

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, April 19, 2012
MAG Office Building
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Christine Smith, Phoenix, Chair	Manuel Castillo, Scottsdale
Louis Andersen, Gilbert, Vice Chair	* James Swanson, Surprise
Cindy Blackmore, Avondale	* Mary Helen Giustizia, Tempe
Elizabeth Biggins-Ramer, Buckeye	* Rick Austin, Wickenburg
# Shereen Sepulveda, Chandler	* Rebecca Hudson, Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry
* Robert Senita, El Mirage	Veronica Garcia, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
Frank Lomeli, Glendale	* Jennifer Gale, Keep Arizona Beautiful
Willy Elizondo, Goodyear	Tim Phillips, Maricopa County
* Chuck Ransom, Litchfield Park	Dan Casiraro, Salt River Project
Will Black, Mesa	Alfred Gallegos, Valley Forward
* William Mead, Paradise Valley	
# Rhonda Humbles, Peoria	
# Ramona Simpson, Queen Creek	
Richard Allen, Salt River	
Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	

*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

#Attended by telephone conference call.

OTHERS PRESENT

Julie Hoffman, Maricopa Association of Governments	Maher Hazine, Peoria
Kara Johnson, Maricopa Association of Governments	Patrick Murphy, Mesa
Sam Brown, Scottsdale	Lonnie Frost, Gilbert
Mariano Reyes, Mesa	Brian Kehoe, Maricopa County
Dave Hauser, Republic Services	Jack Minkalis, Gilbert
	Terry Gellenbeck, Phoenix
	Robert Amaya, Phoenix

1. Call to Order

A meeting of the MAG Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) was conducted on Thursday, April 19, 2012. Christine Smith, City of Phoenix, Chair, called the meeting to order at approximately 10:00 a.m. Shereen Sepulveda, City of Chandler; Ramona Simpson, Town of Queen Creek; and Rhonda Humbles, City of Peoria, attended the meeting via telephone conference call.

2. Call to the Audience

Chair Smith provided an opportunity for members of the public to address the Committee on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG or items on the agenda for discussion, but not for action. She noted that according to the MAG public comment process, members of the audience who wish to speak are requested to fill out comment cards, which are available on the tables adjacent to the doorways inside the meeting room. Citizens are asked not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. Chair Smith noted that no public comment cards had been received.

3. Approval of the February 16, 2012 Meeting Minutes

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the February 16, 2012 meeting. Elizabeth Biggins-Ramer, Town of Buckeye, moved and Richard Allen, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, seconded, and the motion to approve the February 16, 2012 meeting minutes carried.

4. MAG Solid Waste Advisory Committee Survey Results

Julie Hoffman, Maricopa Association of Governments, provided an overview of the MAG Solid Waste Advisory Committee Survey results. She noted that a copy of the results were provided in the agenda packet. The survey was distributed March 8, 2012 to the MAG Solid Waste Advisory Committee to assist in stimulating future discussions and activities. Ms. Hoffman indicated that survey results will be very useful as the Committee moves forward.

Ms. Hoffman stated that the first question on the survey asked which solid waste issues/areas of interest would benefit most from regional collaborative efforts. She indicated that recycling participation ranked the highest. Ms. Hoffman noted that the presentation under agenda item eight, Valleywide Recycling Partnership, relates to the topic of regional recycling collaboration in the Valley.

Ms. Hoffman indicated that the second highest response to the first survey question was regional synchronization. She noted that regional synchronization was mentioned in relation to solid waste statistics, partnering on request for proposals (RFPs) and request for bids (RFBs) as well as recycling regional synchronization, in particular the different acceptable recycling items by municipality. Ranked third on the list of solid waste issues/areas of interest for regional collaborative efforts was employing new technologies followed by legislation, education and community outreach, household hazardous waste, solid waste statistics, environmental regulations, and job creation.

Ms. Hoffman stated that the second survey question asked about best practices that jurisdictions would like to share with the Committee. She indicated that responses were provided by Buckeye, Gilbert, Glendale, Mesa, Phoenix, Queen Creek and the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. Ms. Hoffman commented that a couple of the best practices Committee members listed as willing to share also appeared under question number three which asked about best practices Committee members would you like to learn more about.

Ms. Hoffman stated that the survey also asked about areas of the MAG Regional Solid Waste Management Plan that would be beneficial to update. She stated that the MAG Regional Solid

Waste Management Plan was last updated in 2005 and some Committee members have expressed interest in updating the statistics, facilities, jurisdiction information, and goals in the plan.

Ms. Hoffman stated that the final question on the survey asked about “hot topics” the Committee may be interested in discussing. The responses included: waste-to-energy and conversion technologies; funding mechanisms for recycling; recycling options and requirements; and zero waste.

