



**CITY OF GLENDALE
SUSTAINABILITY COMMISSION
Minutes of Regular Meeting
September 2, 2021 AT 5:30 PM**

1. ROLL CALL – 5:30 PM

- The meeting was called to order on September 2, 2021 at 5:30pm
- Present:
 - Sustainability Commission: Chairperson Bartrosouf, Vice Chairperson Werner, Commissioners Kartounian, Khanjian, and Pinkerton. Ex-Officio Gang and Prado.
 - Glendale Water and Power Commission: President Flanigan Commissioners Jazmadarian, Kedikian, Lall, and Peterson.
- The Agenda for the September 2, 2021 joint special meeting of the Sustainability Commission and Glendale Water & Power Commission was posted August 26, 2021 on the Bulletin Board Outside City Hall

A JOINT SPECIAL MEETING of the Sustainability Commission and the Glendale Water and Power Commission is hereby called to meet at 5:30 PM on Thursday, September 2, 2021, in the Council Chamber, 613 E. Broadway, 2nd Floor, Glendale, CA 91206 to Consider the Following Item(s) of Business, to wit;

2. ACTION ITEMS

- a. Sustainability Office and GWP: Scholl Canyon Biogas Renewable Generation Project (Project) and Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR)

Michael Weber of Stantec Consulting presenting a PowerPoint on the Proposed Biogas Renewable Generation Project.

Proposed Project: Generate electricity through the combustion of landfill gas at Scholl Canyon Landfill
The presentation included Project Benefits, Environmental Review Schedule, Impacts based on project, and Comparison of Project and Alternatives.

Sustainability Commissioner Comments:

- What is the anticipated return on investment by saving the gas rather than burning it?
- Gas production will decrease slowly over time
- Would some emissions be offset by building a pipeline?
- There is currently no powerplant at Scholl—How would power be transmitted to distribution lines.
- What is the projected construction duration?
- Where would the access to Scholl be, Los Angeles or Scholl Canyon Road?
- What measures can be taken to mitigate effects on residents, such as construction noise, air quality, and traffic?
- Define what a “Sensitive Receptor” is for the public.
- How long, in years, will the anticipated Scholl producing enough methane to make the plant viable?
- Has solar PV been considered?
- When comparing alternatives, one was found to be most environmentally sound- how was that conclusion reached and how confident is the research?
- Firetrucks have access to water tanks at the facility if needed.
- Has there been thought of reducing greenhouse gas emissions with this proposed project?
- Would Glendale be emitting more greenhouse gasses if we reduced the number of engines or units and flared more landfill gas?
- Pros/cons of landfill gas being sold to another gas companies
- No costs for the proposed alternative.
- Does the existing pipeline between Scholl and Grayson effect the calculation about constructing a new pipeline through an urban, residential area?
- How is that alternative not environmentally superior to burning this gas at a powerplant near residential homes at Scholl Canyon?
- This project will need a CUP allowance- would the CUP be happening at the same time as the EIR-same meeting, in terms of process?
- Exemption, in terms of aesthetics, of the Ridgeline area only applies to the ‘existing utility’ but this project is considered ‘new development’. This exemption should not apply to a new project
- This exemption is being extended to cover this project as an existing utility.
- Please go into detail of 12 megawatts, state it in terms of how many homes could be powered.
- Is the 12 megawatts base load or peak load?

- Advanced flaring will be happening at this location, regardless of if this project is approved. Does advanced flaring produce less greenhouse gas than conventional flaring? Is this level of analysis reflected in the EIR?
- The flares are not an if but when because it is a new requirement from The Air Quality Management District.
- The information being provided through this EIR is not entirely reflected of what is to be expected in the very near future, when these new flares are installed.
- Can the 40 million dollars being invested into this project be used elsewhere to utilize a different source of renewable energy? Could the other renewable sources get Glendale the 12 megawatts?

