

South Bay Odor Stakeholders Group

Meeting Minutes

Date: January 20, 2022

Time: 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Location: Microsoft Teams

Recorder: Republic Services

Attendees: Chia Ling Kong, City of Milpitas; Abhijit Basu, City of Fremont; Anurag Pal, Office of Asm. Alex Lee; Jose Guerrero, City of San Jose; Vanessa Hernandez Pacheco; Jason Nettleton, City of San Jose; Paul Grazzini, BAAQMD; Urvish Mehta, City of Milpitas; Tamiko Endow, BAAQMD; Michael Geiss, Republic Services; Rachele Huber, Republic Services; Dan North, Republic Services; Rich Tran, Mayor, City of Milpitas; Kevin Divincenzo, Republic Services; Tom Pyke, Congressman Ro Khanna; Tamiko Endow, BAAQMD; Tony Ndah, City of Milpitas; Kathy Cote, City of Fremont;

Discussion

Dan North	<p>1. Call to Order and Introductions</p> <p>Call to order at 13:35AM. Dan reviewed meeting etiquette and meeting process.</p>
Dan North SBOSG members	<p>2. Overview of Meeting Minutes from October 21, 2021</p> <p>Dan called to review the meeting minutes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom Pike – mentioned he was present for the 4Q meeting and was added to the attendee list.
Tamiko Endow	<p>3. Regional Odor Study Status Report</p> <p>Tamiko –The AQMD was hoping to have the report reviewed and ready for the 1Q2022 meeting, however the contractor didn’t provide the report until late 4Q2021. The AQMD is currently working with the contractor teams to finalize the reports which should be complete in 4 to 6 weeks. Presentation of the results is being discussed with the contractor and Jerry. Once approved, the reports will be sent to this group and also published on the District’s website.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <p>Tony (COM) – thank you for the update and follow-up on timing. Would like a city council update like was completed at the beginning of the study. Is there a presentation and when/where? Would the AQMD present to the SBOSG? The City of Milpitas would like to have the AQMD present the report findings at the July City Council meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tamiko – Jerry didn’t mention a City council presentation but mentioned that the report will be presenting the findings to the AQMD Board. I did not discuss potential presentations with Jerry but I assume you are correct about presenting to our board first. Do you have a timeline I can share with him? Tamiko will reach out

to Jerry about the July City of Milpitas Council meeting and presenting the findings at this time.

Ling – from the community there is a lot of interest to participate in the results/presentation if there are any dates the community would like to be informed so they can plan to be present and participate. The public is not able to call into the SBOSG call

- Tamiko - ~~Reports are very technical and it would be best if the reports are reviewed fully and presented in terms by the contractors that the public will understand.~~ **I was not aware this meeting was not open to the public. I will share dates of any presentations scheduled.**

Urvish – two things

1. 1/1/2022 – SB1383 anerobic digestion any summary on what the disposal facility's doing to update their operations to meet this requirement?
 2. Summary on SB1383 – is there a conversation to be had and a road map for implementing SB1383?
- Dan - Jurisdictional requirement, each jurisdiction plan is different, however, I believe this subject to be outside the scope of this call and regulatory implementation is outside the scope of this call as well. CalRecycle is the regulatory agency, if you want more information speak with CalRecycle as no requirement to implement Anaerobic Digestion in SB1383. Not the correct forum to implement this task.

Kathey Cote – There will be some interest from the public on the results in laymen's terms. Don't think the SBOSG forum is a good platform for a large public forum but a presentation for the public would be very helpful and if needed we could modify the date of the next quarterly meeting to accommodate.

- Tamiko – ~~Will work with Jerry and work to see if the board presentation is open for the public to attend.~~ **I was not aware this forum was not open to the public – will find out the date/date of public presentation(s) and let the group know.**

Tom Pike – If the first public presentation of the results would be the presentation to the board, then the group would like to know so they can inform those that would like to attend. The group is frustrated with the delay in the report and results. If it is going to take till march to digest the report. Maybe in April the group can ask detailed questions and would like advanced updates before the 2Q SBOSG Call.