Ms. Hoffman indicated that information from the MAG Solid Waste Advisory Committee Survey will be used to create a list of best practices. She noted that the MAG Management Committee had expressed interest in a list of solid waste best practices for the region. Chair Smith added that the focus of the list of best practices is on programs that can be grown into regional programs versus those that are tailored to specific community needs. She urged the Committee to keep a regional perspective with regard to best practice ideas.

Chair Smith stated that the agenda for this meeting was developed with the survey results in mind. She stated that there were some themes in the survey results, for instance household hazardous waste and green waste. Chair Smith mentioned that there are also topics in the survey results that lead to regional discussions, such as producer responsibility and conversion technology. She commented that the Committee has not talked in depth yet about those topics in particular. Chair Smith mentioned that the topic of conversion technology is a challenging one for this particular region due to the nonattainment area and regional markets. She stated that she is looking forward to more discussions with the Committee. Chair Smith asked if anyone had any comments on the MAG Solid Waste Advisory Committee Survey results.

Louis Andersen, Town of Gilbert, thanked the Committee for their responses to the survey. He commented that the survey is important on determining future direction for the Committee. Mr. Andersen stated that the best practices information provided is valuable.

5. Arizona Department of Environmental Quality Solid Waste Program

Veronica Garcia, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, provided an overview of the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality Solid Waste Program, proposed rulemaking, and the Recycling Fund. She noted that her presentation slides have an emphasis on the new and revised fees for fiscal year (FY) 2013 because ADEQ is currently in the rulemaking process.

Ms. Garcia presented that one of the functions of the ADEQ Solid Waste Program is permitting facilities such as: solid waste landfills, biohazardous waste/medical waste treatment facilities, and special waste storage facilities. Ms. Garcia commented that there are no special waste storage facilities in the state currently; however, the state used to have such facilities. Another function of the ADEQ Solid Waste Program is to issue licenses and permits to other solid waste facilities and transporters. Ms. Garcia noted that septage waste haulers and biohazardous medical waste transporters would fall into this category.

Ms. Garcia stated that the ADEQ Solid Waste Program also conducts periodic inspection of facilities for compliance. She noted that there are a lot of complaint investigations. She indicated that the program also maintains compliance data for regulated entities; provides compliance assistance; and pursues enforcement actions for significant noncompliance.

Ms. Garcia stated that ADEQ also advocates solid waste reduction, reuse, and recycling despite the Recycling Fund sweeps for the past three years. She mentioned that the Recycling Program has been reduced due to the sweeps and ADEQ does not have spending authority for the funds. She

stated that fees are collected; however, they revert back to the General Fund. Ms. Garcia added that despite the diminished activity of the Recycling Program, the ADEQ Communications Officer feels strongly about e-waste recycling and has worked, outside of his normal duties, with communities on e-waste recycling events. She commented that the ADEQ Solid Waste Program staff is grateful for his assistance. Ms. Garcia stated that ADEQ Community Liaisons also work with communities on solid waste clean-up events as well as other solid waste issues such as illegal dumping.

Ms. Garcia stated that the ADEQ Solid Waste Program regulates over 460 facilities and over 1,600 activities. She stated that as part of the program ADEQ conducts approximately 260 inspections and investigates approximately 120 complaints annually. Ms. Garcia noted that ADEQ has seven inspector positions; however, only three positions are currently filled. She mentioned that based on feedback received during the new fee process, the Department has no plan to “grow the program” for the foreseeable future. Therefore, ADEQ plans to hire up to the seven inspector positions but no more. She also mentioned the two plan reviewer positions in the program that write the permits, which are called facility plan approvals.

Ms. Garcia discussed delegation agreements. She stated that ADEQ has delegation agreements with all of the Arizona counties with the exception of Navajo County. With these agreements, the counties determine which functions they will support. She noted that the only ADEQ determined function is landfill permitting; ADEQ is unable to delegate this duty. Ms. Garcia mentioned that functions such as illegal dumping complaints can be included in a county delegation agreement. She added that the county delegation agreements are all very different. Ms. Garcia noted that some delegation duties that the counties takes on give them the ability to charge fees.

Chair Smith asked if the number of inspections and complaints reported are the numbers serviced by ADEQ staff. Ms. Garcia responded yes. Chair Smith inquired about the number of inspections and complaints delegated to other agencies. Ms. Garcia replied that she did not have that number with her, but can report back. Chair Smith asked if there are categories or trends with regard to the complaints received. Ms. Garcia replied that ADEQ receives a lot of used oil complaints. She commented that a challenge in the Solid Waste Program is that there is no de minimis amount for used oil spills. Ms. Garcia indicated that when a used oil dumping complaint is reported, ADEQ investigates that complaint. She noted that ADEQ has a performance measure that is reported to the Legislature that requires the investigation of complaints within five days of receipt. Ms. Garcia stated that ADEQ places an emphasis on complaint investigation because some of the biggest enforcement cases have come from complaint investigations. She added that she will follow up on the number of complaints that have been delegated to the counties and the nature of the complaints.

