

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

Tuesday, December 5, 2017  
MAG Office Building  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Rhonda Humbles, Peoria, Chair	Richard Allen, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Patrick Murphy, Mesa, Vice Chair	Manuel Castillo, Scottsdale
Javier Machuca for Cindy Blackmore, Avondale	# Christina Betz, Surprise
Susan Avans for Robert van den Akker, Buckeye	# Jason Browne for Tony Miano, Tempe
* Sheree Sepulveda, Chandler	* Helen Heiden, Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry
# Nick Russo, El Mirage	Robin Thomas, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
* Frank Flores, Gilbert	* Chris Coyle, Arizona Forward
* Torrance McDonald, Glendale	Michael Denby, Arizona Public Service
Adam Kurtz, Goodyear	Jill Bernstein, Keep Arizona Beautiful
* Chuck Ransom, Litchfield Park	Brian Kehoe, Maricopa County
* Jerry Cooper, Paradise Valley	* Wendy Crites, Salt River Project
Joe Giudice, Phoenix	
Ramona Simpson, Queen Creek	

\*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

#Attended by telephone conference call.

+Participated via video conference call.

OTHERS PRESENT

Julie Hoffman, Maricopa Association of Governments	Aaron Redd, City of Peoria
Kara Johnson, Maricopa Association of Governments	Jason Jordan, Pinal County
	Bill Campbell, Arizona State University

1. Call to Order

A meeting of the MAG Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) was conducted on Tuesday, December 5, 2017. Rhonda Humbles, City of Peoria, Chair, called the meeting to order at approximately 10:00 a.m. Christina Betz, City of Surprise; Jason Browne, City of Tempe; and Nick Russo, City of El Mirage, attended the meeting via telephone conference call. Chair Humbles encouraged Committee members to speak into the microphones so that the audience and teleconferencing members can hear.

Chair Humbles indicated that copies of the handouts for the meeting are available. She noted for members attending through audio conference, the presentations for the meeting will be posted on the

MAG website under Resources for the Committee agenda, whenever possible. If it is not possible to post them before the meeting, they will be posted after the meeting.

2. Call to the Audience

Chair Humbles 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 Humbles noted that no public comment cards had been received.

3. Approval of the June 20, 2017 Meeting Minutes

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the June 20, 2017 meeting. Manuel Castillo, City of Scottsdale, moved, and Ramona Simpson, Town of Queen Creek, seconded, and the motion to approve the June 20, 2017 meeting minutes, carried unanimously.

4. Municipal Diversion Rates

Chair Humbles stated that at the June 20, 2017 Committee meeting, interest was expressed by the Committee for a discussion in how municipal diversion rates are formulated and what factors are included in the rates. She indicated that this agenda item provides an opportunity for jurisdictions to discuss their diversion rates.

Ms. Simpson stated that the Town of Queen Creek diversion rate includes residential trash and recycling. She added that commercial trash and recycling is not included in the diversion rate. Ms. Simpson indicated that Queen Creek's diversion rate is the recycling divided by the total trash and recycling tonnages to determine the percentage that was recycled. She stated that sometimes other communities may include commercial or other streams into their diversion rate; however, Queen Creek only includes residential trash and recycling. Ms. Simpson noted that there is a challenge in comparing diversion rates to other communities due to the difference in factors, for example what is included in the rate and how the diversion rate is calculated.

Patrick Murphy, City of Mesa, reported that the City of Mesa has two diversion rates. He indicated that the first rate is determined from curbside recycling. Mr. Murphy indicated that the second diversion rate includes green waste. He indicated that Mesa has commercial recycling; however, it is not included in the diversion rates.

Adam Kurtz, City of Goodyear, stated that only residential is included in the diversion rate; the City of Goodyear does not provide commercial recycling. He added that the materials diverted by the Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) and Electronic Waste Programs are included in the diversion rate.

Javier Machuca, City of Avondale, indicated that the City of Avondale includes residential trash and recycling, bulk trash collections, and green waste in determining the diversion rate.

