

Meeting Minutes Commercial Recycling Implementation Committee
Thursday, June 15, 2006

Present

Jane Chronis	MAVDevelopment
Jim Frey	RRS
Margie Teall	Environmental Commission/ City Council
Steve Bean	Environmental Commission
Wendi Felgner	Ann Arbor Learning Community
Nicole Chardoul	RRS
Patricia Harroun	Cardea Construction Co.
Linda Lombardini	Trillium Real Estate
David Stead	Environmental Commission
Carol Collins	People's Food Co-op
Tim Stark	1-800-GOT-JUNK
Maggie Ladd	South University Area Association
Scott Rosencrans	Bob Behnke Co.
Melissa Vandam	Dwell Development
Jeff Jackson	Seva
Doug McClure	Conlin, McKenney & Philbrick
Nancy Rucker	Zingerman's Deli
Ida Hendrix	Briarwood Mall

Staff – Bryan Weinert, Tom McMurtrie, Nancy Stone, Kevin Ernst, Shawn Severance

INTRODUCTION

Today's goal is to provide you with concise background information.

The physical product of this committee will be a report to City Council delivered by January 2007. This date is necessary to fit into city budgeting process in case implementation requires city funding. The report will be organized with the following chapters -

1. Executive summary
2. Goals
3. Context
4. Recommended approach
5. Action plan
6. Implementation steps

Process overview

In committee meetings we will do a PowerPoint to lay the groundwork for the discussion that follows. Subcommittees may be formed and they will have clear assignments and goals and the process will be facilitated.

Ground rules

The goal is to use time effectively, so we will start on time, ask you to do your homework, and we will use parking lot concept if needed. Subcommittee assignments will come out of our discussion. Group dynamics will build respect, trust and common understanding.

Go Around

Members of the committee introduced themselves to one another.

Questions

Q -When we get to questions are we going to queue people?

A - Yes – Chairperson David Stead will endeavor to recognize committee members and staff sequentially as hands are raised.

Q- Is there a charter from the Environmental Commission?

A -We have a charge, yes. Process will first go back to the Environmental Commission and then back to council.

Q - Are we limited to exploring options in city plan?

A - No we are not limited – that is just the starting point. Feel free to bring up any option you want considered.

COMMERCIAL STUDY BACKGROUND AND OPTIONS

Current City Facilities - There is significant infrastructure in place giving us a lot of existing tools to work with.

- **The Materials Recovery Facility (MRF)** is a recycling facility. The MRF is owned by City and funded by environmental bond. The City has a 20-year operating contract (until 2015) with FCR. FCR is a national firm that manages the facility because of their ability to market the materials. 40,000+ tons of recyclables are handled at the MRF every year. 35% of this amount is from the City. The remainder is “merchant recyclables” that come from the rest of Washtenaw, Windsor, Toledo, Livingston Co., Oakland Co., & Wayne Co.
- **The City Landfill** was shut down in early 1990s. The borrow pit west of the MRF was intended to be next cell but due to environmental, cost liability and risk issues city chose to build a transfer station instead. There is a new Transfer Station being built and it will be located approximately 100 yards south of the current MRF. City pays \$11.00 per ton to landfill at Woodlands Meadow. The City exports all of our waste out of county. Most of the waste goes through the transfer station, but private contractors will also direct haul to other landfills, Woodland Meadows or one operated by Onyx.
- **The Compost Facility** is owned and operated by the City to process all wood waste, leaf waste, yard waste. Ash borer site is hosted here. Some use of

compost site by outside contractors. UM pre-consumer vegetative food waste is composted here. Pilot for downtown commercial collection also came here.

- **Drop Off Station (DOS)** is owned by city and operated by Recycle Ann Arbor. It is the former site where all recyclables were processed. RAA proposed it be converted into a Drop-Off site when the MRF was built. Being evaluated for relocation and expansion to take more materials. Currently it takes a significant amount of materials from commercial sources. It is funded intergovernmentally.

Current Commercial Recycling Collection - In addition to facilities, the City has significant collection capabilities. It has its own public works operations including staff and trucks. The City also works with private sector to facilitate collection.

