

www.altamontcmc.org

VOTING MEMBERS

Laureen Turner City of Livermore

Karla Brown City of Pleasanton

Donna Cabanne Sierra Club

David Tam Northern California Recycling Association

<u>NON-VOTING</u> <u>MEMBERS</u>

Enrique Perez Waste Management Altamont Landfill and Resource Recovery Facility

Wing Suen Alameda County

Robert Cooper Altamont Landowners Against Rural Mismanagement (ALARM)

<u>STAFF</u>

Judy Erlandson City of Livermore Public Works Manager

COMMUNITY MONITOR COMMITTEE Altamont Landfill Settlement Agreement

*** The Public is Welcome to Attend***

AGENDA

DATE: TIME: PLACE: Wednesday, April 10, 2013 4:00 p.m. City of Livermore Maintenance Services Division 3500 Robertson Park Road

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Introductions
- 3. Roll Call
- 4. <u>Approval of Minutes</u> (Minutes from January 16, 2013)
- 5. <u>Open Forum</u> This is an opportunity for members of the audience to comment on a subject not listed on the agenda. No action may be taken on these items.
- 6. Matters for Consideration
 - 6.1 Responses to CMC Member Requests: Actions to Prevent Recurrence of Disposal of Unprofiled Waste; Review of Conservation Plan Site Map (ESA)
 - 6.2 Review of Reports from Community Monitor (ESA)
 - 6.3 Review of Reports Provided by ALRRF: BAAQMD/ Title V (Air Quality) Semi-Annual and Partial Annual Report, Groundwater Monitoring Report (ESA)
 - 6.4 Finalized Community Monitor 2012 Annual Report (ESA)
 - 6.5 Community Monitor RFP Process (City)
- 7. Agenda Building

This is an opportunity for the Community Monitor Committee Members to place items on future agendas.

8. Adjournment

The next regular Community Monitoring Committee meeting is tentatively scheduled to take place at 4:00 p.m. on **July 10**, **2013** at 3500 Robertson Park Road, Livermore.

Informational Materials:

- Community Monitor Roles and Responsibilities
- List of Acronyms
- Draft Minutes of January 16, 2013
- Reports from City Staff and ESA

City of Livermore TDD (Telecommunications for the Deaf) (925) 960-4104

PURSUANT TO TITLE II OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (CODIFIED AT 42 UNITED STATES CODE SECTION 12101 AND28 CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS PART 35), AND SECTION 504 OF THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973, THE CITY OF LIVERMORE DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE ON THE BASIS OF RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, NATIONAL ORIGIN, ANCESTRY, SEX, DISABILITY, AGE OR SEXUAL ORIENTATION IN THE PROVISION OF ANY SERVICES, PROGRAMS, OR ACTIVITIES. TO ARRANGE AN ACCOMMODATION IN ORDER TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS PUBLIC MEETING, PLEASE CALL (925) 960-4586/4582 (VOICE) OR (925) 960-4104 (TDD) AT LEAST 72 HOURS IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING.

The Community Monitor Committee Agenda and Agenda Reports are prepared by City staff and are available for public review on the Thursday prior to the Community Monitor Committee meeting at the Maintenance Service Center, located at 3500 Robertson Park Road, Livermore. The Community Monitor Committee Agenda is available for public review at the Maintenance Service Center, 3500 Robertson Park Road, Livermore, and on the Community Monitor Committee web site, <u>http://www.altamontcmc.org</u>.

Under Government Code §54957.5, any supplemental material distributed to the members of the Community Monitor Committee after the posting of this Agenda will be available for public review upon request at 3500 Robertson Park Road., Livermore or by contacting us at 925-960-8000.

If supplemental materials are made available to the members of the Community Monitor Committee at the meeting, a copy will be available for public review at the Maintenance Service Center, at 3500 Robertson Park Road, Livermore.

Community Monitor Committee Roles and Responsibilities

Below is a summary of the duties and responsibilities of the Community Monitor Committee and related parties as defined by the Settlement Agreement between the County of Alameda, the City of Livermore, the City of Pleasanton, Sierra Club, Northern California Recycling Association, Altamont Landowners Against Rural Mismanagement, and Waste Management of Alameda County, Inc. The purpose of this document is to aid in determining if discussion items are within the scope of the Community Monitor Committee.

Community Monitor Committee's Responsibilities

Under Settlement Agreement section 5.1.2, the CMC is responsible for supervising and evaluating the performance of the Community Monitor as follows:

- A. Interviewing, retaining, supervising, overseeing the payment of, and terminating the contract with the Community Monitor;
- B. Reviewing all reports and written information prepared by the Community Monitor; and
- C. Conferring with the Community Monitor and participating in the Five Year Compliance Reviews (next due in 2015) and the Mid-Capacity Compliance Review (due when the new cell is constructed and capacity is close to 50%, unlikely to occur before 2028) (Condition number 6 of Exhibit A of the Agreement).

Community Monitor's Responsibilities

The Community Monitor supplements and confirms the enforcement efforts of the County Local Enforcement Agency. The Community Monitor is primarily responsible for:

- A. Reviewing any relevant reports and environmental compliance documents submitted to any regulatory agency (sections 5.7.1, 5.7.2, and 5.7.3);
- B. Advising the public and the Cities of Livermore and Pleasanton about environmental and technical issues relating to the operation of the Altamont Landfill via the CMC (section 5.7.4);
- C. Presenting an annual written report summarizing the Altamont Landfill's compliance record for the year to the CMC and submitting the report to Alameda County and the Cities of Livermore and Pleasanton (section 5.7.5);
- D. Notifying the County Local Enforcement Agency and Waste Management of Alameda County of any substantial noncompliance findings or environmental risk (section 5.7.6);
- E. Monitoring and accessing the Altamont Landfill site and conducting inspections (section 5.7.7);
- F. Counting trucks arriving at the Altamont Landfill (section 5.7.8); and
- G. Reviewing waste testing data and source information (section 5.7.9).

Waste Management of Alameda County's Responsibilities

Per the settlement agreement, Waste Management is responsible for:

- A. Paying for the services of the Community Monitor, based on an annual cost estimate (section 5.3.3).
- B. Paying an additional 20% over the annual cost estimate if warranted based on "credible evidence" (section 5.3.3).

HIS PACE WITHIN ON HIM BUNK

List of Acronyms

Below is a list of acronyms that may be used in discussion of waste disposal facilities. These have been posted on the CMC web site, together with a link to the CIWMB acronyms page: http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LEACentral/Acronyms/default.htm.

Updates will be provided as needed. This list was last revised on December 21, 2011; the most recent revisions are highlighted.

Agencies

ACWMA – Alameda County Waste Management Authority

ANSI – American National Standards Institute

ARB or CARB – California Air Resources Board

ASTM – American Society for Testing and Materials

BAAQMD – Bay Area Air Quality Management District

CDFG or DFG – California Department of Fish and Game

CDRRR – California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery, or CalRecycle

CIWMB – California Integrated Waste Management Board (predecessor to CDRRR – see above)

CMC – Community Monitor Committee

DWR – Department of Water Resources

LEA – Local Enforcement Agency (i.e., County Environmental Health)

RWQCB - Regional Water Quality Control Board

SWRCB - State Water Resources Control Board

Waste Categories

C&D – construction and demolition

CDI - Construction, demolition and inert debris

FIT – Fine materials delivered to the ALRRF, measured by the ton.

GSET – Green waste and other fine materials originating at the Davis Street Transfer Station, for solidification, externally processed.

GWRGCT – Green waste that is ground on site and used for solidification or cover (discontinued January 2010)

GWSA - Green waste slope amendment (used on outside slopes of the facility)

MSW – Municipal solid waste

RDW – Redirected wastes (received at ALRRF, then sent to another facility)

RGC – Revenue generating cover

Substances or Pollutants

ACM – asbestos-containing material

ACW – asbestos-containing waste

ADC – Alternative Daily Cover. For more information: <u>http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/lgcentral/basics/adcbasic.htm</u>

BTEX – benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylene (used in reference to testing for contamination)

CH4 – methane

CO2 – carbon dioxide

DO – dissolved oxygen

HHW – household hazardous waste

LFG – landfill gas

LNG - liquefied natural gas

MTBE - methyl tertiary butyl ether, a gasoline additive

NMOC - Non-methane organic compounds

NTU – nephelometric turbidity units, a measure of the cloudiness of water

RL – reporting limit: in groundwater analysis, for a given substance and laboratory, the concentration above which there is a less than 1% likelihood of a false-negative measurement.

TCE - Trichloroethvlene

TDS – total dissolved solids

TKN – total Kjeldahl nitrogen

VOC - volatile organic compounds

Documents CCR – California Code of Regulations (includes Title 14 and Title 27) ColWMP – County Integrated Waste Management Plan CUP – Conditional Use Permit JTD – Joint Technical Document (contains detailed descriptions of permitted landfill operations)

MMRP – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

RDSI – Report of Disposal Site Information

RWD – Report of Waste Discharge

SRRE – Source Reduction and Recycling Element (part of CoIWMP)

SWPPP - Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

WDR - Waste Discharge Requirements (Water Board permit)

General Terms

ALRRF – Altamont Landfill and Resource Recovery Facility

ASP – Aerated Static Pile composting involves forming a pile of compostable materials and causing air to move through the pile so that the materials decompose aerobically.

BGS – below ground surface

CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act

CQA - Construction Quality Assurance (relates to initial construction, and closure, of landfill Units)

CY – cubic yards

GCL – geosynthetic clay liner

GPS – Global Positioning System

IC engine – Internal combustion engine

LCRS - leachate collection and removal system

LEL - lower explosive limit

mg/L – milligrams per liter, or (approximately) parts per million

 μ g/L – micrograms per liter, or parts per billion

PPE – personal protective equipment

ppm, ppb, ppt - parts per million, parts per billion, parts per trillion

RAC – Reclaimable Anaerobic Composter – a method developed by Waste Management, Inc., to place organic materials in an impervious containment, allow them to decompose anaerobically, and extract methane during this decomposition.

SCF – Standard cubic foot, a quantity of gas that would occupy one cubic foot if at a temperature of 60°F and a pressure of one atmosphere

SCFM - standard cubic feet per minute, the rate at which gas flows past a designated point or surface

STLC – Soluble Threshold Limit Concentration, a regulatory limit for the concentrations of certain pollutants in groundwater

TTLC – Total Threshold Limit Concentration, similar to STLC but determined using a different method of analysis TPD, TPM, TPY – Tons per day, month, year

WMAC - Waste Management of Alameda County



COMMUNITY MONITOR COMMITTEE Altamont Landfill Settlement Agreement Minutes of January 16, 2013

DRAFT

1. Call to Order

Ms. Turner called the meeting to order at 4:07 p.m. with a quorum present.

Acting as chairperson, Ms. Turner reordered the agenda to take item 6.2 next. The Committee presented a Certificate of Appreciation to former Pleasanton City Council member and Committee member Cindy McGovern, making note of her more than five years of continuous, thorough and diligent service to the Committee. Ms. McGovern thanked Committee members and stated that she enjoyed working with Committee members.

2. Introductions

Darrell Triano, an operations manager at the ALRRF with environmental compliance duties, introduced himself as representing the ALRRF, and other Committee members and staff also introduced themselves.

