

and introduced Darron Anglin, District Manager for the sewer district, to give a presentation on the sewer district.

Mr. Darron Anglin stated he would present the state of the sewer. They are known as the Superstition Mountains Community Facilities District. He gave a brief history of the district, the amount of sewage they have treated thus far, their budget and the treatment process.

Councilmember Wilson thanked him on behalf of the equine community for being another place to take manure and work with their composting.

City Manager Bryant Powell commented on the connections to the sewer district and the water treatment plant.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

ORDINANCE NO. 1428, CASE PZ-2-16,
PROPOSED PLANNED DEVELOPMENT
AMENDMENT REQUEST BY APACHE
JUNCTION LANDFILL CORPORATION TO
AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THEIR
SPECIAL USE PERMIT/FIRST AMENDMENT
TO THE AGREEMENT FOR OPERATION OF
MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE LANDFILL AND
RELATED OFFSITE AND ROADWAY
IMPROVEMENTS AGREEMENT)

) Mayor Insalaco asked if
they could have one public hearing on the item.

City Attorney Joel Stern
stated they could have one public hearing but they must have a
separate vote on each item.

Senior Planner Rudy Esquivias
briefed the council on Ordinance No. 1428.

Mayor Insalaco asked what
would happen to everybody's trash if this closes.

Senior Planner Rudy Esquivias
stated he believes Mr. Coyle will address that question.

Basically, if the landfill closed today, there would probably be a transfer station constructed somewhere. They would have to go through the city processes if they wanted to construct it in the city. Everybody's trash would go to a transfer station and then be hauled to one of the other surrounding landfills in the metropolitan area.

Councilmember Wilson commented he had a tour out there. Currently there is no water monitoring in the area at all. They are not required to do it. It is basically grandfathered in due to the age of the original facility. They are doing a lot to try to mitigate any problems but there is no water contamination being evaluated at all. He would like to see what it would take to add that to the conditions. He asked how they could go about doing that.

Senior Planner Rudy Esquivias stated they could add another condition to the zoning or address it in the item Larry will be talking about, the host agreement. There are a couple of places where they could cover that. Perhaps the city attorney could advise on which would be the best place to put it.

City Attorney Joel Stern stated they could put it in both. Larry will be presenting the development agreement in a moment where they can also talk about it.

Councilmember Evans asked why planning and zoning asked to change it from 2035 to 2025.

Senior Planner Rudy Esquivias stated there was a lot of back and forth discussion about whether the 2035 date relates to the progress of waste coming into the landfill. It is an open-ended question best addressed by Mr. Anderson or Mr. Coyle. It might even close sooner; there is also the possibility if there is no closure date it might close later. There were also questions whether 1,723 feet had anything to do with the physics of the landfill itself. The 2035 date was a negotiated date in early discussions with city staff and landfill staff. We all thought it was a fair date when arrived at. He believes the commission would like to see

it closed sooner. He does not recall there being a hard reason to move it from 2035 to 2025.

City Attorney Joel Stern stated one of the issues was they were going to miss out on development for an extra ten years. That issue was brought up by two or three members.

Senior Planner Rudy Esquivias stated that concern was also brought up by the one citizen who spoke at the meeting. Some folks have a vested interest in town and they are interested in seeing it close sooner rather than later.

Councilmember Waldron asked if they would need to go to Arizona Department of Environmental Quality for specific wording for the agreement if they start looking at the water issue.

City Attorney Joel Stern stated he would recommend that. They have certain specifics they would probably want to see as a condition.

Councilmember Waldron commented they would have to approach them and it would take a little bit of time to get a response.

City Attorney Joel Stern stated he would recommend it but he does not know how long they would take or the Arizona Department of Water Resources. It would take a while. They do have a lack of employees. But it would have to be done.

Councilmember Evans asked if anyone included how State Land might feel about having a closure date or not, or if they would prefer 2025 to 2035. She asked if they had any input.

Senior Planner Rudy Esquivias stated they sent a complete copy of the staff report to the contact at State Land. Staff did not receive any comments back from her. He believes no comment means they are fine with what is being done.

City Manager Bryant Powell stated Lisa Atkins, the current State Land commissioner, was in Apache Junction three weeks ago. He asked for her thoughts on this. She stated the current footprint is what it is; it is a scar. They do not have a lot to say on it. However, the inability for the community to have a closure date is something that is not there. The ability to have a date, to be able to say that to developers is something that they have an interest in. That was her comment. She did not say they would engage and they have not seen a letter. She was glad to hear the city and landfill are working together on coming up with a plan.