Joe Giudice, City of Phoenix, indicated that a major challenge with residential recycling programs is that the recycling is measured by weight, yet the traditional residential recycling streams are

becoming lighter. Mr. Giudice stated that when recycling is measured by weight it appears that programs are going backwards; however, it is because many heavy items are no longer in the recycling containers, for example, newspapers and phone books. He commented that this is a challenge many communities are facing around the country in that diversion rates are in place, yet there is a transition to lightweight plastics that reduces the weight of recycling materials. Mr. Giudice commented that many of the efforts to reduce, reuse, and recycle are good, it simply presents a challenge to communities that measure diversion to include other factors into the rate. He commented that when a society has made a transition from paper to electronic forms, how is the diversion of materials that would have gone to the landfill measured.

Mr. Giudice discussed the City of Phoenix diversion rate. He stated that the City does not provide commercial recycling collection; however, commercial haulers do bring materials to the City's two transfer facilities. Mr. Giudice indicated that the City measures diversion from a number of its programs, including residential recycling, HHW programs, and specialized programs, such as the Mattress Diversion Program and compost. The City of Phoenix is also looking into offering curbside textile recycling to divert textiles from the waste stream. Mr. Giudice noted that cities with diversion goals in other parts of the country are projecting diversion from garage sales and donations to charitable organizations. He commented that garage sales and donations are diverting material from the landfill; however, it is difficult to measure accurately. Mr. Giudice stated that Phoenix took part in a discussion sponsored by the City of Seattle in which diversion and how to measure diversion is a growing question. He noted that Phoenix is interested in working with other communities around the country on diversion strategies.

Jill Bernstein, Keep Arizona Beautiful, noted that the challenges with regard to diversion are not likely to end, just evolve.

Michael Denby, Arizona Public Service, indicated that APS has a significant investment in material recovery. Mr. Denby noted that APS has an operation in Deer Valley where it determines if items are recyclable, reusable, or can be sold. He stated that electronic waste is big for APS due to the large amount of computers used at its facilities.

Richard Allen, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, stated that tracking a diversion rate at the Salt River Landfill is difficult due to a number of communities bringing in material. He indicated that the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC) has residential curbside recycling. Mr. Allen noted that commercial recycling is currently collected by Republic Services; however, SRPMIC is looking into collecting commercial recycling. He stated that there is a recycling facility located at the Salt River Landfill that was recently purchased by Republic Services. The facility captures material from Mesa, Scottsdale, commercial haulers, and more. Mr. Allen noted that the facility captures approximately 60,000 tons of material. He indicated that approximately 40,000 tons of green material is diverted each year from the landfill that comes from a variety of sources, such as the City of Mesa, City of Scottsdale, landscapers, and self-haulers. Mr. Allen stated that diversion rates are difficult for the landfill since municipalities have already captured the diversion in their own rates.

Susan Avans, City of Buckeye, stated that the City of Buckeye contracted provider, Republic Services, reports the diversion rate for residential recycling. The City allows other private providers to collect commercial recycling. Ms. Avans indicated that Buckeye is collecting diversion information from its HHW and electronic waste collection, which are conducted by several different entities. She stated that the material collected during bulk collection is not always recycled, so it is not included in the diversion rate. Ms. Avans commented that previously Buckeye had separated

out green waste during bulk collection; however, the City could not provide enough green waste, due to low participation, to support the program. She stated that green waste is still collected through bulk trash; however, it is not being diverted from the landfill. Ms. Avans noted that Buckeye may revisit green waste diversion in the future due to the population growth in the City.

Robin Thomas, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, stated that the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) performs waste diversion in the office. She indicated that ADEQ is working to promote recycling in other state offices. Ms. Thomas noted that ADEQ is interested in what other communities are doing with regard to diversion. She indicated that ADEQ recognizes the challenges with regard to diversion rates that have been mentioned by the Committee.

Ms. Bernstein reported that she recycles at her office.