3. Roll Call

Laureen Turner; Donna Cabanne; David Tam; and Darrell
Triano, Waste Management Altamont Landfill and
Resource Recovery Facility
Karla Brown, City of Pleasanton; Robert Cooper, Altamont
Landowners Against Rural Mismanagement; Wing Suen,
Alameda County Local Enforcement Agency;
Judy Erlandson, City of Livermore Public Works
Department; and Kelly Runyon, ESA, Community Monitor

- <u>Approval of Minutes</u>
 Ms. Cabanne moved approval of the October 10 minutes, and Mr. Tam seconded. The motion passed by a vote of 4-0.
- 5. <u>Open Forum</u> No members of the public spoke.
- 6. <u>Matters for Consideration</u>
 - 6.1 Selection of Chairperson After discussion of procedure, Mr. Tam moved to nominate Ms. Turner to continue as Chairperson for 2013, and Ms. Cabanne seconded the motion. The three voting Committee members present constituted a quorum, and all three voted in favor.

6.3 Responses to CMC Member Requests (ESA)

In response to Ms. Cabanne's question, Mr. Runyon described additional stormwater Best Management Practices (BMP's) installed at the site and noted that they were installed as planned. In discussion of the Conservation Plan Area question, Mr. Tam requested a link to the Conservation Plan Map.

6.4 Review of Reports From Community Monitor (ESA)

Mr. Runyon discussed several highlights from the written report: Tonnage data were difficult to reconcile because some tonnages were not recorded immediately, but the ALRRF did make the necessary corrections by the end of the year.

There was an apparently-unintentional delivery of unprofiled material that was found to have an excessively high concentration of lead. The material (ash) was removed for proper disposal at a permitted California hazardous waste landfill. Ms. Cabanne asked (1) where the material was finally disposed, and (2) if the generator would be tracked or watched in any special way, going forward. Mr. Runyon responded that according to ALRRF staff, the material was disposed at the landfill in Buttonwillow. Mr. Triano noted that the Alameda County District Attorney's Office had taken samples of the material and therefore, with possible legal action pending, he did not wish to identify the source. Also, he stated that the generator of the material was not the party that caused the problem, but a third-party hauling contractor had brought the wrong material to the ALRRF. Ms. Cabanne responded that the generator would have hired the hauling contractor and would therefore have some responsibility; and she urged that the source be monitored more closely. Ms. Erlandson confirmed with the Committee that they would like a report back from the Community Monitor, describing what actions have been taken by the generator and Waste Management to provide further assurance that this problem would not happen again. Ms. Cabanne added that if there is legal action regarding this issue that affects the ALRRF operator, this should also be reported back.

Mr. Runyon called the Committee's attention to the description of Basin B on page 24 of the packet, asking if the description in that area is clear. Committee members had no questions.

6.5 Pending Annual Report (ESA)

Mr. Runyon asked members for comments on the draft report. Committee members had a variety of questions and suggestions which were noted. Major points included the following:

Section 1.3: Since plant debris is now banned from the landfill, where does it go? Can you be more precise about the expected date for construction of Fill Area 2 to begin? Will any other environmental impact statements or reports be needed prior to the beginning of Fill Area 2 operations? What is the acreage of the entire site, and how is it distributed among Fill Areas 1 and 2, the

Conservation Plan Area, etc.? It would be helpful to know how much land was condemned for use by DWR. Provide a more quantitative description of the available landfill capacity in the region, and take all known available space into account. When will the LNG truck fueling station be operational? Describe the acreage available for refuse fill beyond Fill Areas 1 and 2. In section 2.2, explain when the leachate truck fill station was relocated. In section 2.3.1, what is the status of the plan to use MRF fines as ADC? Provide the trade name of the herbicide 2,4-D.

Although it would not be part of the 2012 Annual Report, Ms. Cabanne expressed interest in how well the landfill performed during the heavy December rains.

7. Agenda Building

Two items were raised:

- (1) Mr. Runyon suggested that the Committee use an agenda item to receive an explanation of the acreage and designated land uses at the ALRRF site, based on the Conservation Plan Area map.
- (2) Ms. Erlandson suggested that the Committee allocate some time to discuss the RFP process for selecting the Community Monitor, for 2014 and beyond.
- 8. Adjournment

Chairperson Turner adjourned the meeting at 5:09 PM. The next meeting will be held on **Wednesday, April 10 at 4:00 p.m**. at the Livermore Maintenance Services Division at 3500 Robertson Park Road. HID PACE WITH MALIN BLANK



memorandum

date	April 2, 2013
to	ALRRF Community Monitor Committee
from	Kelly Runyon
subject	CMC Meeting of 4/10/13 - Agenda Item 6.1 - Responses to Committee Members' Requests

In the Committee meeting of January 16, 2013, Committee members expressed interest in learning what measures have been taken to prevent a recurrence of the October 2012 incident involving the near-disposal of unprofiled wastes, which were subsequently found to exceed criteria for Class 2 disposal. This was discussed with ALRRF management via email as shown below:

From: Nettz II, Marcus [mailto:mnettzi@wm.com]
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2013 12:10 PM
To: Kelly Runyon
Subject: RE: Question from January Community Monitor Committee meeting

I have no new information at this time, Kelly. WM has a very specific approvals process and, in this case, the generator did the right thing by contacting the site when it discovered the issue at their facility.

From: Kelly Runyon [mailto:KRunyon@esassoc.com]
Sent: Monday, March 18, 2013 10:48 AM
To: Nettz II, Marcus
Cc: Triano, Darrell
Subject: Question from January Community Monitor Committee meeting

Hello Marcus,

At the January Community Monitor Committee meeting, a committee member asked if there were any special measures taken to prevent a recurrence of the contaminated-ash situation. At the time, neither Darrell nor I had anything to report. Is there any new information that you can provide in response to that question?

Committee members also expressed interest in understanding how the acreage of the ALRRF site is divided among the Conservation Plan Area, the DWR reservoir, the Fill Areas used for refuse disposal, etc. The attached map is provided for discussion and reference at the April 10 Committee meeting. The total area shown in color on the map, and listed in the legend, is 2198 acres.

HIS PAGE INTERNITORIALITY BLANK

Altamont Landfill – Designated Land Uses from 2010 Conservation Plan Area Map



This page intentionally blank



memorandum

dateApril 2, 2013toALRRF Community Monitor CommitteefromKelly RunyonsubjectCMC Meeting of 4/10/13 - Agenda Item 6.2- Review of Reports from Community MonitorAttached are our inspection reports for January through March of 2013.
The January inspection was unannounced and took place on January 23.
The February inspection was unannounced and took place on February 25.
The March inspection was unannounced and took place on March 28.

During these inspections, all landfill operating areas were observed. Recent LEA inspection reports were reviewed on-line, and the Special Occurrences Log was reviewed in detail on March 28.

In preparing these reports, issues that cause concern are marked with yellow rectangles in the left-hand margins of the monthly inspection reports. One topic has been flagged in March: an inconsistency in the monthly reporting of tonnages received from the City of San Francisco. Apparently one day's tonnage was omitted from the February data provided to ALRRF by Recology San Francisco. We expect this to be corrected when the next tonnage report is received, in mid-March. This did not have any material effect on landfill environmental or permit compliance, nor on operations.

Also attached are graphs showing monthly tonnages by type of material for the most recent 12-month period, as in prior reports. Figure 6.2-1 shows the breakdown of materials that make up Revenue-Generating Cover. Figure 6.2-2 shows these same quantities, plus the municipal solid waste tonnage on the lowest (and largest) part of each bar. High volumes of Class 2 cover soil in January probably reflect recent excavation and construction activity in the region, facilitated by dry weather.

January 2013

Reports	Received
---------	----------

Monthly To	nnage Report for December 2012, received January 15, 2013		
Tonna	ge Summary:	tons	
]	Disposed, By Source Location		
1.1	Tons Disposed from Within Alameda County	63,338.16	
1.2	Tons Disposed from City of San Francisco TS	25,642.13	
1.3	Other Out of County Disposal Tons	1,981.70	
	subtotal Disposed	90,961.99	
]	Disposed, By Source Type		
2.1	C&D	83.09	
2.2	MSW	87,450.60	
2.3	Special Wastes	3,428.30	
	subtotal Disposed	90,961.99	
]	Difference	0.00	0.00%
(Other Major Categories		
2.4	Re-Directed Wastes (Shipped Off Site or Beneficially Used)	86.52	
2.5	Revenue Generating Cover	40,615.92	
	Total, 2.1 - 2.5	131,664.43	
]	Materials of Interest		
2.3.1	Friable Asbestos	623.88	
2.3.2	Class 2 Cover Soils	24,031.64	
2.5.1	Auto Shredder Fluff	8,143.66	
2.5.2	Processed Green Waste/MRF fines, Beneficial Use (GSET)	1,468.25	
MMRP Ann	ual Progress Report 2012, received January 31. 2013		

Title V (Air emissions) Report was received electronically on Janauary 29.

Groundwater Monitoring Report was received January 30.

Site Visit

- Site Inspection January 23, 2013, 9:30 to 11:15 AM
 - □ Attended by Kelly Runyon and Wing Suen, LEA. Escorted by Enrique Perez. Unannounced.
 - □ Filling occurring in a small area on the west side of the top deck. Will soon move to the east side and resume filling lower portions of Fill Area 1, moving generally eastward.
 - □ Two dozers and one compactor (with GPS) working. Spotter safety stand in use.
 - □ MRF fines are being stockpiled for testing as ADC. Two size classes of fines are involved: < 9/16-inch and 9/16 to 2-inch. Some recognizable items of MSW seen in fines. No odor or flies.
 - □ Pieces of utility poles have been placed on the ground below the public disposal area, apparently for later burial.
 - □ C&D pile very large but not a problem; no plant-debris stockpile seen.
 - □ Asbestos area observed in a drive-by; appears normal; no issues.
 - □ LNG fuel station not operational. Fire protection water system is in place and is being tested.
 - □ On east side, side-slope cover has been cleaned and is now free of litter / trash.
 - □ The NW end of Fill Area 2 is being "disced" (see photo) to prevent new occupancy of burrows by burrowing owls. A biologist is observing, and when a possible burrow is seen, it is flagged and avoided. Such burrows will have "exclusion doors" installed so that owls cannot re-enter.
 - □ Orange plastic fence in the area to be disced is being removed. Much of that fence is broken. Where necessary it is being replaced with wire cattle fence.



Observation of Environmental Controls

- □ Minimal litter seen on Altamont Pass Road. Crew seen picking up roadside litter ~11AM.
- □ Seagulls present on site and at Dyer Reservoir. Bird cannon audible at Dyer Road, but very faint. Local livestock not reacting.
- □ Flare at LNG plant is running, and LNG plant sounds active. Turbines operating. Other gas equipment not checked.
- □ Virtually no litter on tall fences alongside Fill Area 1. Minimal litter on Altamont Pass Road.

Stormwater Controls and Best Management Practices

- □ Basin A: Water level low; soil around base of riser is exposed. No litter seen.
- □ Basin B: Not observed.
- □ Basin C: A very small flow is appearing at the outlet of the discharge culvert.
- □ Truck wash water pond reportedly contains some water but is not full.
- □ Ditch on east side of Fill Area 1 has had green erosion-control matting removed to facilitate regrading.

Class 2 Cover Soil Profile reviews.

- □ All files are electronic which requires some additional time to access each file by connecting to a file server.
- □ A total of 117 files were reviewed on January 7. Nine were missing some laboratory data. A list of these was provided to ALRRF staff for checking when the next review occurs.
- □ No compliance problems were identified.