Councilmember Wilson commented when he first came on the city council one of their first meetings had a discussion on the landfill with its potential closure and what they would need to do and look into for the future on addressing solid waste. That was over 8 years ago. At that time they were looking at 8 to 10 years into the future. Today it is still 8 to 10 years in the future that they are proposing as they have had a decrease in usage or deliveries. We are doing more in recycling than we were 8 years ago. He understands it. Even if they say it is 8 to 12 years into the future now, they could even take it out even further than that because of the decreasing usage. He likes the idea of having a solid date but he is very concerned about adding water monitoring in any way, shape or form where they can get it done. He knows they are doing a terrific job in using the liners coming up against the old, basic footprint. They still have the basic footprint started that has nothing and that is something they inherited. It was not something they did.

Councilmember Serdy commented several of them had tours down there. As landfills go, it is probably one of the nicer ones. Republic has been a great partner. They would not have had Fourth of July celebrations the last few years without them. Regarding the comment about whether State Land cares or not, they do not develop anything. The people that would be buying and possibly putting something nice there would care for the kind of things he would like to see there. He has wanted to see a resort go in. We do not have anything out here other than Gold Canyon and he questions if they would want to go in next to this. He is leaning towards sooner rather than later.

There was general discussion between the mayor and the city attorney on the order of who would be speaking when.

Development Services Director Larry Kirch briefed the council on the operating agreement and the first amendment to the agreement.

Councilmember Waldron asked if the same time frame triggers kick in under the proposed agreement if the firm closure date is set in 2035 but it fills up quicker than that such as five years for an earlier closure date. He asked if they would start with the increased payments five years earlier.

Development Services Director Larry Kirch stated he believed they would. The trigger is there. He is not sure if it is specific language, it is the intent. If they close in 2030, then in 2025 we would start getting those payments. He thinks that is how it is worded. At the same time, the other revenues do not show up either because it is closed early.

Councilmember Evans asked if the monies received from Republic Services go into the general fund or some other part of the budget.

City Manager Bryant Powell stated they go into the general fund.

Councilmember Evans commented there is no place around here where the city would receive that income to move a dump to.

City Manager Bryant Powell stated that is correct. There is a transfer site across the street on Royal Palm that Right-Of-Way Disposal has, but there is no other site and there is no agreement with them. They are in a county island. We need to prepare financially and fiscally as that day will come. Currently, under the current agreement, if nothing changes, that \$250,000 or \$270,000 or \$220,000, depending on the year, will be gone.

Councilmember Evans asked if that is a percentage of the general fund budget.

City Manager Bryant Powell stated the general fund revenues run about \$25,000,000 a year. It would be around 1% plus or minus. The non-tax revenue is around 5%. It is not insignificant. It would be a work around to figure out how they are going to do it. They would have to prepare for it. It would be a revenue loss.

Councilmember Evans commented it would be a revenue loss but it would also be an additional charge to the citizens for wherever the new dump will be.

City Manager Bryant Powell stated it will be a double whammy of if they wanted to keep the current level of service. They would have to find revenue or manage that one. When it closes, nobody really knows how much of an increase there will be to the service. Currently the residents are charged \$15 a month and get single stream recycling, curbside recycling and trash pickup once a week. He can promise that will change. It will be increased but he does not know what it will be. They are talking years in advance and future dollars. That is another consideration in this.

Councilmember Rizzi commented she thought it was a great presentation.

Mayor Insalaco requested the applicant address the council.

Mr. Steven Anderson, attorney with the law firm of Gammage and Burnham, addressed the council on behalf of Republic Services. General Manager Chris Coyle and Environmental Manager Doug Sawyer of Republic Services were also in attendance. They have two items on the agenda this evening regarding the landfill: an amendment to the current operations agreement and an amendment to the current planned development zoning. Staff has provided them with a detailed report on the proposals that were discussed at the work session two weeks ago. He will not reiterate the details of the staff report, but he will highlight the issues he believes should be touched upon. He wanted to emphasize the current confirmation from city staff

