

**Resource Recovery Board**

**County Members:** Ben Graber • Ilene Lieberman • James Scott • Diana Wasserman-Rubin • Lois Wexler  
**City Members:** Peter Bober • Jim Naugle • Joseph Scuotto • Jim Waldman  
**Executive Director:** Ron Greenstein  
**Counsel:** Eugene Steinfeld

**AGENDA**

**RRB Technical Advisory Committee Meeting**  
**Friday, July 28, 2006, 9:30 - 11:00 a.m.**  
**Broward County Governmental Center**  
**Room 430, 115 S Andrews Avenue**  
**Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301**

- I. ROLL CALL (5 min.)  
*Technical Advisory Committee*
- II. Approval of Minutes for June 23, 2006, TAC Meeting (5 min - AI) (p. 2 - 9)  
*Eliner Ciccone, Recording Secretary*
- III. Statement of Meeting Objectives (5 min.)  
*Thomas Good, Chair, Technical Advisory Committee*
- IV. RRB Executive Director Report (15 min.)  
*Honorable Ron Greenstein, RRB Executive Director*
- V. Old Business (5 min. – DI/AI)  
RRB Composition Status  
RRB-TAC Joint Meeting
- VI. New Business (30 min. – DI/AI)  
MRF Future
- X. Information Items (5 min. DI)
  - Staff Reports
    - MRF Report - FY 2006 1st and 2nd Quarter (p. 10 - 13)
    - HHW Report - FY 2006 3rd Quarter (p. 14 - 18)
  - TAC Attendance (p. 19)
  - Next TAC Meeting: August 25, 2006, 9:30 a.m.  
Broward County Government Center West
  - Next RRB Meeting: Special Meeting, August 24, 2006, 2:00 p.m.  
Broward County Governmental Center, Room 430

**NOTE:**

Total meeting time limited to 2 hours. Time extensions to be approved by majority vote. Items not covered prior to adjournment will be carried to the next regular scheduled meeting.

AI = Action Item  
DI = Discussion Item

- XI. ADJOURNMENT
- 

**MINUTES**  
**RRB TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**BROWARD COUNTY**  
**GOVERNMENT CENTER WEST**  
**PLANTATION**  
**Friday, June 23, 2006**

**MEMBERS**

**PRESENT:**

Tom Good, Chair, City of Miramar  
Richard Salamon, Vice Chair, City of Sunrise  
Raj Verma, City of Coconut Creek  
Carl Miller, Cooper City  
Richard Michaud, City of Coral Springs  
Susan Dean, Town of Davie  
Cheryl Miller, City of Deerfield Beach  
Mario Reboa, City of Deerfield Beach  
Floyd Pittman, City of Hollywood  
Lurleen Evans, City of Lauderhill  
Dawn Rauch, City of Lighthouse Point  
Reddy Chitepu, City of Margate  
Troy Gies, City of Tamarac  
Brad Kaine, City of Weston  
Bob Taylor, City of Wilton Manors  
John Benton, Unincorporated Broward County  
Robert Jindracek, Broward County School Board  
Michael Savino, Eco Waste/Public Waste  
Hunter Varnedoe, All Service Refuse

**MEMBERS**

**ABSENT:**

Diane Patanelli, Cooper City  
Casey Eckels, City of Fort Lauderdale  
Greg Slagle, City of Fort Lauderdale  
Vacant, Town of Hillsboro Beach  
Bill Mason, Town of Lauderdale-By-The-Sea  
Vacant, Village of Lazy Lake  
Manny Diez, City of Lauderdale Lakes  
Louis Johnson, City of Lauderdale Lakes  
Art Graham, City of Lighthouse Point  
Mike Shields, City of North Lauderdale  
Tom Richter, City of Oakland Park  
Todd Larson, Town of Pembroke Park  
Elisabeth Bryant, City of Plantation  
Kenneth Kohl, Village of Sea Ranch Lakes  
Diana Hansen, Town of Southwest Ranches  
Diane Phillips, City of Tamarac  
Vacant, City of West Park  
David Archacki, City of Wilton Manors  
John Albert, Waste Management, Inc.  
Eileen Cudney, Broward League of Cities

**ALSO**

**PRESENT:**

Eugene Steinfeld, RRB Counsel  
Gary Collette, Wheelabrator  
Sandy Gutner, Malcolm Pirnie, Inc. (MPI)  
Jean Dupuis, City of Coconut Creek  
Marnie Rosen, City of Deerfield Beach  
Mary Beth Busutil, WRS Director  
Jeff Turpin, WRS Assistant Director  
Peter Foye, WRS, RCAD Director  
Ram Tewari, WRS, SWOD Director  
Mike Serra, WRS/SWOD  
Phil Bresee, WRS/RCAD  
Rich Meyers, WRS/SWOD  
Jeanne Clinton, WRS/ADMIN  
Steve Kasselakis, WRS/RCAD  
Odette Reza-Brown, WRS/ADMIN  
Patricia Collins, WRS/ADMIN  
Eliner Ciccone, WRS/ADMIN, Recorder

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting of the Resource Recovery Board Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was called to order by Tom Good, Chair, at 9:45 a.m. on June 23, 2006, at Broward Government Center West. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion was made, seconded, and unanimously carried to accept the minutes of the TAC Meeting of May 26, 2006, as submitted.**

**III. STATEMENT OF MEETING OBJECTIVES**

Mr. Good informed the committee that one item has been added under New Business - the MRF and some programming issues. However, today's meeting will primarily be a forum on the Trash Summit that took place on June 16 - 17, 2006, at the Coral Springs Marriott.

**IV. RRB EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT**

Ron Greenstein, RRB Executive Director, was unavailable for today's meeting. In his absence, Eugene Steinfeld, RRB Legal Counsel, reported that Mr. Greenstein requested that he render an opinion on an ethics issue regarding the voting of private TAC members - meaning non-governmental members. Mr. Steinfeld told the members that he said he had spoken with the Ethics Commission because members of TAC are covered by the ethics rules since it is a governmental committee. His opinion is that members of TAC that vote on an issue that ultimately may benefit them or may be contrary to the best interests of either themselves or their employers must abstain from voting.