Ms. Garcia indicated that historically the Solid Waste Program has been funded largely by the General Fund and limited fees from regulated facilities. The fees that have funded the program include landfill registration fees and the special waste management fees. Ms. Garcia commented that the Solid Waste Program is no longer receiving General Fund monies. She discussed that ADEQ was given the authority to establish emergency fees. Ms. Garcia stated that in FY 2009, ADEQ was given authorization for a one-year increase for three solid waste fees. In FY 2010, other funds helped subsidize the program on a temporary basis. Ms. Garcia noted that in FY 2011 and FY 2012, ADEQ was given the authority to increase fees on a temporary basis to allow time for ADEQ to go through the rulemaking process to set permanent fees.

Ms. Garcia stated that House Bill 2705 gave ADEQ the authority to establish new and revised fees for the Solid Waste Program, beginning in FY 2013, in an effort to make the program self-sufficient. She mentioned that it also gave the program the authority to use monies in the Recycling Fund to support other Solid Waste Program activities for services where they can not assess fees. For

example, the Recycling Fund monies could be used for complaint investigations or the used oil management program. Ms. Garcia discussed that following extensive stakeholder involvement, fee rules were drafted and formally proposed in September 2011. Final fee rules will be considered by the Governor's Regulatory Review Council (GRRC) on May 1, 2012. The fee rules are expected to be effective July 1, 2012 (FY 2013). Ms. Garcia commented that there have been some billing issues due to the changes.

Ms. Garcia provided an overview of the proposed fee that will be assessed. She commented that the new waste tire collection site registration fee is a new fee and does not apply to facilities that began operation prior to July 20, 2011. Ms. Garcia mentioned that this matter was negotiated during the stakeholder process. The proposed waste tire collection site registration fee consists of an initial \$500 registration fee and an annual registration fee of \$75, which neither would apply to existing waste tire collection sites operating before July 20, 2011.

Ms. Garcia discussed the used tire storage site registration fee. She commented that there is some conflict in statute on the definition between a waste tire and a used tire. Registration has normally focused on waste tire collection sites and not used tire facilities. Ms. Garcia mentioned that this may be changing.

Ms. Garcia presented on the proposed septage hauler vehicle license fee. She stated that previously ADEQ had been licensing septage haulers at no charge. However, vehicles licensed after June 30, 2012 would now pay an initial registration fee of \$250, and annual renewal fee of \$75. Vehicles licensed before July 1, 2012 pay an initial registration fee of \$75 and annual renewal fee of \$75. Ms. Garcia noted that the septage haulers were some of the most vocal stakeholders given that they are being charged fees by some of the counties already for licensing. She discussed that negotiations between ADEQ and the septage haulers occurred and that ADEQ is required to license the vehicle.

Ms. Garcia discussed the solid waste general permit fees. She stated that the use of general permit is new to the Solid Waste Program. Ms. Garcia indicated that fees are being established although no general permits have been developed or are in use. She noted that general permit fees are based on categories of solid waste. Ms. Garcia provided the fee amount for each category.

Ms. Garcia mentioned the solid waste landfill registration fee. The fee for municipal solid waste landfills is paid annually and based on annual tonnage of waste received at the landfill. She noted that the proposed landfill registration fees are less than the current fees. Ms. Garcia stated that the gained authority to charge fees and the additional new fees have lead to a lowering of the landfill registration fee.

Ms. Garcia discussed the new biohazardous medical waste transporter license fee. She stated that previously there was no charge for biohazardous medical waste transporters licensed by ADEQ; however, new fees include an initial licensing year fee and an annual fee. She noted that there is a maximum licensing year fee cap. Ms. Garcia indicated that stakeholders commented that it is important to have caps on some of the proposed larger fees, such as this one.

Ms. Garcia mentioned the solid waste plan review fee. She stated that this fee of \$122 per hour is comparable to what other departments within ADEQ are charging for hourly permit fees. Ms. Garcia stated that self-certification fees have been in place; however, they not been assessed. The fee rule proposes to have them assessed. Ms. Garcia discussed the special waste management fee and that the proposed fees are lower than current fees.

Ms. Garcia stated that the ADEQ Solid Waste Program staff was asked to look for alternative sources of funding. She indicated that the goal of the program fee rules is to make ADEQ's Solid

Waste Regulatory Program self sufficient through a fee-based program that is not reliant on General Funds. Ms. Garcia noted that the annual budget necessary to operate ADEQ's Solid Waste Program is approximately \$2.3 million. However, she stated that the fees to be implemented in July 2012 are not sufficient to sustain the program. The estimated revenue from the new and revised fees is approximately \$1.1 million. The fees were calculated assuming a significant contribution from the Recycling Fund of about \$1.2 million. Ms. Garcia noted that the Recycling Fund currently receives between \$2.1 to \$2.3 million. She noted that the Recycling Fund has not been available to the Solid Waste Program for the last three years since they have not had the spending authority. She indicated that ADEQ has been working with stakeholders in an effort to avoid another sweep of the Recycling Fund. Ms. Garcia commented that if the Recycling Fund is swept again, the potential for another fee increase may be sought. She stated that, if the Recycling Fund is not reverted back to the General Fund, ADEQ is looking for input on the future of the Recycling Program and how it will move forward.