on the point of current compliance. Apache Junction Landfill Corporation and the city both have been and remain in compliance with the current operations agreement and planned development zoning that currently exists on the site. Regardless of what happens this evening, those two items will remain in place tomorrow morning and they will continue to comply with them until otherwise notified. They believe they have operated the facility in a responsible manner and as part of that operation have attempted to keep the city regularly apprised of what is happening at the landfill. He showed them an aerial photograph of the site. He also had a detailed photograph that was labeled. It had a little more detail than the one showed by Rudy Esquivias. It has specific activities that occur on the site labeled. They also brought a 3D printer model of the landfill and he passed that up to the council. There are three aspects to the proposed amendment to the operations agreement that he wanted to present. The first of those is closure. The proposals before them this evening establish a closure date. The proposal are from staff and the negotiated one they agreed to is December 31, 2035. At this time no closure date exists for this landfill. If this is approved this evening, it will become the only Republic landfill in the state with a publicly set closure date. Filling a landfill is subject to a wide range of factors: the state of the economy, fuel prices, recycling and competition. When entering this amendment, Republic will replace a rubric in which all of those factors are a part of the decision on how the landfill operates with a primary goal of filling this landfill by a certain date. It will change the way they operate the facility. The second thing he wanted to discuss are the financial commitments that are a part of the operations agreement amendment. The proposals increase the current financial commitments they are willing to make to the city. There is an immediate and indexed increase in the tonnage fees, the creation of the free dumping rights for the city throughout the year and the creation of closure funding payment of \$1.5 million. None of these obligations currently exist at the facility. The planning commission did recommend approval of the planned development amendment but through a jurisdictional quirk of this process the planning commission does not have jurisdiction over the operations agreement amendment. They never saw that or heard Larry's presentation. They did not have all the information before them. They remain ready to commit to the 2035 closure date. In their mind it is part of a complex

and completely negotiated agreement. That is why they differ with the planning commission's recommendation with regard to condition number four. However, they are willing to agree to and actually welcome their recommendation for the additional landscaping stipulation that some landscaping be done at this time. The language in the staff report is acceptable to them as an additional stipulation as part of approval. The final item is the groundwater monitoring with regard to the various amendments before the council. Currently this is a grandfathered site. Arizona Department of Environmental Quality does not require this landfill to have groundwater monitoring at this time. If they approve these proposals tonight, Republic would be required to amend its current operating documents with Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. It is their 100% expectation that Arizona Department of Environmental Quality will, as part of such an amendment, require Republic to begin groundwater monitoring. If they see fit to add something into the approval of either of the documents that are before them, he would estimate they would have Arizona Department of Environmental Quality groundwater monitoring within one year of approval. It would be fully consistent with what they expect to have to do anyway. They do view this as an Arizona Department of Environmental Quality process, not an Arizona Department of Water Resources process. He recommends they defer to Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. As part of city approval, they are already required to comply with Arizona Department of Environmental Quality regulations. If they do have to do that, it will be a six-figure cost to Republic in order to install the necessary groundwater monitoring wells and all the equipment that is involved in that effort as an initial startup. There is then an ongoing annual compliance cost. It is something that is not without financial impact on Republic and it is indeed part of the calculus that was part of their negotiated approach to this process. He commented on the community outreach that Rudy was talking about previously. The red circle is the required city notice under their ordinances. They went half a mile more north to Baseline and then an additional quarter mile in each direction on Tomahawk for the notifications. They appreciate the fast acknowledgement of their efforts. To date there has been a neighborhood mailing, a community open house, a planning commission study session, a planning commission hearing and a city council study session. There have been five separate occasions for public input thus far. Prior to today they were

