

# South Bay Odor Stakeholders Group

## Meeting Minutes

Date: January 19, 2022

Time: 10:30 a.m. – 10:55 a.m.

Location: Microsoft Teams

Recorder: Republic Services

---

**Attendees:** Anurag Pal, Office of Asm. Alex Lee; Chia Ling Kong, City of Milpitas; Elaine Ko, BAAQMD; Elaine Marshall, City of Milpitas; Eric Kiruja, CalRecycle; Gregory H. Nudd, BAAQMD; Jason Nettleton, City of San Jose; Jeanne Serpa, Republic Services; Juan Ortellado, BAAQMD; Kathy Cote, City of Fremont; Michael Geiss, Republic Services; Paul Grazzini, BAAQMD; Rachelle Huber, Republic Services; Richard Elkins, Republic Services; Roberto Alonzo, City of Milpitas; Stanley Tom, BAAQMD; Tamiko Endow, BAAQMD

## Discussion

Jeanne Serpa	1. Call to Order  10:33 am. Introductions
SBOSG members	2. Overview of Meeting Minutes from October 20, 2023  Add Chia Ling Kong to list of attendees
Paul Grazzini Chia Ling Kong Rachelle Huber	3. <b>BAAQMD – Odor Complaints and Enforcement Activities</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Paul: 64 odor complaints in October. One complaint confirmed to the Newby Island Landfill. It was a compost complaint, so we referred it to the San Jose LEA. 22 unconfirmed complaints in November and 9 in December. 3 so far in January. Enforcement Activities: More regular inspections at the landfill facility. Some were joint inspections with California Air Resources Board as well as EPA. Whatever landfill leaks that that were found, we issued or they issued notices of violation. Chia: Regarding the landfill leaks. You mentioned that there was a violation issued. Was that purely from the inspection or was that also linked to the confirmed order complaint back in October? Paul: No, that that was purely from the inspection. Chia: To Newby Island, are you proactively understanding what happened in October because as the reports were showing, there is a spike in October. Rachelle: We as a site understood what was going on. The working face was in a different location. We as a site have been working on implementing</li></ul>

	<p>additional odor mitigation lines. We use a deodorizer. We worked on closing our working face earlier, so decreasing the size of the working face.</p>
<p>Tamiko Endow</p>	<p>4. Odor Study Update</p> <p>The comment period for the group ended on November 21, 2022. We've received comments but haven't finished going through them and compiling the comments and writing responses. Competing priorities have been occupying our time (Source Test group). We're hoping to finish compiling the comments in the next couple of weeks and work with the contractors to finalize the reports in mid-February.</p>
<p>Rachelle Huber</p>	<p>5. Update on Newby Island Facility Modifications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All construction from 2022 was completed by the end of 2022. 2023 start projects are in the process of getting started. We're in the process of working on designs and should be starting by the end of first quarter with all construction projects. Kathy: Can you just talk a little bit or provide just an overview on what the anticipated projects are construction projects are for 2023? Rachelle: Four major capital projects that we're doing this year, we have landfill gas infrastructure improvements which will be spaced out into two projects. The first one should start at the end of first quarter, beginning of second quarter. We're installing new wells. Improving the footprint of where we're installing the new overlayers, which are our new cells. We do a lot of gas infrastructure there. We install our overliner ourselves. Then the second project will be additional wells and areas across the landfill where we see that there needs to be new wells, we do an assessment of our well field every year then it's an upgrade or an update. The second major project is the overliner or cell infrastructure updates. That will start in the second quarter and run through third, beginning of fourth quarter. We're doing electrical updates around the entire perimeter of our site and our flare station. This will all start in about April or May.</li> </ul>
<p>Kathy Cote Greg Nudd Rachelle Huber Elaine Ko Elaine Marshall</p>	<p>6. Round-Table Update</p> <p>Kathy I didn't have a chance to read the materials that were sent out. Can we get an update on the odor study comments? Elaine: They ranged from just being a general support of the report to being mostly editorial and wanting to correct nomenclature. And then there were some comments, not so much the methodology itself, but. questioning whether the results have enough backing. There was one question about whether it took into account the fact that there are other wastewater sources within the vicinity and the odors may not just be coming from the facility itself. Kathy: In terms of process, so these comments are being evaluated? The odor study is done. What does this mean in practical terms? Greg: The first step is to make sure that we've got the final study in hand and that folks that have raised technical concerns about the robustness of the findings that we think about how to address that. Then the next steps are thinking through how we incorporate this into the enforcement process, thinking through whether we need to do some rulemaking to address the findings. And so that would be the next steps from our</p>

	<p>perspective is this giving us some new tools that we didn't have before to enhance our enforcement process? We have some insights now where we can make some changes in the regulatory environment that would require modifications to operations or physical configurations at the sources that would avoid these odors in the future. Those would be the next steps. The enforcement one would probably be the sooner one just given our current queue for rulemaking at the air district and how this gets prioritized into that queue. Rachelle: There's a section of that report that asks about or suggests or has recommendations. Is the board going to sit down with the sites individually and walk through what they're looking for or is there going to be any conversation with sites and the air board? Greg: I think that's a good idea. Ideally the sites would take as many actions as they think are reasonable and feasible voluntarily, and as soon as possible. And we can talk about getting those checked off the list. Or they may see some insights from the study that leads them to find that there are some other things that they think they can do. They weren't one of the recommendations that would be the first step, certainly before we get into any kind of rulemaking. Any rulemaking would of course involve broad stakeholder participation from the sources and from the impacted community. Kathy: What is the timeline that you're envisioning at this point in terms of finalizing the report? Elaine Ko: I've done an initial review of the comments. We'll be working with the contractors and other internal staff over the next few weeks to address those comments and we're hoping to get the final report out mid February. Elaine Marshall: In terms of process for finalizing the report is that something that will also go to your board and board committees for finalization and acceptance or is this done administratively? Greg: That will be done administratively. Elaine Marshall: If there are recommendations that require funding for implementation? How does that work its way through? Greg: Typically, this would bear the cost of the monitoring system. I see that coming through a rulemaking process. If we do have additional fence line monitoring that comes as a result of this study, that would probably need to come through a rulemaking process so that we could fully examine and have the board make the final decision on that imposition in light of the evidence supporting it. And in light of the understanding of the costs.</p>
Jeanne Serpa	<p>7. Suggested Next Meeting Date</p> <p>Next scheduled meeting April 20, 2023 at 10:30 am – 12 pm via Microsoft Teams</p>
Jeanne Serpa	<p>8. Adjourn</p> <p>10:55 am</p>