Brian Kehoe, Maricopa County, reported that Maricopa County operates six transfer stations. He indicated that many of the transfer stations are located adjacent to closed landfills. He stated that all green waste is chipped and used as erosion control on the closed landfills. Mr. Kehoe stated that all green waste is diverted, approximately 10,000 tons of green waste is processed every month. He added that the transfer stations are strictly residential drop off centers in which they do not have scales. Mr. Kehoe noted that there are weight tickets when material is taken to the landfills. He reported that approximately 40 to 50 percent of material brought to the transfer stations is recycled or reused as erosion control at the landfill.

Mr. Castillo stated that the City of Scottsdale includes any materials diverted from the landfill in their diversion rate. He noted that appliances, moving boxes, commercial recycling, and residential curbside recycling are some of the factors included in the diversion rate. Mr. Castillo indicated that a solely residential curbside recycling diversion rate can be supplied for comparison to other communities who only include residential recycling.

Chair Humbles inquired how diversion of moving boxes is calculated. Mr. Castillo replied that the moving boxes are collected every Wednesday and the numbers are calculated when the moving boxes are dropped off at the material recovery facility. Chair Humbles asked if there is a truck dedicated to collecting moving boxes. Mr. Castillo responded that there is a truck dedicated to collecting just moving boxes.

Ms. Betz reported that the City of Surprise diversion rate is calculated similar to how others have discussed for residential trash and recycling. She indicated that the diversion rate includes the residential recycling programs; the City does not operate a commercial program. Ms. Betz stated that items such as HHW or appliances diverted from the landfill are also included in the diversion rate. She commented that the Surprise education and outreach to reduce contamination has impacted the diversion rate in that the diversion rate, that is calculated by weight, has slightly declined with the contamination reduction. Ms. Betz indicated that the City diversion rate is approximately at 21 or 22 percent based on materials collected through the residential program.

Mr. Browne indicated that the City of Tempe diversion rate sounds similar to other communities; however, Tempe includes some additional programs. He stated that the City recently began expanding the collection of green waste for residents throughout Tempe. Mr. Browne reported that the City is also collecting inert material such as rock and heavy soil to be reused in parks or by residents. He noted that Tempe is also looking to divert more commercial and industrial material from roll off containers. Mr. Browne indicated that Tempe is looking into multiple pilot programs, such as food waste and an in-vessel for composting.

Mr. Russo reported that Parks & Sons of Sun City is the City of El Mirage contracted provider for residential trash and recycling. He stated that the diversion rate provided by Parks & Sons of Sun City includes residential collection and bulk collection twice a year.

Chair Humbles inquired if communities recycle Christmas trees or chip them for use in parks. Ms. Simpson replied that Queen Creek offers two Saturdays in which residents can drop off their Christmas trees.

Ms. Simpson commented that in Queen Creek it is approaching budget season in which performance measures and goals are established. She stated that issues such as decline in the weight of materials and what materials are recycled present challenges. Ms. Simpson noted that in previous years, a 25 to 30 percent diversion rate was the sign of a successful residential recycling program. She indicated that Queen Creek has an HHW contract with the Town of Gilbert, as well as collection of latex paint through Green Sheen at special events, and appliance recycling. Ms. Simpson inquired how could all of these forms of diversion be crafted into a performance measure. She commented that with the current commodity market being down and other challenging factors, should the measure of success be the percentage of trash that is recycled. Ms. Simpson commented on the inclusion of other specialized programs into the diversion rate. She asked if other communities have diversion performance measures or goals other than a specific diversion rate.

Ms. Bernstein commented that the goal for recycling and diversion is resident behavior change. She asked if a measure could be built around participation. Ms. Simpson replied that participation can be tracked for things such as when residents set out their recycling containers and how frequently. However, she indicated that participation rates do not include what is being recycled and how well residents are recycling. Ms. Simpson noted that all of the information is tracked, including how many people participate in the special events and the number and tonnage of Christmas trees brought in; however, the challenge is translating that information into a performance measure or goal.

