

# **CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL**

## **TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

### **Meeting Attendees:**

#### County of Los Angeles

Fire Department (Forester and Fire Warden)- Kelly Kim, Ron Durbin, Bill Romo

Department of Regional Planning- Richard Claghorn, Samuel Dea, Jose De La Rosa, Oscar Gomez, Thomas Dearborn

Department of Public Works- Martin Aiyetiwa, David Nguyen

Department of Public Health / Local Enforcement Agency (LEA)- Shikari Nakagawa-Ota, Dorcas Hanson-Lugo, Monica Galimberti, Eric Morofuji, Nelly Castellanos

Supervisor Barger's Office- Rosalind Wayman

#### Chiquita Canyon Landfill

Steve Cassulo

#### Jacobs

Brenda Eells

**DATE: WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 2018**

**TIME: 2:00 PM**

**LOCATION: 900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803, Annex Building, TMC Conference Room**

### **MEETING MINUTES**

#### **I. Call to Order**

- II. Status Report from Chiquita Canyon Landfill-** Steve Cassulo commented briefly on the annual report, which he said speaks for itself. The comments received on the report have been addressed. He reported that an average of approximately 5,200 tons per day of municipal solid waste (MSW) has been received at the landfill on weekdays (Monday through Friday). On Saturdays, the MSW average has been approximately 3,000 tons per day. The average for beneficial use materials has been approximately 2,200 tons per day Monday through Saturday. The landfill plans to construct Cell 6 over the next two years. The landfill has been working with DPW, DRP, Edison, and Caltrans on the new entrance and has a goal to break ground by next year, after receiving the required approvals.

- III. Comments from Department of Public Works (DPW)-** DPW provided a list of four items that it deemed were not in compliance with CUP No. 2004-00042-(5). These items were:
- 1.) The Waste Plan Conformance Agreement (WPCA) amendment required by Condition No. 45; DPW stated that in approximately two weeks they would provide a draft amendment to the WPCA to the landfill's representatives. It was agreed by the TAC that this item would not be classified as not in compliance because it is still pending;
  - 2.) Bridge and Thoroughfare Fee required by Condition No. 79.B.6; the landfill has not paid this fee and is in litigation challenging the legality of this fee and other CUP conditions; it was agreed by the TAC that this condition is not in compliance;
  - 3.) Indemnification Agreement required by IMP, Part VII; The landfill submitted a \$10 million performance bond as required, but it was recently rejected by the County because it was not in a form acceptable to the County. It must be approved by the County Treasurer/Tax Collector; the landfill will need to submit a letter of credit or other security acceptable to the County; after discussion, this item was removed by the TAC from the list of items not in compliance because it is still pending;
  - 4.) Finding of Conformance required by Condition No. 100; This item is still under consideration by the County Integrated Waste Management Task Force; After a discussion, it was agreed by the TAC that this item would not be classified as not in compliance because it is still pending.
- IV. Comments from Department of Regional Planning (DRP)-** Landfill representatives addressed the written comments provided by DRP before the meeting to the satisfaction of DRP; therefore, no further discussion of these comments was necessary.
- V. Comments from Department of Public Health (DPH / LEA)-** LEA did not have any comments about the Draft Annual Report. The requirement in Condition No. 68 for a Community Health Assessment Study was discussed. Condition No. 68 requires that DPH approve the independent consultant. Jacobs submitted a statement of qualifications to Dr. Rangan of DPH prior to the meeting; Dr. Rangan responded did not feel it should be DPH's role to approve the consultant; DRP to follow up with Dr. Rangan regarding this requirement.
- VI. Comments from Fire Department (FD)-** FD did not have any comments about the Draft Annual Report. Their only comment was to make sure they had the correct permit conditions for the oak tree permit (OTP). DRP was to follow up with FD and to provide the final CUP & OTP Conditions.
- VII. TAC Discussion on Draft Annual Report-** The TAC members agreed that at the current time, Condition No. 79.B.6 is the only item deemed to be "Not in

Compliance”. Three other items were deemed to be still “pending”: Condition No. 45, Condition No. 100, and IMP Part VII.

- VIII. TAC Decision on Certification of Draft Annual Report-** TAC decided to postpone a decision on certifying compliance with the permit. A follow-up TAC meeting would be scheduled, possibly in August, to review changes made to the 2017 Draft Annual Compliance Report and status of the items that are currently pending.
- IX. Discussion on Billing Process for Review of Annual Report-** A discussion was held about whether FD and DPH would prefer to bill the permittee directly to compensate them for the costs incurred in administering the grant. The alternative would be for these two other departments to be compensated for their work using the drawdown account administered by DRP for Condition No. 19, and then having DRP send invoices to the applicant. The TAC members decided that direct billing by each department would be preferable and this option was selected.
- X. Public Comments-** No members of the public attended the meeting, so there were no public comments.