Glendale Water and Power Commissioner Comments:

- Please confirm size of project site
- What is the overall size of Scholl Canyon, what is the footprint of project on the site?
- How is the generation equipment at Scholl Canyon different than that at Grayson?
- Page 1.3 of the Final EIR under the section discussing air quality and greenhouse gases: there is a description of new regulations from the South Coast Air Quality Management District that requires the change or upgrading of equipment used to flare natural gas (methane) from biogas facilities. Is it the case, this project was not built, would this require Glendale to build new facilities to meet the requirement- or has that already been done?
- Where is the closest connection to SoCal Gas' infrastructure?
- Would that be losing 25% in comparison with burning it on sight?
- Please discuss the transmission available on site. Is 12 megawatts the capacity or is there availability for more?
- Is there potential for the plant to be reused for cleaner energy in the future?
- Is there additional capacity for future solar development, or future development, on that line?
- How does having 12 megawatts of power produced within Glendale effect the city grid, positively or negatively?
- It was stated that emissions of greenhouse gasses are the same whether you we flare or install or generate the 12 megawatts – Was this intended to specifically mean in the Scholl Canyon area?
- If Grayson would need to burn an additional 12 megawatts to make up this energy while the Methane at Scholl is still being emitted, could Glendale defer the 12 megawatts being burned in Grayson

to the proposed Scholl project? In other words: would this program reduce greenhouse gas emissions overall?

- Was there any consideration in terms of transmission risks: fires, transformers, etc.?
- Are the new flares called the regenerative flares?
- In terms of air quality impact, do the advanced flares have less air quality impact than the engines proposed for this project?
- To clarify: these flares are not going to have a lower CO2 emission?
- In general, is flaring the best way to destroy those pollutants?
- Are The Air Quality Management District's private reserve of offsets purchased to offset the natural gas used?
- Is the City of Glendale going to be paying the cost of the credits?
- Alternative 2 is lacking a cost analysis, making it just a concept at this time.
- If the City doesn't know the cost of Alternative 2, how can the Commissioners make a reasonable recommendation to elected officials and Council members?
- The cleaning of natural gas doesn't seem like a foreign concept, is this technology really non-existent?
- Years ago, steel could not be made without releasing CO2 but now there are a number of companies doing just that!
- This project would be generating energy 24/7, when compared to solar that would only be generating energy for about 5 hours per day.

Public Comments:

- Jackie Gish, a resident in Glenoaks Canyon, presenting on behalf of the Glenoaks Canyon HOA Landfill Committee and The Eagle Rock Association (TERA). Asking for voters to not recommend certification of the FEIR and project as proposed.
- Priscilla Tasha: Advising against the construction of this area, owns 3 homes in the area and claims project will cause environmental burden. Is opposed to the construction of this project because it will result in decrease in property values, worsened air quality, and potential hazards. Compares this project to Aliso Canyon which is home to the largest gas leak in American history. Biogas laws may change causing the plant to be a stranded asset costing the city millions of dollars.
- Helen Mallory: Resident of 25 years. In the DEIR, there were any comments about pertinent material left out of the EIR like Where does the water go? Logistics of the project: 20,000 cubic yards of dirt will need to be moved for this project. Unsafe air has a permitter but there is no way to contain toxic air. Advising the commission to vote against.

