

**CITY OF URBANA
COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION & FINANCE - JANUARY 9, 1995
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS - 400 S. VINE STREET, URBANA, IL**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Michael Pollock, Chairman; James Hayes; Esther Patt; Marya Ryan; Clifford Singer; John Taylor; Joseph Whelan

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Tod Satterthwaite, Mayor; Phyllis Clark, City Clerk; Bruce Walden, CAO; Eddie Adair, Police Chief; Charles Gordon, Asst. Police Chief; William Gray, Public Works Director; Rodney Fletcher, Solid Waste Manager; Bruce Stoffel, Community Development Division Manager

OTHERS PRESENT: Earl O'Shea; Charles Smyth; Glenn Stanko; Katie Hickey Snyder; Helen Woodard; Beth Chato; John Thompson; Liz Cardman; Ty Newell; Joan T. Hicks; Hazel Spitze; Mary Kruse; Amy Kummerow; Susan Korn; Rob Moore; Gopal Rao; Katherine Sauer; Michele Gurgas; Douglas Chien; Ernst Strenge; Jack Wilson; Patricia Huth; Steve Frankel; Roger Fliege; Laura Huth; Francis Young; Marilyn Morris; Larry LaPre; Sophia Gehlhausen; Regina Galer-Unti; Media

Chairman Pollock called the meeting to order at 7:36 p.m.

Additions to the Agenda and Staff Report

There were none.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

December 12, 1994: Mr. Hayes moved to approve the minutes of December 12, 1994. The motion was seconded by Ms Patt. Motion carried by a voice vote.

Ordinance Revising The Annual Budget Ordinance - TIF 3/Durst Property

Mr. Walden presented.

Mr. Whelan made a motion to send this item to Council for approval. Ms Patt seconded. Motion carried.

Ordinance Revising The Annual Budget Ordinance - Budget Transfer Human Relations Office

Mr. Walden presented.

Ms Patt made a motion to send this item to Council for approval.

Committee on Administration & Finance
January 9, 1995
Page 2

Ms Ryan seconded. Motion carried.

Disposition of 808 East Park

Mr. Stoffel presented staff's report.

Mr. Hayes made a motion to send this item to Council for approval. Ms Ryan seconded. Motion carried.

Petitions and Communications

Earl O'Shea, 606-A Glover, spoke on the topic of a better government.

On the topic of solid waste (franchising, recycling, volume-based pricing), the following persons did not wish to address the Committee, however, indicated on the Public Input Form that they were in support of letting out the RFP's (Request For Proposals):

Charles Smyth, 805 S. Coler; Katie Hickey Snyder, 203 S. Poplar; Helen Woodward, 1408 S. Vine; Beth Chato, 714 W. Vermont; Liz Cardman, 708 W. California; Joan T. Hicks, 8 Burnett Circle; Hazel Spitze, 1406 S. Vine; Mary Kruse, 2210 Combes; Amy Kummerow, 28 Montclair; Susan Korn, 908 E. California; Gopal Rao, 609 W. Main; Katherine Sauer, 1106 S. Garfield; Michele Gurgas, 409 W. Elm, #6; Douglas Chien, 404 W. Elm; Ernst Strenge, 609 W. Main; Roger Fliege, 800 W. Church, #6; Marilyn Morris, 804 Cedar; Larry LaPre, 804 Cedar; Sophia Gehlausen, 712 W. Illinois, #3; Regina Galer-Unti, 507 W. High.

Glen Stanko, attorney representing Waste Haulers Association, was present to speak on the topic of solid waste. Since the normal time limit for public input is five minutes, Mr. Singer made a motion that Mr. Stanko be allowed to speak for ten minutes because he represented a large fraction of the community. There was no second to the motion, however, there were no objections.

