

1 OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL
2 SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
3 ERIKA CHAVEZ, State Bar No. 265247
4 PRINCIPAL DEPUTY DISTRICT COUNSEL
5 21865 Copley Drive
6 Diamond Bar, California 91765
7 Tel: (909) 396-3400 • Fax: (909) 396-2961
8 E-mail: echavez@aqmd.gov
9 Attorneys for Petitioner
10 South Coast Air Quality Management District

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**BEFORE THE HEARING BOARD OF THE
SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT**

In the Matter of

SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY
MANAGEMENT DISTRICT,

Petitioner,

v.

ORGANIC ENERGY SOLUTIONS
[Facility ID No. 184672], R3
SUSTAINABILITY,

Respondents.

Case No. 6292-1

**DECLARATION OF MELISSA
MENDOZA**

Hearing Date: August 19, 2026
Time: 9:30 a.m.
Place: Hearing Board
South Coast AQMD
21865 Copley Drive
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

I, Melissa Mendoza, declare:

1. I am employed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District as an Air Quality Engineer II. If called as a witness, I would testify to the following based on personal knowledge.

2. I am familiar with the Permits to Construct originally issued to Organic Energy Solutions (Fac. ID 184672) on December 31, 2019. Respondent OES was originally issued Permits to Construct Application Numbers (A/N) 594048-9, 594052, and 610611-4 for the following equipment at the facility.

- a. Food Waste Anaerobic Digestion Operations (A/N 594048);
- b. Digester Gas (Biogas) Handling and Treatment System (A/N 594049);
- c. Flare, digester gas fired (A/N 594052);
- d. Air Pollution Control System (Selective Catalytic Reduction Unit No. 1) (A/N 610611);
- e. Air Pollution Control System (Selective Catalytic Reduction Unit No. 2) (A/N 610612);
- f. Cogeneration System (Internal Combustion Engine, No. 1)(A/N 610613);
- g. Cogeneration System (Internal Combustion Engine, No. 2)(A/N 610614);

3. On January 30, 2025, Respondent's A/Ns 594048-9, 594052, 610611-4 were denied Permits to Operate, for failure to conduct source testing, failure to provide operational records, and failure to provide procedural information, such that it could not be demonstrated pursuant to Rule 212 that the equipment complied with Division 26 of the State Health and Safety Code and all the requirements set by the Rules and Regulations of the South Coast AQMD. A true and correct copy of the Denial Letter is attached to the Petition as Exhibit A.

4. My understanding is that OES was unable to complete source testing pursuant to its permit conditions and source testing protocol because the plant was unable to operate at 80% or greater than the maximum food waste slurry throughput rate. OES did not submit applications to Engineering and Permitting for a change of condition, request a variance, or submit a new source testing protocol, after identifying that they would be unable to source test in compliance with permit conditions.

5. South Coast AQMD Rule 214 prohibits South Coast AQMD from accepting a permit application for equipment covered by the denied permit unless the applicant has overcome the reasons for denial.

6. Respondents are unable to overcome the reasons for denial, including failure to source test, because Respondents do not have a currently approved source testing protocol, nor a permit to construct with conditions to allow for operation to test.

7. The Proposed Order for Abatement conditions contain increments of progress to

1 require both the permit application submittal and the necessary source testing of the equipment to
2 demonstrate compliance with emissions limits.

3 8. The Proposed Order for Abatement conditions also include several equipment
4 specific conditions, which were originally found in the previously issued Permits to Construct.

5 9. The Proposed conditions also require Respondents to provide an inventory of
6 equipment and produce operation records, so that Petitioner may evaluate actual emissions at the
7 facility and learn of any additional equipment that may need Permitting.

8 10. My understanding is that Respondents can comply with the Proposed Order for
9 Abatement conditions.

10 11. Potential daily emissions for continued operation of the equipment were previously
11 calculated, based on each equipment's potential to emit evaluated in the original Permits to
12 Construct. See table below. The equipment's potential to emit will be re-evaluated during review
13 of Respondents' applications.

Criteria Pollutant	Total Facility Emissions (lb/day)
Carbon monoxide (CO)	98.9
Nitrogen Oxides (NOx)	21.99
Particulate Matter 10 (PM10)	21.51
Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	20.65
Sulfur Oxides (SOx)	3.96

14
15
16
17
18
19
20 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

21 Executed on August 13, 2026 at Diamond Bar, California.

22
23 

24 Melissa Mendoza