



# COMMUNITY MONITOR COMMITTEE

## *Altamont Landfill Settlement Agreement*

Minutes of July 10, 2013

---

### **DRAFT**

1. Call to Order  
Ms. Cabanne called the meeting to order at 4:06 p.m. with a quorum present.
2. Introductions  
All of those present were already acquainted, so introductions were not made.
3. Roll Call  
Members Present: Donna Cabanne; Karla Brown; David Tam; Enrique Perez, Waste Management Altamont Landfill and Resource Recovery Facility; and Wing Suen, Alameda County Local Enforcement Agency  
  
Absent: Lauren Turner, City of Livermore; Robert Cooper, Altamont Landowners Against Rural Mismanagement;;  
  
Staff: Judy Erlandson and Dana D'Angelo, City of Livermore Public Works Department; Kelly Runyon, ESA, and Dorinda Shipman, Treadwell & Rollo, Community Monitor.
4. Approval of Minutes  
Because there were only two voting members present who had attended the January 16 meeting, approval of those Minutes was continued until the October meeting. It was moved by Ms. Cabanne and seconded by Ms. Brown to approve the minutes of the April 10, 2013 meeting. In discussion, Mr. Tam suggested a correction, for clarity. The correction was moved by Mr. Tam and seconded by Ms. Brown. With that correction, all three voting members present voted to approve the April 10, 2013 minutes.
5. Open Forum  
No members of the public spoke.
6. Matters for Consideration
  - 6.1 Responses to CMC Member Requests: Update re Preventing Disposal of Unprofiled Waste; Testing MRF fines as Cover Material  
Mr. Runyon summarized his actions to date regarding disposal of unprofiled waste: he had emailed ALRRF management asking if additional actions to prevent disposal of unprofiled waste had been taken, and had received no response. Ms. Cabanne asked that if he receives a response, he advise the Committee. Mr. Perez explained that serious personal health issues may have prevented Mr. Netz from responding, but the existing procedure remains in

place, and the testing of every single load is impractical. Ms. Brown asked if it is practical to spot-test one load out of every hundred or so. Mr. Runyon responded with the opinion that spot-testing would need to be far more intensive than that in order to provide a good probability of finding material being improperly disposed.

Regarding the testing of MRF fines, Mr. Runyon summarized the need for testing MRF fines with a demonstration project; what the sources and sizes of MRF fines are; what some of the apparent contaminants are; the criteria in the test plan; and the status of the test. Ms. Cabanne asked what happens after the demonstration project is complete. Mr. Runyon stated his belief that if the fines are shown to meet the criteria, they would be approved for use as ADC unless other concerns were identified during the demonstration project. Ms. Suen mentioned the regulations that also apply, and the monthly reporting and periodic testing involved. She stated that approval is not automatic but is based on a review of all of the available information by the LEA and CalRecycle. Ms. Cabanne asked if there would be further review after approval. Ms. Suen stated that there would not be further formal review, but would be subject to weekly inspections like the rest of the site. Also, the Joint Technical Document would need to be amended to include this process. Mr. Perez concurred.

#### 6.2 Review of Reports From Community Monitor (ESA)

Mr. Runyon began by pointing out several typographical errors that appeared in the cover memo for this item, and stated that he would correct them. He also explained the differences in tonnage totals for March, on page 22. In response to a question from Ms. Cabanne, Mr. Perez noted that bids for Fill Area 2 construction work are due July 15, with construction to begin August 15 and continue for several months, depending on weather. Ms. Cabanne asked for an update at the October Committee meeting. Mr. Runyon also stated that in April and May, the gull population was much less than in prior months. Ms. Brown asked if other parties monitor bird activity. In response, Ms. Suen described the LEA's role in assuring that the landfill uses available bird control techniques to prevent birds from interfering with operations. Mr. Runyon also described the operation of the litter-vacuuming "Trilo" machine and responded to questions from Mr. Tam regarding how that machine works, indicating the intake duct at the front of the machine, and explaining that in the photo, the hose that picks up litter was on the opposite side of the machine, out of view. In reviewing the May report, Ms. Brown asked about the handling of friable asbestos. Mr. Runyon stated that the landfill includes a special asbestos disposal area, and Mr. Perez explained how that is operated and how contingencies are dealt with. Mr. Tam also noticed an error in the inspection date on page 26; the correct date was May 21. Mr. Runyon called attention to the damage to well 601 and Mr. Perez responded to Committee members' questions about how this type of problem is detected and isolated for repair, and the efforts made to prevent these problems. Ms. Brown asked for further information about how the issue was managed. In reviewing the report for June, an error in the inspection date was noted on page 29; the correct date