Will Black, City of Mesa, inquired which stakeholders ADEQ is working with to avoid another sweep. Ms. Garcia replied that ADEQ is working with the Chamber of Commerce and a solid waste association. She also mentioned that Allied Waste and Waste Management were involved. Mr. Black expressed interest in being part of the process and asked if anyone on the Committee was part of that process. Mr. Andersen replied that he was not part of the ADEQ stakeholder process. He commented that cities are contributing 25 cents per ton into the Recycling Fund; however, they have no opportunity for input on what happens to the fund. Ms. Garcia noted that ADEQ is not part of the discussions on the fund either, other than to lobby to try to prevent the fund from being swept. Mr. Black indicated that Mesa contributes \$56,000 per year into the Recycling Fund and would be interested in being a stakeholder. Ms. Garcia appreciated the interest and mentioned that the League of Cities and Towns as well as representatives from some municipalities did participate in the stakeholder process.

Chair Smith asked if anyone in the room was part of the stakeholder process. Ms. Biggins-Ramer stated that she involved herself in the process. She commented that there were some jurisdictions participating in the stakeholder process; however, she believes many of the representatives were not from the solid waste divisions. She added that the private industries were more involved. Ms. Biggins-Ramer commented on the fact that the fee of 25 cents per ton is based on material going in to the landfill. She noted that if recycling is done well, the 25 cent revenue stream will go down, thus hurting the Recycling Fund. Ms. Biggins-Ramer also discussed that the money from the Recycling Fund is not benefitting recycling. She stated that the 25 cent per ton charge is really a tax on disposal. Ms. Biggins-Ramer commented on receiving percentages versus budget numbers. She discussed involving those on the Committee in the process.

Ms. Garcia clarified that the discussions for the future of the Recycling Fund have not occurred yet. She indicated that the stakeholder process that she had mentioned was for the fee rulemaking process. Ms. Garcia discussed that ADEQ is seeking input on the future of the Recycling Fund. Mr. Black stated that it had sounded like the stakeholder process for the Recycling Fund had already started. Ms. Garcia replied that it has not started and the Solid Waste Advisory Committee would be a good forum to discuss the Recycling Fund. Chair Smith asked if there is a timeline in which this discussion would be initiated. Ms. Garcia responded soon and suggested discussing at a future meeting. Chair Smith thanked Ms. Garcia for her presentation.

6. City of Mesa Green Waste Barrel Program

Mariano Reyes, City of Mesa, presented the City of Mesa Green Barrel Program. Mr. Reyes stated that he is a Marketing Communication Specialist for the City of Mesa Solid Waste Management Department. He noted that with Earth Day coming up on April 22nd, the Green Barrel Program is a great topic to discuss. Mr. Reyes indicated that Mesa is proud to offer a program that allows residents to recycle green waste.

Mr. Reyes stated that in FY 2010/FY 2011, the City had 37,410 green barrels in service which equates to approximately one third of Mesa residents participating in the program. Through this program more than 19,000 tons of material was collected in FY 2010/2011. Mr. Reyes indicated that because green waste has a reduced processing fee as opposed to the traditional disposal fee, the City saved over \$87,000 in landfill costs. He noted that four to six routes run daily and the operation runs six days per week. Mr. Reyes noted that the green barrel receptacle is placed on the curb the same day as the blue barrel.

Mr. Reyes stated that the program began with an initial survey to gauge resident interest in a green waste recycling program. After interest in the program was determined, the pilot program began in July 1996. The pilot program was launched in a small area in the southwest quadrant of the City, in a development that had a lot of mature landscaping and potential for green waste. Mr. Reyes added that in order to minimize initial costs for this pilot program, green lids were purchased and placed on existing black barrels instead of purchasing all new barrels. He noted that 50 ventilated barrels were also purchased to test effectiveness at controlling odors and insects; however, the ventilated barrels did not have an impact that warranted the additional cost. Therefore, the City did not move forward with these barrels after the pilot program. Mr. Reyes added that throughout the program, Mesa worked with Maricopa County Health Department to ensure health compliance.

Mr. Reyes stated that the pilot program was strengthened and expanded when a Waste Reduction Grant of \$75,000 was received in December 1996. In September 1997, the program switched to green barrels. Mr. Reyes stated that the program was recommended for citywide expansion in March 1998. The goal for the expansion was to attain citywide implementation by mid 1999. Mr. Reyes indicated that the program was gradually implemented throughout the City, from West to East, to accrue density and maximize route effectiveness.