It was clarified that the newly appointed TAC member representing the Broward County School District falls into the same category as municipal members in regard to voting because he is a governmental employee. Mr. Good requested that Mr. Steinfeld include that clarification in the opinion. Mr. Steinfeld suggested that Mr. Good request that Mr. Greenstein ask for a supplement to the opinion.

The opinion in the form of a letter from Mr. Steinfeld dated June 1, 2006, and addressed to Mr. Greenstein will be posted on the WRS website.

V. **OLD BUSINESS**

**RRB Composition Status**

Mr. Good asked the members for updates on their cities' commissions' decisions regarding the 10th amendment to the Interlocal Agreement.

<u>City</u>	<u>April 28, 2006</u>	<u>May 26, 2006</u>	<u>June 23, 2006</u>
Coconut Creek	no decision	approved	
Cooper City	no decision		approved
Coral Springs	approved		
Davie	no decision	not approved	Davie passed a resolution to modify the amendment
Deerfield Beach	no decision		Requested a copy of the amendment.
Fort Lauderdale	approved		
Hollywood	no decision		approved
Lauderdale by the Sea		approved	
Lauderhill	no decision		no decision
Lighthouse Point			Has not come before their commission yet
Margate	approved		
Miramar	no decision	not approved	The City Commission of Miramar has directed the attorney to write a letter stating that they do not agree with the amendment.
Oakland Park	no decision		
Sunrise	not approved		No action will be taken.
Tamarac	no decision		It will go before the city commission on July 12, 2006 - the intention is to approve it as written.
Unincorporated	no decision		no action yet
Weston		not approved	passed a modified version
Wilton Manors	no decision	approved	

Mr. Good asked that WRS make any additional available information regarding the passage of the amendment a part of the minutes of this meeting. The following was not available at the time of this meeting:

- Sea Ranch Lakes      approved
- Tamarac                approved
- West Park              approved

## VI. NEW BUSINESS

### Trash Summit

The members participated in a discussion based on issues that came to light as a result of the summit.

Concerns were expressed:

- Communication and cooperation between TAC, RRB, and the ILA cities needs improvement.
- Some members were disappointed that no elected officials from their cities attended the summit.
- TAC meeting attendance is spotty.
- Some members feel they have little power to affect TAC-related decisions within their cities.
- The committee has lost momentum.

Suggestions for improvements were offered:

- Workshops with the cities presented by Mr. Greenstein, WRS, and teams including TAC members.
- Joint sessions with RRB and TAC.
- Letters that include TAC member attendance should be sent to mayors and city managers encouraging staff to attend TAC meetings.
- Certified letters sent to city managers or mayors inviting them to TAC meetings and informing them that there are critical issues on the table and their input is required.
- More TAC members should attend RRB meetings to support the TAC chair as spokesperson.
- Issues presented to the RRB should be on paper and have clear options and possibly recommendations so the RRB and the cities have adequate data on which to base their decisions.

Some of TAC's accomplishments and strong points were noted:

- TAC now has representation (the TAC chair) on the RRB - albeit a non-voting position.
- Cities are being paid monies that they were not paid before.
- The lawsuit is over.
- The ILA 10th Amendment was created - an amendment that would have the cities taking over a majority of the Resource Recovery Board.
- The beach glass project was initiated.
- Many TAC members have excellent rapport with their city officials and expertise in the field.
- TAC framed the Strategic Plan.

(10:42. a.m. Dawn Rauch, City of Lighthouse Point, departed.)

Additional issues:

- There was a brief discussion on independent/dependent districts in which Mr. Steinfeld said that the difference between independent and dependent is whether or not the county controls the resource recovery system. He reminded the committee that he had given a presentation on the subject at a previous TAC meeting (April 22, 2005). A request was made that a document be prepared with that information in it and he told the committee that he has already prepared such a document.

- Mr. Steinfeld clarified TAC's mission for the members, telling them that, basically, it may be summed up by two paragraphs found in Article 5 of the Interlocal Agreement:

*Each member is responsible for participating in the activities of the Technical Advisory Committee, including the attendance at meetings for the purpose of considering technical issues regarding the resource recovery system.*

*The Technical Advisory Committee shall serve in an advisory capacity to both the Resource Recovery Board and County.*

The information may also be found in the TAC bylaws. Both documents may be accessed on the WRS website.

- Sandy Gutner, Malcolm Pirnie, Inc., told the committee that the firm has been asked to provide a more detailed analysis using case studies and examples of what different types of district structures would look like. They will use that to facilitate the information-sharing goal that was established at the Trash Summit. He said the goal is an intensive effort to provide this information to elected officials within six months.
- Gary Collette of Wheelabrator Technologies emphasized that Wheelabrator is a strong proponent of source reduction and recycling. He said the company's policies may be found on their website (wheelabratortechologies.com).
- Mary Beth Busutil, WRS Director, told the committee that she participated in the Summit and that WRS will support the process that follows.

(11:09 Brad Kaine, City of Weston and Carl Miller, City of Cooper City have departed.)

## **MRF**

Mr. Bresee discussed the declining tonnages from system cities over the past five or six years as described in the **FY 2006 1st and 2nd Quarter MRF Report** that he emailed to the committee on June 22, 2006. He requested that TAC refer this issue to the Programs Subcommittee for further discussion and perhaps a recommendation in the next month or so to help increase recycling tonnages.

Mr. Good said this will be referred to the Programs Subcommittee and suggested that educational outreach is the key to increasing recycling.

## **XII. INFORMATION ITEMS**

RRB established a MRF contract committee in May 2006 to negotiate with Waste Management. It includes a member from TAC, Mayor Waldman of Coconut Creek, a county commissioner, and the chair of the RRB. RRB staff will provide support. The committee has not yet met. The meetings will be covered under the Sunshine law, so any TAC member may sit in. Mr. Good, the TAC representative on this newly formed committee, wants to put together an ad hoc committee to provide feedback and help frame some of the issues to be presented at the MRF Contract Committee meetings regarding the MRF and the 2009 end date and such matters.

Mr. Good said that a TAC/RRB joint workshop would be discussed at the next TAC meeting. He said the discussion would include ideas on structuring the workshop and the items to be discussed at the workshop. Mr. Michaud suggested that a joint workshop take place in October or November 2006 to allow time to prepare an agenda. A request was made to inform the RRB that TAC would be having this discussion at the next TAC meeting.

Mr. Michaud requested that the policy paper from the Trash Summit and the Strategic Plan also be items for discussion at the next TAC meeting.