Ms. Simpson stated that she is looking to present options for performance goals other than a single recycling rate. She commented on the contamination being presented as a performance measure; however, the diversion rate typically declines when contamination is reduced due to non-recyclable materials being removed from the recycling container. She asked if other communities are seeking to change their goals to better represent the success of their programs.

Mr. Giudice discussed contamination. He stated that items removed as contamination after they have passed the scales at the Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) may not be discounted from the diversion rate. He noted that contamination in the recycling container costs recycling programs money. He stated that contamination in the recycling stream costs money to process the material, diminishes product quality, and the materials are not being diverted from the landfill. Mr. Giudice added that the Committee should have a future discussion on the changes to the commodity market which is having an impact on the solid waste industry. He indicated that the City of Phoenix is working to help residents perceive trash as a commodity and attract businesses that re-purpose those products. Mr. Giudice stated that the City of Phoenix palm silage is scheduled to begin processing in February 2018 and that the City is looking into textile recycling. He discussed that Phoenix is interested in cost-effective methods to divert materials from the landfill. Mr. Giudice commented that cost-effective alternatives can be a challenge with low landfill costs.

Mr. Giudice responded to the question on performance measures. He suggested that they not be overly complicated since that can create additional challenges.

Ms. Simpson asked if other communities have separate goals for the specialized programs or if all of the material is included in a single diversion rate goal. Mr. Giudice replied that in Phoenix, if material would have been sent to the landfill and was not, it is included in the diversion rate.

Chair Humbles inquired if communities that offer commercial recycling in addition to residential recycling, have separate or combined diversion rates. Mr. Browne responded that the City of Tempe has separate diversion goals for multi-family, residential, and commercial. He stated that the three groups are hard to group due to differences. He indicated that the diversion goal for residential is much higher than multi-family. Ms. Simpson asked if specialized programs are included in the Tempe residential goal. Mr. Browne replied that any material diverted from the landfill is being included in the diversion rate. He added that bulk collection, green waste, HHW, and Christmas trees are all included in the diversion rate. Mr. Browne stated that the City of Tempe is also looking into options to collect Christmas trees from other municipalities so they would not go to the landfill.

Mr. Murphy added that the City of Mesa does not include specialty items such as Christmas trees, front-load comingled, and HHW; however, Mesa may look into including those items into the diversion rate in the future.

Chair Humbles stated that the City of Peoria diversion rate currently includes residential recycling. She stated that the Peoria diversion rate is approximately 23-24 percent. Chair Humbles stated that the diversion rate may increase if the City included the twice a year bulk trash collection and HHW collected at events.

Chair Humbles asked if communities with contracted private providers have language in their contract in which the service provider is to supply the trash, recycling, and diversion information. Ms. Simpson replied that their contracted service provider, Right Away Disposal (RAD), is required to provide all of that information. She added that all Queen Creek material is tracked separately by the private provider and they supply the Town with a monthly breakdown of the trash and recycling information. Ms. Simpson noted that Queen Creek tracks information at the special events and the Town of Gilbert provides a report of all HHW material collected from Town of Queen Creek residents.

Chair Humbles asked if the Queen Creek report is broken down by day, in which the Town would know if a certain area had higher recycling contamination so that the area can be targeted for increased education and outreach. Ms. Simpson responded that the Town currently tracks by zones monthly. She indicated that it is possible to break it down farther. She stated that Queen Creek also has a detailed inspection program. Ms. Simpson indicated that Queen Creek will be conducting a recycling audit with RAD in which one area of the community will be audited to determine the largest issues in that area. She stated that the Town will then perform enhanced and specialized education and outreach in that area. Ms. Simpson stated that RAD will conduct an audit for the same area after six months to assess the success of the enhanced outreach and education.

Ms. Avans asked Queen Creek if the report on HHW material collected is broken down by weight or type. Ms. Simpson replied that both weight and type are reported to Queen Creek for each voucher that was used at the Town of Gilbert facility. She mentioned that the Town contracts with Green Sheen for collection of latex paint at special events which saves Queen Creek money. Ms. Avans responded that the City of Buckeye utilizes Green Sheen as well.