Mr. Reyes presented the keys to success for establishing the Green Barrel Program. The first key to success was to find a vendor that will accept the green waste material. Mr. Reyes stated that the next key to success was the gradual implementation of the program by geographic zones. He noted that it was important to heavily promote the program to residents in order to gain participation, but also to educate residents on what green waste is accepted. Mr. Reyes commented that their program currently accepts grass, yard clippings, and small tree branches. He stated that grant funding was another component that led to the success of the program. Mr. Reyes stated that the financial incentive to residents also aided in the success of their program. He indicated that the green barrel is half the cost of an additional black barrel. Mr. Reyes introduced Rich Allen, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, to provide an overview of what happens to the green waste material.

Mr. Allen stated that when the City of Mesa approached Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community about the Green Barrel Program they looked into processing the green waste themselves. He mentioned that initially the Salt River Landfill processed the green waste, but currently do not due to the high cost. Mr. Allen added that it was also difficult to market the processed material. He noted that an outside contractor, Western Organics, was hired to process the

green waste. Mr. Allen mentioned that Western Organics also contracts with the City of Phoenix for their Green Waste Program. He stated that the Western Organics facility is able to economically accommodate large amounts of green waste and has established markets for the processed material.

Mr. Allen discussed that the main reason for their involvement with the program is to keep the green waste out of the landfill and to extend the life of the facility. He stated that green waste programs do not result in big financial gain since there is a processing fee on the green waste and they do not receive the benefit of marketing the material.

Mr. Allen indicated that it is projected that the Green Barrel Program is saving approximately one year's worth of air space for every ten years. The Salt River Landfill receives about 40,000 to 50,000 tons of green waste per year from the City of Mesa as well as the Town of Gilbert and City of Scottsdale through their bulk pick up days. Mr. Allen noted that a little over half of the green waste is collected from landscaping companies or self haulers.

Mr. Allen provided an overview of the processing operations. He commented that the material is processed by Western Organics, a subsidiary of Gro-Well. Mr. Allen stated that the green waste is dried and then ground. Water is then added to the ground material. This material is then screened and shipped to another facility that finishes the processing for the marketable material. Mr. Allen stated that the final product is bagged and sold in Lowe's stores. He indicated that another market being explored is the opportunity to use the green waste processed material as a source for biomass fuel. Mr. Allen specified that biomass fuel requires the larger processed green waste material. Once the ground green waste is screened the fine material goes for compost and the larger material would potentially be used for biomass.

Mr. Allen stated that Waste Management is looking to start their own green waste program at the inactive Sierra Estrella Landfill. He stated that they may market their processed green waste material to the Frito-Lay facility in Casa Grande, which is interested in biomass fuel.

Mr. Allen discussed some challenges facing green waste. He indicated that contamination can pose problems for green waste programs. Mr. Allen noted that it is important to educate residents on a green barrel program and bulk green waste pickups in order to maximize the acceptable green waste materials. He added that sorting the green waste can get very costly.

Chair Smith inquired about the percentage of Mesa residents that participate in the Green Barrel Program. Mr. Reyes responded that about one third of residents participate in the program. He added that some residents have more than one barrel. Chair Smith asked Mr. Allen if there is an incentive for landscaping companies that drop off green waste to separate the materials. Mr. Allen replied that the landscaping companies can market that their green waste is not going to the landfill, but they do not receive discounts. He stated that discounts are given to jurisdictions that have agreements with the Salt River Landfill. Chair Smith inquired if palm frawns and oleanders are accepted. Mr. Allen replied that these materials are not accepted. He stated that the Salt River Landfill has an agreement with Western Organics that a certain percentage of ground material (mulch) is available at Salt River Landfill at no extra cost to residents.

Frank Lomeli, City of Glendale, inquired about the contamination rate. Mr. Allen indicated that the contamination rate depends on collection methods. For example, the City of Scottsdale use to collect their material all in one truck, which resulted in a high contamination rate. He noted that the City then had the waste sorted. Mr. Allen stated that if a green waste drop off was more than 40 percent contaminated it would go to the landfill. He added that Scottsdale has since changed its method of collection. Manuel Castillo, City of Scottsdale, stated that was correct; the green waste

could not be deposited if the contamination rate was beyond a certain threshold. Mr. Castillo indicated that Scottsdale has changed their collection methods in order to attain less contaminated loads. Mr. Andersen noted that Gilbert found it more expensive to segregate green waste versus collecting bulk green waste. He indicated that Gilbert does not segregate noncommercial bulk waste; it goes to the landfill. Mr. Allen mentioned that Mesa's contamination rate is lower due to their Green Barrel Program. He noted that the Salt River Landfill will direct landscapers and self haulers to the landfill if the green waste is too contaminated.

Cindy Blackmore, City of Avondale, inquired if the Salt River Landfill has issues with capacity. Mr. Allen responded that not chipping fast enough would be more of an issue. He discussed that the recent recession may have affected green waste production; however, new markets such as biomass may change things.