- **City Directed Recycling**
 - **City** - Commercial Cardboard Dumpsters – the city collects from 70 businesses city wide. Downtown Development Authority – the city collects cardboard, paper, and containers from 150 businesses in the DDA
 - **Recycle Ann Arbor (RAA)** is a non-profit that for 20 years has had a city contract to do curbside recycling. Started recycling and talked the city into developing its program. They are a long term partner of the city. Recycle Ann Arbor collects from smaller businesses and schools outside of the DDA that can be easily serviced with bins or carts. This was a logical extension of their residential collection. The logic was that you have that collection system out there, so make sure it is also used in the commercial sector. They have an individual out promoting this service to businesses. RAA was also doing commercial recycling pickup outside of the city boundaries but this program is now being modified.
 - **Drop Off Station (DOS)** – 70-80 thousand visits a year. Final DOS design next year, ground breaking 2007, construction finished 2008.
- **Other Commercial Recycling** – This category involves some big unknowns. Private waste haulers are very hard to get data from.
 - Document shredding– estimates developed from document shredding. People pay for confidentiality aspect, but most of material ends up being recycled.
 - Back hauler arrangements – Kroger and Meijers will have a baler in the back, and the material gets back hauled in one of their empty delivery trucks.
 - U of M works closely as partners in MRF and in planning.

Recycling Trends -

- **DDA** has shown a positive attitude about working with the city collection program. Recycling levels have pretty steadily increased, from 600 tons range (in 2001 to 995 ton in 2005). They recycle 35-45% of the waste generated in the DDA. This demonstrates there is great potential for success when some effort is invested. Due to growth, the DDA is generating more trash as well as recycling more. Keep in mind there will be growth in waste generation as the city grows.

- **Non-DDA sector** only generates as much recycling volume as the DDA, and has not grown. Waste volumes have dropped due to a shift to private haulers that resulted from changes in city provided services. It doesn't really reflect waste reduction.

Planning for Commercial Recycling -

A significant amount of work has been done to plan for how to handle expanded commercial recycling from a processing standpoint. We are well on our way to getting the necessary processing capacity.

- The transfer station is being relocated to make more room for recycling.
- The MRF is being expanded - Commercial recycling equipment is being added that will enhance how recycling can happen, and will make some types of commercial recycling much easier.
- The Drop Off station is being relocated and upgraded assessing adding a construction waste sorting station to the DOS.

Strengths and Weaknesses of current programs -

- Programs currently have a great deal of flexibility.
- Recycling is provided at no additional cost – it is made available through a city millage assessed on all properties including commercial ones. The millage is permanent, created under a law established in state of Michigan to charge up to 3 mils for solid waste services. Most cities use a millage approach to funding these services. City Solid waste operations are set up as an enterprise fund.
- There are few incentives for businesses to reduce waste. Many do not pay for trash collection, or pay a private hauler.
- Commercial collection routes are operating under capacity and can be added to. There were lots of corrugated dumpsters that would sit there full and not get serviced for 4 more days. Would surmise their service was once a week and things would go into a trash dumpster when full.
- Identity – trash and recycling is mixed don't have distinct identities on bins
- Cherry picking - private commercial collectors target customers where paper is worth the most and service cost is lowest. This does not provide breadth and depth across the city, so it becomes more expensive to collect the remainder because most lucrative sources are gone.
- Education is limited.

Our Challenge – In residential collection Ann Arbor is a top program. Now our task is to figure out how to expand commercial recycling and organics collection capacity. Commercial collection is at the 20-22% range. A huge majority is being landfilled. These figures are estimates but the commercial performance is nowhere near the 50% we achieve on the residential side. There is a reasonable opportunity for city directed recycling to go up to 19% and other recycling up to 29%. Even if organics stay the same, it is possible to achieve over 50% in the commercial sector at a reasonable cost. We need to continue to work on more careful data collection and benchmarking. Still don't know what is happening with other commercial haulers.

Businesses are willing to look to the city to add services. The City's current user fee is not well defined and the city can't adapt its rate structure as easily as Waste Management or other private haulers. Changing the base load of services is also difficult.

The Future – pieces of the puzzle we will ask you to put together.