was June 5. Ms. Brown asked if windblown litter would be reduced by the plastic bag bans taking effect in Alameda County. Mr. Runyon stated that he is seeing fewer bags stuck on fences, but that may also be due to more aggressive litter control by the ALRRF. Ms. Suen also mentioned that a substantial amount of the windblown litter is not bags but film plastic. Mr. Runyon also provided an explanation of the bar charts (Figures 6.2-1 and 6.2-2).

### 6.3 Use Permit PLN 2010-00041

Mr. Runyon began by citing the Committee's interest in this new County Land Use Permit, as well as the position expressed by ALRRF staff at the prior Committee meeting that this may not be within the purview of the Committee. In discussion, Ms. Cabanne expressed the opinion that this Use Permit is within the Committee's purview, and that the Committee has the right to review and monitor plans and operations. Mr. Perez stated that WM continues to take the position that the Community Monitor Committee's purview relates to the prior CUP, and not to this newer one. He also stated that he would communicate the Committee's concerns to ALRRF's management and attorney. Ms. Erlandson stated that this issue could affect the Community Monitor's Scope of Work, and Mr. Perez indicated that at least some of the operations described in the new CUP are likely to be occurring within the next three years (i.e. during the term of the 2014-2016 Community Monitor consultant). Ms. Cabanne made a motion that the new CUP be included in the scope of the Community Monitor's work unless there is a legal problem in doing so. There was no second. Ms. Suen pointed out that the last 5-year permit review included only general information about the nature of the permitted operation; and the LEA's office did not receive a copy of the Initial Study, or other information, related to this permit. Ms. Cabanne made a motion that the new Conditional Use Permit granted in March 2013 falls under the same CUP and therefore it is part of the Committee's job to monitor all activity on the landfill including this new addition and expansion of recycling and composting; and secondly, if this is accurate, then it would become part of the Community Monitor's duty, within the next 3-year contract, to follow the construction and daily operation of the new activity; and that the Committee might consider an addendum [to the Community Monitor contract] for additional hours. Ms. Brown seconded. All three voting members present voted in favor.

In further discussion, Ms. Suen stated that prior to construction of the new operations, the ALRRF would need to submit more information to the LEA office for review. Mr. Tam asked the ALRRF representative if the current Solid Waste Facility Permit included the composting and recycling operations under discussion. Mr. Perez replied that did not have the answer and would have to get back to the Committee with a response. Mr. Tam suggested that Stopwaste.Org would be involved in the issuance of a Solid Waste Facility Permit for these new activities. Ms. Cabanne and Ms. Suen stated that Stopwaste might be involved but they are not the agency authorized to issue

the permit. However they would be responsible for changes to the County Non-Disposal Facility Element.

In further discussion, Mr. Runyon stated his opinion that the County permit PLN2010-00041 does not modify the prior Conditional Use Permit C-5512 but is intended as a separate, overlay permit for the operations described therein.

Ms. Cabanne moved that when any new developments occur for permitting of the new operations, the Committee would be informed by Ms. Suen and Mr. Runyon. Mr. Tam seconded. All three voting members present voted in favor.

6.4 Closed Session: Community Monitor Selection Process.

The Committee entered closed session at 5:30 PM and returned to open session at 6:40 PM. The action that was taken is that the Committee will hold a special meeting August 16 at 3PM to hold an Open Forum and resume Closed Session for further discussion.

7. Agenda Building

One item was raised:

Ms. Brown expressed interest in adding a stipend for Committee Members that attend Committee meetings. She noted that many other agencies do this. All three Committee members agreed to discuss this at the next regular meeting.

8. Adjournment

Ms. Cabanne adjourned the meeting at 6:45 PM. The next meeting will be held on **Wednesday, October 9 at 4:00 p.m.** at the Livermore Maintenance Services Division at 3500 Robertson Park Road.