Mr. Andersen inquired about the set-out rate for the City of Mesa Green Barrel Program. Mr. Black stated that the set-out rate is about 30 percent of the one third. Mr. Andersen asked Mr. Allen if he had any information on the Frito-Lay biomass facility in Casa Grande. Mr. Allen responded that he did not have much information other than he had heard that Waste Management is going to be supplying the facility with the materials. He noted that he is not familiar with a time frame.

Chair Smith inquired if any municipalities take back the processed green waste materials for use in public areas. Mr. Reyes replied that the City of Mesa does not currently use the green waste processed material. Mr. Andersen noted that Gilbert has donated green waste, in particular Christmas trees, to their Wastewater Department.

7. Town of Gilbert Household Hazardous Waste Collection Program

Jack Minkalis, Town of Gilbert, provided an overview of the Town of Gilbert Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) Program. He stated that he is the Manager of the Household Hazardous Waste Facility. Mr. Minkalis indicated that the facility is located at the Public Works South Area Service Center and was opened in July 2007 with an approximate cost of \$800,000. He stated that it is a 4,000 square foot standalone facility with an annual budget of approximately \$350,000. Mr. Minkalis noted that only Town of Gilbert residents may use the facility since it is funded by charges included on the solid waste bill for Town residents.

Mr. Minkalis discussed the hours of the facility and stated that there are currently two full time HHW employees. He noted that approval has been received to add another full time HHW employee in FY 2013. Mr. Minkalis indicated that the HHW Collection Facility has served over 20,000 residents since their first day of operation on July 6, 2007. Since opening the facility has diverted over 1.5 million pounds of waste from the landfill.

Mr. Minkalis presented the pounds per month of HHW that the facility collects, which has slowed in the last few years to approximately a three to five percent annual increase. He discussed the cars served per month. Mr. Minkalis indicated that the cars served has slowed down recently; however, there is still a 10 to 15 percent increase in residents utilizing the facility.

Mr. Minkalis discussed acceptable items at the facility. Some acceptable items include: latex and oil based paints; rimless automobile tires; automotive fluids; pesticides; automobile and household batteries; pool chemicals; household cleaners; fluorescent and compact fluorescent lights (CFL); propane tanks; smoke detectors; fire extinguishers; electronic waste; and many more. Mr. Minkalis noted items that the Town of Gilbert's HHW Collection Facility does not accept. Some non-acceptable items include: business or commercial wastes (for now); tires with rims; ammunition;

fireworks; radioactive materials; 55 gallon drums of materials; large appliances; and medical waste/sharps.

Mr. Minkalis discussed building and worker safety. He stated that the HHW Program's first priority is worker safety. The facility has a ventilation system that provides constant air flow during operations to prevent accumulation of gases or vapors in the building. He mentioned that the building has no heat or air conditioning. Mr. Minkalis added that the facility has a combustible gas detection system, smoke and heat detectors, and overhead sprinklers. The facility is equipped with an explosion proof storage building for unknown materials and potentially reactive materials.

Mr. Minkalis provided an overview of the collection process and what happens to the materials. Once each vehicle is unloaded of their HHW, after verifying residency, the material is weighed and documented into a database. The materials are then sorted. Mr. Minkalis noted that corrosives and pesticides are bulked together and incinerated. Aerosol cans are punctured, emptied of their contents, and the cans are crushed, which are then recycled. Flammable liquids are sent out and reused in fuel blending. Household cleaners are bulked and sent out for disposal. Collected oil and antifreeze are picked up by a local recovery company and recycled into new oil and antifreeze.

Mr. Minkalis indicated that latex paint is recycled. If the collected paint is in good condition, it is reused as paint or primer. If the paint collected is unusable, it is bulked into 55 gallon drums and sent to Amazon Environmental to be recycled. Mr. Minkalis stated that the Amazon facility uses the paint in waste-to-energy burning. However, the reusable paint collected is mixed using a pneumatic mixer and when a consistent color is achieved, the paint is screened and poured into new buckets. This paint is then free to residents of the Town, but also donated to churches, schools, and non-profit organizations. Mr. Minkalis stated that since the facility opened, the HHW program has redistributed 26,344 gallons of latex paint. He indicated that latex paint comprises about 33 percent of the facility's total volume collected for FY 2011. He added that the metal paint cans are crushed and recycled.

Mr. Minkalis discussed other materials that the facility recycles. Fluorescent light and CFL bulbs are recycled. The bulbs are placed into a machine and pulverized. The mercury is captured by a vacuum filter which is then recycled. Mr. Minkalis stated that lead acid, alkaline, and all rechargeable batteries are recycled as well. He noted that the facility pays to have the alkaline batteries recycled instead of sending them to the landfill. Electronic waste is collected by a local electronics company that processes and recycles electronic equipment. He noted that the electronics company erases any harddrive or personal information from the devices. Mr. Minkalis stated that Maricopa County collects the tires at no charge to the Town which are recycled into rubberized asphalt. Propane tanks are picked up by a local refilling company and are recycled free of charge. Mr. Minkalis stated that any product that the HHW facility takes in that is still usable is placed into a swap shop. The swap shop gives away products that are reusable to the public.