February 2013

Reports Received

Monthly Ton	nage Report for January 2013, received February 15, 2013		
Tonnag	ge Summary:	tons	
D	Disposed, By Source Location		
1.1	Tons Disposed from Within Alameda County	73,366.41	
1.2	Tons Disposed from City of San Francisco TS	33,659.96	
1.3	Other Out of County Disposal Tons	2,034.36	
	subtotal Disp	losed 109,060.73	
D	Disposed, By Source Type		
2.1	C&D	218.50	
2.2	MSW	102,058.77	
2.3	Special Wastes	6,779.77	
	subtotal Disp	losed 109,057.04	
D	Difference	-3.69	0.00%
C	Other Major Categories		
2.4	Re-Directed Wastes (Shipped Off Site or Beneficially Used)	193.16	
2.5	Revenue Generating Cover	67,314.05	
	Total, 2.1	- 2.5 176,564.25	
Ν	Aterials of Interest		
2.3.1	Friable Asbestos	853.61	
2.3.2	Class 2 Cover Soils	45,120.09	
2.5.1	Auto Shredder Fluff	10,101.32	
2.5.2	Processed Green Waste/MRF fines, Beneficial Use (GSET)	1,233.98	

February 2013

Site Visit

- Site Inspection February 25, 2013, 10:00 to 11:15 AM
 - □ Attended by Kelly Runyon. Escorted by Darrell Triano and Enrique Perez. Announced.
 - □ Filling occurring along eastward edge, filling north to south. Working around solidification area while specs for closure and relocation of solidification are completed.
 - □ LNG fueling is in testing mode. A WMAC transfer truck was fueling as we passed by.
 - □ Two dozers and two compactors at the working face. One of the dozers was being repaired (wire wrapped around wheel & chassis). A third dozer was stripping off cover soil in an area that is soon to be filled.
 - □ Due to a recent move of the dry-weather tippers to the east side, most portable litter fences are temporarily set aside. Consequently there is a substantial amount of windblown litter immediately east of the fill area, but very little beyond the tall perimeter fences at this point.
 - □ Wet-weather tippers are about to be moved closer to the dry-weather ones, and the wet-weather truck access pad will be extended to match.
 - □ Asbestos area was not observed.
 - \square MRF fines are being stockpiled for testing as ADC. Two size classes of fines are involved: < 9/16-inch and 9/16 to 2-inch.
 - □ Discing of the upper portion of Fill Area 2 is reportedly nearly complete but on hold for logistical reasons.
 - □ Reportedly, a badger hole was found in Fill Area 2, and the environmental consultants for ALRRF are working with the regulatory agencies to handle this correctly.
 - □ Plant debris pile large but not excessive (100 CY?). C&D pile normal, no prohibited materials seen.

Stormwater Controls and Best Management Practices

- □ Basin A: Normal wet-weather level; not discharging. No litter seen.
- □ Basin B: typical wet weather level but not about to discharge. No litter seen.
- □ Basin C: Not observed.
- \Box Truck wash water basin about 1/2 full.
- □ Along the east side of Fill Area 1, erosion-control matting is still out of the drainage ditches and will remain so until a low area on that side can be regraded to prevent ponding.
- □ Truck wash water pond contains about 3 feet of water; more is being added to prevent wind damage to the pond liner.
- □ An erosion problem that occurred in the last wet-weather event has been repaired but will need cosmetic repair after the end of the rainy season.

Observation of Environmental Controls

- □ Minimal litter seen on Altamont Pass Road. Crew seen picking up roadside litter ~11AM.
- □ Seagulls present on site and at Dyer Reservoir. Bird cannon not heard. Bird-scare "screamer" munitions in use. Birds not responding significantly. A very large number of birds (a couple of thousand?) is present at the Dyer Road reservoir.

Per Enrique, in the early morning a number of seagulls come to the landfill from the Bethany reservoir to the northeast of the landfill.

□ All landfill gas equipment appears to be running except the "old" flare (A-15) near the turbine building, and the IC engines, which are being prepared for testing.

Truck Traffic Count

The semiannual count of refuse trucks arriving between 6:45 and 8:45 AM was conducted on February 12. The maximum number of refuse trucks arriving per hour was 28, between 7:06 and 8:06 AM. The maximum established in the Use Permit is 50 per hour.

March 2013

Reports Received

Monthly To	onnage Report for February 2013, received March 15, 2013		
Tonn	age Summary:	tons	
	Disposed, By Source Location		
1.1	Tons Disposed from Within Alameda County	62,867.47	
1.2	Tons Disposed from City of San Francisco TS	27,898.90	
1.3	Other Out of County Disposal Tons	1,303.09	
	subtotal Disposed	92,069.46	
	Disposed, By Source Type		
2.1	C&D	140.35	
2.2	MSW	86,820.49	
2.3	Special Wastes	3,379.33	
	subtotal Disposed	90,340.17	
	Difference	-1,729.29	-1.91%
	Info from San Francisco for 2/28 not sent, per ALRRF report		
	Other Major Categories		
2.4	Re-Directed Wastes (Shipped Off Site or Beneficially Used)	69.73	
2.5	Revenue Generating Cover	35,024.38	
	Total, 2.1 - 2.5	125,434.28	
	Materials of Interest		
2.3.1	Friable Asbestos	1,095.19	
2.3.2	Class 2 Cover Soils	18,150.73	
2.5.1	Auto Shredder Fluff	9,923.88	
2.5.2	Processed Green Waste/MRF fines, Beneficial Use (GSET)	1,641.86	

Site Visit

- Site Inspection March 28, 2013, 10:30 to 11:45 AM
 - □ Attended by K. Runyon and Wing Suen, LEA. Escorted by Mike Feldthouse. Unannounced.
 - □ Filling occurring in dry-weather area, east side, immediately north of solidification pit. Fill activity to continue eastward, filling each advance from south to north.
 - □ Solidification pit will be relocated as soon as Water Board approves design of new pit.
 - □ Two dozers and two compactors working. Spotter safety stand in use.
 - □ Asbestos area not observed. C&D pile and plant debris pile normal size.
 - □ Experimental use of MRF fines as cover (ADC) is continuing. The material is a blend of <9/16" and 9/16"-to-2" fine materials. Some small, recognizable but non-putrescilble items of refuse present (soda straws, etc.) LEA directed the ALRRF to cover part of the test area with soil because too much refuse was visible. Also, the cover soil contained some plastic film from construction work; ALRRF staff were directed to have this removed.</p>
 - □ Wet-weather fill area is west of and adjacent to the dry-weather area; is used as needed.
 - □ Raw water storage pond contains approx. 2 to 3 feet of water; visible portion of liner appears to be in good condition.
 - □ LNG fuel station not observed.
 - □ Lowest portion of soil stockpile #2 appears dry.
 - □ Entry road in fair condition. Rough surface but no major potholes.
 - Discing continuing in upper portion of Fill Area 2, to prevent occupancy by burrowing owls.
 Existing potential owl burrows are not disced but are flagged and fitted with exclusion doors by the observing biologist. Discing not acvtive during this site visit.

Stormwater Controls and Best Management Practices

- □ Basin A: Lower than normal wet-weather level; discharge riser fully exposed. No litter seen.
- □ Basin B: Approx 1 foot below discharge level. Minor windblown litter on east edge of basin.
- \square Basin C: Not observed.
- □ Truck wash water pond not observed.
- □ No areas of significant erosion seen. No ponding seen.
- □ Leachate truck loading area has moved slightly. Antenna that transmits remote control signals back to leachate plant was damaged recently by wind, so control is achieved by using two workers one at truck, one at pump with 2-way radios. Containment area looks OK.
- □ Mulched areas near lower office buildings have begun to support weeds.

□ In flat areas, the green erosion-control matting in ditches has begun to trap silt.

Observation of Environmental Controls

- □ Light amount of litter seen on Altamont Pass Road. Worker seen picking up roadside litter.
- □ Seagulls present on site and at Dyer Reservoir. Bird cannon and bird-scare "screamer" munitions in use.
- □ All landfill gas equipment appears to be running except the "old" flare (A-15) near the turbine building.

Special Occurrences Log Review

- □ Jan 6 Power outage failure at PG&E substation. Power restored at 0920 Jan 7, then brief outage from 1130 to 1245.
- □ Jan 8 Minor leak of landfill gas condensate at petcock on flare A-15, due to corrosion. Fluid cleaned up and petcock replaced.
- □ Jan 17 Davis Street MRF fines out of spec (too much refuse), were disposed as refuse.
- □ Mar 15 Labor action (walkout) by ILWU Local 6 at ~2 AM, to draw attention to need for new contract. Resolved and returned to work at 8AM.
- March 26 Truck accidentally drove off the side of the inbound scale. No significant damage apparent. Outbound scale was used until inbound scale was checked by the site's scale services contractor (same day). Inbound scale was deemed OK for use.

Figure 0.2-		Generating Cover
Bio Solids	Auto Shredder Fluff	Clean Soil
Concrete, Measured by Ton	Concrete, Measured by Load	■ Shredded Tires
Green waste ground for solidification or cover (GWRGCT)	Green waste used for slope amendment (GWSA)	□Fines (green waste or C&D), used for solidification (GSET
Concrete for reuse in Class 2 area	Liquids, solidified, approved as Class 2 cover	Cover soil meeting Class 2 requirements
■Ash	2373 MRF fines	

Figure 6.2-1 Monthly Volumes of Revenue-Generating Cover





Figure 6.2-2 Monthly Volumes of Landfilled Materials



memorandum

date	April 2, 2013
to	ALRRF Community Monitor Committee
from	Kelly Runyon
subject	CMC Meeting of 4/10/13 - Agenda Item 6.3 - Review of Reports Provided by ALRRF

Title V (Air Quality) Report, June 1, 2012 – November 30, 2012

This extensive semiannual report tracks all permit-compliance aspects of landfill gas control, emission sources such as engines, and other emissions such as the handling of contaminated soils. Key topics in this report are:

- Emissions testing of major sources
- Changes to the landfill gas extraction well system
- Surface Emissions Monitoring for methane escaping from the landfill
- Performance of landfill gas control devices (turbines, engines, etc.)

Emissions Testing

Six devices were source tested during, or shortly before, the current reporting period. The devices are:

- The two landfill gas turbines
- The two landfill gas internal combustion engines
- The two landfill gas flares, one of which (A-16) is tested in combination with the liquefied natural gas plant.

All six devices passed.

Changes to Landfill Gas (LFG) Extraction Wells

Ten wells were decommissioned and fifteen new wells were installed. This was similar to wellfield changes in prior reporting periods. The ten decommissioned wells varied in age and location. The fifteen new wells were installed on the western portion of Fill Area 1, in an area that is nearing its final height.

During the six-month reporting period, several gas wells encountered problems with high temperature or the presence of oxygen in the extracted gas. Oxygen in landfill gas can mean that a well's production rate is declining and the suction at the well is pulling in air through the soil; this degrades gas quality and increases the potential of a fire within the landfill. These conditions were typically corrected within one to two months.

Surface Emissions Monitoring

Surface emissions monitoring was conducted quarterly, as required, in the third and fourth quarters of 2012.. The third-quarter round of monitoring found no exceedances, so repairs and retests were not necessary. The fourth-quarter monitoring was conducted but was not written up in time for the current report; it will be described in the next report.

