disposed into a landfill. Some landfills obtained emergency waivers to accommodate the increase in disposal.

Task Force members commented at the last month's meeting that members and staff were under the impression that COVID-19 contaminate waste and recyclable materials that were disposed due to temporary closures in processing facilities because of the COVID-19 State of Emergency would be exempt from being counted as disposal against a jurisdiction. Additionally, Task Force members indicated that there is a distinction in disposing contaminated COVID-19 recyclable materials and disposing recyclables because of inadequate disposing capacities. Staff has identified these additional issues:

- This guidance comes three months after the Public Health orders.
- Inconsistent classification of the non-diverted recyclable waste, and some landfills informed Staff that the co-mingled waste, including materials that normally would be recycled, was being counted as disaster waste, and some landfills entered all materials received as general municipal solid waste while others indicated were not tracking the recyclables separately.
- There were no specific instructions provided by CalRecycle to landfill operators on how to report recyclable materials that were being brought to the landfills due to the COVID-19 impacts. How will the operators be able to identify the impacted waste and the regular waste, especially handling all materials is a concern.
- Landfill facilities are now required to submit their data through the RDRS, but the 2020 RDRS data is not available to all jurisdictions yet. Jurisdictions do not know what disposal quantities and types may have been entered by the disposal services, but if the non-disposal recyclable waste was already entered as general municipal solid waste, jurisdictions may see significant increases in their total disposed waste for 2020 but do not know how to estimate the non-diverted recyclable materials from those that were disposed.

Mr. Darenbour described some impacts on the jurisdictions. By August 2021, jurisdictions will have difficulties justifying increases in tonnages of non-diverted recyclables because CalRecycle has precluded distinguishing COVID-19 recyclables from non-COVID-19 recyclables. Jurisdictions will have difficulties providing supporting documentations of the tonnage claimed for the deduction against disposal, especially if we do not receive the information in a timely manner or if the landfill operators do not properly collect the information. Jurisdictions may have difficulties describing their diversion programs to maximize the diversion of COVID-19 solid waste because they may have suspended the implementation

during this period. Moreover, explaining why recyclables had to be diverted should be obvious throughout the State. In the early phases in the Public Health orders the recyclable materials were diverted out of an abundance of caution due to possible contamination either by being comingled with trash at a curb to be picked up by a disposal truck or precautionary measures at the material recover facilities (MRFs) to minimize potential exposures of personnel to COVID-19 at the sorting line. Jurisdictions may have experienced an increase in quantity of recyclable materials because of the Stay-at-Home orders. Jurisdictions were unsure if disposable gloves and masks would be considered COVID-19 contaminated waste. There is an increase in single-use items as many supermarkets have disallowed shopping containers and bags. Public Health advised the public on the handling of take-out and groceries with a precaution including discarding materials previously considered recyclable as potentially contaminated. MRFs that continue to recover recyclable materials may have been too far for some waste haulers, their recycling total pounds per capacity was maximized by trusted recyclables.

Mr. Darensbourg continued that jurisdictions may also have difficulty obtaining timely access to data that will be directly sent to CalRecycle through the RDRS. If there are delays in receiving disposal quantities data, CalRecycle will create difficulty for jurisdictions in determining if disposal facilities possibly classify and quantify non-diverted recyclable waste. Jurisdictions may not be able to adequately explain the increase to CalRecycle's satisfaction. It is not known if CalRecycle will evaluate a "good faith effort" to maximize recycling when a lot of handling waste is out of the jurisdiction's control. Mr. Darensbourg wanted to clarify that the disposal data to CalRecycle through the RDRS, may cause Staff difficulties in justifying the data if it is late.

Ms. Clark asked if there had been any response from CalRecycle and if they are willing to consider some of the issues mentioned. Mr. Darensbourg did not reach out to CalRecycle and has only prepared the summary for now.