- Justin King: A resident of Glenoaks Canyon and a member of the Glenoaks Homeowners Association. Discussing the issue of fire caused by a methane gas pipeline explosion. The Fire Protection Design Basis Plan identifies a methane gas pipeline explosion and a resulting hydrocarbon fireball as the risk that would have the most severe outcome. A fireball resulting from a pipeline explosion would cause equipment failure within 32 meters, roughly 105 feet, and skin burns to personnel within a 60-meter radius, roughly 197 feet. The heat flux or radiant heat exposure experienced within 32 meters is sufficient to cause spontaneous combustion of wood and pilot ignition of wood. Thus, it is possible that a fire could result beyond 100-foot vegetation clearance. The Fire Plan itself concludes “following the fireball, a large hydrocarbon fire would be expected to occur rupturing the LFG pipe until the gas flow is secured. A methane gas pipeline resulting in explosion and resulting fire would likely result in a complete loss of the system at the generate plant.” The Fire Protection Design Basis Plan does not list the explosion at the natural gas line as a potential fire risk. The proposed natural gas line will be above ground and through a steep hillside with dense vegetation. There have been fires in the area within the last year. Advising the commission to vote no on certification.
- Robert Hutchins: Resident of Glendale for 27 years. Lived in the area when the pipeline connecting Grayson and Scholl Landfill was built. The pipeline transported gas and it was used in Grayson. The pipeline was shut down due to air quality around Grayson. Since the sites are linked, there should not be separate EIRs. Sharing a copy of a letter sent by Glenoaks Canyon Homeowners Association’s attorney, Amy Menteer, to the Sustainability Commission. Highlighting section 2: “The FEIR continues to improperly segment the biogas project from the Grayson Repowering Project” on pages 2 and 3 of the letter.
- Owen Lewis: Resident of Glenoaks Canyon. Agreeing with segmenting issue. Disagreeing with the way the EIR dismisses microturbines. EIR does not mention any significant environmental impact of the thousands of gallons of oil and the filters and the thousands of government coolant that have to be replaced and disposed of during this operation. Grayson would be the best site to use due to the available resources. Urging to not approve the EIR and devote more study to the use of a more viable alternative technology deployed at Grayson, in microturbines.
- Marie Freeman: Board Member of Glenoaks Canyon Homeowners Association. Discussing land use issues. In the General Plan, the land use designation is “recreation and open space”. Conditional Use Permit is required but the 3 primary conditions are believed to not be met. All decisions have implications for the future.

- Nina Chomsky: President of the Linda Vista- Annandale Association (LBAA) in Pasadena. Approximately 1,350 homes will be directly impacted by the proposed project. Agenda has an error, says that both commissions are recommending to The Council, but they are recommending to The Planning Commission. This is misleading because The Planning Commission is meeting right away. Concerned about air quality. Adopting the position of Amy Menteer and her legal letter as well the Glenoaks Canyon Homeowners Association. Very concerned about wildfires due to the geography and the natural environment. FEIR is inadequate.
- Han Johnson: President of The East Area Progressive Democrats. Letter from The Chair of the County Board of Supervisors and First District Supervisor, Hilda Solis, to add to oppositions of the proposal. Wildfire threat is evident, there have been multiple fires in the area. Existing pipeline to Grayson is functional and operative. Urge to stop the proceeding of this project and look further into alternatives, in particular utilizing Grayson.
- Michael McDonald: Resident of Eagle Rock and on behalf of The Eagle Rock Association (TERA). Urging Commissioners to recommend no certification of the FEIR and proposed project. Recommending the conversion into a recreation area. This project would have significant impact in noise, air quality, traffic, construction, and fire danger to nearby residential communities of Glenoaks Canyon, Chevy Chase Canyon, Eagle Rock, and La Canada Flintridge. TERA urges for The City of Glendale to abandon the project and to focus on environmentally friendly sources.
- Kate Unger: Resident of Pelanconi Estates. Upset that the project objective was defined as beneficial use before asking the community. Believes the beneficial use is short-term. Doesn't want to see more air quality impacts in this area. Laws may change as time progresses
- Audrey Sarokian: Glenoaks Canyon Homeowners Association Board Member. Opposes the EIR for the power plant. Once the landfill closes, the methane will gradually decrease over time. Once the methane is gone, natural gas will need to be pumped to the plant to continue operations. There are multiple sensitive receptors within a 2-mile radius of the projected site. Stantec is not taking amplified sound into consideration. Neighbors claimed to hear the flares currently in use during the evening. If Alternative 4 was implemented, is there state-of-the-art equipment with emissions controls and filters that can be used to process the methane at Grayson? How many megawatts are needed to power the City of Glendale on a given day or in a given year?
- Walt Kasha: Resident of Glenoaks Canyon for 10 years. Oppose the Scholl Canyon Biogas Project and the EIR. Fire insurance cancellation has been a common issue due to extreme fire risks in the area. The plant would make the

chance of a fire occurring in the area more likely. The next issue is the proximity to the earthquake fault. How will the project look when the landfill closes? How will the project impact the intended future recreation of this site? Why is the natural gas not underground? The report underestimates the project's impact on transportation by not including increased traffic for construction. More groundwater monitoring needs to be done to assure no release and migration of hazardous materials effect the water quality. Similar project in Mimosa Beach, a stock oil initiative in a residential area, where the residents defeated the project. Requesting the landfill be closed as soon as possible and, in the meantime, be used only for Glendale residents, specifically Glendale Canyon Residents.