- Tamiko – ~~Working on the review at this time and not to the point of discussing the public presentation or when it will be presented to the AQMD board. Jerry mentioned that the report will be made available to the group when it has been finalized. The report is very technical, and it would be more helpful if it was presented in laymen's terms.~~ **I understand the group has been waiting for this data for some time and your frustration. We have the reports now and are focused on reviewing and finalizing the reports. The reports will be shared directly with the group once finalized. We are struggling with staffing issues and the reports are hundreds of pages, so that is our first priority. I'm sure Jerry has thoughts about presentations in his plan, but I did not ask him for details.**

Dan North	<p data-bbox="444 197 935 226">4. Update on MRF Facility Modifications</p> <p data-bbox="396 233 1446 478">Update on the MRF Facility Modifications, Republic is still in the process of obtaining an ATC from the AQMD. When Republic has the ATC, the next step is to complete the building permits with the City of San Jose and which Republic is working to complete by the end of 2022. Republic purchased the required offsets in \$Q 2021 and were received and verified by the AQMD on 1/17/2022. Once the site has the ATC the site will move forward with building permits. Republic is proceeding with urgency and pushing forward with the design updates and required permitting documents, so we are ready.</p> <p data-bbox="396 516 1433 546">Ling – reviewed the plans a while ago, will the design still include wet waste processing?</p>
-----------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dan North - The modifications to the building include, a fully enclosed building and doors that seal. The doors open briefly for entrance and exit of trucks. The areas that contain organic are in a separate air handling system and the air is sent through a filtration system. There will be some organic processing completed through a system called a THOR. This is a large blender/mastication machine suitable for anaerobic digestion or composting. This is a completely different system than what was onsite previously. The offloading of the blended organic material is in an enclosed area. Republic can plan to review the schematic drawing in a future meeting, if it is helpful. • Ling – don't need to review again. Is the organic material from other jurisdiction that will be coming to the facility? Yes. • Ling - Is there an anticipated increase to the volume of the organic waste stream? There is no anticipated increase in the waste stream volume
Dan North	<p>5. Round-Table Update</p> <p>Paul Grazzini – AQMD Odor compliant update for 4Q 2021: October there were 43 complaints all alleging Newby, in November there were 76 complaints all alleging Newby, in December there were 32 complaints alleging Newby and 1 complaint alleging ZWED. During the 4Q of 2021 the following complaints were referred to the LEA 1 complaint in October, 3 complaints in November, 4 complaints in December.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <p>Ling – for the complaints during the 4Q of 2021 were any confirmed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul Grazzini - For Q4, no complaints were confirmed. Most occurred at night and is difficult for the AQMD to follow up on. <p>Ling - There were several days of odor that was frustrating and the process does not seem to be working. Is there an improvement plan for the odor experienced?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul Grazzini – SOP is that when complaints are received during the day an inspector follows up w/in 30 mins. Have noticed a lot of anonymous complaints which are difficult to follow-up on. getting face to face and then tracing it back to a facility. The inspectors are working on strategically placing themselves and then being able to follow-up. AQMD is working on it. <p>Tom Pike – 3Q there was a huge jump and the AQMD was looking for the reason for the large increase. There was no definitive answer found, the working face is at a higher elevation and the potential for impact and odor increases. The odor source identification occurred during this time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TE – The report summary and the complaints, took samples during this time and the contractors are looking into it and the report is addressing. I recall discussion of last meeting and odor study report did detail that the contractors were onsite at a time that odors were being received – not sure if it was at the time of these complaints in particular but report should shed some light on the odor complaints that were received at the time the contractors were taking samples. <p>DN - Site was in the middle of cell construction and during which trash was exposed, Site worked to time the events to be less invasive.</p> <p>Urvish – number of complaints reported. Silicon V odor problem. 2018 – RS has opted out from AB1975(?) Meeting March 2018 BAAQMD – addressing odor issue, then</p>

	<p>Milpitas 3rd party study. Has been an instance due to wildfire, data not collected in 2020. But 2020-21 ... present 2022 cause of odors. Already at a stage where we have public's point to id cause of odor – to improve current situation near landfill facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul – also skimmed report yesterday; believe this was addressed. I would need to familiarize myself with 2018/2019 events – was not working in this area at this time. • TE - The intent of the study was to identify the source of the odors, and I believe it has done so. The report will not be a method to go back and identify the reasons behind complaints received in 2018 and 2019, but we were hoping the study would fingerprint odors to connect complaints to the source in the future. Does this answer your question? <p>Urvish – public funding ... want to see whether the odor study will be helpful for narratives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TE - I believe the study was successful at identifying sources of odors. Once the report is finalized the next step will be addressing odors – minimizing and eliminating. I believe we are on the path to resolution.
Dan North	<p>6. Suggested Next Meeting Date</p> <p>Next scheduled meeting April 21, 2022 at 10:30 am – 12 pm via Microsoft Teams</p>

	<p>Does this date work or do amend? Would we like to have a SBOSG and then have a public meeting?</p> <p>Kathy Cote, let's keep this date as a place holder, Assuming the presentation to the AQMD board is a public meeting, that would be a good forum for us to understand the results. Keep 4/21/2022 can be updated later.</p>
Dan North	<p>7. Adjourn</p> <p>Adjourn 11:27am on 1/20/2022</p>