

EQRA Stakeholders Meeting Minutes  
5/28/09

Welcome from, Bill—introductions  
Purpose of meeting:  
Provide opportunity info regarding EQRA  
Background info on EQRA  
Why we now have a problem with this fund

Copy of slides provided  
(See slides)

Current state of EQRA:  
Provided sufficient source of funding (see slide 2)  
SHW had general fund money taken away early

See slide 3—revenue that come into EQRA  
Light blue boxes on fee schedule for DEQ (2 fees)  
Generator site access paid for by energy solutions generators  
Other fees are in statute in appropriate act—in order to change those fees we have to go through legislative process (7 fees)

Slide 4

Disbursements from EQRA  
Optional that may be appropriated by legislature  
Hazardous substances mitigation fund—match obligation  
Public safety for hazardous substance handling and training—optional  
Yearly 400,000 comes out of fund to general fund for use by legislature as they wish  
Tooele County receives 10% of hazardous waste fees  
Fund used to fund HLNW, General Fund, DAQ, and DWQ  
User paying into acct, do not benefit from using the money for other accts  
\*(Give numbers of money taken from acct to use for other purposes to Dave Bird)

Phil—ARRA money will come and help with the match money for superfund  
\*(give site names that have supplemental money to Phil)

EQRA balances slide—in fy2010 we are going into the red on EQRA

Why are we in this situation? (See slide) prior estimates too high

Waste quantity problems—projections were for current activity we had for the year (trend analysis) we do make some inquiries with industry to see what they project

Worst case balance for fy10 would be -2.2 million  
This number will change for us with end of year  
Grant dollars—won't help this fund

See slide with graphs—  
56% covers entire hazardous waste program—rad program only get the low level  
waste program

Slide—EQRA rev vs. disbursements  
The last 15 years 6 years exceeded the money necessary, 7 years didn't meet the  
revenue need  
The line across top changes— personnel costs are factored in  
In 2008—\$565,000 taken out for one time funding for AQ and WQ, new auditor  
and records retention person  
Fees that would avoid ratcheting up effect—(Nathan)  
The trend is when there is money in acct—legislature will take some money  
Looking at fy2011 budget right now

Next slide – immediate need  
Support for supplemental appropriation from all here

Options for stabilizing (see slide) 3 options  
Option 1: Ask for supplemental from legislature

Option 2: Increase fee structure rates

Option 3 – Flat fee structure (assign a fee for different industry)

Consequences for inaction:  
Look at reduction in force at DEQ in SHW and LLW program (can jeopardize  
program)

Where do we go from here?  
--take some time in thinking about these options, or other ways that we could  
potentially look at this problem and solve it

\_\_DEQ will be looking at our programs  
--are there other options that might be of value  
--we are looking at a 3 month time frame—in  
June  
--good dialogue about what the options are  
--what are some ideas to best approach the problem  
July meeting: develop our path forward  
--consensus on best approach  
August meeting  
--strategy gelled and most likely will have some legislation

Is there interest in legislature not taking money away to give to non-program (Duane) that represents 9% of the disbursement?

Nathan—flat fee structure. Problematic—revenues are relative to tonnage.

Dan—real user fee where we pay for the hours for the people who do the work for oversight of facilities as opposed to flat fee. Then they have some control over it.

Hazardous waste industry—does pay on hourly basis.

Radioactive waste—pay by tonnage.

CPI adjustment—(Phil) A fair way of keeping up to date on inflation.

Dave Bird—discussion of disbursements and how it has gone at next meeting.

Duane—review of potential duplication of services.

June meeting date:

June 18<sup>th</sup>—2:30 \*\*\*\*\*