- David Eisenberg: Scholl Canyon flares currently emit a significant amount of heat which is carrying over into the nearby communities. Double pollution issue- if you don't generate the 12 megawatts of power, you need to search elsewhere for that energy. Advising for Grayson to not take a double burden- if it is not safe to burn this gas at Scholl Canyon, it shouldn't be safe for the same gas to be burned at Grayson- residents have been impacted enough. Landfill gas pipelines cover the hillside. Not advising for or against the project but is requesting a deeper analysis of the heat being produced by the flares and if there is a better alternative.

1. Sustainability Commission Recommendation:

Motion for The Sustainability Commission, having heard staff presentations, reviewed materials, considered public comments, and having deliberated and discussed the available data, should direct staff to provide the following recommendations to the City Council and Planning Commission concerning the certification of the Final EIR and the proposed project:

To not certify the EIR and to reject the Project as proposed for reasons that include the following:

1. The data on the "no project" alternative is out of date since the existing flairs are being replaced with "advanced flaring" with lesser but as yet unknown pollutant levels.
2. It would violate the Glendale Municipal Code by failing to protect primary ridgelines. The EIR asserts that the proposed project would be new and independent when it wants to be separate from Grayson but claims to be an existing utility when seeking exemption from aesthetic impacts on the primary ridgeline. The proposal is a new project with new equipment and independent utility. The facts don't support that it's an existing project.

3. The economic benefits stated as a purpose of the project are speculative and will decline from year to year. It appears that breakeven point could occur at about the time the project is decommissioned. Staff should study this in more detail and provide a report since CEQA does not address the financials.

4. Mr. Eisenberg raised an interesting point about the heat signature. Staff should do a report looking at the average temperatures in the City before and after the flaring system was installed.

5. As other fellow commissioners and members of the public mentioned, we need a holistic approach that considers the totality of our emissions and considers Scholl Canyon LFG as a local resource that could be utilized at Grayson using Best Available Control Technology and incorporating this strategy into the Grayson repowering plan.

6. Segmentation of Glendale's power resource plan does not serve the public interest of powering the City in the least impactful and most economical way possible.

7. The Planning Commission Council should reject the assertion that the Biogas Project and Grayson are separate because they serve different purposes. The facts suggest that they both could achieve the same purposes, they are physically connected, and both must be considered as part of the state mandated Renewable Portfolio Standard.

8. The highest form of environmental stewardship is the reuse of existing resources, so every effort must be made to ensure that Glendale's energy plan integrates existing infrastructure as much as possible. The biogas project does not achieve this.

9. In conclusion, An Integrated Resource Plan must be developed through an Integrative Process, without Segmentation, where everyone works together to achieve regulatory requirements, impact avoidance, power reliability, and cost effectiveness.

10. We need a better indication of the impacts on Scholl of SB 1383 requiring diversion of organic materials from landfills.

11. Microturbines should be revisited; they are in use in other cities.

12. Wants a study of a solar photovoltaic option at Scholl Canyon.

13. Spending \$40 Million on building a gas-burning utility does not seem sustainable when we are trying to shift toward renewables.

Moved by Vice Chairperson Werner
Seconded by Commissioner Pinkerton

Ayes: Bartrosouf, Werner, , Khanjian, and Pinkerton
Noes: Kartounian
Absent: None
Abstain: None

2. Glendale Water and Power Recommendation:

Motion recommending approval of the Final EIR as proposed, taking into consideration concerns about fire issues and any increased risk of wildfire hazards, not just when the plant is running.

Moved by Commissioner Kedikian
Seconded by Commissioner Jazmadarian

Ayes: Jazmadarian, Kedikian, Lall, Peterson, Flanigan
Noes: None
Absent: None
Abstain: None

3. ADJOURNMENT 9:27 pm

Moved by Commissioner Kedikian
Seconded by President Flanigan