aware of three people who had expressed concerns about the proposals and they were primarily expressed to the city. Mr. Ken Johnson sent in a letter in response to an original neighborhood mailer two months ago and they sent him a responsive letter. Ms. Diana Burns sent a letter to the city two weeks ago with six questions that were addressed at one of the two staff presentations just heard. He would address those items if requested. If they had come up at the open house or in response to the neighborhood mailing they would have addressed those questions at that time. The letter from two weeks ago contained no responsive contact information. The post card over the weekend from Ms. Burns did have a phone number and they called her yesterday and left a message. She had not responded but she may not have had the opportunity to do so. The gentleman engaged the most is Mr. Andy Kunasek. He does not live in Apache Junction; he lives in Paradise Valley. He was forthright about his motivations with the planning commission at the hearing last month. He is a real estate investor and potential competitor to Republic with regard to this facility. His information is a matter of public record. He has an investment in the Silverado Landfill in Pinal County. He showed them a map for their approval in Pinal County and an aerial photograph showing their location which is about 24 miles away. It seems like is as a long way away in a typical zoning case but when it comes to a landfill it is actually a next door neighbor. He showed them deeds for the site with Mr. Kunasek's signature operating through Mineral Mountain LLC, a limited liability company that he has for maintenance of the site. He got the original approval from Pinal County in January 2008. They have not done an exhaustive review of all of his approvals. The map is simply related to his original approval in 2008. They understand that nothing has happened on that site since that time. He is waiting for an opportunity to begin development or a buyer. He is not someone who has been in the waste disposal business on a day-to-day, routine basis. He showed the council the approvals from planning and zoning and industrial use permit that are very similar to the city approvals with much of the same requirements imposed. There were a few he wanted to highlight. He has a schedule of development with an opening day about two years away in 2018. He does not have a closure date. It is typical to not have a closure date in a landfill approval. He has an odd stipulation that Republic does not have that requires him to be able to support his landfill through transfer

station sites. Stipulation number twelve actually says that he has to have a transfer station site included in Apache Junction. To the best of his knowledge, such a site has not been developed at this point but it is in there. Mr. Kunasek's investment risk is not really the business of Apache Junction but he thought they would be interested to know the specifics about his approvals. To date, in their minds, the people who have really been interested here before this evening have been the council and city staff. Some of them took the time to come to our community open house and they appreciated that time. Some of them have taken the time to tour the landfill and they appreciate that as well. They sat through a detailed study session two weeks ago. They have sat through an hour of presentation from staff and him this evening. He appreciated their interests and efforts.

Vice Mayor Barker asked them to explain how they are going to mitigate that area from the earlier landfill with the moisture seepage.

Mr. Chris Coyle, Republic Services, 4050 S. Tomahawk, Apache Junction, general manager for the Apache Junction Landfill Corporation, addressed the council. The original portion of the landfill is the center 40 acres. The original landfill was a trench landfill where they dig a trench about 25 feet deep, fill it with trash, cover it and dig another trench next to it and keep moving along like that. They have an assumption of where the bottom of that trash is as they did not keep records in the 50s and 60s. To be safe they dug below where they believe the bottom of the landfill was and installed the liner there all the way around the landfill. They have one last segment to do. The theoretical assumption is that anything that migrates from that original landfill will be captured by liner underneath the landfill. It will also capture all the water that has gone through the trash. They have a landfill gas system that is over the entire landfill.

Vice Mayor Barker commented they then pull the moisture out from the liner.

Mr. Chris Coyle stated they pull the moisture out from the liner. They have four subdrains

and subpumps in the landfill. They pump it out and use it as dust control for the lined areas along the landfill.

Councilmember Rizzi commented the tour was fascinating and educational. She never thought it would be that interesting and he had answers to all the questions. It would be interesting for other people to take it and get educated. They had talked about how thick the liner is and the unlikelihood that it should tear. Should it tear, there is a material that if water somehow hits it, it becomes concrete.

Mr. Chris Coyle stated it is a composite liner. The liner below it has a geotech soft fabric that has a bettanite layer below it. Once bettanite gets wet it solidifies and essentially turns into concrete. On top of that is a 60 mil plastic they use in all their landfills across the country unless local regulations require it to be higher. From there they put two feet of dirt to make sure the plastic does not get damaged. They then put waste on top of the solid waste to protect the liner. If something does happen to get through the plastic, it would be solidified underneath there.

Councilmember Rizzi commented they are grandfathered in and not required to monitor the groundwater. In their conversation he commented he was prepared to do that and he was willing to do that.

Mr. Chris Coyle stated absolutely. If they have approval from the council this evening or in the future they would have to do a modification. They have to apply for a modification with Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. They fully expect Arizona Department of Environmental Quality to impose groundwater monitoring requirements on the site. They have budgeted for it and prepared for it. They will have one up gradient well and two down gradient wells to make sure the water, whatever travels underneath the landfill, remains consistent before and after.

Councilmember Waldron asked if it is his understanding in the proposed agreement that should the landfill close prior to 2035 proposed date, that the five

year trigger would kick in. For instance, if it will close in 2030 it would kick in in 2025.

Mr. Chris Coyle stated he does not remember the specific language but one way or another if it closes early they will have all the funds when it closes.