- Ordinances? Curbside residential recycling is currently mandatory with soft enforcement. We don't have garbage inspectors. In multifamily recycling it is the "opportunity to recycle" that is mandatory.
- How to motivate participation?
- How should outreach and education change?
- How to have the right package of services given by the correct service providers and make the service responsive to changing needs.
- Should we target our efforts in some way, by sector, business size, or geographic area?
- Ownership – who provides the service, not just the resources in the city but private partners as part of the solution.

DISCUSSION

What are the real and perceived barriers we are trying to address?

How do you recover recyclables out of a mixed Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) stream? There are two ways to look at this. Residents separate their own recyclables, this is known as source separation. But how viable is this on the commercial side? Is a mixed waste stream most convenient for businesses and if so, how do we handle that downstream at the MRF?

All the MRF does is clean up presorted materials – it is a packaging facility. For a while the right side of the facility was set up to sort trash. They tried for about 10 years to do this but it was viewed as not the most effective way to get large amounts of recovery. Modify to allow separated recyclables to have more mixed materials in it so it can move through MRF more efficiently. In other words you won't have to take so much garbage out of it.

Paper, cardboard and food seem to be the focus at the outset but there are a lot of other recyclables to consider.

Questions about what we are doing right now.

Q. What are the economics of running garbage through the MRF? The City makes money from it. From a private standpoint do we want to aim at capturing the waste we don't currently process or collecting more high grade paper? How do we set a goal to pay for this program?

A. We will bring a summary of the current economic system to the next meeting that will describe the structure of contracts and incentives taken out to 2015.

Q. Does the City get paid for recyclable materials?

A. It does for some of them. It depends on their market value. The key variable is market value - the average commodity revenue (ACR) goes up and down. Overall the values are increasing due to Asian markets and the increasing price of oil.

Q. In addition to doing the right thing, is the city really trying to make a profit off of this?

A. Not necessarily. The key question is how to provide incentives for businesses and make the MRF work. The city's goal is to maximize recovery. The programs are paid for out of an enterprise fund that is funded by a millage and the City's revenue from the MRF. That's how we pay for programs as well as capital improvements. If we come up with programs the city can't pay for, we need to come up with other fee structures. The city's goal isn't to generate revenue – the revenue goes right back into the enterprise fund not the general fund. The money stays in the program. It's not to raise money for other programs.

Comment: Space for C&D recycling dumpsters is a potential barrier. With one trash dumpster on site, there often isn't room for another dumpster. And you'll get on a lot of jobs where there isn't even room for one so you call another waste hauler to bring it to a facility. To put a container in the street at a lot of locations you would have to get a lane closure and pay for it. On-site recycling often increases the cost of demolition and removal. Could you bring the waste and have it sorted here at the MRF so waste is not sorted on site? A split roll off is also an option. At least getting some separation that is easy to do. Would that be city provided? What is the relationship with generators, how much source separation do we have to do in various sectors? Timely removal of recycling dumpsters is another issue– does the city have that infrastructure? Sometimes the dumpster will fill up in one day. There is discussion with the new DOS design & Calvert's how to facilitate recovery of C&D waste. Construction sort floor now on the drawing boards weather or not it will occur here or at Calvert's isn't certain. There are barriers to using Calvert's facility. The goal is to have no barriers other than choice at the MRF facility. What do these services need to look like to be attractive to you?

Comment: Sorting Municipal Solid Waste - Look at overall capacity for change. Electronics isn't going to change diversion rate much b/c the volume isn't there. Look for tonnage where tonnage is. Other waste materials include wide variety of things - mix of rubble, dirt, concrete, block rubber, piping latex, gloves, plastic, film diapers, food, pet litter. From a restaurant standpoint would have little garbage if composting food.

Comment: New DOS will target mixed rigid plastics like vinyl siding, old coolers, lawn furniture, and 5 gallon buckets. Now there are markets that want to buy that in baled form.

Comment: Composting - Have a lot of paper being recycled and containers recycling has increased over time – but food waste is still a large category. Bathroom waste – have they found ways to recycle hand towels? Organics can include tissue products. Food and organic category – is there information available on pilot program so we aren't reinventing the wheel. Information on what University is doing. 2.5 years long.

Collection frequency was an issue here. What are the examples out there? There are communities with programs in place for all of these sectors. Let's look at successful programs and then decide what we want and tweak it. From a school aspect – collect lunch food waste? We need to be educated about how to set up our own compost programs.