Performance of Control Devices

The report provides day-by-day volumes of gas consumed by each of the control devices; these are shown in the graph below. Three noteworthy problems arose during this period. First, the annual maintenance shutdown of the LNG plant, from September 9 through 25, was followed by a period of very unsteady LNG-plant operation lasting for more than a week. During the maintenance shutdown, the flare was used to maintain gas extraction rates by burning gas that would otherwise have been used to make LNG. Then in early October, a 5-day outage by PG&E disrupted normal processes and required that the "spare" flare A-15 be operated while the LNG plant and both turbines were down. Finally, in early November, a planned PG&E outage provided the opportunity to run the site entirely on self-generated power for the first time. This worked successfully for about a day but in the end, diesel generators were needed to power the gas control system, and the LNG plant was taken off line. Also, at the end of this outage, the LNG plant again had difficulty achieving steady operation. Figure 6.3-1, below, illustrates the general performance of the system and each of its major components (flares, LNG plant, IC engines and turbines).



Figure 6.3-1 - ALRRF Daily LFG Flow

CMC Agenda Packet Page 29 of 68

First Semiannual – Annual 2012 Groundwater Monitoring Report

The attached memorandum from Treadwell and Rollo provides a detailed review of groundwater and surface water monitoring as described in the Monitoring Report. To summarize:

- VOC's were detected at three groundwater wells, each of which has had similar detections in the past. The concentrations do not show an increasing trend.
- Several man-made organic compounds were detected at very low concentrations in the discharges from, or the waters within, the three stormwater basins. Although these should continue to be tracked, none of them is at a level that would trigger regulatory action.
- Several man-made organic compounds were also detected in samples taken from points beneath the landfill. In the past, the presence of these compounds as been attributed to landfill gas, and that appears to continue to be the case. The existing landfill gas control system, together with the groundwater monitoring wells and landfill gas probes, indicate that this issue is stable.

In general, continued monitoring is advised but no further action appears to be needed.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Kelly Runyon, ESA

FROM: Jeremy Gekov, PG, Project Geologist Dorinda Shipman, PG, CHG, Senior Associate/Vice President

DATE: 19 March 2013

- **PROJECT:** Altamont Landfill (ALRRF) Livermore, California Project: 750477405
- **SUBJECT:** Groundwater and Storm Water Analysis for Community Monitor Progress Report #11

Number of Pages: 4

Treadwell & Rollo, has reviewed hydrogeologic data for the Altamont Landfill and Resource Recovery Facility in Livermore, California (ALRRF) in the *Second Semiannual 2012 Groundwater Monitoring Report, Altamont Landfill and Resource Recovery Facility (WDR Order R5-2009-0055),* prepared by SCS Engineers, Long Beach, California, dated January 2013.

This memorandum describes the results of the above effort and provides our opinions and recommendations for the Community Monitor Committee (CMC). The report was reviewed for issues described in previous CMC meeting minutes and for potential trends in groundwater and storm water analytical data over recent years. Groundwater monitoring activities and findings, as required by the Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR), were generally found to be in compliance during the December 2012 sampling event and are discussed below.

Semiannual Groundwater Sampling Results

Detection and Corrective Action Well Inorganic and Volatile Organic Compound Concentrations

Concentrations of inorganic compounds remained stable in detection and corrective action wells during the December 2012 monitoring event. Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) not attributable to laboratory cross contamination were detected in three wells, as indicated in the table below. These well locations, the VOCs detected and the respective concentrations were similar to historical data.



Groundwater and Storm Water Analysis for Community Monitor Progress Report #11 Altamont Landfill (ALRRF) Livermore, California Project No: 750477405

1,1,-Dichloroethane Tetrachloroethene 1,4-Dichlorobenzene Dichloropropane Methyl tert-butyl Tetrahydrofuran Trichloroethene dichloroethene fluoromethane flouromethane Vinyl chloride ether (MTBE) **Diethyl ether** Dichlorodi-Dichloro-Cis-1,2-1,2, E-03A No VOCs detected E-05 Х Х Х Х Х Х Х Х Х E-07 Х Х Х E-17 No VOCs detected E-20B Х Х Х Х Х Х Х Х Х Х Х E-23 No VOCs detected MW-2A No VOCs detected MW-5A No VOCs detected MW-6 No VOCs detected **MW-7** No VOCs detected MW-11 No VOCs detected PC-1B No VOCs detected PC-1C No VOCs detected

Vinyl chloride has been historically detected in well E-20B since 1999 and the source of vinyl chloride has been attributed to landfill gas. The area surrounding E-20B is undergoing corrective action including landfill gas control and E-20B is monitored for natural attenuation. As presented in the 22 March 2012 Groundwater Analysis for Community Monitor Progress Report #9 by Treadwell & Rollo, results for this sampling event indicate that well E-20B continues to show a decreasing trend for vinyl chloride indicating that corrective action is improving groundwater quality at E-20B.

Detection wells PC-1B and PC-1C are currently used to monitor for potential migration of VOCs downgradient of E-20B. Wells PC-1B and PC-1C have not had any VOC detections since the start of monitoring in 2006, with the exception of those attributable to laboratory cross contamination.

19 March 2013 Page 2 of 4



Groundwater and Storm Water Analysis for Community Monitor Progress Report #11 Altamont Landfill (ALRRF) Livermore, California Project No: 750477405 19 March 2013 Page 3 of 4

Unsaturated Zone Inorganic and VOC Concentrations

During December 2012, inorganics and VOCs at VZM-A¹, VD², and VD2³ were similar to historical concentrations and appear to be stable, i.e. concentrations have not shown an increasing trend. The VOC detections at VZM-A, VD, and VD2, have been attributed to landfill gas. Concentrations of VOCs and inorganics in unsaturated zone monitoring points will be evaluated in subsequent monitoring reports for potential increasing trends.

Leachate Inorganic and VOC Concentrations

Inorganic and VOC concentrations at leachate monitoring point LS and LS2⁴ during December 2012 were similar to historical values.

Sampling of Storm Water Retention Basins

For the 2012-2013 rainy season, one set of samples was collected at Basins A, B, and C during November 2012. Sampling results as required by the WDR (VOCs and select inorganic parameters) for the November 2012 sampling event are reported in the Second Semiannual Groundwater Monitoring Report and discussed below. Additional sampling results as required by the Storm Water Discharge Permit are reported separately and usually made available for review concurrent with the first semiannual groundwater monitoring report.

Inorganics in Storm Water

Concentrations of inorganic compounds in storm water during November 2012 were similar to historic values.

Volatile Organic Compounds in Storm Water

VOCs detected in storm water basin samples collected in November 2012 included trace⁵ levels of acetone, 2-butanone (methyl ethyl ketone), methyl isobutyl ketone (MIBK), or iodomethane. Ethanol was detected in Basin B at non-trace concentrations of 370 micrograms per liter (μ g/L) (in-basin sample) and 430 μ g/L (discharge sample), and in Basin C at trace concentrations of 130 μ g/L (in-basin sample) and 120 μ g/L (discharge sample). Ethanol has not been previously detected in surface water samples at ALRRF.

¹ VZM-A is a monitoring location in the vadose zone (unsaturated zone below the landfill liner, and above the groundwater table).

² VD is the monitoring location for the valley drain system beneath the clay liner at Unit 1. This drain system is designed to collect and drain groundwater that accumulates beneath the liner, or any liquids that seep below the liner at Unit 1.

³ VD2 is the monitoring location for the subdrain beneath the engineered liner at Unit 2. This drain system is designed to collect and drain groundwater that accumulates beneath the liner, or any liquids that seep below the liner at Unit 2.

⁴ LS and LS2 are leachate sumps, where leachate is collected at the bottom of landfill prior to being pumped to a storage and recirculation system.

⁵ A trace concentration is a concentration that equals or exceeds the laboratory method detection limit, but is below the laboratory reporting limit.



Groundwater and Storm Water Analysis for Community Monitor Progress Report #11 Altamont Landfill (ALRRF) Livermore, California Project No: 750477405 *19 March 2013 Page 4 of 4*

Acetone is a common laboratory contaminant. Methyl ethyl ketone (MEK) is not a common laboratory contaminant and has been historically detected in samples from Basins A, B, and C. MEK is a commonly used solvent in paints and glues, and is also released to the air from car and truck exhausts. It also occurs as a natural product and is found in some fruits and vegetables in small amounts⁶. Methyl isobutyl ketone is not a common laboratory contaminant but is used in many commercial products including surface coatings, adhesives, printing ink, and special lubricating oils; MIBK is also an intermediary chemical used during the production of some pharmaceuticals and organic and inorganic chemicals⁷. Iodomethane is a pre-plant soil fumigant used to control insects, nematodes, plant pathogens, and weeds⁸. The source of the trace iodomethane detection is not clear. Ethanol is used as a gasoline additive, but the source of the ethanol in the surface water samples is unclear. Other common gasoline constituents such as benzene, ethylbenzene, toluene, and xylenes were not detected in surface water samples. Ethanol has a half-life of approximately 0.25 to 1 day in surface water, and is unlikely to persist in the environment⁹.

The leachate spill that occurred on 24 April 2012 reportedly caused leachate to flow downslope towards Basin B. The impacted soil was reportedly excavated after the spill and confirmation samples collected indicating VOCs weren't detected in soil after excavation. Surface water sample results for Basin B during November 2012 do not indicate that leachate impacted the basin.

We will continue reviewing storm water analytical data for trends and changes.

Recommendation

We recommend continuing review of groundwater and storm water data as it becomes available, and evaluating for trends in data, especially for groundwater monitoring wells where contaminants have previously been detected.

⁶ Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Toxic Substances Portal – 2–Butanone. 3 March 2011. http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/toxfaqs/tf.asp?id=342&tid=60

⁷ Chemicals in the Environment: Methyl Isobutyl Ketone (CAS no. 108-10-1). Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics. United States Environmental Protection Agency. September 1994.

⁸ Regulatory Fact Sheet – Iodomethane. United States Environmental Protection Agency. September 2008. http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/factsheets/iodomethane_fs.htm

⁹ Evaluation of the Fate and Transport of Ethanol in the Environment. Malcolm Pirnie, Inc. November 1998. http://www.calgasoline.com/MPI_0010.PDF

HIS PAGE INTERNATIONALIA BLANK



memorandum

date	April 2, 2013
to	ALRRF Community Monitor Committee
from	Kelly Runyon
subject	CMC Meeting of 4/10/13 - Agenda Item 6.4 - Annual Report

The Community Monitor's Scope of Work includes the preparation of an Annual Report, "no later than the end of the contract period each year summarizing the CM's activities and the ALRRF's compliance record with respect to all applicable environmental laws and regulations."

Comments on the draft Annual Report were received at the January meeting, and those comments are incorporated into the attached version. For reference, the sections with changes are:

Section 1.3: How is plant debris currently handled? Can the start date for Fill Area 2 be described more precisely? Will additional environmental impact statements be needed?

Section 1.3.1: Provide a more complete description of the available landfill space in the region.

Section 1.3.2: Give the acreage of the land taken for use as a reservoir. When will the LNG fueling facility come on line?

Section 2.2: When was the leachate fill station relocated?

Section 2.3.1: Update the status of the MRF fines demonstration project.

HIS PAGE INTERNATIONALIA BLANK

ALRRF COMMUNITY MONITOR ANNUAL REPORT 2012

Prepared for ALRRF Community Monitor Committee January 16, 2013



CMC Agenda Item 6.4

ALRRF COMMUNITY MONITOR ANNUAL REPORT 2012

Prepared for ALRRF Community Monitor Committee January 16, 2013

550 Kearny Street Suite 800 San Francisco, CA 94108 415.896.5900 www.esassoc.com

Los Angeles

Oakland

Orlando

Palm Springs

Petaluma

Portland

Sacramento

San Diego

Santa Cruz

Seattle

Tampa

Woodland Hills

D207592.00

CMC Agenda Item 6.4

OUR COMMITMENT TO SUSTAINABILITY | ESA helps a variety of public and private sector clients plan and prepare for climate change and emerging regulations that limit GHG emissions. ESA is a registered assessor with the California Climate Action Registry, a Climate Leader, and founding reporter for the Climate Registry. ESA is also a corporate member of the U.S. Green Building Council and the Business Council on Climate Change (BC3). Internally, ESA has adopted a Sustainability Vision and Policy Statement and a plan to reduce waste and energy within our operations. This document was produced using recycled paper.