Councilmember Waldron commented it is the same for the park.

Mr. Chris Coyle stated that is correct. They can work that out with staff. Sometimes it is hard to project when five years will be but they will have a trigger in there to where if they do close early and they have only made one or two payments, they will have a trigger in there were all funds become due.

Councilmember Rizzi commented they had also talked about the height increase and comparisons. She asked for an idea to give her a visual. He compared the height increase to two basketball hoops.

Mr. Chris Coyle stated it is essentially. It was about 23 feet from where they were sitting and right on top of the landfill.

Councilmember Rizzi commented they are not going bigger and wider. They are going the equivalent of two basketball hoops.

Mr. Chris Coyle stated that is correct.

Councilmember Wilson commented he had asked him what the height difference is between the 1723 and Silly Mountain. When he looked it up he found that Silly Mountain is 5 feet taller.

Mr. Chris Coyle stated he went back and looked at that. The trailhead of Silly Mountain, where you actually start to go up, is the elevation of 1727. You could stand there and look back at the site and it is below you.

Mayor Insalaco opened the public hearing on the item. He asked everyone to be courteous. There is a time limit and they will see it pop up. He asked if there was anyone who would like to speak on the item.

Mr. Larry Johnson, chief executive officer of the Apache Junction Chamber of Commerce, 567 W. Apache Trail, Apache Junction, addressed the council regarding Republic Services being a member of the chamber, last year being voted Large Member of the Year, and listed a number of events they have sponsored and supported. He spoke in favor of the plan.

Mr. Joe Durbala, 673 E. Kachina, Apache Junction, addressed the council to speak about the closure date, to try to get a transfer station in the city and recycling.

Mr. Tom Aulik, 503 E. Montebello, Apache Junction, addressed the council regarding his concern for a closure date, a well put in next door, putting the issue of what to do with the landfill to a vote, having a transfer station, his distrust for corporations, the council vote and his concern for the hazards.

Ms. Thressa Kelly, 2900 W. Superstition #99, #58, #5, #8 and #6, Apache Junction, addressed the council regarding her concerns for recycling alternatives, giving the garbage to other people and a concern for the aquafir.

Mr. Paul Winkman, Royal Palms, addressed the council to commend the people who take care of the place. He was concerned about where the trash would go once it is closed and it would be good to keep the landfill open as long as possible.

Ms. Karen Kunasek-Taylor, 3344 E. Camelback, Phoenix, representing DMV Associates, commented on the Eastmark property and the future of Superstition Vistas and Lost Dutchman Heights, the existing capacity for the landfill and the closure date.

Ms. Sandy Reed, 2221 E. 36th Avenue, Apache Junction, addressed the council regarding her opposition to all the development due to her concern for water and yard debris that could be composted in the future.

Pinal County Supervisor Todd House, 5027 E. Hidalgo Street, Apache Junction, addressed the council regarding economic development being easier with a park than with a landfill. He thinks future development would help to pay to develop that into a park.

Mr. Tim Waters, 2207 E. Baseline, Apache Junction, addressed the council regarding his concern about the landfill remaining there. He would like to see a park.

Mr. Rory Blakemore, Kowie Companies, 1242 E. Jackson Street, Phoenix, owners of Silver Bar Mine Regional Landfill, addressed the council regarding the alternatives to Republic, their expansion request and the possibility of briefing the council on their company at a future meeting.

Mr. Clark Smithson, 1700 S. Weaver Drive, Apache Junction, addressed the council regarding his concern for the monies needed to turn the landfill into a recreational area and long term obligations secured by bonding.

Ms. Diane Burns, 527 W. Whitely, Apache Junction, addressed the council regarding questions by the residents that included concerns for cancer risk, the underground water table, environmental hazards, the unlined aspect, property values going down, debris causing flat tires and exploring the alternatives. She urged they vote against this or delay it until they have the answers.

Mayor Insalaco closed the public hearing on the item and reopened the items to council discussion.

