

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.