PARKING LOT ISSUE FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION/FOLLOW-UP: Mixed waste (“Other”) recovery potential/constituent materials



**City of Ann Arbor
Commercial Recycling Committee of the Environmental Commission**

Meeting Minutes
Thursday, July 27, 2006

Clarifying locations of next meetings.

Goal is to complete within 6 months.

Supplied list of acronyms

Summary of City services. (clarification that greenbag program is part of downtown program)

Overview of City services contractual relationships.

Clarify when South University has refuse collection – just one day per week or three days per week.

Quick go-around: barriers to recycling (Notes from Jim)

- Jane: office buildings. It was difficult figuring out how to fit pieces. Where to get materials, how to put it in place. Not one stop shopping. Concise place to go to.
- Scott: Location where he does work is constantly changing. Finding locations for dumpsters; finding space to separate materials. Identifying fixed costs. Some separation facilities like Calvert's, but cost is not well known. Need somewhere to bring material and more clarification on costs. Need locations on sites.
- Just accepted a lot of furniture, and had large pieces of cardboard; could not collect through RAA program. Runs school. Runs material down the street to the drop off station. Staffing. Costs.
- Ida: Briarwood Mall; Dictate to merchants who they use. Recycle cardboard, but not much else. Won't change who they use because of costs. Recycle some of the bottles through janitorial staff.
- Jeff: Been recycling a long time. If it costs more, is going to be a problem. (Seva).
- Linda – Trillium real estate: Not a whole lot of issues, except for Styrofoam. Sun takes it periodically to DOS.

Parking lot issue: What's in the waste stream (particularly "other" category)

Review presentation reviewing what is in waste stream. "Other" category: almost half is other plastics. Also includes dirt/rocks, pallets, bulky construction & demolition, textiles. New drop off station might be able to help with some of these categories, such as other plastics, carpet padding, etc. Plastic film, such as shrink wrap, bags, etc. is getting to be a much larger portion. Durable plastic, such as 5 gallon pails, toys, etc. is a growing portion.

Building waste stream: distinguish between construction waste (new): wood waste is a large portion. Drywall is another big item. Cardboard & metals present. Brick, block, and plastic are also present.



Demolition is a different material. Roofing is about 14%; very difficult to deal with. Some drywall. Polystyrene, such as foam insulation, is present. Metals are a little higher.

LIKELY TARGETED MATERIALS & COLLECTION SYSTEMS

Powerpoint presentation.

Next month will be case studies.

Fiber (cardboard & mixed papers);
Other: Food waste / organics / containers / plastics
New Processing services: construction

Question: what happens to shredded paper?
Question: is all the material collected being recycled?

Dave: clarified that City is making investment in upgrading commercial recycling capabilities; now is the time to upgrade collection capabilities.

Dave: some of challenge with food waste is the collection system: how do you deal with this wet waste? Need special containers, sometimes you need special collection vehicles, etc.

Food waste pilot was collected in standard side load trucks.

Possibility of using onsite processing systems.

We currently use the millage system to pay for solid waste.

Discussion about presentation:

Dave: Commercial recycling is very tough to do. Very easy to cherry-pick the large generators. These free market approaches are challenged to provide broad range of services to broad target sectors – without undermining the integrity of the system-getting volumes needed

Question: For case studies, will there be staff recommendations – pros/cons, etc..

Dave:

- Yes! And what those recommendations will do regarding other adjacent communities, etc..
- Convenience trumps motivation at generator end – but at processor end there needs to be/is a financial incentive (a large one) not just a mandate – City has a financial desire to process recyclables as opposed to going into the landfill.
- Taxes didn't drop – but had to start paying for the program.

Question: How much does committee want recommendations from consultant/staff as opposed to committee developing them?

Dave:

- Look at options and discuss then give direction to staff.
- Suggestion for staff to say what the emphasis is on; "this one is heavy on...."; show balance points.

Next Steps – for next meeting: broad option groups with some info on the "balance point, etc." followed by discussing at meeting to refine – then consultant/staff (and or work subcommittees) go to work to further develop.