Vice Mayor Barker commented this is not an expansion. Many people who came up here described this as an expansion. The land that has been there

for many years has always been the landfill. It was simply in two different parcels, like your house and the house next door. All they want to do is pull the two parcels together. That is what this is about; it is not an expansion. If they vote no tonight, the landfill could go on for the next fifty years if they wish. They only have one point that is up to the height of Ordinance No. 1034. It can go on forever if that is what it takes to the point of recycling. We do have recycling but we do not recycle garbage. To her knowledge that methodology does not currently exist. State law prohibits the city from prohibiting the use of plastic bags. It is a state law so they cannot do it. It is a good point and she would love to do it but they cannot do that. The reason they do not see landfills in Mesa is because those landfills are now covered by parks and retail areas. We are only 39 years old. Mesa is 139 years old. They have had the opportunity to cover their landfills and to build their parks, etc. We are babies when it comes to the age and the opportunities to do these things. She resents the comment to the point of being selfish. This council is thinking about the future of this city and what the kids and grandkids, etc., will have. The whole goal in whatever decision we make here, and this is not a done deal, we have not cornered ourselves somewhere and said we are all going to do this, we have not done that. But whatever we do, each and every one of us is looking at the future of this city, a future that some of them will not be alive to see more than likely. However, they have an obligation to do what we see as the very best for this community. The State Land person, when she came out, gave us absolutely no indication that there will be any development of our state land for a very long time. She was pretty clear about it in a very convoluted manner. That is something they also need to keep in mind. She commented it is really cool to be looking through it with developers' eyes if money is all they are worried about. We are also worried about quality of life, with what is going to happen with health; we are worried about all those things. That is not economic development. It is a piece of it but it is not. She cannot look at her city strictly through the eyes of economic development. She has got to look at it through every lens she can find because that is the only way they are going to have a future in this community that is good for as many people as possible. That is their goal, for the most people possible.

Councilmember Rizzi commented when they went on the tour Chris was just so informative on answering questions. From her understanding, anyone that has questions that are unanswered and they would like a tour as the council had, they can call and get that. They can get those questions answered and they can take the tour. There are safety mechanisms in place for this seepage people are concerned about. Someone had mentioned prescriptions at the police department. The police department has a very successful prescription take back program. If they are not aware of that, maybe it is a good time to make people aware of it. They do it four days a week. Many police departments do it once a month. She heard something about flat tires. There are requirements to have the load covered. She knows because she goes there frequently. There is a requirement that the load be covered. If the load is not covered there is a fine. She has received phone calls from citizens with concerns. They are very concerned that the cost for trash removal is going to go up. The cost of fuel will go up. Desert dumping will be increased. As Vice Mayor Barker mentioned, there is a plan for a park. Anybody that is willing to contact Republic Services, go on the tour and get educated, do so. The view from the top is absolutely amazing. It is a 360° view. As far as development goes, she would like to see if they can pull up pictures of Mt. Trashmore Park. She wanted to show the public what the possibilities are. She asked if anyone knew where it is located.

Mayor Insalaco commented it is in Norfolk, Virginia. It is a park built on top of a landfill. So far as it being an eyesore, this was planned for the future and future generations.

Councilmember Wilson commented one of the things he is concerned about for future generations in protecting them is that right now there is no requirement for monitoring. If they say no or do not look at this or try to negotiate this, they do not have to monitor the groundwater because they are grandfathered in because of the original date when this landfill was established. He thinks more than anything else it is very important they look at that and the positives in this. He understands the Silver Bar Mine wants to have their opportunities. There are other trash companies in the area. They are all in competition with one

another. Right Away Disposal has a transfer station in the county island and there will most likely be more of these transfer stations established within the city. He has to say yes to Silver Bar that there will be more opportunities for other companies to come in and do this. Right now there is only one that has the transfer station. They will have to have more but that will be after further discussions in the future.

Councilmember Waldron commented on future economic development. A few years ago that land was auctioned off with the name of Portalis for \$55 million. It is now Lost Dutchman Heights. Unfortunately the developer went broke. It had nothing to do with the landfill. The development opportunities are there. He would like to pursue with Arizona Department of Environmental Quality the language necessary to have monitoring wells. He thinks that is a legitimate concern.

Councilmember Serdy commented he wants the city to grow and he agrees with many of the points Mr. House said. If we are going to keep our density low in the rest of the city the growth would have to go down there. He thinks the landfill would retard the growth. He does not want to see the city get left behind like a lot of the communities along Route 66 where they just got left behind when the freeway came in. He thinks Apache Junction is at risk of that happening at this end of the city unless we expand down there.