Mr. Stanko stated that he was gratified that there were some alternative licensing proposals before the Committee (i.e., Whelan proposal, Pollock outline, Singer proposal). Mr. Stanko recalled a brief history of the of this issue noting that it was approximately two years ago when there was a licensing ordinance passed and the haulers filed suit and ended up in court. When this Council came on board and Mayor Satterthwaite was elected there was a decision made to rescind that ordinance and consider other alternatives.

Mr. Stanko indicated some concerns he and his clients had regarding the licensing proposals:

1. Whether or not they are workable from a functional, operational standpoint. Mr. Stanko stated that this covers two areas: one is in the area of reporting; another is in the area of the curb side services. Stanko said that functionally it would not work to ask the haulers to pick up garbage, recyclables and yard waste in one of five zones on one particular day of the week. One of the reasons for this, Mr. Stanko stated, is because many haulers only service Urbana a couple of days a week.
2. Reporting requirements. Mr. Stanko stated that he was concerned about his clients being asked to provide garbage tonnage figures, yard waste figures, and asking them to require that their processors provide documentation that the recyclable materials actually go where they should. Stanko said that he could not think of an instance where his clients had been accused of doing anything improper with recyclable products. He said a reporting requirement seems to suggest that there is a problem.

In conclusion, Mr. Stanko stated that he was disappointed that his outline and proposal was not on tonight's agenda. Stanko said he and his clients had a three-page outline which addressed all of the things they propose to do as part of a licensing system.

Ms Patt inquired how many haulers come to Urbana only twice a week. Mr. Stanko responded that he did not have the exact number, however, his understanding was a lot of the smaller "one horse" operation people would come twice a week. He said that he had not taken a poll, but could think of several who might fit in that category.

Ms Patt asked Mr. Stanko if the City were to pass a licensing ordinance that opened the curb once a week, would his clients sue the City to block enforcement of that ordinance. Mr. Stanko responded that this is something that does not functionally work for his clients. He said that if it does not functionally work and keeps them from doing business in the City of Urbana, unfortunately that is one of the few options left to them.

Ms Patt asked if right now the haulers are coming to Urbana twice a week to provide back door pick-up and if they had the option of coming to different zones on different days for curb side and that did not work out for them, how would it be interfering with their business for the City to give them that choice even if the individual hauler did not choose to avail themselves with the

option to provide curb side pick-up? Mr. Stanko responded that as soon as you open any form of curb side pick-up, you are putting the company, the large company such as United Waste, at a competitive advantage. Stanko said that if the people who are only providing back door service now cannot provide a curb side alternative to their clientele, they are going to lose a lot of business.

Ms Patt asked Mr. Stanko if he felt the City should enact laws to prevent some businesses from getting a competitive advantage over others? Mr. Stanko said that he did not believe the City should do something that would drive out small family-owned businesses.

Ty Newell, 704 W. Michigan, stated that he was in favor of sending out the RFP's for the franchise plan. He said that he agreed with Mr. Whelan's suggestion of having people pay at the cost of their service level. However, he did not agree with the math that Mr. Whelan discussed (i.e., once per week collection, 2 cans/\$12; twice per week collection, 2 cans/\$16). Newell said that he believed twice per week should be doubled.

Rob Moore, 111 W. Charles Street, Champaign, stated his support for volume-based pricing and letting out the RFP's. He stated that with landfill space at a premium in this country, it seems that any plan that reduces the waste stream of a community should be applauded and not stonewalled by the city councils of this nation. Moore said that he feels the plan only has benefits (i.e., gives the opportunity for customers in the community to control their own waste disposal cost, gives the opportunity to decrease the amount of waste that is going into a landfill site, and gives decreased rates through competitive contracting with waste disposal companies. Mr. Moore indicated some problems he has with his waste hauler (UWA) and said that he would like to see Champaign also come up with a similar plan.

Mr. Whelan asked Mr. Moore if he could get someone else to haul his garbage if he was not satisfied with United Waste. Mr. Moore said that he had discussed this with his landlord and he was informed that this is the service that he would be paying for. It is not negotiable in his lease.