Ms. Busutil suggested that the CD from the Summit be shown at the next TAC meeting.

**Next TAC Meeting:** July 28, 2006, 9:30 a.m.  
Broward County Government Center  
Room 430

**Next RRB Meeting:** September 21, 2006, 2:00 p.m.  
Broward County Government Center, Room 430

### **XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

**There being no further business to come before the committee at this time, on motion of Richard Salamon, seconded by Michael Savino and unanimously carried, the meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.**



Public Works Department

Waste and Recycling Services

**RECYCLING & CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION DIVISION**

1 North University Drive, Suite 400 • Plantation, Florida 33324 • 954-765-4202 • FAX 954-577-2390

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 22, 2006

TO: Chair and Members, Resource Recovery Board Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

FROM: Phil Bresee, Recycling Program Manager

RE: **FY 2006 1<sup>ST</sup> AND 2<sup>ND</sup> QUARTER MRF REPORT**

This report and its attachments provide Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) statistics and some analysis for the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> quarters of FY 2006 (October through March). We anticipate being back on track with full quarterly reports with associated charts and spreadsheets in time for our 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter report. The report and attachments underscore some of the issues I raised at April's TAC meeting.

### MRF Tonnage Trends

The total amount of RRS City recyclables delivered to the Waste Management/Recycle America Alliance (WM-RAA) MRF in Davie *decreased* by 11% during the first six-months of FY 2006 when compared to the first six-months of FY 2005. Program tonnages fell from 29,800 tons from 33,475 tons for the same time frame in FY 2005. Total recyclables (includes commercial and non-RRS residential) delivered to the MRF also decreased, falling to 65,013 tons from 72,272, a drop of 10%.

RCAD believes that the decrease in tonnages can be attributed in part to Hurricane Wilma impacts in October, 2005, which effectively shut down the MRF for almost two weeks in October and early November. Moreover, the gradual lightweighting of food and beverage containers as well as newspapers (publishers use less newsprint per copy), and the overall shift from heavy glass to lighter plastic for food and beverage packaging over the past 10 years likely continues to have some long-term impacts on tonnages. However, RCAD also believes that declining residential recycling program participation is applying downward pressures on recycling tonnages.

Attachment 1 details city-by-city deliveries by commodity (newspaper = ONP; commingled metal, plastic and glass food and beverage containers = RGD or rigid) for the first six-months of FY 2006.

### Recyclables Revenues

While the amount of materials delivered to the MRF by RRS Partner Cities has declined, overall program revenues continue to increase thanks to robust end-markets. Partner Cities have earned more than \$2.6 million in recyclables revenues during the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> quarters combined, which is nearly equal to the

same amount from FY 2005's 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> quarters. Per-ton city revenues for FY 2006 have averaged \$88.09 vs. \$79.70 realized during the first six-months of FY 2005.

Attachment 2 details overall RRS tonnages and revenues for the first 2 quarters of FY 2006 along with historical statistics.

### **Staff Recommendation**

RCAD recommends and requests TAC referral of MRF tonnage and program participation issues to Programs Subcommittee for review and subsequent recommendations to full TAC. Actions could include enhanced and more focused outreach, RRS recycling bin purchase and bin delivery systems, etc.

### **MRF Operations**

Curbside Recycling Load Mixing – WM-RAA has raised load mixing concerns from curbside recycling routes, indicating that some loads coming into the MRF contain a high percentage of rigid containers and ONP mixed together. Reasons for the mixed loads might include malfunctions between the ONP and commingled compartments inside the collection truck which allow materials to escape and mix with the other. Cities should also ensure that their franchise haulers are not mixing recyclables while emptying them into the recycling collection vehicles. In addition, residents should be educated to ensure that they set recyclables per RRS city collection guidelines (ONP and commingled separated inside bin or placed in separate bins subject to rejection or downgrade per the Inspection Protocol outlined in the Plan of Operations.

Wet Fiber Loads at MRF - WM-RAA also has raised concerns over the amount of wet newspaper being delivered by residential recycling trucks. Excessively wet ONP that does not meet end-market specifications can lead to mill rejections. RRS cities are encouraged to remind residents to try and hold off on setting out ONP for collection on rainy days.

MRF Facility Inspections – Malcolm Pirnie, Inc., (MPI), continues to perform scheduled monthly inspections/walk-throughs and make recommendations to enhance mechanical and processing efficiencies, and note upgrades to the facility as well. MPI also attends monthly meetings with RCAD to discuss inspection findings and related issues. During the second quarter, MPI conducted a Residue Analysis and findings from the final report will be made available to TAC in the near future. Also in draft form is the MRF's Semi Annual Operational Monitoring Report which will be made available to TAC once reviewed and finalized.

### Attachments:

1. RRS City MRF Tonnages FY 2006 Quarters 1 & 2
2. Total RRS city MRF Tons and Revenues FY 2006 Quarters 1 & 2



Public Works Department

Waste and Recycling Services

**RECYCLING & CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION DIVISION**

1 North University Drive, Suite 400 • Plantation, Florida 33324 • 954-765-4202 • FAX 954-577-2390

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 22, 2006

TO: Chair and Members, Resource Recovery Board Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

FROM: Phil Bresee, Recycling Program Manager

RE: **FY 2006 1<sup>ST</sup> AND 2<sup>ND</sup> QUARTER MRF REPORT**

This report and its attachments provide Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) statistics and some analysis for the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> quarters of FY 2006 (October through March). We anticipate being back on track with full quarterly reports with associated charts and spreadsheets in time for our 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter report. The report and attachments underscore some of the issues I raised at April's TAC meeting.

### MRF Tonnage Trends

The total amount of RRS City recyclables delivered to the Waste Management/Recycle America Alliance (WM-RAA) MRF in Davie *decreased* by 11% during the first six-months of FY 2006 when compared to the first six-months of FY 2005. Program tonnages fell from 29,800 tons from 33,475 tons for the same time frame in FY 2005. Total recyclables (includes commercial and non-RRS residential) delivered to the MRF also decreased, falling to 65,013 tons from 72,272, a drop of 10%.