SECTION 1 Introduction

1.1 Settlement Agreement

In December 1999, a Settlement Agreement was reached among parties involved in a lawsuit regarding the proposed expansion of the Altamont Landfill and Resource Recovery Facility (ALRRF). The Settlement Agreement established the Community Monitor Committee (CMC) and a funding mechanism for a technical consultant, referred to as the Community Monitor (CM).

The Settlement Agreement defines the purview of the CMC and the CM. The CM's scope of work is further defined in a contract between the CM and the CMC. In broad terms, the CM is to review certain reports and information, as defined; monitor incoming traffic by conducting truck counts, as described in the Settlement Agreement; and inspect the ALRRF site no more than once a month. The Settlement Agreement describes the CM's Scope of Work to include "issuing a written report each year summarizing the ALRRF's compliance record for the period since the last such report with respect to all applicable environmental laws and regulations." This Annual Report provides that summary for 2012.

The Settlement Agreement also requires that the ALRRF operator, Waste Management of Alameda County (WMAC), pay invoices submitted by the CM to the CMC, if the work represented in those invoices is consistent with the CM's scope of work and the CM role as defined in the Settlement Agreement.

The City of Livermore provides staff and administrative support to the CMC, as well as management of the CM contract and space for CMC meetings. The City also acts as financial agent for the CMC, pursuant to a letter agreement dated July 6, 2004.

1.2 Prior Community Monitor Work

Available records indicate that the CMC retained a technical consultant as the CM from 2005 through part of 2007.

In mid 2007, the CMC selected the current CM team of Environmental Science Associates and Treadwell & Rollo. This team began work in February 2008. From 2008 through 2012, the team has carried out report reviews, Class 2 soil analysis file review, and site inspections as intended. In 2008, the primary issue of concern was the rate at which groundwater monitoring wells were purged during sampling. This was resolved satisfactorily. In 2009, the CM team took a close look at the methodology used by ALRRF and its consultants to track variations in groundwater quality. No issues or areas of concern arose as a result of this effort; the team was satisfied that the method conforms to regulatory requirements and is conservative. In 2010, landfill gas monitoring was a key issue: new perimeter probes were installed to comply with new regulations,

and one of those probes detected landfill gas at levels that exceeded regulatory limits. This was abated by installing several gas wells close to those probes (but still within refuse) to intercept the gas that was migrating toward the perimeter there. In 2011, it became apparent that fine material¹ from the Davis Street Material Recovery Facility (MRF), used as Alternative Daily Cover, was beginning to include some municipal solid waste materials, such as plastics from consumer goods. This issue continued into 2012 and is discussed further in Section 2.3 below.

1.3 Overview of Operations, Regulations and Permits

Like most large landfills throughout California, the ALRRF performs a variety of functions that support the region's management of solid wastes. These functions continue to grow and evolve as increasing emphasis is placed on reducing and recovering wastes, but the primary function of the site continues to be the safe disposal of solid wastes by placing, compacting and covering these materials. Federal, State and local regulations require that at the ALRRF:

- Wastes are covered to control litter, prevent fire, and prevent the spread of disease.
- Wastes are placed and compacted to be physically stable.
- Plant debris is not to be disposed; if received, it must be separated and reclaimed by composting or other methods. Currently it is back-hauled to the Davis Street facility for processing and eventual use as compost or biomass fuel.
- A liner and liquid recovery system prevent groundwater contamination by leachate.
- Landfill gas is controlled by an extraction system.
- Emissions from energy systems (diesel engines and landfill gas systems) are controlled.
- Other air pollutants and nuisances (dust, odor, litter, etc.) are prevented.
- Stormwater erosion is controlled and stormwater runoff is tested for pollutants.

Compliance with these requirements protects the environment and public health, and also presents opportunities to develop and support innovative methods for improved waste management. Currently, such activities on the ALRRF include:

- using landfill gas to produce electricity and a liquid fuel (LNG);
- stockpiling and processing materials for beneficial use on site, such as using waste concrete for wet-weather roads and access pads;
- using contaminated soils and other wastes (biosolids, MRF fines, treated auto shredder fluff) as cover material, as permitted;
- stockpiling construction and demolition (C&D) materials for processing elsewhere;
- providing an area for the separation of plant debris from other wastes, to avoid landfilling plant debris; and
- hosting site visits, by prior arrangement, for public education.

The ALRRF property covers more than three square miles. Within that area, the portion that is delineated as landfill is divided into Fill Area 1 (currently active) and Fill Area 2 (anticipated to be developed in the near future). The active parts of Fill Area 1 cover approximately 211 acres.

Lands surrounding the active area are managed primarily as grazing land, with portions leased for wind energy. These surrounding lands also provide habitat for several special status species. The active area will be supplemented by the expansion area (Fill Area 2) in the near future. In 2010,

¹ MRF fines: Fine material produced by a waste sorting system that processes construction and demolition debris at the Davis Street Transfer Station. The coarser fraction of this material (size range 3/8 inch to 2 inches) is brought to the ALRRF and blended with certain liquid wastes, in a process known as "solidification", and used as Alternative Daily Cover (ADC).

the last major permits for the development of Fill Area 2 were obtained. Construction of Fill Area 2 may begin in 2013, though the need for Fill Area 2 may be less immediate if disposed tonnage continues to diminish. Also, design revisions in 2010 for the final contour of Fill Area 1 increased its capacity, further increasing the expected lifetime of Fill Area 1. At this time no further environmental review is expected to be necessary for disposal to begin in Fill Area 2; but if anticipated composting and material recovery processes are developed, those are likely to require environmental review for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

1.3.1 Industry Trends

Trends in the landfill disposal industry within the greater Bay Area have affected, and will continue to affect, operations and future developments at the ALRRF:

- The economic recession, and ongoing efforts to reduce waste and increase recycling, have contributed to a downward trend in disposal tonnages. Although the recession currently appears to be ending, disposed tonnages at ALRRF do not appear to be increasing.
- There are no new landfill sites currently in development in the region, and two sites (West Contra Costa, Tri-Cities) have closed in recent years or are in the process of closing. However, on a regional basis there appears to be adequate capacity for refuse disposal in the short to medium term, at least through the year 2035.²
- Three recent efforts to increase disposal capacity for the region have met with opposition that makes their outcome uncertain.
 - The City of San Francisco is in the process of negotiating for the rail haul of its wastes to Ostrom Road Landfill in Yuba County. The City approved the plan, but due to opposition a full environmental review will be required prior to any further action.
 - In December 2012, the proposed Potrero Hills Landfill expansion in Solano County was dealt a setback when a judge overruled the issuance of a key permit from the Bay Conservation and Development Commission.
 - Redwood Landfill near Novato also faced opposition to the adoption of the mitigated alternative in its Environmental Impact Report for its planned expansion. A court ruling has set aside the EIR and the associated solid waste facility permit. The County may either appeal or begin to explore other landfill options in the Bay Area, including Keller Canyon Landfill in Contra Costa County and Central Landfill in Sonoma County.

1.3.2 Site-Specific Constraints and Opportunities

The Settlement Agreement added new conditions to the Use Permit for the ALRRF. Solid wastes from out-of-county sources are strictly limited to those covered by existing disposal agreements. During peak traffic hours, the number of refuse trucks entering the landfill is limited. Numerous conditions intended to protect natural resources on the ALRRF property were imposed. Also, the size of the future expansion area was limited to 40 million tons of capacity, with a footprint of approximately 250 acres. In addition to Use Permit conditions, the Settlement Agreement

² This estimate is based on a simple and conservative set of calculations assuming steady growth in population, no increase in diversion, the continued delivery of San Francisco refuse to the ALRRF, and the ability for some regional disposal sites to receive all materials when other facilities reach their present capacity.

establishes the CMC and the CM role, as described above; and establishes mitigation funding related to the landfill expansion.

The physical setting of the ALRRF site also presents certain constraints and opportunities. Hilly terrain and high winds require constant attention to windblown litter, especially film plastic bags and foam plastic packaging. Proximity to the South Bay Aqueduct led to the eminent-domain condemnation of 34 acres of the landfill property for use as a reservoir by the California Department of Water Resources. This has complicated the ALRRF's efforts to comply with a Use Permit requirement for 750 acres to be set aside for a biological habitat mitigation and buffer area, but this last issue has been resolved; a 991.6-acre Conservation Plan Area has been delineated, and plans for its development and management will be provided in conjunction with the development of Fill Area 2.

Local policies and needs will likely result in further changes at the ALRRF. The Alameda County Waste Management Authority and Recycling Board (Stopwaste.Org) goal of 75% waste diversion is continuing to decrease waste flows into the ALRRF, most recently through a countywide ban on plant debris disposal. Stopwaste.Org is also promoting efforts in many local jurisdictions to divert more organics, including food scraps, into composting rather than landfill disposal. In addition, Stopwaste.Org has developed, and most of its member agencies have adopted, a single-use bag ban ordinance and a local mandatory commercial recycling ordinance to reinforce AB 341, the state mandatory recycling law enacted in October 2011³. These waste diversion efforts represent a constraint because they limit the flow of refuse to the ALRRF, but they are also an opportunity for the ALRRF to (a) reduce its litter cleanup effort if the bag ban has a material effect, and (b) provide processing of recyclables in a MRF that may be developed at the landfill in the future.

Several other recent developments present new opportunities and/or constraints:

- The ALRRF is seeking a change to its Conditional Use Permit, to allow development of composting and recyclables-processing facilities.
- In 2011 the California Department of Water Resources completed construction of a reservoir on the western side of the property. One result has been an increase in the number of seagulls present at the landfill; they appear to be using the reservoir as a dwelling area and the landfill as a food source.
- A truck fueling facility has been added to the LNG plant at the site; it will become operational when required fire protection measures are fully installed.
- The City of Oakland has issued Requests for Proposals for refuse and recycling collection and disposal services. This could lead to the disposal of Oakland refuse at a different landfill in the future.

³ AB 341 requires that all California businesses (including public entities) that generate four cubic yards or more of commercial solid waste per week or are a multifamily residential dwelling of five units or more shall arrange for recycling services.

SECTION 2 Community Monitor Activities and Issues

2.1 Introduction

Under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, when the ALRRF is in compliance with operating requirements, the Community Monitor (CM) has three ongoing duties:

- Review reports, data and information related to the ALRRF's reports that are required to be submitted to regulatory agencies
- Conduct monthly inspections of the ALRRF facility
- Review the records of testing and acceptance of "Class 2 soils", i.e. soils known to come from a contaminated site.

Throughout 2012, the CM was active in each of these areas, as described below.