- Want to hear "how efficient" enforcement is for "clean communities" etc... S. U experience, etc. Current enforcement situation – how is it working, what are resources, trends, realistic expectations on how this would work. Need to consider that as part of the costs of some of these potential solutions.
- Suggestion of a sticker for curbside cart (like the compost sticker) that says "no recycling allowed".
- Need to show structure of FCR financial deal in contracts flowchart.
- Couple with City financial information that Bryan is assembling on millage funded
- Enforcement Presentation
- Education Summary



**City of Ann Arbor
Commercial Recycling Committee of the Environmental Commission**

**Meeting Minutes
Thursday, July 27, 2006**

Introduction

- Clarifying locations of next meetings.
- Goal is to complete within 6 months.

City Informational Items

- DDA Ordinance Changes (Tom McMurtrie)
- MRF Commercial Upgrades (RRS)
- Recycling Logo vote

Handouts and Discussion/Questions

All handouts on website link.

- Supplied list of acronyms. Can be added to as needed.
- Summary of City services. Clarification that greenbag program is part of downtown program. Clarify when South University has refuse collection – just one day per week or three days per week.
- Overview of City services contractual relationships. Will add financial details for next meeting.
- City Food Waste/Source Separated Organics Pilots. More in presentation.

Go-around: Barriers to recycling comments from committee members

- Office buildings: It was difficult figuring out how to fit pieces, where to get bins, containers, carts, dumpsters, etc., city-support for “one stop shopping”.
- C & D Locations are constantly changing. Finding locations for dumpsters, finding space to separate materials. Identifying fixed costs. Some separation facilities like Calvert’s, but cost is not well known. Need somewhere to bring material and more clarification on costs. Need container locations on site.
- Internal staffing costs and training, on-site storage for recyclable materials.
- How to recover periodic special wastes, i.e. Styrofoam, electronic waste, old furniture, etc.
- City needs to be a repository of information and “how-to” support.

Parking lot issue: What’s in the waste stream (particularly “other” category)

- “Other” category: almost half is other plastics. Also includes dirt/rocks, pallets, bulky construction & demolition, textiles.
- New drop off station might be able to help with some of these categories, such as other plastics, carpet padding, etc. Plastic film, such as shrink wrap, bags, etc. is



getting to be a much larger portion. Durable plastic, such as 5 gallon pails, toys, etc. is a growing portion.

- Building waste stream: distinguish between construction waste (new): wood waste is a large portion. Drywall is another big item. Cardboard & metals present. Brick, block, and plastic are also present.
- Demolition is a different material. Roofing is about 14%; very difficult to deal with. Some drywall. Polystyrene, such as foam insulation, is present. Metals are a little higher.

Presentation on Commercial Technologies and Selected Case Studies

Next month will be case studies:

- Fiber (cardboard & mixed papers);
- Other: Food waste / organics / containers / plastics
- New Processing services: construction

Question: What happens to shredded paper?

Answer: Recycled with other office grades.

Question: Is all the material collected being recycled?

Answer: 94% of what comes into the Ann Arbor MRF as recyclables leaves as recyclables.

- Dave clarified that City is making investment in upgrading commercial recycling capabilities; now is the time to upgrade collection capabilities.
 - Some of challenge with food waste is the collection system: how do you deal with this wet waste? Need special containers, sometimes you need special collection vehicles, etc.
 - Food waste pilot was collected in standard side load trucks.
 - Possibility of using onsite processing systems.
 - City currently use the millage system to pay for solid waste.
 - Commercial recycling is very tough to do. Very easy to cherry-pick the large generators. These free market approaches are challenged to provide broad range of services to broad target sectors – without undermining the integrity of the system-getting volumes needed
- Question: Will there be staff recommendations coming out of this process?
 - Yes, likely building off of the work of the subcommittees and staff's own perspectives based on experience.
 - City has a financial desire to process recyclables as opposed to going into the landfill. While there are increased recycling collection costs, there is also revenue generated and disposal costs avoided.