RCAD believes that the decrease in tonnages can be attributed in part to Hurricane Wilma impacts in October, 2005, which effectively shut down the MRF for almost two weeks in October and early November. Moreover, the gradual lightweighting of food and beverage containers as well as newspapers (publishers use less newsprint per copy), and the overall shift from heavy glass to lighter plastic for food and beverage packaging over the past 10 years likely continues to have some long-term impacts on tonnages. However, RCAD also believes that declining residential recycling program participation is applying downward pressures on recycling tonnages.

Attachment 1 details city-by-city deliveries by commodity (newspaper = ONP; commingled metal, plastic and glass food and beverage containers = RGD or rigid) for the first six-months of FY 2006.

### Recyclables Revenues

While the amount of materials delivered to the MRF by RRS Partner Cities has declined, overall program revenues continue to increase thanks to robust end-markets. Partner Cities have earned more than \$2.6 million in recyclables revenues during the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> quarters combined, which is nearly equal to the

same amount from FY 2005's 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> quarters. Per-ton city revenues for FY 2006 have averaged \$88.09 vs. \$79.70 realized during the first six-months of FY 2005.

Attachment 2 details overall RRS tonnages and revenues for the first 2 quarters of FY 2006 along with historical statistics.

### **Staff Recommendation**

RCAD recommends and requests TAC referral of MRF tonnage and program participation issues to Programs Subcommittee for review and subsequent recommendations to full TAC. Actions could include enhanced and more focused outreach, RRS recycling bin purchase and bin delivery systems, etc.

### **MRF Operations**

Curbside Recycling Load Mixing – WM-RAA has raised load mixing concerns from curbside recycling routes, indicating that some loads coming into the MRF contain a high percentage of rigid containers and ONP mixed together. Reasons for the mixed loads might include malfunctions between the ONP and commingled compartments inside the collection truck which allow materials to escape and mix with the other. Cities should also ensure that their franchise haulers are not mixing recyclables while emptying them into the recycling collection vehicles. In addition, residents should be educated to ensure that they set recyclables per RRS city collection guidelines (ONP and commingled separated inside bin or placed in separate bins subject to rejection or downgrade per the Inspection Protocol outlined in the Plan of Operations.

Wet Fiber Loads at MRF - WM-RAA also has raised concerns over the amount of wet newspaper being delivered by residential recycling trucks. Excessively wet ONP that does not meet end-market specifications can lead to mill rejections. RRS cities are encouraged to remind residents to try and hold off on setting out ONP for collection on rainy days.

MRF Facility Inspections – Malcolm Pirnie, Inc., (MPI), continues to perform scheduled monthly inspections/walk-throughs and make recommendations to enhance mechanical and processing efficiencies, and note upgrades to the facility as well. MPI also attends monthly meetings with RCAD to discuss inspection findings and related issues. During the second quarter, MPI conducted a Residue Analysis and findings from the final report will be made available to TAC in the near future. Also in draft form is the MRF's Semi Annual Operational Monitoring Report which will be made available to TAC once reviewed and finalized.