2.2 Operational Improvements and Changes

Through report reviews and site visits, several new developments in ALRRF facilities and operations in 2012 became apparent:

- Additional landfill gas wells were brought on line in one round of installation, in midsummer of 2012.
- **Traffic Director protection.** The Davis Street Transfer Station is operated by Waste Management and is the source of much of the refuse that is delivered to the ALRRF. In June of 2012, fatal injuries to a traffic director at the transfer station prompted additional protective measures for workers performing similar tasks at the ALRRF. A highly visible metal enclosure was constructed to provide a "safety zone" for traffic directors while near the unloading area at the landfill.
- Intensified bird deterrence. Additional operations staff were trained and qualified in the use of bird scare cartridge guns, and the use of the two propane bird cannons on site was increased. Both of these devices use loud noises to startle birds and interrupt their normal activities.
- Relocation of leachate truck fill station, and installation of secondary containment berm. After the leachate spill described below in Section 2.3.2, by July 2012 the fill station had been relocated roughly ½ mile to the north, well within the Class 2 portion of Fill Area 1. In addition, the controls for the pump for this operation were changed to a timer with automatic shut-off, and a berm was built immediately downslope of the truck parking area to capture and contain any spill that might occur. Subsequently, a test of the bermed containment area found that it has more than enough capacity to contain an entire truckload of liquid.

- **Improvements to Stormwater Basin B and upslope drainage structures.** Upslope of • Basin B, a concrete-lined v-ditch discharges onto a sloping ground surface that is protected with rock to diffuse flow and prevent erosion. In the past, high flows in the vditch have escaped the ditch before reaching its end, causing significant soil erosion. (This area is on native soil, not refuse.) To address this problem, in 2008 a section of concrete K-rail was placed along the outboard edge of the v-ditch to help contain overflow. This was not a complete success, but the K-rail has been repositioned and extended, and additional rock has been placed to limit further erosion. Additional improvements to the basin itself were prompted by the leachate spill described in Section 2.3.2 below. When the spill occurred, the discharge was moving toward Basin B, so operations staff quickly excavated a "pre-basin" to capture any flow that arrived there in the short term (none did). After the cleanup from the leachate spill was complete, this pre-basin was removed, and sediment was also removed from the inlet side of Basin B. This material was placed on slopes and roads adjacent to the basin, to improve access for stormwater testing and system maintenance.
- **Reduction of litter.** Several rows of fencing, approximately 5 feet tall, were installed downwind of the refuse unloading area and perpendicular to the prevailing wind direction. Additional fencing was added near the perimeter of the unloading area, in concentric rows. Also, grasses and shrubs were trimmed on parts of the top deck of the landfill, to enable the wind to push litter to these fences where it would be collected. Along Altamont Pass road, litter collection crew hours were changes so that they picked up litter every day rather than every other day. All of these measures reduced the amount of loose litter on, and escaping from, the site.
- Liquefied natural gas (LNG) truck fueling station. This station, located next to the on-site LNG plant, would provide truck fuel made from landfill gas, for use by suitably equipped refuse collection and/or transfer trucks. The station itself was fully constructed in 2012, but unanticipated Fire Department requirements have led to the installation of a fire protection water tank and piping to serve the fuel station and other parts of the site. Purchase and installation of the water system required additional time and will also require Fire Department inspection and approval after installation is complete. In the interim, the fueling station is not being used.

One further change, less directly related to current operations, is also pending. In discussion, ALRRF staff have mentioned that the facility is seeking revisions to its Conditional Use Permit C-5512 to accommodate certain additional operations that were described in the 2010 revisions to the facility's Joint Technical Document. Specifically, a material recovery operation (to reclaim recyclable materials) and an on-site composting operation are contemplated. In the October 2012 Committee meeting, ALRRF management mentioned that the proposed changes are under review by the County Fire Department, and when that review is completed, the formal process for revision of the use permit will move forward.

2.3 Compliance and Significant Incidents

As noted above, the Settlement Agreement describes the CM's Scope of Work to include "issuing a written report each year summarizing the ALRRF's compliance record for the period since the last such report with respect to all applicable environmental laws and regulations." This Annual Report provides that summary. In 2012 there was one Violation and several Area of Concern notices issued by the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA). The Violation and several of the Area

of Concern notices were related to the first of the three topics described below. Several other Area of Concern notices indicated thin or missing cover over landfilled refuse; these instances were promptly corrected.

2.3.1 Refuse in MRF Fines

This issue first arose in 2011 when the presence of refuse in MRF fines⁴ was noted by the LEA, and a Notice of Violation was issued at the LEA's September 23 inspection. Subsequently, the ALRRF proposed methods to control the quality of this material, and criteria for acceptability. This issue was not fully resolved, and MRF fines continued to be used. This led to a Notice of Violation from the LEA in January 2012; and the Regional Water Quality Control Board also required the removal of exposed cover containing MRF fines from outside slopes of the landfill by November 2012, unless the testing plan was approved and had shown no potential harm from the MRF fines. At this writing (December 2012), the ALRRF has complied with the Regional Water Board's directive to remove cover containing MRF fines from the outside slopes of the landfill, and the Regional Water Board and the LEA have agreed to consider a proposed test of MRF fines as ADC on a small portion of the landfill.

2.3.2 Leachate Overflow at Truck Loading Station

At the ALRRF, leachate that is extracted from the landfill is stored in an on-site tank and transferred to a pump truck, to be used for dust control. The filling station, near the south edge of the landfill, was a simple overhead pipe that discharged into the open hatch of the tank truck below. On April 24, 2012, a valve was not fully closed after the truck was filled, and leachate spilled onto the ground and began to move toward stormwater basin B. The situation was brought under control before any leachate reached Basin B, but the incident led to several improvements in leachate handling, described in Section 2.2 above. This incident did not result in any Notice of Violation being issued.

2.3.3 Unprofiled Material with High Lead Content

In late October, a transporter notified ALRRF that ten loads of ash brought in the previous day for solidification (mixing with liquid wastes prior to disposal) had been delivered before profiling (testing for hazardous materials) was complete. ALRRF took several steps to contain and remove this material, and to test the remaining soils where the material had been staged, to assure that cleanup had been complete. This incident did not result in any Notice of Violation being issued.

2.4 Review of Reports

2.4.1 Semiannual Groundwater Monitoring Reports

Two groundwater monitoring reports were reviewed in 2012. The first covered the time frame from July through December of 2011; the second covered January through June of 2012. Both reports reflect revised Waste Discharge Requirements issued by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board that took effect in April of 2009.

⁴ MRF fines: Fine material produced by a waste sorting system that processes construction and demolition debris at the Davis Street Transfer Station. The coarser fraction of this material (size range 3/8 inch to 2 inches) is brought to the ALRRF and blended with certain liquid wastes, in a process known as "solidification", and used as Alternative Daily Cover (ADC).

In 2012, as in previous years, groundwater monitoring and sampling activities at the ALRRF were performed by SCS Engineers, with testing conducted by TestAmerica, Inc. Treadwell & Rollo, Inc. reviewed the two semi-annual groundwater monitoring reports and prepared memoranda to summarize their review comments. One noteworthy occurrence was the finding and confirmation of low but detectable concentrations of the herbicide 2,4-D during 5-year Constituent of Concern testing of stormwater basins. Because only one Constituent of Concern was found, this did not become a regulatory action, but it does reinforce the need to continue to control stormwater pollution at the site.

In general, groundwater quality in the area varies, both by location and over time; without an obvious trend it is difficult to attribute quality problems to the landfill or any other specific cause. At this time the recommended course of action is to continue to review monitoring results and watch for trends.

2.4.2 Annual Mitigation Status Report

The Mitigation Status Report covering calendar year 2011 was received in January 2012. It is a table that lists each of the conditions described in the current Conditional Use Permit (CUP), followed by a description of the implementation status of that condition or mitigation.

We found that the status descriptions accurately reflected the current status of each mitigation measure.

2.4.3 Semiannual Title V Report

Title V is one of several programs authorized by the U. S. Congress in the 1990 Amendments to the federal Clean Air Act (CAA). The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) administers Title V requirements for the ALRRF. Title V operating permits include the requirements of all applicable air quality regulations. Hence, the Title V reports provide a comprehensive review of compliance with BAAQMD permits and regulations.

In 2012, we received the Title V reports for the periods June – November 2011, and December 2011 – May 2012. These reports largely consist of routine documentation of landfill gas control operations and source testing, but they also document new or unique developments at the site that can have an effect on air emissions. In 2012 there were several such developments:

- Approximately 15 new landfill gas wells were installed and placed into service.
- Surface emissions monitoring continued, and although exceedances were found, they were typically remedied on the first try, without the need for repeated attempts or repairs. Also, the protocol for surface emissions testing was modified from a path-based approach to a zonal approach, which will have advantages in identifying problem sites within the landfill.
- The LNG plant continued to operate, and unscheduled down-time was minimal.
- All control devices passed their emissions tests without incident.

2.4.4 Monthly Tonnage Reports

Each month the ALRRF provides a report to County Planning and other interested parties, containing several tables that detail the quantities of materials received in that month. The most

recent 12 reports cover December 2011 through November 2012. All of these reports indicate compliance with the requirements of permits and the Settlement Agreement. In addition, the following points were noted:

- Refuse tonnages were well below EIR / CUP limits. On average, they stayed at a constant level throughout 2012.
- Once again, the monthly quantities of special wastes, particularly Class 2 cover soil, and biosolids, varied widely. In 2012, biosolids were only delivered to the ALRRF in October.
- Monthly tonnages of Class 2 cover soil were small through most of 2012 but were substantially larger in August through October.

2.4.5 Storm Water Annual Report, 2010-2011

This report provided a record of stormwater monitoring that took place during the most recent "water year", from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012. It includes results from the water quality sampling that is required when there are discharges from the three stormwater detention basins (denoted A, B and C) to local drainages. Basins B and C were sampled twice; Basin A only had one discharge event, which was also sampled.

Testing found slightly elevated concentrations (above benchmark values) for:

- Iron, in all three basins
- Zinc, in Basins B and C
- Nitrate, in Basin B

This is consistent with prior years' measurements but indicates little improvement in spite of ever-increasing efforts to control stormwater pollution. To address the exceedances, Best Management Practices have been further augmented in the 2012 Winterization Plan.

2.4.6 Summary of Report Reviews

Our reviews of the various reports described above have not identified any issue that would indicate an immediate increase in risk to environmental or public health. We continue to believe that it is prudent to track changes in the concentrations of contaminants in groundwater, to note any problems with landfill containment systems as soon as possible. No such problem is believed to exist at this time.

2.5 Monthly Site Inspections

Twelve site inspections were held during 2012. To obtain the best possible understanding of the range of operating conditions, the inspection day and time were varied as shown in Table 2-1 below.

Date	Day of	Inspection	Announced	With LEA
	Week	Time	in Advance?	staff?
Jan 31	Tue	3:30 PM	yes	no
Feb 27	Mon	2:30 PM	yes	no
Mar 14	Wed	9:30 AM	no	yes
Apr 17	Tue	3 PM	no	yes
May 9	Wed	5 PM	yes	no
Jun 27	Wed	6 AM	yes	no
Jul 19	Thurs	8:30 AM	no	yes
Aug 29	Wed	7 AM	yes	no
Sep 18	Tue	2:30 PM	no	yes
Oct 2	Tue	1:30 PM	yes	no
Nov 19	Mon	2 PM	yes	no
Dec 17	Mon	10:30 AM	yes	no

Table 2-1 Site Inspection Summary

In general, satisfactory conditions were observed, and minor problems were rectified prior to the next inspection. Details are available in the monthly site visit reports provided to Committee members. There were no observed problems regarding refuse placement, public safety or traffic management. Throughout these inspections, staff and management were forthcoming regarding operating practices and current conditions. Distinct operations, such as the stockpiling and processing of specific materials, took place in well defined areas. No instances of unpermitted activities were noted.