Ms. Avans inquired about what other communities do to address recycling contamination, in particular with regard to education/outreach and enforcement. Mr. Browne replied that the City of

Tempe utilizes a combination of both education/outreach and enforcement. He stated that Tempe conducts special events and other types of education and outreach; however, the City is also looking to increase solid waste audits. Mr. Browne stated that Tempe recently approved a new program called SMART - Save Money and Recycle Tempe that will offer different size trash containers with a corresponding cost level to encourage recycling. He indicated that a smaller trash container would cost a smaller fee; however, the City is aware some residents may purchase the smaller trash container that may be too small for their needs while contaminating the recycling container with trash. He noted that the audits will be needed to address this issue.

Ms. Avans asked if the smaller trash container was a 64 gallon size. Mr. Brown responded that the container sizes offered would be 48, 64, and 96 gallons. He commented that the smaller trash container sizes are significantly more affordable than the 96 gallon size, which would offer the residents a cost benefit for increased recycling. Mr. Browne stated that the City is aware that contamination of recycling and green waste containers may increase; however, Tempe is planning to be proactive with their inspection team.

Ms. Betz replied that City of Surprise focuses more on education and outreach with regard to contamination. She stated that the City conducts outreach programs. Ms. Betz commented on a successful interaction with residents on their Facebook social media page. She noted that the City posted audit results that included contaminated items found in the audit and the consequences contamination has on their recycling program. She noted that this post received the most amount of likes than any of their other posts have received and the post was also tagged and shared. Ms. Betz commented that Surprise has had success with using social media to encourage residential perspective change. She stated that education and outreach is a good focus to help achieve performance goals.

#### 5. Regional Solid Waste Management Data

Julie Hoffman, Maricopa Association of Governments, stated that the Committee has expressed interest in collecting updated regional solid waste management data. She reported that the previous data collection effort was conducted in 2013. Ms. Hoffman noted that these materials are provided at each place and on the MAG website. The previous information compiled included: MAG Residential and Commercial Breakdown of Solid Waste Generation Summary; MAG Solid Waste Management Facilities Summary; MAG Member Agency Solid Waste Management Programs; Recycling Material Collected; and Solid Waste Rates and Services. In addition, Ms. Hoffman indicated that there has also been interest expressed in the following topics: how Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) televisions are processed in other jurisdictions; how cities and towns set up new homes with service and if there are new home set up fees; what contractors are charging for HHW and other services; and municipal solid waste landfill positions, equipment, and schedules by jurisdiction.

Ms. Hoffman inquired about what information the Committee would like to collect that would be the most useful. She stated that perhaps some of the items could be a discussion at a future meeting. Ms. Hoffman began by asking if the information on the MAG Residential and Commercial Breakdown of Solid Waste Generation table would be beneficial to send to the MAG member agencies to collect updated information. She noted that the table features data from 2012. Ms. Hoffman commented that it can be challenging to compare municipalities when the services offered differ by community. Mr. Giudice responded that the City of Phoenix recently came across a situation where all solid waste data for the City of Phoenix was required; however, the City does not have data on commercial trash and recycling and a majority of multi-family trash and recycling. He stated that information provided by private providers would be helpful to include. Mr. Giudice

indicated that the table is useful to update, but that it would be more useful if the private sectors reported their information as well.

Ms. Hoffman inquired about sending the survey to the MAG member agencies, who would then work with the private hauler to provide the data. Mr. Giudice replied that in some jurisdictions that have a contract with a private hauler, they would be able to get that information from the private hauler; however, in some areas the private hauler operate within the jurisdiction to provide private services that are not under contract. He indicated that private haulers have been reluctant to share this information in the past in which they do not report this information to any agency.

