U.S.-Mexico Border 2012 Waste Policy Forum Meeting
January 20, 2005 - Private Meeting

Camino Real Hotel
Av. Paseo de los Héroes
10305 Zona Rió
22320 Tijuana, B.C. México

Meeting Summary Contents

I. Reactions to the Public Meeting

II. Discussion of Documents

Binational Action Plan and Capacity Building
Binational Policy on Site Revitalization
Tracking Evaluation Report
Borderwide Tire Strategy

III. Roles of Policy Forum and Task Forces

IV. Possible Approaches to Communication

V. BECC Presentation

VI. National Coordinator's Meeting

VII. Attendees

I. REACTIONS TO THE PUBLIC MEETING

The main topic of concern during this discussion was how to fund the many projects that were discussed the previous day. Mr. Castillo suggested that resources and money should be leveraged so that the limited dollars available are used strategically.
The need for coordination among the task force members was also mentioned several times.

II. DISCUSSION OF DOCUMENTS

Binational Action Plan and Capacity Building

Funds leverage, small communities, undocumented immigrant waste, education and technology transfer, and the need for increased enforcement were all discussed by the forum. Specific action items mentioned by forum members are listed below.

- Mr. Picardi expressed the importance of not including specific waste streams in the action plans because it is uncertain which projects will get funded. However,

Mr. Jones spoke that the best way to get funding is with specific bullet-like objectives.

- Ms. Mendoza stated that a policy statement to address the waste problems due to illegal immigration should be added to the action plan.
- Mr. Picardi wondered if the action plan should mention the CEC's efforts to harmonize international waste codes and whether the WPF should become involved in this effort.
- Several people want to include a statement regarding helping small communities with their needs, which are often different from those of large cities. In particular, Dr. Bremer suggested designing technologies to lower the cost of disposal for small communities. Mr. Chavez suggested working with communities to encourage them to work regionally with other communities. Mr. Chacon suggested a pilot project to help a small community apply for NADBank funds for something along the lines of a small sanitary landfill. Mr. Balarezo of BECC was glad to hear of everyone's interest in BECC and NADBank and that BECC is currently reviewing their processes to determine how to make them more accessible.

Binational Policy on Site Revitalization

This discussion focused mainly on how best to use the limited available resources. After several requests to create more complete inventories of contaminated sites, Mr. Martin del Campo expressed concern that with all the talk about inventories, action was not being taken and ultimately sites were not being cleaned up. He argued that we should spend less money on creating a complete list of all the contaminated sites and instead should pick a site and begin clean-up. He later added to his statement that he did not disagree that studies on a particular site should be carried out before taking action on that site, but that money was not well spent on creating inventories when there is already a substantial list containing more sites than there are funds to clean-up those sites that are already known.

Another member of the Waste Policy Forum believed that long term studies will ultimately lead to more effective clean-up than immediate action, and said that money needed to first be spent on characterizing a site before beginning clean-up of the site. As site assessments only account for 5-10% of the total clean-up costs, site assessments should be carried out to receive the most results from the resources.

Mr. Jones reconciled these two viewpoints by saying that the policy document needs to show the balance between short term results and long term benefits more. He said clean-up is a balance between stabilizing a dangerous site by removing immediate hazards followed with longer term studies to determine the best strategies to fully revitalize the site.

Tracking Evaluation Report

Because the tracking evaluation report is still in a draft phase, this discussion was tabled until after the comments of Mr. Hale and Mr. Chacon are incorporated into the report.

However, Ms. Mendoza asked that the US States and regions coordinate with Robby Snowbarger and Bonnie Romo of EPA Region 6 about the Region 6 online pilot tracking database.

Border-wide Tire Strategy

Mr. Chacon asked whether GIS mapping/satellite imaging could be used to identify tire piles. Dr. Bremer said he would look into whether tire piles produce a recognizable pattern for one of these technologies. Ms. Pimentel said that EPA has some satellite photography of the California-Baja California border region. Mr. Castillo said that Texas has a record of nine official tire piles, but that unofficial tire piles also should be incorporated into the inventory.

Other suggestions for the strategy include:

- Mr. Martin del Campo called for the addition of studies on using scrap tires to the strategy. He noted that documented studies that standardize scrap tire pile engineering applications would make communication and collaboration with other agencies easier.
- Mr. Hale noted that the strategy reads as if the forum is just beginning work on this issue. The strategy should be amended to include assessments of current progress.