2.5.2 Summary of Observations

In 2012 our observations continued to focus on:

- Storm drainage and erosion control, including the installation and performance of stormwater Best Management Practices.
- Traffic on site, and the adequacy of crews and equipment to handle incoming traffic and waste volumes
- General observations of fill activities, including spreading, compaction and traffic control during normal and off-hours operations
- Observation of issues of concern, including the increased presence of seagulls and the quality of materials used as Alternative Daily Cover.
- Management of windblown litter, which is improving but is an an ongoing problem as Fill Area 1 reaches its maximum height.

The Scope of Work for the Community Monitor specifies that at least three inspections will be performed off hours, and that approximately four to six are to be performed jointly with the LEA. As shown in the table above, three off-hour and four joint inspections were conducted in 2012.

One aspect of each inspection is to review available inspection reports filed by the Local Enforcement Agency. Through November 2012, the LEA reports made note of one violation

(refuse in MRF fines, described above) and several Areas of Concern that focused on two issues: refuse in MRF fines, and thin or absent landfill cover.

We also review the Log of Special Occurrences during inspections. In 2012, apart from the leachate spill and unprofiled waste delivery described above, there were minimal Special Occurrences until the latter part of the year, when two end-dump trucks fell over while unloading. Fortunately, no injuries occurred in these incidents. No fires were reported. One minor injury to an employee was also reported; it did not require an emergency response.

In addition to the on-site inspections, counts of arriving refuse trucks were conducted by the CM in December of 2011 and July of 2012. These counts continued to be well below the limit stipulated in the CUP.

2.6 Class 2 Soils File Review

The ALRRF is permitted to accept Special Wastes that include soils from sites known to be contaminated, if a waste profile and applicable laboratory reports indicate that these soils comply with the landfill's Waste Acceptance Criteria. The profile information is kept on file in the administration offices of the landfill. These soils are generally referred to as Class 2 Cover Soils.

Treadwell & Rollo conducted file reviews to verify that Class 2 Cover Soil profiles for soils received in 2012 follow Waste Acceptance Criteria as defined in the Regional Water Control Board order governing the ALRRF. All files were found to be complete and in compliance with Class 2 acceptance criteria.

Based upon file reviews completed in 2012, ALRRF is following Waste Acceptance Criteria as defined in the Regional Water Control Board order governing the Site. Treadwell & Rollo will continue to conduct quarterly file reviews during 2013. The frequency of review events may be adjusted depending on the number of new profiles approved for disposal at ALRRF.

CMC Agenda Item 6.4

SECTION 3 Looking Ahead: Anticipated Efforts and Issues

3.1 Introduction

In the 2013 contract year, our efforts will continue to focus on report review, site inspections and Class 2 soils file review. As Fill Area 1 nears completion, operations will become more complex in order to control the final height and shape of the filled area. Also, if the ALRRF begins the development of Fill Area 2, we expect to spend time reviewing submitted plans for Fill Area 2, as well as mitigation plans for the Conservation Plan Area.

3.2 Issues to be Tracked in 2013

3.2.1 Ongoing Report Review

With regard to report review, the following issues will continue to be monitored in the coming year:

- Groundwater monitoring methods.
- Groundwater quality, including the vadose zone.
- Stormwater quality and management practices.
- Performance of landfill gas handling equipment.
- Additional changes to the landfill gas extraction system.
- Surface emissions monitoring under new regulations.
- Reports related to the opening of Fill Area 2, if construction begins.

3.2.2 Site Inspection Work

All operations will continue to be observed, and the following areas will receive emphasis.

3.2.2.1 Landfill Gas Control System

Performance of this system is closely related to groundwater quality, and it takes place within a complex regulatory framework involving Federal permits, local permits, new State regulations, and ALRRF CUP conditions. Physical changes to this system will include the further addition of landfill gas extraction wells and ongoing operation of the LNG plant, as well as startup of the LNG truck fueling system.

3.2.2.2 Stormwater Controls and Monitoring

Throughout the year, and especially during wet weather months, we will monitor conditions at all stormwater basins.

3.2.2.3 Windblown Litter

As noted above, this will be an issue for Fill Area 1, which is generally higher than its immediate surroundings and subject to strong winds through much of the year.

3.2.2.4 Fill Area 2

If physical preparations or development occur in Fill Area 2, we will ask to observe these operations. If mitigation plans regarding the Conservation Plan Area or the Conservation Easement are submitted to a regulatory agency, we will review them to the extent required by the Settlement Agreement.

3.2.3 Class 2 Soils File Review

As required in our Scope of Work, we intend to continue this review several times through the year 2013.

3.3 Project Management Considerations

The budget for the CM in the 2012 contract year has been adequate. Budget should be adequate for work load in 2013, but the development of Fill Area 2 (if it occurs) could require some extra care in managing time and prioritizing work to stay within budget.

At the end of 2013, the current contract for Community Monitor services will reach the end of its term. It appears that a procurement process will need to be conducted in 2013 to select a Community Monitor consultant, if desired.



COMMUNITY MONITOR COMMITTEE STAFF REPORT

TO: Community Monitor Committee Members

FROM: Judy Erlandson, Public Works Manager

SUBJECT: Community Monitor RFP Process

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Staff recommends that the Community Monitor Committee discuss and initiate a Request for Proposal for the services of a Community Monitor.

BACKGROUND

The Settlement Agreement, dated November 30, 1999, between the County of Alameda, the City of Livermore, the City of Pleasanton, Sierra Club, Northern California Recycling Association, Altamont Landowners Against Rural Mismanagement, and Waste Management of Alameda County, Inc. (Settlement Agreement), created the Community Monitor Committee to hire and oversee the work of a Community Monitor.

The Community Monitor is a technical expert retained to monitor the Altamont Landfill and Resource Recovery Facility's (ALRRF) compliance with environmental laws and regulations, and to advise the public and the Cities of Livermore and Pleasanton about technical issues relating to the ALRRF.

DISCUSSION

On January 9, 2008, the Community Monitor Committee (Committee) and Environmental Science Associates (ESA) entered into an Agreement for Consulting Services for ESA (Agreement) to perform the duties of the Community Monitor as defined by the Settlement Agreement. The Agreement included a provision for one three-year extension with majority approval from Committee members at a Committee meeting. On December 21, 2010, the Agreement was extended for the final term from January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2013.

Therefore, staff recommends the Committee discuss the attached draft Request for Proposal (RFP) and initiate a RFP for the services of a Community Monitor to the Committee.

MEETING DATE:

April 10, 2013

AGENDA ITEM:

6.5

Process to Request for Proposal for a Community Monitor

Upon the Committee's initiation of a RFP for the services of a Community Monitor, the consultant selection and RFP preparation process will involve the following steps:

- 1. Prior to releasing the RFP, the Committee will give Waste Management of Alameda County (WMAC) five (5) working days to review and comment on the contents of the RFP.
- 2. The Committee will release the RFP and RFP Notice. The RFP Notice is to be posted to the public at least 10 days before the submittal deadline.
- 3. The Committee will coordinate the evaluation of responses to the RFP, and then invite a select number of consultants that are deemed to be most qualified to an interview. Emphasis will be placed on overall experience and the consultant's approach to providing services as expressed during the interview process.
- 4. The Committee shall provide WMAC with copies of all submitted proposals.
- 5. Within fifteen days after receiving all submitted proposals, WMAC shall have the right to submit to the Committee objections to any proposal based upon an objective showing that (1) the applicant does not individually or collectively possess the minimum qualifications set forth in the scope of services, and/or (2) the proposal exceeds the scope of work.
- 6. If three or fewer qualifying bids are submitted, then the Committee must accept either the lowest bid for the Community Monitor work, or any bid within a certain range of the lowest bid as described below.
- 7. The Committee may accept any qualifying bid which does not exceed the lowest by the applicable amounts set forth below:
 - a. If the lowest bid is fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) per year or less, then twenty-five percent (25%) of the lowest bid;
 - b. If the lowest bid is greater than fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) per year and equal to or less than seventy-five thousand dollars; (\$75,000) per year, then twenty percent (20%) of the lowest bid, or \$12,500, whichever is higher;
 - c. If the lowest bid is greater than seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000) per year, then ten percent (10%) of the lowest bid, or \$15,000, whichever is higher.
- 8. If the Committee reasonably determines that a higher bidder would provide better community monitoring services, the Committee may ask WMAC to waive the requirements of the low bid.
- 9. The Committee shall consult with WMAC prior to accepting any bid for the Community Monitor work.

- 10. The Committee shall take action by majority vote of the voting members for approval of a new Monitor.
- 11. The Committee will negotiate Agreement with the selected bidder.

A new Agreement with the selected Community Monitor must be executed by December 31, 2013. The previous RFP process for a Community Monitor took seven months to complete from posting of the RFP Notice to agreement execution.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft Community Monitor Request for Proposal

Approved by:

Gilandfu

Judy Erlandson Public Works Manager

HIS PAGE INTERNATIONALIA BLANK

COMMUNITY MONITOR COMMITTEE

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

"COMMUNITY MONITOR" TO MONITOR ALTAMONT LANDFILL AND RESOURCE RECOVERY COMPLIANCE

The Community Monitor Committee is requesting sealed proposals for the "Community Monitor" to Monitor Altamont Landfill and Resource Recovery Compliance. All proposals must be received no later than 3:30 p.m. on May 31, 2013. Proposals will not be opened publicly. Proposals received after said time will not be considered. Proposal shall be submitted via email to:

Judy Erlandson jaerlandson@cityoflivermore.net

Proposals must be submitted plainly marked with the proposal title and PROPOSER name. Faxed proposals will not be accepted.

The Community Monitor Committee reserves the right to award or reject proposals in part or in whole and on any basis it deems in the best interest of the Community Monitor Committee.

Questions regarding the Request for Proposal may be directed to Judy Erlandson at (925) 960-8002.

Date of Issuance: April 15, 2013

COMMUNITY MONITOR Request for Proposal

Introduction

Pursuant to a legal settlement governing the expansion of the Altamont Landfill and Resource Recovery Facility (ALRRF), the City of Livermore, the City of Pleasanton, the Sierra Club, the Northern California Recycling Association (NCRA), and Altamont Landowners Against Rural Mismanagement (ALARM) won the right to have an independent Community Monitor (CM) to monitor the operations at the Landfill. The costs for the CM are to be paid by Waste Management of Alameda County, Inc. (WMAC). This document provides guidelines for work to be performed by the CM as required in the "Settlement Agreement Between and Among the County of Alameda, the City of Livermore, the City of Pleasanton, Sierra Club, Northern California Recycling Association, Altamont Landowners Against Rural Mismanagement and Waste Management of Alameda County, Inc." (Settlement Agreement). The Community Monitor Committee (CMC) is the representative body for the plaintiffs in the settlement and consists of the following four (4) voting members:

- 1 member appointed by the Livermore City Council
- 1 member appointed by the Pleasanton City Council
- 1 member appointed by the Northern California Recycling Association
- 1 member appointed by the Sierra Club

The CM shall be an independent contractor retained and supervised by the CMC. The CM will report to the CMC and shall represent the interests of the community in seeing that regulations are properly applied to minimize the impacts of the ALRRF on the surrounding community.

The CMC is seeking proposals from any individual, firm, organization, or any combination thereof ("Consultant"), which meets the minimum qualifications to perform the duties of Community Monitor (CM). The CMC will be responsible for interviewing, retaining, supervising the work, and overseeing the payment of, and, if necessary, terminating the contract of the Consultant serving as CM.

The CMC anticipates that the CM will be functioning for the life of the landfill expansion, estimated to be 20-40 years. The initial contract that results from the Request for Proposal (RFP) is expected to be for a three-year duration with the option to renew for one additional three year period.

