

**SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 24, 2011**

Chairwoman Minarik called a Sustainability Committee Meeting for Monday, January 24, 2011 at 6:00 PM in the Euclid Municipal Center Council Chamber.

AGENDA

Ord. (221-11) An emergency ordinance authorizing the Director of Public Service of the City of Euclid to purchase a used 2001 CCC Model LE 8500 with a 25YD Loadmaster Rear Loader Packer, to be used for the recycling program, from Tom's Truck Sales, 8620 Quarry Road, Manassas, Virginia 20110, for Thirty Thousand Six Hundred Fifty Dollars (\$30,650.00) (Sponsored by Councilperson Wojtila by request of Service Director)

Members Present: Holzheimer Gail, Jones, Langman, Scarniench, Minarik.
All Present.

Others Present: Mayor Cervenik, Director Smith, Director Frey, Asst. Director Bock, Councilman Wojtila, Councilman Van Ho, Clerk of Council Cahill.

Chairwoman Minarik – This meeting is to discuss the second purchase of a truck for recycling. Let me turn it over to Director Smith.

Director Smith – If you'd afford me the opportunity to go backwards and come to date, I'd appreciate it. In 2009 we received bids for standard curbside collection and disposal, automated curbside collection and disposal, various recycling options, container services and waste water treatment plant disposal services. A total of four companies participated in the bidding process at the time: J&J Refuse, Republic Services, Rumpke, Waste Management of Ohio was the last bidder. After careful consideration the determination that J&J Refuse was the lowest bid received.

As you may recall the recycling option was not utilized specifically due to the cost. For your awareness the year one cost was in the amount \$341,353.20; year two cost \$351,393; year three cost \$361,432.80; year four \$381,512.40. The fifth year of the contract the amount would have been \$401,592. If you were to sum these, it would bring the total cost of the contract over a five year term to \$1,837,283.40. This was for a bi-weekly collection.

We continued to have discussions with the solid waste district in reviewing various options. As a result of these discussions we became aware of the 12 member recycling consortium. Some of the key advantageous of the consortium agreement was as follows. Number one the potential for profit sharing. Number two, a five year contract term. Number 3, no cost for tipping in the event the value of recyclables would drop to zero. Number 4, it certainly provided the means for an in-house long term recycling program.

As the word spread about our consideration of this alternative, other entities and companies were suggesting various options. Some of these options were never reduced to paper and the others were more expensive or never came to fruition.

In order to complete the in-house program, the following was needed. A recycle truck. The cost was determined to be \$90,680 including delivery. Then there was consideration of bins versus bags for collection. After much consideration we utilized the bins. This results in a one time cost and the history indicates higher recycling participation levels. The cost for 16,000 bins was in the amount of \$86,080.

Employees, we retained three individuals. Two employees are earning \$10 per hour and one is making \$12 per hour.

For your awareness, energy efficiency and conservation block grant monies have been secured to address \$112,604.65 of the initial employee expense. Other considerations for the program included overtime monies, fuel and maintenance, uniforms, office supplies, postage, miscellaneous supplies, professional services.

The program was up and running in December and I have given the numbers but I'll repeat them. For the week of 12/6-12/10 we recycled 28.21 tons; 12/13-12/17 32.35 tons; 12/20-12/24 40.75 tons; 12/27-12/31 42 tons. Some additional figures for more recent. January 3 – 7th, 38.8 tons; January 10-14th 34.30 tons. If you were to total the amount specifically for December disregarding the January tonnage, the total volume would be 143.31 tons for the month. If you were to multiply this rate by your current landfill disposal fee of \$39, it would total \$5,589.09. This would be the disposal fees that have been avoided at this time. Factor in the recycle rebates and keep in mind that these prices will vary based upon the market rates. From December 15th through January 15th, the rate was \$30.45 per ton for co-mingled with fiber; \$36.57 per ton for co-mingled without fiber.

Applying these rates with the deduction for container services, the city received a check in the amount of \$3,214.99. The savings generated from reducing landfill tonnage and rebates for the month of December totaled, \$8,804.08.

Today I received an update on the recycle rebates and to my surprise they increase substantially. For the time period of January 15th-February 15th, the rate of \$30.45 per ton for co-mingled with fiber rose to \$37.25 per ton. The \$36.57 per ton for co-mingled without fiber rose to \$41.69. Once again, I certainly want to remind you that these rates are subject to change based upon the market conditions.

At this point in time we have one remaining program need and that is a back up unit. As I indicated at the previous council meeting there have been basically two reasons as to why I am recommending the purchase of this unit. Number one, we are currently utilizing a one ton dump truck as a back up to the recycle truck. As the recycle truck heads to the facility, the one ton dump is used to collect. As the recycle truck, #400, has been in route, we have experienced a couple of difficulties. One has been with traffic accidents in route to the facility. Two we have experienced delays due to an unloading line at the center. Three, they have experienced some equipment breakdowns at the center.