Next Steps



- For next meeting: broad option groups with some info on the "balance point, etc." followed by discussing at meeting to refine – then consultant/staff (and or work subcommittees) go to work to further develop.
- Want to hear how efficient enforcement is for the city's Clean Community program. Current enforcement situation – how is it working, what are resources, trends, realistic expectations on how this would work. Need to consider that as part of the costs of some of these potential solutions.
- Suggestion of a sticker for curb-cart (like the compost sticker) that says "no recycling allowed".
- Need to show structure of FCR financial deal in contracts flowchart.
- Couple with City financial information that Bryan is assembling on millage funded system
- Education Summary

**CITY OF ANN ARBOR
COMMERCIAL RECYCLING IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE
AUGUST 17, 2006**

Committee Members Present: Nancy Rucker, Carol Collins, Linda Lombardini, Melissa VanDam, Wendi Felgner, Ida Hendrix, Doug McClure, Susan Pollay, Patricia Harroun, Margie Teall, David Stead, Scott Rosencrans, Tim Stark

Others Present: Jim Frey, Nicole Chardoul, Tom McMurtrie, Nancy Stone, Bryan Weinert

I. City Information Items

City staff will be providing budget and community standards (ordinance enforcement) information as it becomes available.

II. Go-around

Changes to the membership roster, general web updates and the posting of the original "Commercial Recycling Plan" on-line were discussed.

III. Commercial Recycling Program Profiles

Jim Frey highlighted the "community profiles" provided to the committee from select communities in North America relating to general recycling, organics recovery and construction/demolition waste recovery. Almost every case study includes some city ordinance language to back-up the programs described.

Franchises as described can be material or geographic specific, and generally outline various solid waste services to be provided within a community. The role of government vs. the role of the free market was discussed, in the areas of direct service, bidding, enforcement and promotion/education. The size of the community can also impact the overall efficiency of various services and procurement strategies. The vast office space within Alexandria, Virginia was offered as one example.

Committee members offered their comments as part of three "go-arounds" on general commercial recycling, organics recovery and construction/demolition separation. Following are highlights:

- How might volunteers be used in these systems?
- How to efficiently recycle while protecting the security of documents?
- How to create incentives for businesses, haulers, etc. to *want* to do the right thing, to get beyond enforcement only?
- How do these successful programs use education/communication to effectively implement their programs?
- The City's residential program appears to be quite successful. But how to achieve "buy-in" from businesses and contractors that live outside the City?
- Important to protect the private recycling services already in place (ex: Briarwood) while encouraging other businesses to get involved in recycling.
- Has food waste been banned from landfills in other states/communities?
- Construction/demolition contractors would likely be opposed to new requirements without economic incentives and education.
- How much money is the City willing to pay to increase commercial recycling rates?
- If construction/demolition recovery is to be effective, it must be a comprehensive City program.

IV. Creation of Subcommittees

After substantial discussion, it was decided to create three subcommittees as follows:

- Organics/Hospitality
- Multi-Tenant/Mixed Use
- Construction/Demolition/Bulky Waste

Rather than creating a separate downtown subcommittee, it was decided that each subcommittee would consider downtown issues as part of their overall charge. Initial subcommittee meeting dates were then established. General guidelines for the subcommittees was provided to guide the deliberations and work products of the sub-groups.

V. Next Meeting

The scheduled Thursday, September 21 meeting date of the full Committee will instead provide a convenient meeting time for each of the subcommittees to meet. The next full meeting of the Committee will thus take place on Thursday, October 5 at 7:30 a.m. in the 7th floor conference room of the City Center Building.

commminutes.aug17

October 5, 2006

Steve Bean started the meeting at 7:35.

Bryan clarified the accelerated timeline – meeting every two weeks till November 16th.

Organics / Hospitality overview:

Decided on an expansion of the pilot as the Phase I. Have daily collection because of need for material odors. (including Saturday) Participation would be voluntary. (partly because of constraints of current facility). Goal is 10% of total waste stream. Discussed franchise; decided on City providing service. Special vehicle would be best, because of potential liquid waste. No need for ordinance because will not be mandatory at this point.

Material will be ground and mixed with yard waste. Biodegradable plastic bags or lined kraft paper bags should be used. Can containers be washed outside? Not sure.

Discussed in-vessel composting. Could do it with one of the larger generators. Didn't discuss budget issues and cost too much. User experience is similar to other programs. Interest in having City provide bags and containers.

Question about animal bedding;

Cost: should be at the same level of cost as trash collection.

Options to pay for program: pay as you throw for trash, to help subsidize compost system.

Cons: site volume restriction at current site; will be an issue when current site reaches limit. Need to wash containers is an issue. Cost of new organics truck.