Laura Huth, 504½ E. Elm, representing Urbana Citizens For Waste Solutions, spoke in support of franchising. Ms Huth read a letter from her organization stating that from their survey of communities around the state, it was clear that a number of them have taken progressive and positive steps to promote source reduction, reduce waste and increase recycling. Ms Huth said

they would like to see Urbana join this group that is more concerned with environmentally sound practices and with special interest groups. Huth stated that they had provided the Committee with a comparison of eight franchise communities where average waste hauling costs, including recycling, are approximately \$7.50. These communities have integrated programs including volume-base pricing and education. Ms Huth then went on to speak on the amount of savings that could be met if everyone went to curb side service.

Jack Wilson, 1004 E. Michigan, spoke in opposition to franchising, but in favor of recycling. Mr. Wilson said that it seemed to him that the goals of the City could be met without having to franchise garbage collection. He stated that if the City wanted to increase recycling, education could this and residents would respond. Wilson said that he agreed with the concept of volume-base pricing and likes the fact that education would be continuing on the benefits of recycling and that it would be expanding recycling for plastics and cardboard. Mr. Wilson indicated that he was concerned with the way problems would be resolved under the franchise plan if he were not satisfied with his hauler.

Patricia Huth, 822 N. Spring Avenue, LaGrange Park, spoke in support of franchising. Ms Huth stated that she has lived in LaGrange Park, Illinois for 26 years and has experienced waste removal from simply throwing things away to their current program of paper bag/recycling program. Ms Huth stated that for under \$2.00 per month her family garbage costs are significantly less than ever have been. Huth said that based on her experience with volume-based pricing over the past five years, she believes it would be worthwhile for Urbana to seriously consider this program.

Steve Frankel, 409 W. Elm, #6, spoke on the topic of solid waste bringing up the truck issue. Mr. Frankel stated that if you want to reduce the number of trucks you go to the franchising system. With regard to concerns about getting recycling figures, Mr. Frankel stated its importance because of State requirements that would have to be met. Mr. Frankel said that he was in favor of sending out the RFP's and encouraged the Committee to do so as quickly as possible.

Francis Young, 1006 S. Orchard, spoke in support of garbage franchise on behalf his wife and himself. Mr. Young stated that the City should go with garbage franchising, however, if they choose not to at this point a licensing agreement should done on

a temporary basis to see how it will work.

John Thompson, 809 S. Fifth, Champaign, spoke on behalf of Central States Education Center on the topic of solid waste issues. Mr. Thompson stated that either franchising or licensing will work and will achieve the goals of volume-based pricing and increase recycling. Thompson stated that, depending on how it is implemented, you can use either system to reduce truck congestion and lower costs. He said that he did not see one as exclusively good for the environment and the other as bad. Mr. Thompson said that going with the licensing approach the City could, over a period of time, limit the number of licenses that are issued; thereby cutting down the number of trucks that are on the streets. Mr. Thompson stated that he would also like to see Champaign move in the same direction as Urbana with these issues.

Multi-Family Recycling Process and Timetable

Chairman Pollock noted that this item was as a result of a motion made at Committee quite a while ago about taking a look at how we might proceed with achieving a program for recycling and multi-family apartment dwellings in the City.

Rod Fletcher reviewed staff's report with the Committee. (See attached.)

Mr. Whelan inquired who would be expected to pay for the service. Mr. Fletcher responded by saying the consumer. The tenant would pay for in their lease.

Mayor Satterthwaite mentioned that a meeting with the apartment owners had been scheduled for Wednesday, January 11, 1995 from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

Mr. Singer inquired about a breakdown in usage. Mr. Fletcher responded that he would get it to Committee.

Mr. Taylor stated that it was his understanding to have staff investigate the extension of recycling services to multi-family apartments. It seems to be the conclusion that the renters are going to pay for it. Mr. Taylor said that he had some reservations about mandating recycling in multi-family residential, not knowing what the costs are going to be to renters. Taylor pointed out that many renters are single mothers with children, people on fixed incomes, some social security, and some retirement. Taylor stated that he would like to know specifically what the increase in cost of rent would be on a

monthly basis before mandating recycling to apartment owners. As long as there is drop-off available there is at least an option.