Mr. Minkalis stated that the diversion rate for 2009 was 56 percent, 61 percent in 2010, and 85.5 percent in 2011. He stated that the facility has the goal of a 90 to 95 percent diversion rate for 2012. Mr. Minkalis noted that the diversion rate has increased so rapidly due to the recycling of unusable latex paint, which was not previously recycled.

Maher Hazine, City of Peoria, asked if the Town has any events for HHW drop off or if residents drop off HHW during hours of operation at the facility. Mr. Minkalis responded that residents drop off their waste during hours of operation at the site. Mr. Hazine inquired about the annual budget and monthly rate charged to residents. Mr. Andersen replied that it is approximately 50 cents per

month. He stated that Gilbert has approximately 67,000 residents paying the rate in their utility bill. Mr. Hazine asked about the Town's current residential solid waste rate. Mr. Andersen responded that the residential rate is \$17.30 per month for a 96 gallon waste barrel, which includes the HHW facility usage. He stated that the Town is looking at a rate decrease of approximately 7 percent for next year.

Mr. Allen inquired if the Town of Gilbert has investigated working with other jurisdictions on HHW collection. Mr. Minkalis replied that Gilbert has spoken with Queen Creek on partnering. Ms. Biggins-Ramer asked if the full time employees were contracted by Amazon. Mr. Minkalis responded that they are Town of Gilbert employees. Chair Smith inquired if Gilbert evaluated the concept of privately operating the HHW Collection Facility. Mr. Andersen replied that both options of operation were explored. He stated that in the planning phases of the HHW Program, the Town had thought about having two contracted HHW facilities that would take drop offs on an appointment basis. Mr. Andersen noted that prior to the permanent HHW facility, the Town coordinated three HHW collection events per year to collect as much HHW as possible. He stated that the Town found the HHW Program would better serve citizens if run internally. Chair Smith inquired what percentage of residents use the HHW Collection Facility. Mr. Andersen replied that the percentage of residential usage of the facility is low. He stated that Gilbert is currently working on an outreach plan for the Town's recycling efforts which may increase usage of the HHW Collection Facility. Mr. Andersen noted that the facility is servicing approximately 5,000 cars per year and many are return customers.

Chair Smith inquired if any Committee members wanted to add information about HHW programs in their jurisdiction and if there were any other permanent facilities for HHW. Shereen Sepulveda, City of Chandler, stated that Chandler has a HHW program and facility. She noted that Chandler works hand in hand with Gilbert but the Chandler HHW Program differs. Ms. Sepulveda discussed that the Chandler facility does not have full time staff dedicated to HHW operations. The staff is also responsible for operating the recycling solid waste collection center. She added that staff in the field also occasionally work the facility. She indicated that the Chandler HHW facility operates on specific hour/day schedules and by scheduled appointments by Chandler residents. Ms. Sepulveda commented that the Chandler program serves approximately 3,000 residents. She noted that the numbers are comparable to Gilbert. She stated that approximately 65 to 70 percent of the HHW collected is being recycled or reused. The Chandler HHW program annual budget, not including employee salary and benefits, is approximately \$65,000 per year due to the measures in place for material diversion. She commented on a paint reuse program. Ms. Sepulveda stated that Chandler looked strongly at what Tempe and Gilbert were doing in terms of their exchange program for residents. She added that Chandler works with clean up projects in the community and also self help programs. Ms. Sepulveda added that Chandler sends a large portion of their latex paint to Amazon Environmental.

Chair Smith inquired if the Committee was interested in discussing potential regional HHW collection events. She added that HHW was mentioned several times in the survey results. Ms. Biggins-Ramer responded that she would be interested in that discussion and also a discussion on potential regional use of the permanent HHW collection facilities in the Valley to serve as a clearinghouse.

Ms. Sepulveda stated that when Chandler investigated opening a permanent HHW collection facility versus holding HHW collection events periodically throughout the year, they found that despite the higher cost of operating a permanent facility, a permanent collection facility collected a higher

volume of HHW. She added that a permanent facility is more convenient for residents which will hopefully curb improper disposal of HHW.

8. Valleywide Recycling Partnership

Terry Gellenbeck, City of Phoenix, presented the history of the Valleywide Recycling Partnership (VRP). He stated that the program started from an Eastside Recycling Coordinators meeting with a desire for a recycling subcommittee that had a collaborative focus. Mr. Gellenbeck indicated that he volunteered to set up the VRP Program which started out with seven communities in 1999. The VRP focused on similarities between regional recycling programs, rather than differences. Mr. Gellenbeck stated that in 2001 Valleywide Recycling Partnership won a MAG Desert Peaks Award for the program's work. He mentioned that grant money assisted in starting VRP. The VRP now has 20 members. Mr. Gellenbeck introduced Robert Amaya, City of Phoenix, to discuss the current efforts of VRP.