Mayor Insalaco commented as far as the dust, we live in a desert. He lives in a development not close to the landfill but when the monsoons come and the wind blows that dust comes from everywhere. It even comes from the streets where the traffic is. That does not hold water to him. He moved here from a green area and is glad he is here. He is away from the water and the snow, but he had to put up with something. Wherever you go you have something you are going to have to live with. The landfill was here long before any of us were here. We have that burden now. For a long time it was not a problem but, like everyone has said, there is no closure date. It can go on for one hundred years if no one does something. They are trying to do something now. They are trying to get a closure date so they can get it done. He called

for any further discussion. There being no further discussion he called for a motion.

Councilmember Wilson asked if he could make a motion to go back and have a future date in November or December to renegotiate this agreement to include water monitoring and the planting of the vegetation.

Mayor Insalaco commented he means the landscaping.

Councilmember Waldron asked if that is item number 17.

There was general discussion on which item they wanted to move on first.

City Attorney Joel Stern stated it is kind of mixed. That is the problem.

Vice Mayor Barker asked if they both go together.

City Attorney Joel Stern stated it depends. If they are going to add the monitoring wells, his recommendation is to put that in both documents, in the zoning and the development agreement. It may take a while. He does not know how long. November or December, he is not sure that is enough time with Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. They might want to go a little longer. There is also the vegetation. They pretty much agree with the developer on that one. There is also the issue of the payment. There is language in here but it does not say, from what he has seen, that they have to pay us if they close early. He did not see that in there. He thinks they would like to work that out, too. He thinks they want more face time with the developer and staff. That could take some time. He would recommend, if it does not go back to the planning and zoning commission and the way to avoid that is to continue both items.

Mayor Insalaco commented they do not table it, just continue it.

City Attorney Joel Stern stated they do not table it because if they do that they would have to go back through the planning and zoning commission. They would continue it to a date certain and they could pick a date later this year or next year. They need a council meeting and he thinks they want another work session. They would also want a public hearing. They would want to set both of those dates.

Councilmember Rizzi asked what they would do if they pick that date and there is some kind of issue with Arizona Department of Environmental Quality.

Vice Mayor Barker commented they would continue it again.

There was general discussion on future meeting dates. The consensus was the work session on November 14 and the regular meeting on December 6.

Vice Mayor Barker MOVED THAT ORDINANCE NO. 1428 BE READ BY TITLE ONLY AND THE READING OF THE ENTIRE ORDINANCE BE WAIVED.

Councilmember Wilson SECONDED THE MOTION.

VOTE: Unanimous.

The motion carried.

City Clerk Kathleen Connelly read the ordinance by title only.

Vice Mayor Barker MOVED THAT WE CONTINUE ORDINANCE NO. 1428 TO THE WORK SESSION OF NOVEMBER 14TH AND THE REGULAR SESSION OF DECEMBER 6TH AND DURING THE CONTINUATION WE WORK WITH BOTH THE LANDFILL FOLKS AND ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TO WORK OUT AN AMENDMENT THAT INCLUDES WATER MONITORING AND ANY OTHER THINGS THAT WE TALKED ABOUT. She believed the landscaping was already in there.

City Attorney Joel Stern
requested she repeat the dates.

Vice Mayor Barker commented
November 14th work session and December 6th regular session.

Councilmember Rizzi **SECONDED**
THE MOTION.

City Attorney Joel Stern
asked if it is for a public hearing.

Vice Mayor Barker **AMENDED TO**
ADD FOR A PUBLIC HEARING.

Councilmember Rizzi **SECONDED**
THE AMENDMENT.

VOTE: **Unanimous.**

The motion carried.

Vice Mayor Barker **MOVED THAT**
THE FOLLOWING DIRECTION BE GIVEN TO STAFF REGARDING THE FIRST
AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT FOR OPERATION OF MUNICIPAL SOLID
WASTE LANDFILL AND RELATED OFFSITE ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS
AGREEMENT: THAT THE AGREEMENT BE CONTINUED UNTIL THE NOVEMBER
14TH WORK SESSION AND THE DECEMBER 6TH REGULAR MEETING, AND, IN
THE MEANTIME, THAT STAFF WORK WITH THE LANDFILL CORPORATION AND
ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ON GETTING WATER
MONITORING EQUIPMENT AND SO FORTH ON THE PROPERTY.

Councilmember Wilson **SECONDED**
THE MOTION.

VOTE: **Unanimous.**

The motion carried.

Mayor Insalaco called for a
ten minute break at 9:15 p.m.