Mr. Castillo asked if information sharing could be included into the licensing process for private haulers obtaining a license. He commented that if it is not a requirement, the private haulers are not required to provide full or partial data. Mr. Giudice responded that language can be placed into licensing or the contract with the private haulers in which many communities have included the information sharing requirement. Ms. Simpson commented that the Queen Creek private hauler provides tracking data for the Town; however, the same company provides service to other communities and unincorporated areas that may or may not be tracked. She commented that the reluctance by the private haulers may be due to an unnecessary tracking burden when tracking is not a requirement. Ms. Simpson stated that a few private providers participated in green waste discussions at Arizona State University; however, there was reluctance to provide information on green waste by the private providers.

Mr. Kehoe commented that Maricopa County is tracking material that comes into the transfer stations from unincorporated areas. He noted that there are some municipalities that are extending services into unincorporated Maricopa County land in which that material may not be captured. Mr. Kehoe stated that the Maricopa County data is not reported, but the data is tracked.

Ms. Avans stated the City of Buckeye includes language in the municipal code that all solid waste haulers operating in Buckeye are required to obtain a license, as well as report the number of solid waste customers served in the City for residential, multi-family, industrial, and commercial accounts including the total number of tons for disposal by type. She stated that the same information is collected for recycling. Ms. Avans indicated that she maintains the private provider information, permitting, and aids in inspections. She stated that the compiled information is provided to ADEQ when available. Ms. Avans noted that the private providers are required to report the data to the City by January 31.

Ms. Hoffman inquired if the MAG Residential and Commercial Breakdown of Solid Waste Generation table would be worth updating if the private sector participated in providing their data so that the table consists of a complete snapshot of the region. Mr. Giudice stated that if the private providers shared that information, it would be helpful.

Ms. Hoffman asked if the Committee is interested in updating the MAG Solid Waste Management Facilities Summary that is based on 2012 information. Ms. Simpson stated that when this table was being updated it was in response to outdated information. She inquired if the Committee knows of any updates that could be made to the table since 2012. Ms. Simpson indicated that Right Away Disposal has a few new facilities that are not included on the table. Ms. Simpson commented that the table would be helpful to update in terms of regional planning. She added that a similar table was created by Arizona State University with regard to green waste recycling opportunities.

Mr. Giudice asked if ADEQ has this information. Ms. Thomas replied that ADEQ has landfill and transfer station information, but that it is a good idea to cross check information. Mr. Giudice inquired if ADEQ also has recycling facilities. Ms. Thomas responded that ADEQ has recycling facility information; however, it may not be fully up-to-date.

Mr. Kehoe asked if J.B. Shaw, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, collects the recycling information. Ms. Thomas replied that Mr. Shaw collects as much recycling information from the communities as possible. She stated that permitted facilities are listed on the ADEQ website. Mr. Giudice commented that ADEQ should have a fairly accurate list of facilities due to law that requires entities to notify ADEQ. He stated that the facility information is helpful to communities.

Ms. Simpson commented that there can also be operators that have not reported to ADEQ. She provided the example of a green waste hauler that was not known until there was a fire.

Ms. Hoffman commented that MAG would not want to duplicate ADEQ's efforts if the facilities information already exists. Ms. Simpson commented that MAG could provide a link to ADEQ's site for information. She stated that information can be difficult to find and a link may make it easier to locate helpful information. Mr. Giudice added that MAG could send out a table that is populated with information provided by ADEQ and the communities can fill in any potential gaps. Mr. Allen commented that finding the gaps is a good idea. He noted that certain information is provided online; however, it may not have all the information available.

Ms. Hoffman discussed the MAG Member Agency Solid Waste Management Programs and Recycling Material Collected tables. Ms. Simpson commented that MAG Member Agency Solid Waste Management Programs table is very helpful to communities to see what programs other communities are offering in the region. She noted that City of Phoenix has programs with regard to palm fronds and mattresses which would be helpful to include on the table. Ms. Simpson stated that additional categories may need to be added to the list. Ms. Bernstein commented that this table may be helpful to change the public perspective to one that views trash as a resource commodity.

Ms. Hoffman inquired if the Committee was interested in updating the Solid Waste Rates and Services table as well. The Committee responded yes. Ms. Simpson added that this information is helpful to communities because municipalities often call each other during contract renewals and Request for Proposals to get a regional benchmark.