### Attachments:

1. RRS City MRF Tonnages FY 2006 Quarters 1 & 2
2. Total RRS city MRF Tons and Revenues FY 2006 Quarters 1 & 2

MUNICIPAL TONS DELIVERED TO THE MRF 2005-06

FY 2006		Coconut Creek	Cooper City	Coral Springs	Davie	Deerfield Beach	Fort Lauderdale	Hollywood	Lauderdale By-The-Sea	Lauderdale Lakes	Lauderhill	Lighthouse Point	Margate	Miramar	North Lauderdale	Oakland Park	Pembroke Park	Plantation	Southwest Ranches	Sunrise	Tamarac	Weston	West Park	Wilton Manors	Unincorporated	TOTAL
OCT	ONP	143.36	76.88	250.20	138.37	228.89	191.67	153.09	6.19	41.04	48.48	45.61	89.55	105.59	24.66	32.92	1.10	197.89	18.72	142.25	175.74	149.58		27.24	95.66	2,384.68
	RGD	49.64	35.55	120.68	67.73	129.30	163.12	106.51	3.13	9.71	21.60	20.23	50.60	75.45	21.03	26.60		85.34	10.65	63.96	61.60	75.01		16.21	64.56	1,278.21
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>193.00</b>	<b>112.43</b>	<b>370.88</b>	<b>206.10</b>	<b>358.19</b>	<b>354.79</b>	<b>259.60</b>	<b>9.32</b>	<b>50.75</b>	<b>70.08</b>	<b>65.84</b>	<b>140.15</b>	<b>181.04</b>	<b>45.69</b>	<b>59.52</b>	<b>1.10</b>	<b>283.23</b>	<b>29.37</b>	<b>206.21</b>	<b>237.34</b>	<b>224.59</b>		<b>43.45</b>	<b>160.22</b>	<b>3,662.89</b>
NOV	ONP	235.43	102.89	305.41	175.26	363.96	300.44	192.72	12.30	62.11	70.01	75.46	123.26	145.24	56.67	42.31	1.90	305.44	22.97	240.45	297.82	270.66		34.40	136.68	3,573.79
	RGD	76.76	46.93	149.35	92.44	201.10	282.82	127.33	10.70	17.54	31.16	34.51	71.17	108.26	45.17	27.55	0.89	130.17	15.74	115.23	120.42	125.29		23.00	88.90	1,942.43
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>312.19</b>	<b>149.82</b>	<b>454.76</b>	<b>267.70</b>	<b>565.06</b>	<b>583.26</b>	<b>320.05</b>	<b>23.00</b>	<b>79.65</b>	<b>101.17</b>	<b>109.97</b>	<b>194.43</b>	<b>253.50</b>	<b>101.84</b>	<b>69.86</b>	<b>2.79</b>	<b>435.61</b>	<b>38.71</b>	<b>355.68</b>	<b>418.24</b>	<b>395.95</b>		<b>57.40</b>	<b>225.58</b>	<b>5,516.22</b>
DEC	ONP	231.82	102.34	339.23	214.78	378.50	314.38	226.91	16.27	68.22	77.97	68.80	126.05	150.60	53.30	50.64	3.42	287.52	20.98	226.26	256.13	233.18		41.81	146.55	3,635.66
	RGD	74.70	47.09	153.99	94.70	163.85	244.35	146.93	8.43	11.81	30.30	28.50	82.42	92.50	35.68	37.60		120.73	11.90	92.85	74.53	100.51		25.93	87.56	1,766.86
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>306.52</b>	<b>149.43</b>	<b>493.22</b>	<b>309.48</b>	<b>542.35</b>	<b>558.73</b>	<b>373.84</b>	<b>24.70</b>	<b>80.03</b>	<b>108.27</b>	<b>97.30</b>	<b>208.47</b>	<b>243.10</b>	<b>88.98</b>	<b>88.24</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>408.25</b>	<b>32.88</b>	<b>319.11</b>	<b>330.66</b>	<b>333.69</b>		<b>67.74</b>	<b>234.11</b>	<b>5,402.52</b>
JAN	ONP	209.47	93.64	305.65	163.57	312.14	273.82	208.09	12.63	52.29	73.48	65.88	106.03	126.06	64.38	60.12	4.52	252.16	20.52	205.95	234.95	210.50		29.29	117.40	3,202.54
	RGD	71.83	48.11	168.59	92.93	163.27	243.49	151.23	7.45	13.49	33.99	30.25	68.15	90.36	46.39	54.14	2.43	122.48	15.14	92.30	91.09	112.66		23.96	69.60	1,813.33
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>281.30</b>	<b>141.75</b>	<b>474.24</b>	<b>256.50</b>	<b>475.41</b>	<b>517.31</b>	<b>359.32</b>	<b>20.08</b>	<b>65.78</b>	<b>107.47</b>	<b>96.13</b>	<b>174.18</b>	<b>216.42</b>	<b>110.77</b>	<b>114.26</b>	<b>6.95</b>	<b>374.64</b>	<b>35.66</b>	<b>298.25</b>	<b>326.04</b>	<b>323.16</b>		<b>53.25</b>	<b>187.00</b>	<b>5,015.87</b>
FEB	ONP	195.34	99.14	284.93	176.63	350.17	266.80	202.90	17.00	58.09	61.68	70.85	99.37	123.10	44.73	70.74	3.14	255.90	17.48	195.49	212.23	222.68	14.88	28.22	88.93	3,160.42
	RGD	58.81	41.30	136.68	87.91	151.84	221.87	132.83	9.23	13.01	29.78	31.93	53.07	81.30	33.49	52.07	3.84	106.86	12.43	82.95	67.65	99.80	15.00	14.05	40.54	1,578.24
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>254.15</b>	<b>140.44</b>	<b>421.61</b>	<b>264.54</b>	<b>502.01</b>	<b>488.67</b>	<b>335.73</b>	<b>26.23</b>	<b>71.10</b>	<b>91.46</b>	<b>102.78</b>	<b>152.44</b>	<b>204.40</b>	<b>78.22</b>	<b>122.81</b>	<b>6.98</b>	<b>362.76</b>	<b>29.91</b>	<b>278.44</b>	<b>279.88</b>	<b>322.48</b>	<b>29.88</b>	<b>42.27</b>	<b>129.47</b>	<b>4,738.66</b>
MAR	ONP	194.78	99.40	350.54	206.70	466.60	298.67	237.27	20.13	66.91	85.42	76.07	121.88	138.39	40.84	74.30	6.53	290.24	19.80	221.04	263.65	231.91	16.03	42.91	96.91	3,666.92
	RGD	67.39	42.85	162.33	99.90	175.50	242.36	155.10	11.41	16.76	39.48	33.17	60.23	95.10	28.06	57.31	1.93	124.20	11.33	99.08	85.07	99.81	14.19	26.84	46.61	1,796.01
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>262.17</b>	<b>142.25</b>	<b>512.87</b>	<b>306.60</b>	<b>642.10</b>	<b>541.03</b>	<b>392.37</b>	<b>31.54</b>	<b>83.67</b>	<b>124.90</b>	<b>109.24</b>	<b>182.11</b>	<b>233.49</b>	<b>68.90</b>	<b>131.61</b>	<b>8.46</b>	<b>414.44</b>	<b>31.13</b>	<b>320.12</b>	<b>348.72</b>	<b>331.72</b>	<b>30.22</b>	<b>69.75</b>	<b>143.52</b>	<b>5,462.93</b>
YEAR TO DATE	ONP	1,210.20	574.29	1,835.96	1,075.31	2,100.26	1,645.78	1,220.98	84.52	348.66	417.04	402.67	666.14	788.98	284.58	331.03	20.61	1,589.15	120.47	1,231.44	1,440.52	1,318.51	30.91	203.87	682.13	19,624.01
	RGD	399.13	261.83	891.62	535.61	984.86	1,398.01	819.93	50.35	82.32	186.31	178.59	385.64	542.97	209.82	255.27	9.09	689.78	77.19	546.37	500.36	613.08	29.19	129.99	397.77	10,175.08
		1,609.33	836.12	2,727.58	1,610.92	3,085.12	3,043.79	2,040.91	134.87	430.98	603.35	581.26	1,051.78	1,331.95	494.40	586.30	29.70	2,278.93	197.66	1,777.81	1,940.88	1,931.59	60.10	333.86	1,079.90	29,799.09

## MRF Average Revenues \*

	<u>Quarter</u>	<u>Revenue</u>	<u>Tonnage</u>	<u>Rev/Ton</u>	
FY 02 **	1st	\$710,621.07	17,485.78	\$40.64	
	2nd	\$671,324.68	17,315.42	\$38.77	
	3rd	\$758,031.45	16,616.54	\$45.62	
	4th	\$897,867.66	15,251.84	\$58.87	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,037,844.86</b>	<b>66,669.58</b>	<b>\$45.57</b>	
FY 03	1st	\$983,693.53	17,345.61	\$56.71	
	2nd	\$792,827.23	17,248.31	\$45.97	
	3rd	\$848,767.76	16,760.84	\$50.64	
	4th	\$869,611.70	15,505.61	\$56.08	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,494,900.22</b>	<b>66,860.37</b>	<b>\$52.27</b>	
FY 04	1st	\$1,074,111.92	17,619.43	\$60.96	***
	2nd	\$1,266,041.62	17,430.61	\$72.63	
	3rd	\$1,261,647.80	16,424.48	\$76.82	
	4th	\$1,195,154.11	15,119.76	\$79.05	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,796,955.45</b>	<b>66,594.28</b>	<b>\$72.03</b>	
FY 05	1st	\$1,362,813.09	16,950.04	\$80.40	
	2nd	\$1,305,307.45	16,525.38	\$78.99	***
	3rd	\$1,381,727.24	16,122.44	\$85.70	
	4th	\$1,312,124.10	14,438.64	\$90.88	***
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$5,361,971.88</b>	<b>64,036.50</b>	<b>\$83.73</b>	
FY 06	1st	\$1,336,870.38	14,581.63	\$91.68	
	2nd	\$1,288,408.14	15,220.18	\$84.65	***
	3rd				
	4th				***
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,625,278.52</b>	<b>29,801.81</b>	<b>\$88.09</b>	

\* Revenue as adjusted for revenue share, residue allowance and other adjustments per contract.