Ms. Jennifer Wallin commented on the e-mail that was sent out about disposal modifications. She pointed out that the tonnage of non-diverted recyclables could not be coded out as disaster waste as noted in Charles' summary. She mentioned that under the new reporting disposal system, disaster waste does not get coded to a jurisdiction. However, to avoid impacts to a jurisdiction's per capita disposal figures, the disposal modification request allows a jurisdiction to provide justification for increased tonnages. This disposal modification request would not change the official RDRS disposal number, but it would show CalRecycle that there has been an impact to the tonnage number reported by the jurisdiction. Mr. Mohajer explained that this procedure needed to be written and formalized to inform jurisdictions. Ms. Wallin agreed that there should be a follow-up on these

components. Ms. Landis commented that the problem is that realistic data is needed so plans can be made for the future. She continued that in the end there is a lot of waste, which could be hazardous, and must be identified properly to understand the data and to plan. She also commented that CalRecycle must take a step back from making demands and evaluate the situation.

VIII. JUNE 16, 2020 CALRECYCLE PUBLIC NOTICE TO LISTED JURISDICTIONS REGARDING MCR/MORE PROGRAMS SUMMARY

Mr. Ajwani summarized CalRecycle's June and July 2020 staff reports on compliance investigation results regarding implementation of jurisdiction's Mandatory Commercial Recycling and/or Mandatory Commercial Organics Recycling (MCR/MORE) Programs. CalRecycle's June 2020 staff report indicated a total of 27 jurisdictions in California having significant gaps in their MCR/MORE Programs as determined by CalRecycle's annual review. The following 19 out of the 27 jurisdictions are located within Los Angeles County: Baldwin Park, Bell Gardens, Bellflower, Gardena, Hawaiian Gardens, Hermosa Beach, Huntington Park, Lancaster, Lynwood, Maywood, Montebello, Palmdale, Pasadena, Rancho Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills Estates, San Fernando, Santa Clarita, Torrance, and Vernon. Mr. Ajwani stated that according to the CalRecycle report, almost all of these jurisdictions were implementing some form MCR/MORE. However, their non-compliance rates amongst their businesses and multifamily complexes continue to be high, which appears to be the basis for CalRecycle indicating that those jurisdictions have significant gaps in their programs. The report indicated that all 27 jurisdictions did submit adequate plans to address those program gaps and CalRecycle will be monitoring those jurisdictions over the next 12 to 15 months. Mr. Ajwani continued that those plans are to adopt an enforcement ordinance and/or implement mandatory organic services. Mr. Ajwani reported if the local assistance marketing development staff from CalRecycle finds that any of these jurisdictions have not made adequate progress implementing their plans that they submitted to CalRecycle, they will be referred to a jurisdiction compliance unit (JCU) and will then conduct an independent investigation and consider what their compliance order should be issued. If the jurisdiction fails, the JCU's compliance order may issue fines up to \$10,000 per day.

Mr. Ajwani explained that what he had explained was in reference to a June 2020 report. He mentioned there was a July 2020 report that will be presented at the next CalRecycle public meeting, which identified another 13 jurisdictions in California having Program gaps, and ten of which are located in Los Angeles County. The Los Angeles County identified jurisdictions are: Arcadia, Bell, Carson, Cerritos, Glendale, Hawthorne, LaVerne, Lakewood, Pico Rivera, and South Gate.

These jurisdictions have the same issues of having non-compliance participation rates within businesses and multifamily complexes. Mr. Ajwani continued that these jurisdictions have submitted a plan that is adequate per CalRecycle.

Ms. Landis expressed her concerns of how these jurisdictions will not be able to pay for anything because these jurisdictions are not wealthy and especially during the COVID-19 pandemic and losing tourist income. Ms. Morgan commented that each of these jurisdictions have different circumstances, and she mentioned that her team will be working with these jurisdictions to adjust their plans and timelines depending on their situations. Ms. Morgan continued that some jurisdictions passed their non-compliance rates, and some others are still planning on their implementation which could be delayed, depending which businesses are still open and the businesses' ability to participate. There were plans when first submitted by jurisdictions that the timelines and activities had to be adjusted due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Mr. Ruiz asked under Assembly Bill 939 when a jurisdiction has a plan of correction and it is approved by CalRecycle, typically they would be bound by what they have committed. If they do not fulfill their commitments, would they be subject to enforcement. Ms. Morgan responded that a jurisdiction can modify their programs, in this case regarding the MCR/MORE, changing timelines for example. She continued that even on a compliance order, the timelines can be changed, revised, and applied to these programs.