Mr. Taylor indicated that he could not support mandating without knowing what the price would be to renters.

Ms Patt pointed out that it would be hard to get a sense of what increase of rent would be and that there are some property owners who charge tenants for garbage hauling, however, more do not. Patt stated that it is hard to determine exact cost without knowing what services are to be provided.

Ms Ryan stated that her primary concern would be to see that there is a very high rate of participation in any kind of multi-family recycling that we have. Ryan said that she did not know of any other way besides mandating that apartment owners provide the service to get that high level of participation.

Following debate, Chairman Pollock stated that he would like to find out who out there is offering these services and at what cost, how they do it, the problems involved, and would like the landlords to tell us what the obstacles are so that we could try to design a system that would answer those problems. Pollock said that he would hope that this information would go to our staff, who could more clearly define the policy questions and bring it back to the Committee; hopefully within 30 days.

Solid Waste Issues

1. Discussion of Mr. Singer's Motion. Mr. Singer distributed a book he had prepared to the Committee. Mr. Singer presented the Committee with the following options:

- A) To allow customers to use the curb side;
- B) To remove the prescription from using the curb and guaranteeing truth and advertising for people who say they are picking up recyclables;
- C) To re-enact the licensing ordinance with the dates moved back by two years;
- D) To take the previous franchising ordinance and revise with some simpler bid procedure to specify what the volume-base pricing schedule is and what happens if the bids come in higher than what we want;
- E) To negotiate licensing (i.e., do something that would

not end up in court);

F) To adopt the Champaign ordinance;

G) To adopt the final RFP as it was before us at the end of last year; and

H) To continue funding the recycling program out of the annual budget.

2. Mr. Whelan's Resolution. (See attached.) Mr. Whelan stated that it was important to be careful not to put small haulers out of business. Ms Patt inquired if this proposal would not mandate recyclables. Mr. Whelan responded not in apartments.

3. Mr. Pollock's Outline. (See attached.) Chairman Pollock stated that he would be willing to drop reporting, based on staff's recommendation to do so. Chairman Pollock said that he would like a response within thirty days.

Mr. Whelan pointed out similarities between his proposal and that of Chairman Pollock's; however, he felt there may be some problems with Chairman Pollock's proposal. Whelan suggested reviewing in two weeks.

Mayor Satterthwaite stated that if the consensus of the Council was to design an ordinance, Chairman Pollock's plan has more detail and should be the one to follow.

Chairman Pollock stated that he would like to have staff draw up the actual document (ordinance).

Mr. Hayes made a motion to proceed with the RFP. Ms Ryan seconded. Chairman Pollock ruled Mr. Hayes' motion out of order.

Mr. Singer moved to appeal the Chair. Mr. Hayes seconded. The appeal passed with a show of hands (4:2).

Mr. Taylor made a motion to extend the meeting hour tonight to 11:15 p.m. The motion was seconded by Ms Patt. The motion passed by a show of hands.

Mr. Taylor made a motion to table this item until the next Committee meeting. Mr. Whelan seconded. The motion failed with a show of hands.

Regarding Mr. Hayes' previous motion to proceed with the RFP, the

Committee on Administration & Finance
January 9, 1995
Page 10

motion carried with a show of hands.

Mr. Taylor moved to send Chairman Pollock's outline to staff for further development. Ms Patt seconded.

Mr. Whelan moved that his resolution be sent to staff with Chairman Pollock's outline. Mr. Taylor seconded. The motion failed with a show of hands.

Mr. Taylor's motion to send Chairman Pollock's outline staff passed with a show of hands.

Committee on Administration & Finance
January 9, 1995
Page 11

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Committee, Chairman Pollock adjourned the meeting at 11:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah J. Roberts
Recording Secretary

*This meeting was broadcast on cable television.