In addition to these specific suggestions for the strategy, Mr. Castillo mentioned a Texas DOT $50 million project for road paving. He said that EPA should leverage funds against this project so that tire scraps could be used in the road paving. Finally, Ms. Pimentel mentioned that there are several upcoming meetings where presentations about scrap tiles should be made. She mentioned the Rubber Tire Association meeting and the California Integrated Waste Management Board meeting.

III. ROLES OF POLICY FORUM AND TASK FORCES

Although consensus was not reached on the specific roles of the task forces, several people had ideas for what the forum should and should not do.

- In regards to the competitive funding process, Mr. Jones, echoed by Ms. Pimentel, felt that the forum should not be involved in ranking projects. This would add another layer of review for a process that is already intimidating for those who are applying for funds.
- Mr. Castillo felt that one role of the forum should be to translate documents into Spanish. He pointed out that there are many documents available, but few of them are in Spanish.
- Mr. Chacon said that the forum should make communication easy between all players. For example, he spoke of the potential of working with a university to help upload information onto a website.

IV. POSSIBLE APPROACHES TO COMMUNICATION

- There were many different ideas on how and how often to communicate. They included: periodic conference calls and emails, and creating a listserve/website.

There was some discussion over whether it would be possible for forum members to come a day early to the National Coordinators Meeting in March, but consensus was not reached. Mr. Hale also suggested that informal task forces of a broad group of people should be pulled together to work on tires and on civil engineering projects.

V. BECC PRESENTATION

Tomas Balarezo represented BECC and explained BECC's relationship to NAD Bank and BECC's current certified projects. In order for a project to receive funding from NAD Bank, it must first be certified by BECC. In the past, projects that address the pollution problems of water treatment, potable water, and municipal wastes have been certified. BECC and NAD Bank are trying to streamline their application process to make funding more accessible to communities. Mr. Balazero stated that communities on the Mexican side of the border do not always have the know-how to effectively apply for grants, while communities on the US side are better informed. In addition, the sizes of the communities on the Mexican side are larger than their counterparts on the US side. As such, more money has been slotted for projects in Mexico than projects in the US. In terms of their waste projects, $2.2 million has been slotted for Mexican and US communities. There are currently two solid waste projects in the US which are in Patagonia, AZ and Douglas, AZ. There are four solid waste projects in Mexico, three of which are in Nueva Leon.

VI. NATIONAL COORDINATOR'S MEETING

The waste session at the National Coordinator's Meeting will be 3 hours long. Mr. Picardi suggested further communication to decide ahead of time which topics to highlight.

VII. ATTENDEES (35)

Edna A. Mendoza	AZ Dept. Env. Quality
Edward Ranger	AZ Dept. Env. Quality
Herberto Cavazos	
Hector Chavez	City of Eagle Pass, TX
Tomas Balarezo	COCEF (BECC)
Saul Martin del Campo	Ecologia de B.C.
Gerardo Echevarra	GEN (Recolectora King Kong)
Rene Javier Castrejon Montoya	GEN (Recolectora King Kong)
Pablo Guzman	GEN (Recolectora King Kong) /Vicra PASA
Martin Bremer	ITESM
Jorge Duran C	Municipio Matauonos
Toni J. Duggan	NM Env. Dept.
Jesus Jimenez Payan	PROFEPA
Francisco Trevino Cabello	PROFEPA- NL
Ramiro Mendival R	PROFEPA-Sonora
Q. Martha Sandval	PROFEPA-Tijuana
Rauldela Garza	Regidor M. de Matamoros
Saul Guzman	SEMARNAT B.C.
Juan M. Aguilar Esteves	SEMARNAT- Restauración de Sitios Contaminados
Alfonso Flores	SEMARNAT/HQ
Daniel Chacon	SEMARNAT/HQ
Humberto Ruiz Molina	SEMARNAT-Sonora
Ramon Castrejon Lomos	SIUE-Sonora
John Swanson	Sumex/Xerox
Jorge Castillo	Texas Commission of Env. Quality
Carlos E. Pena	University of Sonora
Patricia Overmeyer	US EPA/Brownfields
Albes Gaona	US EPA/OIA
Abigail Ryder	US EPA/OSW
Matt Hale	US EPA/OSW
Rick Picardi	US EPA/OSW
Norma Duran	US EPA/R6
Robert Snowbarger	US EPA/R6
David Jones	US EPA/R9
Emily Pimentel	USEPA/R9-San Francisco