IX. CALRECYCLE UPDATE

Ms. Wallin provided CalRecycle's upcoming public meetings, events, and application due dates:

- City/County Payment Program (Update) – Original due date of the application was June 29, 2020. There has been an extension for the Fiscal Year 2017-2018 expenditure term to September 1, 2020.
- Farm and Ranch Solid Waste Cleanup and Abatement Grant Program for Fiscal Year 2020-2021 – Application Due Date: August 13, 2020 and November 5, 2020.
- Tire Incentive Grant Program for the Fiscal Year 2020-2021 – Application Due Date: August 20, 2020. Ms. Wallin added that tire material is switching from virgin crumb rubber over to recycled crumb rubber, and there could be opportunities in funding the material.
- CalRecycle's Next Monthly Public Meeting – July 21, 2020.

X. CALRECYCLE ON SB 1383, COMPLIANCE LETTERS, AND COVID-19 SITUATION

Mr. Matt Henigan, Deputy Director of CalRecycle and Ms. Cara Morgan, Branch Director of CalRecycle, introduced themselves and answered questions from the Task Force. Mr. Henigan began that he is familiar with the subject of sustainability. He has a background in green business and a Master of Business Administration from the Presidio School of Management, which is a sustainability focused school. His career path began at the City of Santa Monica in their Environmental Programs Division. He brought up his background because he understands the challenges of local government, especially as the City of Santa Monica employees, including his colleagues, had layoffs. During Governor Brown's office, Mr. Henigan was appointed as the Chief Sustainability Officer for State facilities. He learned that in working with CalRecycle, staff has tremendous experience with a "forward thinking" vision for the state.

Ms. Clark mentioned the difficulties that were brought on by the China's National Sword Policy, enacted in January 2018, which banned the import of most plastics and other materials headed for China's recycling processors that handled nearly half the world's recyclable waste. Ms. Clark said that it was better to invest in conversion technology (CT) and to keep those jobs here in America where we can make clean energy and products from recyclables. Unfortunately, there was opposition from the State Legislature who did not allow CT and companies are not coming to California due to CT companies wanting a guaranteed waste stream. If cities did not get their credit mentioned in Assembly Bill 939, the recyclables will not be sent to these CT companies. Ms. Clark hoped that the problem can be solved with clean technology, therefore keeping jobs here.

Ms. Clark expressed concerns on tracking the disposal letter that was summarized by Mr. Darensbourg. She hoped that explanations could be provided. Mr. Darensbourg provided his summary and reiterated Task Force members and Staff's concerns and issues to Mr. Henigan and Ms. Morgan to provide more clarification. Mr. Henigan is not too familiar with the RDRS but had mentioned the challenges and constraints that are currently going on during the COVID-19 pandemic and understood that guidance was not provided after some time had passed during the pandemic. Ms. Morgan acknowledged that CalRecycle providing the opportunity to deduct the additional disposal tonnage, but the way the regulations are written for Assembly Bill 901 for the RDRS regulations, CalRecycle was not able to use the disaster waste classification that was provided in the RDRS. A number of intermittent meetings with legal, RDRS, and local assistance staff groups have worked through what is allowed in the regulations and what relief can be provided to jurisdictions because it was the primary

intention; to provide relief to jurisdictions that they were hearing from that were very concerned with what CalRecycle will do with the increased disposal. She continued that because they are not able to use the disaster waste pathway in the RDRS, they are left with a traditional method of disposal modifications that an individual jurisdiction would submit. While keeping in mind all the points and issues that were brought up in Mr. Darenbourg's dialog and Ms. Morgan understanding the concerns, the expectation that jurisdictions may not have actual tonnage data and may have to provide estimates for their disposal modification. What those estimates can be based on, may be last year's disposal for those months which the jurisdictions may use as the bases for their estimates from either the hauler or the facilities. Ms. Morgan explained that they plan to be very flexible in the type of data estimates that are provided with these the disposal modifications. She mentioned with respect to describing the diversion programs to maximize COVID-19 related waste, it is important that CalRecycle provides an explanation. What they would expect in the disposal modification is just a brief description of what took place during those months and being claimed for disposal modification. Ms. Morgan's team will be working with their assigned jurisdictions on their disposal modification and guiding appropriate staff from those jurisdictions in what they should submit. She pointed out that this tonnage will be for the year 2020, which means that this year is the first year of a four-year cycle. If a jurisdiction chooses not to deduct any disposal and their total annual target is over per capita equivalent, there will be no compliance that will send a jurisdiction down a path, but this is only one point during this four-year cycle. The number that has been laid out in the statute is only an indicator during an extraordinary event, so no action of compliance will be taken because a jurisdiction is over their target.