\*\* Revenue share increased to 80% effective 10/1/2002.

\*\*\* Revenues include adjustments.



Public Works Department-Office of Integrated Waste Management  
**RECYCLING & CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION DIVISION**  
1 N. University Drive, Suite 400-B • Plantation, Florida 33324 • 954-765-4202 • FAX 954-577-2390

July 20, 2006

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**From:** Peter Foye, Director, Recycling and Contract Administration  
**RE:** **3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report - Household Hazardous Waste Collection Program**

---

### Remote Collections

Remote Collection Events were conducted on: May 21st at Weston's Regional Park site, June 11<sup>th</sup> at Lauderdale Lakes Public Works Complex, and June 18<sup>th</sup> at the Plantation Public. The Sun Sentinel, and City Publications coupled with the event sign appear to be the principle manner that residents learn about the events. **The attached Remote Collection Event Summary highlights event statistics and efforts to date.**

The next quarter scheduled Remote Collection Events include: July 16th at Davie's Pine Island Park site, and September 17<sup>th</sup> at Tamarac's Public Works Complex.

### Program Participation

Program participation increased 19.9% above the same period last year. All stations are reporting some increase in usage. Friday collections have been implemented at the North and South TTS; an additional 465 residents were accommodated during the quarter. We will post external site signs that advertise both Friday and Saturday collections, as well as modify flyers and general information that highlight the additional service day. We will continue to report user trends for this new service. **The attached spreadsheets highlight 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter statistics.**

### Facility Upgrade – HHW infrastructure

The contractor for the HHW Facility Upgrade has not secured permits from the city of Pompano Beach and delays may require price escalation due to cost of materials. The warehouse complex associated with the north site operation was damaged in Hurricane Wilma and requires other modifications to ensure adequate safety and staffing accommodations. The attached proposal has been forwarded to the Executive Director, RRB for recognition that cost increases are pending. A possible relocation of this operation to a more central site (possibly the former Ft. Lauderdale compost site) warrants consideration.

## **Proposal – HHW Infrastructure / upgrades**

### **Overview**

In September 2000, Malcolm Pirnie Inc. submitted a report that provided Conceptual Design of Improvements to the Household Hazardous Waste Facility (2780 Powerline Rd., Pompano Beach). The county's PWD coordinated the design, sought bids and processed a contract, but many challenges and procurement problems have arisen, and no permits were issued and construction has been delayed. Projected costs have increased significantly as the prices for steel and other materials have escalated. Furthermore the 20+ year old warehouse and office area located at the site sustained damage (Hurricane Wilma) and working conditions require urgent attention.

New office accommodations, repair / replacement of the warehouse structure coupled with the current project for an improved HHW / Electronics reception area will require considerable expenditure. A similar SWA facility in Palm Beach County cost over \$1.5 million. Short term remedial works and possible interim arrangements for temporary office trailers at the current site will aid the process, but the scope and importance of the HHW program warrants a permanent solution. The site of the former Ft Lauderdale Compost facility would be a preferred location, but time factors may limit that option.

### **Objectives**

Provide appropriate infrastructure for HHW collection services to meet service demands, including use of county's TTS network.

Establish a centralized site for functional operations that includes reception, on-site processing and warehouse components as well as locations of paint distributions and ancillary HHW / electronic recycling services.

### **Outcomes**

Improved operations related to fully integrated facility and possible centralized geographic location better servicing the District communities.

Enhanced program recognition and visibility associated with a modern operation.

### **Implementation**

- Examine site options – current Pompano Beach site, former Ft. Lauderdale compost facility, or other county/municipal sites with appropriate land use and zoning.
- Provide temporary office accommodation and examine cost to refurbish/replace current warehouse.
- Pursue contracts for a full facility (design and construction) in FY 2007.

### **Budget**

Preliminary budget estimate is \$1-2 million, not including site acquisition costs. This would include the \$500,000 already earmarked within the FY 06 budget.

BROWARD COUNTY HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE PROGRAM - USER REPORT