Ms. Hoffman asked if the additional information requested about CRT's and new container fees should be included in the data compilation. The Committee responded yes. Ms. Hoffman inquired if the requested information on what contractors charge for services should be collected through a survey or be discussed as an agenda item. Ms. Simpson stated that this topic is broad, due to a variety of options provided by vendors, and could be narrowed down. Ms. Hoffman stated that this topic can be made into an agenda item to be discussed at a future meeting.

Ms. Hoffman inquired if information on landfill equipment and positions would be helpful to the Committee. Ms. Simpson stated that Mr. Murphy has coordinated a Mutual Aid Agreement that contained equipment information that could be shared in times of emergency. Mr. Giudice replied that landfill specific information is not useful without context. He added that communities with landfill questions can reach out to others who have similar businesses. Mr. Giudice stated that the City of Phoenix would be willing to share business practices for those with questions. He noted that the City of Phoenix has shared equipment in the past; however, this information is challenging to make meaningful through a survey.

Ms. Hoffman thanked the Committee for their input. She reported that a majority of the information provided at each place will be updated. Ms. Hoffman noted that MAG will work with ADEQ first on gathering the information they have available. She stated that she will also look into what information is available from the private providers.

Ms. Hoffman inquired about the most recent data ADEQ has available. Ms. Thomas indicated that the data is for the year 2016. Ms. Hoffman asked when the 2017 data would be available. Ms. Thomas replied that Mr. Shaw will work on the 2017 data in the first quarter of 2018. Mr. Hoffman asked if the Committee would like to wait for 2017 data or move forward with 2016 data. The Committee expressed interest in waiting for 2017 data. Ms. Hoffman responded that MAG staff will wait to work with ADEQ once 2017 data is available. Ms. Hoffman indicated that if the Committee has any more ideas or feedback they can be emailed to her at any time.

6. Tentative Meeting Schedule for the MAG Solid Waste Advisory Committee

Chair Humbles stated that the tentative meeting schedule for 2018 has been included in the agenda materials.

7. Call for Future Agenda Items

Chair Humbles provided the opportunity for Committee members to suggest future agenda items. She noted potential agenda items on education/outreach and HHW contractor information.

Mr. Allen commented that a discussion on contamination rates and the commodity market would be timely. He noted that the Chinese market has placed restrictive requirements on material brought into China that has impacted our nation. Mr. Allen stated that he is familiar with some of the current issues, but that he is interested in hearing how this has impacted others. He indicated that he has seen increased contamination going into the landfill. Mr. Giudice suggested that the Committee try to bring in a guest speaker from the industry with expertise to discuss the impacts. He noted that a representative from Republic Services could speak with the Committee or other entities with experiences regarding the current market. Mr. Giudice remarked that the world market issues are going to impact trash and recycling programs for the coming years. He stated that product quality is extremely important in the current market. Mr. Giudice indicated that these impacts may cause programs to utilize more enforcement to address contamination and communities may see revenue decline.

Chair Humbles stated that markets and commodities will be added as a topic for a future agenda item. Ms. Betz added that Waste Management has been experiencing impacts also. She stated that a speaker from Waste Management or a similar entity would be beneficial to discuss impacts that MRF's may be facing regarding the world market issues. Mr. Allen stated that Pete Keller from Republic Services could be a potential local speaker.

8. Comments from the Committee

Chair Humbles asked for any comments from the Committee.

Mr. Murphy stated that the regional bid for containers went well. He indicated that a reverse bid was utilized that ended up saving the City of Mesa money. He noted that the contracts are currently being negotiated.

Chair Humbles stated that the next Committee meeting is tentatively scheduled for March 20, 2018. She stated that the new Chair in 2018 will be Patrick Murphy, City of Mesa, and the new Vice Chair will be Christina Betz, City of Surprise. With no further comments, Chair Humbles called for adjournment of the meeting at approximately 11:15 a.m.