The following information is included in the Request for Proposal (RFP) as background information.

Request for Proposal Community Monitor Page 1 of 7 CMC Agenda Packet Page 62 of 68 • <u>Attachment A – Summary of Regulating Agencies</u>

This is a summary of the agencies that regulate the operation of the ALRRF and recent approvals that have been issued to the landfill.

- <u>Attachment B List of Permit Approvals</u>
 These are the most recent permit approvals that have been issued to the ALRRF.
- <u>Attachment C Solid Waste Facilities Permit (SWFP)</u>
 This is the most recent SWFP that was issued to the ALRRF by the Alameda County Environmental Health Department.
- <u>Attachment D Settlement Agreement</u>
 This is the Settlement Agreement that governs landfill
 expansion and the role of the Community Monitor
- <u>Attachment E ALRRF Conditional Use Permit</u>
 This is the permit that places conditions on the operation of
 the ALRRF.
- Attachment F Sample Agreement

Qualifications of Consultant to Serve as Community Monitor

The CM may be any individual, firm, or organization, or any combination thereof, which meets the minimum qualifications set forth in this subsection. The CM shall serve as an independent contractor for the CMC, and the CM shall meet the following minimum qualifications:

- a. A minimum 10 years experience is recommended relating to the areas of landfill design, construction, operations, and regulatory oversight;
- b. Familiarity with the Settlement Agreement in order to assist the CMC in carrying out its responsibilities under the Settlement Agreement and to carry out the work of the CM under the Settlement Agreement;
- c. Possess a California Professional Engineers license;
- d. Expertise in monitoring environmental impacts, including air emission and discharges to groundwater;
- e. Experience in monitoring compliance with mitigation measures pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act or other California laws or regulations requiring environmental mitigation;

Request for Proposal Community Monitor Page 2 of 7 CMC Agenda Packet Page 63 of 68

- f. Familiarity with the operations of solid waste landfills, and with regulatory requirements of the California Integrated Waste Management Board, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, the Alameda County Local Enforcement Agency ("LEA"), and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District relating to the operation of solid waste landfills;
- g. The CM shall possess the ability to communicate environmental information in a clear and comprehensible manner; and
- h. The CM shall demonstrate that it does not have a conflict of interest.
- i. The CM shall be willing to avoid employment, contracting, or consulting arrangements with WMAC, its parent company, or affiliates of WMAC, or its parent through to completion of this project.
- j. The CM shall have familiarity with the requirements for compliance with the Brown Act.

The CMC anticipates hiring a CM to complete the duties as described in the Scope of Work below. Services in general will include, but are not limited to, reviewing and analyzing materials, reports, documents, and data, advising the public via written or oral reports, issuing written reports, conducting inspections, and reporting to the CMC.

Scope of Work

- CM shall review all reports, documents, and data, which WMAC is required to submit to the County or any other regulatory agency pursuant to the Settlement Agreement or the terms of WMAC's permits and approvals for the ALRRF. Material to be reviewed by the CM includes, but is not limited to, the documents listed in the Attachments.
- 2. The CM shall directly lead and oversee all inspections and report preparations.
- 3. The CM shall present reports and findings to the CMC.
- 4. The CM shall serve as the primary CMC liaison with WMAC and regulatory agencies.
- The CM shall review all documents submitted to the County in connection with the Conditional Use Permit (CUP), any compliance reviews, and the CUP Mid-Capacity Compliance Review to be conducted pursuant to the Settlement Agreement.

Request for Proposal Community Monitor Page 3 of 7 CMC Agenda Packet Page 64 of 68

- 6. The CM shall review and evaluate all testing data and source information as provided in Attachment D (Exhibit "A," of the Settlement Agreement) to determine acceptability of variance waste (e.g., material that requires a variance from the then existing permit conditions) or declassified waste (see California Code of Regulations Title 22, 66260.200). Such notice, data, and information shall be provided to the CM by WMAC within 48 hours after receipt by WMAC, and no fewer than ten (10) days prior to any acceptance at ALRRF of such material.
- 7. The CM shall review all other reports, documents, and data regarding the ALRRF's compliance with applicable environmental laws and regulations.
- 8. The CM shall prepare meeting agendas and minutes for all CMC meetings, reserve and set up the meeting room, provide the required materials for CMC Members in a timely fashion, and provide other support as necessary. CMC meetings will be scheduled bi-monthly, or as otherwise directed by the CMC.
- 9. The CM shall advise the CMC, as requested by the CMC, via a brief oral presentation (approximately 15-20 minutes) accompanied by a written executive summary regarding progress on execution of the scope of work. The CM shall provide the CMC with an electronic version of any written materials that are associated with the presentations at least two weeks before the CMC meeting.
- 10. The CM shall issue a written report no later than the end of each year of the contract period summarizing the CM's activities and the ALRRF's compliance record with respect to all applicable environmental laws and regulations including an oral presentation to the CMC of no longer than one hour.
- 11. The CM shall notify the CMC if the CM reasonably suspects that there is any noncompliance with environmental laws and regulations, or with the agreement, or with the conditions of any permit or approval for the operations of the ALRRF. If the CM suspects the noncompliance involves a substantial environmental or health risk, the CM shall immediately notify WMAC and the LEA of such suspected substantial noncompliance.

12. Review Reports

a. The CM shall review all testing data (except contaminated soil projects of less than 10 cubic yards - Condition No. 2.3) and source information submitted to WMAC as provided in Attachment D (Settlement Agreement Exhibit "A" - Condition No. 2) with regard to any proposed acceptance at the ALRRF for any use or disposal of material that (a) requires a variance from the then existing permit conditions at ALRRF in order to be accepted there or (b) is a hazardous waste that has been declassified or is proposed to be declassified for purposes of acceptance at ALRRF ("declassified waste" per California Code of Regulations Title 22, 66261.200). The CM shall review the propriety of such receipt of material

Request for Proposal Community Monitor Page 4 of 7 CMC Agenda Packet Page 65 of 68 under all applicable laws and regulations and may as necessary notify or consult with any appropriate regulatory agency regarding such action.

b. The CM shall review the inspection reports of the regulatory agencies and target its inspections accordingly to issues that are not covered by those inspection reports.

13. Inspections

- a. The CM shall inspect the ALRRF twelve (12) times during each contract year for compliance with permits or any applicable environmental laws or regulations, including at least 3 (three) off hour inspections. Such inspections shall occur upon prior or simultaneous telephonic or personal notice to WMAC. Whether the notice given is prior or simultaneous shall be at the sole discretion of the CM. WMAC is required to provide the CM the appropriate contact(s) and telephone number(s) for notice of the visit. WMAC has the right to have a representative accompany the CM on any such inspection. Within two weeks of beginning work, the CM shall send to WMAC a list of the name(s) and contact information for its personnel who will conduct all inspections during the term of the contract.
- b. At the direction of the CMC, the CM shall accompany the LEA inspector on their visits to and inspections of the facility. The LEA inspector shall retain control of the inspection, and the CM shall not interfere with the work of the LEA inspector. The LEA is required to provide reasonable notice to the CM of its regular and other inspections of ALRRF and allow the CM to accompany its inspector(s) on any such inspections. In the case of impromptu inspections, telephonic notice to the CM, including the leaving of a telephone message, shall constitute reasonable notice. The CM should anticipate 4-6 visits annually with LEA inspector.
- c. The CM may conduct up to six (6) additional same day inspections per calendar year, if, in the conduct of the CM's duties, the CM reasonably determines that the ALRRF is in substantial noncompliance with any environmental law or regulations, the substantial noncompliance is reported to the applicable regulatory agency, and the regulatory agency determines that there is a substantial noncompliance problem. Such additional inspections, if authorized by the CMC, will qualify for additional compensation to the CM, up to an additional twenty percent (20%) beyond the annual contract amount. The CM shall immediately notify and obtain pre-approval from the CMC to perform these inspections.
- 14. The CM shall conduct up to 12 independent counts of trucks arriving at the ALRRF during the time period indicated by the CMC, with such monitoring to be done at or outside the entrance gate to the ALRRF. The truck counts shall be conducted, at a minimum, to determine compliance with the 50 total refuse truck

Request for Proposal Community Monitor Page 5 of 7 CMC Agenda Packet Page 66 of 68 trips per hour limitation during the hours of 6:45 a.m. to 8:45 a.m. and the 10 total refuse truck trips per hour limitation during the hours of 4:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.

- 15. The CM shall report to the CMC, and the CMC shall provide reasonable oversight and supervision of the CM's work and expenses.
- 16. Contact the EPA inspectors at least once annually to determine if the EPA has any regulatory compliance issues regarding with the ALRRF that would be of interest to the CM.

Qualifications Package

The Qualifications Package shall include the following:

- (1) Name, address, phone number, fax number, and website of Consultant.
- (2) Proposed services.
- (3) Name of principal contact person.
- (4) Year Consultant was established.
- (5) Time Consultant has operated in providing related services to public and private agencies.
- (6) Name, title, experience, licenses, and qualifications of lead person or persons to be designated as CM.
- (7) A list of similarly related contracts that the Consultant has completed or is currently working on, including length of contract and references to be contacted in relation to same.
- (8) Information about the Consultant's qualifications and ability to perform the work as described in the Project Guidelines.
- (9) The Consultant's experience completing a similar project for another agency.
- (10) Information about the Consultant's ability to complete the term of the contract.
- (11) A list of any contracting or consulting arrangements with WMAC, its parent company (Waste Management, Inc.), or affiliates of WMAC or its parent, current or past (last ten (10) years).
- (12) Provide at least 3 (three) references. Reference will not be contacted unless there is interest in the candidate.
- (13) The proposal must include time and materials costs and a not-to-exceed cost for each item in the scope of work.

Request for Proposal Community Monitor Page 6 of 7 CMC Agenda Packet Page 67 of 68 WMAC has the right, by giving written notice within 15 days, to disqualify for consideration as the CM any party, which is, or includes as part of a team, a party that is adverse in pending litigation to WMAC, its parent, or affiliates of WMAC or its parent.

Selection Process

- (1) The CMC will coordinate the evaluation of responses to the RFP and then invite a select number of Consultants that are deemed to be most qualified to an interview. Emphasis will be placed on overall experience and the Consultant's approach to providing services as expressed during the interview process.
- (2) The CMC will provide WMAC with copies of all submitted proposals.
- (3) Within fifteen days after receiving all submitted proposals, WMAC may submit to the CMC objections to any proposal based upon an objective showing that (1) the applicant does not individually or collectively possess the minimum qualifications set forth in the scope of services, and/or (2) the proposal exceeds the scope of work.
- (4) The CMC will take action by a vote of at least three of the voting members.
- (5) The proposal must include time and materials costs and a not-to-exceed cost for each item in the scope of work.

If you have any questions regarding the RFP, please email Judy Erlandson at <u>jaerlandson@cityoflivermore.net</u>. If you decide to respond to this RFP, in order to be considered, your response must be emailed and addressed to Judy Erlandson, City of Livermore Public Works Department, at <u>jaerlandson@cityoflivermore.net</u>.

RFPs will be accepted no later than 3:30 p.m. on May 31, 2013

Attachments:

Attachment A - Summary of Regulating Agencies Attachment B - List of Permit Approvals Attachment C - Solid Waste Facilities Permit Attachment D - Settlement Agreement Attachment E - ALRRF Conditional Use Permit Attachment F – Sample Agreement

> Request for Proposal Community Monitor Page 7 of 7 CMC Agenda Packet Page 68 of 68