		THIRD QUARTER FY 2006								QUARTERLY TOTALS TO DATE								
Cities with Broward County Inter-Local Agreements		APRIL 06				MAY 06				JUNE 06				APR-MAY-JUN (ILA)				USERS
MUNICIPALITY		USERS		WM	USERS		WS	USERS		6/11/06 LL	USERS		USERS		USERS			
		HHW		4/9/2006	HHW		5/21/2006	HHW		6/18/06 PL	HHW		HHW		HHW			
		NORTH	CENTRAL	SOUTH	EVENT	NORTH	CENTRAL	SOUTH	EVENT	NORTH	CENTRAL	SOUTH	EVENT	NORTH	CENTRAL	SOUTH	EVENT	TOTALS
1	COCONUT CREEK	72		1	4	39				72			1	183		2	5	190
2	COOPER CITY		9	13			10	12	6		14	22	5		33	47	11	91
3	CORAL SPRINGS	121			1	107				142		1	3	370		1	4	375
4	DAVIE	5	61	20	4	3	38	15	30	8	46	20	12	16	145	55	46	262
5	DEERFIELD BEACH	48				41				56				145				145
6	FORT LAUDERDALE	132	28	11	193	87	29	12		137	17	11	8	356	74	34	201	665
7	HILLSBORO BEACH	2				1				2				5				5
8	HOLLYWOOD		2	141	3			108	2	3	4	153	1	3	6	402	6	417
9	LAUDERDALE BY THE SEA	8			3	4				6				18			3	21
10	LAUDERDALE LAKES	3			1	1	1			7			9	11	1		10	22
11	LAUDERHILL	12	2	2	2	6	2			5	1	1	7	23	5	3	9	40
12	LAZY LAKE				1												1	1
13	LIGHTHOUSE POINT	28				26				30				84				84
14	MARGATE	66			2	51				63				180			2	182
15	MIRAMAR		4	72			2	28	2	1	4	62		1	10	162	2	175
16	NORTH LAUDERDALE	16				7		1		13				36		1		37
17	OAKLAND PARK	20			32	14	1			32			1	66	1		33	100
18	PEMBROKE PARK			3				1				1				5		5
19	PLANTATION	18	67	10	12	16	42	15	5	14	69	7	292	48	178	32	309	567
20	SEA RANCH LAKES									1				1				1
21	SOUTHWEST RANCHES		5	3	1		6		25	1	9	4	1	1	20	7	27	55
22	SUNRISE	30	25	3	5	15	16	3	11	22	25	4	60	67	66	10	76	219
23	TAMARAC	36	1	1	6	33	1		3	49		1	3	118	2	2	12	134
24	WEST PARK			60				53		1		45				158		158
25	WESTON	4	40	8		1	19	7	495	2	32	19	9	7	91	34	504	636
26	WILTON MANORS	5			141	9				8				22			141	163
27	UNINC BROWARD COUNTY	2	19	1	4	5	15	1	1	4	17	1	6	11	51	3	11	76
	OTHER																	
	<b>ILA TOTALS</b>	<b>628</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>415</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>679</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>1772</b>	<b>683</b>	<b>958</b>	<b>1413</b>	<b>4826</b>
	<b>NON-ILA CITIES</b>																	<b>NON-ILA</b>
28	DANIA BEACH		1	19	3		3	19			4	17	1		8	55	4	67
29	HALLANDALE BEACH		1	12				10				13			1	35		36
30	PARKLAND	31			1	30				33				94			1	95
31	PEMBROKE PINES	1	12	84	4	2	18	71	14	2	10	83	6	5	40	238	24	307
32	POMPANO BEACH	100		1	14	87				109			1	296		1	15	312
	<b>NON-ILA CITY TOTALS</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>817</b>
	<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	<b>760</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>465</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>585</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>594</b>	<b>823</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>465</b>	<b>426</b>	<b>2167</b>	<b>732</b>	<b>1287</b>	<b>1457</b>	<b>5643</b>

PREPARATION:  
7/21/2006 17:27  
G:/iw/tts/hhrpt06.xls.