Mr. Amaya noted that many communities participating in VRP are represented on the MAG Solid Waste Advisory Committee. He stated that VRP meets twice per year. Representatives from Arizona Food Marketing Alliance (AFMA) were present at the last VRP meeting and the president of AFMA, Tim McCabe, spoke on the issue of plastic bags. Mr. Amaya added that a representative from Strategic Materials Glass was also present at the most recent VRP meeting.

Mr. Amaya discussed that VRP aids members with regard to educational efforts. He indicated that VRP's website contains a link to each participating municipality website to view their educational effort. Mr. Amaya stated that most of the municipalities have their curriculum, usually for kindergarten through high school, available for use. Mr. Amaya stated that the VRP website also has radio and television advertisements available to view, but also for use as educational tools. Mr. Amaya played a short commercial that is available on VRP's website that talks about the benefits of recycling.

Mr. Amaya stated that VRP participates in community events like the Home and Garden Show. He thanked Maricopa County for assisting VRP at those events. VRP also has a community outreach booth at the Phoenix International Raceway for NASCAR events. Mr. Amaya noted that VRP partners with Basha's Grocery Store, in which VRP sets up information tables outside their stores. Mr. Amaya noted the Valleywide Recycling Partnership website, www.recyclevrp.com. Mr. Amaya thanked the VRP participants for their support. He noted that VRP is currently speaking with the Gila River Indian Community as they implement their recycling program.

Ms. Blackmore thanked VRP for their presentation. She stated that she regularly attends the VRP meetings and noted that VRP is a great resource for Recycling Coordinators. She indicated that VRP is a model for regional collaboration and a great group to be a part of.

Chair Smith stated that funding has been a significant challenge for many municipalities with the economy. She indicated that because of the economic times, advertising and outreach efforts have diminished. Despite this challenge, Valleywide Recycling Partnership has provided outreach and advertising tools for communities to utilize.

9. MAG Solid Waste Information Management System Database

Ms. Hoffman discussed the MAG Solid Waste Information Management System (SWIMS) database. She indicated that interest was expressed at a previous meeting about the database and the potential to update it. Ms. Hoffman stated that the SWIMS database was established as part of the 1991 MAG Regional Waste Stream Study. The SWIMS database was then used to produce the 1993 MAG Regional Solid Waste Management Plan. Ms. Hoffman stated that SWIMS was a planning instrument that incorporated socioeconomic, waste generation, waste disposal, and recycling assumptions. She indicated that the database could calculate past trends, current activities, and future projections based on different scenarios. Originally, SWIMS was created using 1989 data and was last updated in 1998 following a solid waste information collection effort and the 1997 ADEQ Annual Waste Reduction and Recycling Survey. She added that national data was also incorporated. In terms of updating the database, Ms. Hoffman noted that SWIMS was based on outdated technology platform that is no longer supported. In order to update the information, a new database would need to be created.

Mr. Andersen indicated that data collection for a potential plan update seems to be a more feasible option than recreating the SWIMS database. He mentioned that jurisdictions appear to be more interested in the data for benchmarking ability and general information which could be adequately supported through information collection rather than recreating a database.

10. Call for Future Agenda Items

Chair Smith asked the Committee for suggestions on future agenda items. She mentioned that the Committee is investigating a potential conference call with Los Angeles County on their recent efforts regarding conversion technologies. Mr. Andersen mentioned that an update on Arizona biomass facilities would be interesting. Mr. Allen stated that he can contact Western Organics regarding this matter. Chair Smith asked if the Committee had any successful public/private partnerships that they would like to share. No responses were noted.

11. Comments from the Committee

Chair Smith asked for any comments from the Committee. Mr. Allen mentioned that the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community is holding an Earth Day event on April 21, 2012. He stated that the Community will be coordinating numerous clean ups, planting trees, holding an Environmental Fair, and also collecting HHW.

Ms. Sepulveda commented on the suggestion for a future agenda item on biomass facilities. She indicated that Chandler has been contacted by companies involved in gasification systems. Ms. Sepulveda commented on including this during a potential discussion on biomass. She inquired if anyone else could share if they have been contacted by these companies and their experience. Chair Smith commented on including this discussion with a presentation from Los Angeles County on conversion technologies. She noted that City of Phoenix has been approached on the matter of biomass as well.

Chair Smith discussed having an agenda item discussing Glendale's Gas-to-Energy Project. Mr. Lomeli offered to present on the project or to set up a site tour of the facility. With no further comments, Chair Smith thanked the Committee for participating and called for adjournment of the meeting at 11:43 a.m.