Ms. Landis commented that CalRecycle had some dates that jurisdictions had to be in compliance or they were going to be fined, and said that this four-year cycle may be plagued by the problems of the pandemic, and it may be a high variable and may need to change what is recyclable and what is not recyclable and how to take care of it. She thought there should be no implementation of imposing fines or restrictions because the years to come, will be a learning cycle for everyone on how to handle the waste. She suggested that process should be more experimental, request for more exact data, to understand what is going on. All the jurisdictions, to the best of their ability, should be giving exact data and the jurisdictions understand that they will not be punished for it. Ms. Morgan responded that the degree in which a jurisdiction is able to provide tonnage data, they will do so, and in the cases that it is not possible, the jurisdiction will work with their service provider to provide estimates to CalRecycle. She added that it is important to provide relief to jurisdictions and that the number is an indicator of performance not the determinative factor for compliance.

Mr. Kracov posed a question regarding CalRecycle working with the California Air Resources Board (CARB) on plans for electrification of solid waste collection vehicles. How are the haulers able to meet the organics collection requirements and mandates and how the two mandates are going to intersect. Mr. Henigan responded that this is an issue they are aware of and have conversed with CARB. His understanding is that the clean truck rule has phased in over time in the initial decade, the percentage targets for the manufacturing for trucks and for fleet operators is fairly low in terms of total percentage of electric vehicles that have to be incorporated and they understand that amount will get higher. He believes that the best opportunity to convey these concerns is the scoping plan CARB is going to be engaging in. CARB is writing a new scoping plan and an informal stakeholder consultation will begin Fall 2020, followed by robust formal stakeholder input hearings. There are steps to develop a cohesive response as the California Environmental Protection Agency, is one agency. Ms. Morgan mentioned that she and Mr. Henigan can convey this feedback back to their executive team.

Ms. Landis commented that CalRecycle had a study by University of California, Davis on taking food waste and composting it to use to grow lettuce, but the food waste had Escherichia coli bacteria in it and it was in the lettuce as well. She continued that compost must meet rigorous rules by the California Department of Food & Agriculture (CDFA). She explained some reasons that composting is not a useful tool is that materials must be separated by hand and mixing the food waste is a very dangerous thing to do, and may be contaminated, including finding any gravel in it or other miscellaneous items tossed with the waste. Ms. Landis continued that perhaps it can change in shape and become electricity for small towns or farm equipment, etc. She did not want to see any compost made from solid waste dumped on the parklands. Ms. Clark brought up a concern regarding the HLB citrus virus earlier in the meeting. Ms. Clark stated she lived right outside of the quarantine area of the HLB citrus that has killed so many citrus trees. The concern is that when everybody wants to combine green waste and organic waste with no oversight, a person can transport diseases to other non-affected areas. Ms. Morgan responded that they are working with the CDFA regarding SB 1383 regulations to address such issues because there will be times where quarantine material cannot be composted and must be disposed.

XI. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Wayde Hunter, representative of the North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens (NVCCC), mentioned his gratitude to the Task Force for sending a letter to SCL. He expressed that in the past, any imported soil that went into SCL, even if covered, was counted towards their daily tonnage. The NVCCC has sent letters in the past regarding their concerns, including that the material going in can still

contain something that could blow towards the neighborhood. Mr. Hunter said that an EIR may need to be done, especially with the additional traffic from the 500 trucks a day to respond to the request of 10,000 tons of soil.

Mr. Mohajer commented that SCL made a presentation at the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting last week, but did not mention any importing of soil into SCL.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:41 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled remotely on Thursday, August 20, 2020.