HHW Program Remote Collection Event Summary Fiscal Year 2006

Location Date	Sunrise 10/16/2005		Miramar 1/8/2006		Fort Lauderdale 1/22/2006		Coral Springs 2/12/2006		Cooper Cty 3/19/2006		Wilton Manors 4/9/2006		Weston 5/21/2006		Laud. Lakes 6/11/2006		Plantation 6/18/2006		Davie 7/16/2006		Tamarac 9/17/2006		Totals	
Participation	Part	% tot	Part	% tot	Part	% tot	Part	% tot	Part	% tot	Part	% tot	Part	% tot	Part	% tot	Part	% tot	Part	% tot	Part	% tot	Part	% tot
Cooper Cty	1	<1%	5	1%	0	0%	0	0%	244	56%	4	1%	6	1%	0	0%	5	1%						
Coc Creek	0	0%	0	0%	1	<1%	6	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%						
Coral Spr	2	<1%	0	0%	0	0%	326	86%	1	0.2%	1	<1%	0	0%	0	0%	3	1%						
Dania	0	0%	0	0%	2	<1%	0	0%	2	0.5%	3	1%	0	0%	0	0%	1	<1%						
Davie	7	2%	9	3%	4	1%	0	0%	63	14%	4	1%	30	5%	2	6%	10	3%						
Deerfield	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%						
Fort Laud	2	<1%	1	<1%	208	78%	0	0%	5	1%	193	44%	0	0%	0	0%	8	2%						
Hallandale	0	0%	0	0%	1	<1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%						
Hollywood	7	2%	6	1%	3	1%	0	0%	8	2%	3	1%	2	0%	0	0%	1	<1%						
Laud BTS	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%						
Lauderhill	11	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	<1%	0	0%	2	<1%	0	0%	3	9%	4	1%						
Laud Lks	2	<1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	<1%	0	0%	9	27%	0	0%						
Lazy Lake	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	<1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%						
Light Point	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%						
Margate	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	13	3%	1	0.2%	2	<1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%						
Miramar	3	1%	167	42%	1	<1%	0	0%	3	1%	0	0%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%						
N Laud	1	<1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%						
Oakland Prk	1	<1%	0	0%	5	2%	0	0%	1	0.2%	32	7%	0	0%	0	0%	1	<1%						
Parkland	0	0%	1	<1%	0	0%	23	6%	0	0%	1	<1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%						
Pem Park	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%						
Pem Pines	3	1%	186	46%	1	<1%	0	0%	50	11%	4	1%	14	2%	0	0%	6	2%						
Plantation	61	20%	5	1%	10	4%	1	<1%	7	2%	12	3%	5	1%	9	27%	283	72%						
Pompano	0	0%	0	0%	1	<1%	0	0%	0	0%	14	3%	0	0%	0	0%	1	<1%						
SR Lakes	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%						
Sunrise	189	62%	5	1%	4	1%	2	<1%	6	1%	5	1%	11	2%	9	27%	51	13%						
SW Ranch	1	<1%	5	1%	0	0%	0	0%	10	2%	1	<1%	25	4%	0	0%	1	<1%						
Tamarac	6	2%	1	<1%	1	<1%	6	2%	2	0.5%	6	1%	3	1%	1	3%	2	1%						
Unic BC	0	0%	0	0%	4	1%	0	0%	10	2%	4	1%	1	0%	0	0%	6	2%						
Weston	4	1%	11	3%	2	<1%	1	<1%	24	5%	0	0%	495	83%	0	0%	9	2%						
Wilton Man	0	0%	0	0%	17	6%	0	0%	0	0%	141	32%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%						
<b>Total</b>	<b>301</b>		<b>402</b>		<b>265</b>		<b>379</b>		<b>437</b>		<b>437</b>		<b>594</b>		<b>33</b>		<b>393</b>							
<b>Referral</b>																								
Direct Mail	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	54	14%						
Forum Ad	7	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%						
County Ad Sun Sen	148	49%	166	41%	112	42%	208	54%	223	51%	354	81%	254	43%	28	85%	223	57%						
Cable TV	0	0%	23	6%	14	5%	6	2%	5	1%	1	0%	23	4%	0	0%	0	0%						
City Publication	3	1%	92	23%	91	35%	102	27%	71	16%	13	3%	131	22%	0	0%	0	0%						
OIWM-Internet	5	2%	0	0%	20	8%	42	11%	9	2%	4	1%	55	9%	1	3%	27	7%						
Press Rel	29	10%	4	1%	14	5%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%						
Utility Bill	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	13	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%						
Sign	90	30%	95	23%	0	0%	15	4%	104	24%	29	7%	99	17%	2	6%	69	18%						
WO Mouth	19	6%	7	2%	14	5%	6	2%	25	6%	22	5%	32	5%	2	6%	20	5%						
<b>Waste Sum</b>																								
Latex Paint	1,000 gal	8,000 lb	1,500 gal	12,000 lb	750 gal	6,000 lb	2,000 gal	16,000 lb	2,385 gal	19,080 lb	2,277.5 gal	18,220 lb	2,055 gal	16,440 lb	447.5 gal	3,580 lb	2,670 gal	21,360 lb						
Alkyd Paint		1,291 lb		1,706 lb		2,041 lb		2,443 lb		1,315 lb		2,604 lb		2,188 lb		480 lb		1,764 lb						
Auto Batt	77	3,465 lb	148	6,660 lb	89	4,005 lb	106	4,770 lb	180	8,100 lb	128	5,760 lb	195	8,775 lb	9	405 lb	78	3,510 lb						
Rech Batt		50 lb		75 lb		100 lb		100 lb		100 lb		100 lb		100 lb		3 lb		50						
Used Oil	100 gal	800 lb	250 gal	2,000 lb	150 gal	1,200 lb	220 gal	1,760 lb	330 gal	2,640 lb	330 gal	2,640 lb	275 gal	2,200 lb	40 gal	320 lb	165 gal	1,320 lb						
Antifreeze	50 gal	400 lb	50 gal	400 lb	25 gal	200 lb	50 gal	400 lb	55 gal	440 lb	55 gal	440 lb	55 gal	440 lb	10 gal	80 lb	55 gal	440 lb						
F Tubes		35 lb		31 lb		10 lb		72 lb		14 lb		14 lb		30 lb		0 lb		7 lb						
Flammables		415 lb		440 lb		802 lb		943 lb		360 lb		1120 lb		507 lb		169 lb		883 lb						
Poisons		426 lb		783 lb		601 lb		734 lb		592 lb		868 lb		912 lb		181 lb		1,101						
Corrosives		324 lb		594 lb		302 lb		545 lb		452 lb		550 lb		777 lb		144 lb		885 lb						
Aerosols		207 lb		392 lb		274 lb		324 lb		322 lb		406 lb		453 lb		60 lb		631 lb						
Oxidizers		0 lb		27 lb		10 lb		81 lb		63 lb		12 lb		87 lb		0 lb		37 lb						
Fuels		392 lb		786 lb		940 lb		960 lb		894 lb		821 lb		937 lb		45 lb		917 lb						
Reactives		0 lb		2 lb		0 lb		4 lb		12 lb		3 lb		9 lb		0 lb		10 lb						
LP Tanks	40	400 lb	55	550 lb	38	380 lb	63	630 lb	89	1,090 lb	102	1,195 lb	50	500 lb	5	50 lb	45	470 lb						
Fire Ext	13	26 lb	17	34 lb	12	24 lb	24	48 lb	25	50 lb	30	60 lb	15	30 lb	1	2 lb	16	32 lb						
<b>Total</b>		16,231 lb		26,480 lb		16,839 lb		29,814 lb		35,524 lb		34,839 lb		17,945 lb		5,519 lb		33,417 lb						
<b>Avg per User</b>		53 lb		65 lb		63 lb		78 lb		81 lb		80 lb												
<b>Other Mat</b>																								
Haz frm City		0 lb		0 lb		0 lb		0 lb		0 lb		0 lb		0 lb		0 lb		0 lb						
Trash		30 yd		40 yd		30 yd		40 yd		40 yd		40 yd		40 yd		40 yd		40 yd						

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE RECORD**

Municipality	2005												2006												
	28-Jan	25-Feb	18-Mar	Apr	May	June	July-CX	Aug-CX	9-Sep	23-Sep	Oct-CX	Nov-CX	Dec-CX	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Coco Creek	P	P		P	P				P	P			P	P	P	P	P	P							
Cooper City																									
Carl Miller	P	P				P													P						
Diane Patanelli									P	P				P	P										
Coral Springs	P	P	P		P	P			P	P				P	P	P	P	P							
Davie		P	P							P				P		P	P	P	P						
Deerfield Bch																									
Mario Reboa				P																					P
Cheryl Miller	P	P			P	P			P	P				P	P	P	P	P							
Ft. Lauderdale																									
Slagle	P		P	P	P	P								P	P		P								
Eckels	P	P	P			P			P					P		P		P							
Hillsboro Bch																									
Hollywood		P	P	P	P				P	P				P		P	P	P	P						
Laud-by-Sea																									
Laud. Lakes				P		P			P																
Lauderhill	P	P				P				P				P	P		P	P	P						
Lazy Lakes		P													P										
Lighthouse Pt.		P	P		P													P	P						
Margate	P	P	P	P		P																			P
Miramar	P	P	P	P					P	P				P	P	P	P	P	P						
N. Lauderdale																									
Oakland Park	P	P	P	P						P				P	P		P								
Pembroke Park	P	P	P	P	P	P				P				P	P	P									
Plantation	P	P	P	P	P	P			P	P				P		P									
Sea Ranch Lakes																									
Southwest Ranches		P																							
Sunrise	P	P	P	P	P	P				P				P			P	P	P						
Tamarac				P		P								P		P	P								P
West Park																									
Weston																									P
Wilton Manors	P	P	P			P				P				P		P	P	P	P						
Unincorporated		P	P															P	P						
<b>Non Municipal</b>																									
Eileen Cudney				P	P																				
Rob Jindracek																		P	P						
John Albert	P													P	P	P	P								
Hunter Varnedoe	P	P	P	P	P				P	P				P	P				P						
Michael Savino			P	P	P					P				P		P			P						