Question: would the residential compost cart pilot (which accepts veggie waste) use up some of the 10% allowable food waste capacity at the existing compost site? Answer would be yes; would require moving more quickly to alternate processing system. One of questions is how much non-Ann Arbor yard waste (total capacity) is coming to site.

Suggestion: need to encourage composting at home.

10% limit is self-imposed, based on what has been experienced at other sites.

Another factor: how much food waste goes down disposal.

Does in-vessel include tunnel composting system? Yes, this is a flexible system, but more expensive operating system.

Tim: interested in system being franchised, wants to bid on this system. Why does this necessarily have to be operated by the City? City would be responsible, not necessarily be the operator.

Freezing conditions: problem in Burlington with materials not falling out of the carts.

Recommendation on number and type of containers;

C & D Overview:

Projects over \$50,000 – would be responsible for using licensed haulers and franchised processors.

Licensed haulers would qualify by meeting certain criteria and paying fees.

Processing would be enhanced version of what is currently available at the DOS. Problem currently is can't rely on dependable pricing and delivery system.

Options: source separated or commingled. Commingled is a little more expensive.

Franchised facilities will have lower tip fees based on more source separation.

Idea is to not move towards an exclusive program because there are so many haulers. Will not be one hauler. Market already works.

Permit puller would be responsible entity. If building permit exceeds \$50,000, need to submit report – needs to be easy.

Dumpster hauler would be entitled to refuse hauling if material is commingled. System of fines and potential loss of license if do not comply. Some exemptions would be available.

Coordination and technical assistance: would be available through the City. Appeals process would be available to haulers. Workshops should set up to educate everyone – very important.

Should be an easy way to bring materials that can be re-used. Expansion of current Re-use facility would be helpful.

Submit recycling plan – important part of permitting process. Needs to be easy and straightforward. Weekly reports seems like a lot. Need for weekly is that some of these projects is not very long. Maybe 3 reports during whole project? Perhaps use web-based tool.

How much extra time is this going to put into projects? Suggesting doing it through phase in process for people to get used to it. Suggesting that once system is set up,

people should get used to it (like residential). Just matter of additional containers.
Problem with whole house demolition – this is done by large equipment – more difficult.

Are we recommending that City set up facility? Either or; could franchise facility or set one up.

Question: Will components be broken apart, so that builders can get around \$50k limit?
Need to clarify this in ordinance.

Materials should be in Spanish.

Multi-Tenant Overview:

Franchise trash side of service: reduce number of commercial haulers, particularly through DDA, deliver lower costs. Franchised component would be charged directly to customer; recycling service would be provided for free.

If you participated in City service, would automatically be in compliance with program. If not doing through City, would need to be in compliance with system.

One issue is DDA: need to have meeting to discuss implementations. Chances for improvements, chances for DDA to provide some funding?

Franchisee component would be provided through competitive proposal.

User experience: through City program would be very easy.

Cost calculations: this is the program that is going to be the costliest of the 3. \$2 to \$3 million per year.

Revenue: Some of revenue is from City eliminating trash dumpster program and DDA refuse collection program. How do these costs shift? Also, Solid Waste consistently comes in under budget. Revenue share from the MRF also a big item, when markets are good. Franchise fee is another revenue. State level: possible funding mechanism.

Businesses that currently pay through private hauler should see savings of 10 to 30%. Those businesses that get “free” service might get slight increase in cost.

On the web is “Multi-tenant Report” available to group.

Are we talking about privatizing trash pickup? Currently is largely private; would increase it slightly.

Use of franchisees would lessen problems with multiple waste haulers not knowing City rules.

How do we deal with multiple users of single containers. Would need to define in ordinance who responsible parties would be. City has database of existing businesses; over time develop email interaction with each business; Need to determine who is custodial service. Need to go beyond “opportunity to recycle” that is used in multi-family. This will be one of the more challenging issues.

This information (requirement to recycle) would have to be built into lease. Who would be responsible for enforcement: property owners.

Will be pulling ordinance language together.

PLAN DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Capture everything that has been developed, and do some integration. RRSI will be pulling some information to review.

Linda reviewed DDA conference that she and Maggie are going to.

Jim will pull together internal DDA meeting together shortly. Will also be pulling some more budget information together.