These delays have resulted in additional collection overtime for the crew. Although the one ton can complete the task, it is certainly not the most efficient, nor effective means to do so. Also by purchasing a back up packer, our non-emergency container usage will be eliminated, which will add to our reimbursement. As I had noted previously, the check we received, \$3,214.99 had a deduction for container services. That deduction would not apply if we were to add a second truck.

The second factor in this request is having a true back up vehicle in the event a recycle truck goes down. Rather than wait until an occurrence, we wanted to be prepared such the need arise. We spoke with several local dealers and they were only willing to lease by the month. These rates varied between \$5,000-\$6,000. This cost seems to make the lease very impractical.

That's all I have to offer. That is some current, up to date information and the Mayor has put together a spreadsheet that he was going to review with you at this time.

Mayor Cervenik – First of all our employees will not be working 2080 hour per week, that is per year. When I do these things at home, I don't always have a chance to have my secretary, Colleen, review these. She definitely would have caught that and we will send out a new one tomorrow.

Basically we have the one crew leader at \$12 an hour for a total of \$24,960 and two loaders at \$10 per hour at a cost of \$41,600. With their retirement, PERS, Work Comp and life insurance is roughly \$13,290. Hospitalization we're using an average of \$9,000 per person. That varies between whether they use it or not because we're a self-insured city, but I put in a high amount. I estimated \$6,000 of overtime which with this new truck I certainly don't think we'll come close to achieving that. So that you can see the worst case scenarios, I used \$6,000.

Fuel and maintenance from the numbers we have right now should be somewhat less than \$32,000, but I used the higher number because maintenance will be unpredictable for awhile. Supplies of \$5,000. To give a true picture of the cost, I spread the purchase price of the truck, depreciated it over 10 years. If you look at what we sell on govdeals.com most of our equipment lasts much longer than that, but I'm again being conservative. We would spread the cost of the truck out at \$9,070 per year towards the program. If you permit us to purchase the second truck, I would only amortize that over 5 years because it is a used truck, although I certainly expect it to last longer than five years because of its limited use. That would cost \$6,200 a year towards the program. The depreciation of the bins over ten years is \$8600. I don't know about you but I still got two other colored bins in my garage that are much older than 10 years. We don't ever expect to have a whole sale replacement of these bins, so we've amortized them over 10 years. That gives you a total supplies of \$60,870. Total personnel costs of \$112,850, for a total of \$173,720.

Revenues estimated for the first year, in your budget book you will see the number if \$50,000. Yet, if you were to take the numbers that we have this evening and they were to hold true for the whole year, at recycling only 2,000 tons for the year, our revenue would be approximately \$61,800. Using the lower rate where we use the mixed without fiber. Again to be conservative and to match what our projections are in the budget, we left it at 50. If our tonnage is 3500 tons, we would save \$39 for the first two months of the year and then it will go up to \$40. I left it \$39, it is not that big of a difference. It would give us a savings of landfill fees to J&J of \$136,500; which gives us total revenue and tonnage reduction savings of \$186,500. At minimum, we will be \$13,000 in the black actual savings on what we're doing.

It should be noted that it was opted to put the wages and some other expenses as Director Smith's report stated for the first year, taking it out of the energy grant so we wouldn't put a drain on the general fund, as we get people more involved in the recycling program. The last two times we recycled every other week, the last two years, one year it was 3800 and the other year was 4,000 tons and we didn't recycle cardboard at that time. We firmly believe that the 3500 is achievable and again I'm being conservative. I firmly believe that we will exceed 4,000 tons annually.

When you factor in the cost of the second truck over five years, versus the cost of us having to continue one with delays and two, with the cost of pulling the pans, it really makes a lot of sense to do that. This should be the final change of the program. The personnel are working out well. With that I'll answer or Director Smith or Asst. Director Bock will answer any questions that you may have.

Sustainability Committee

January 24, 2011

Page 3

President Holzheimer Gail – Director Smith, did I hear you right and maybe this is in the email. The cost of the container for January was \$3,200?

Director Smith – No I'm sorry. The reimbursement to the city was in the amount of

President Holzheimer Gail – That was a reduction due to the use of, did we use their container?

Director Smith – That is correct.

President Holzheimer Gail – What is the cost if we had to use that on a monthly?

Director Smith – The container cost, the check reimbursement to the city was in the amount of \$3214.99. The difference for the container was \$260 x 5, \$1300.

President Holzheimer Gail – Without the extra truck, is it fair to assume we would need to continue to use a container such as that and that would be the average monthly cost?

Director Smith – That is correct, that's a fair assessment.

President Holzheimer Gail – With the additional truck we would also see a decrease in the amount of overtime?

Director Smith – That is correct.

President Holzheimer Gail – The purchase of the other truck just isn't for back up, it makes the operation and the whole program more efficient.

Director Smith – It would definitely make it more efficient and I would like to add to the overtime. I had sent out an email, there was an inquiry earlier today and the overtime associated with the two weeks of collection in January, we were down to six and a quarter hours per employee over the two week timeframe. I necessarily don't want to say the truck will decrease the overtime as the crew becomes more experienced with the routes, that's going to help us decrease the overtime, but it will certainly free up other time when they can be doing other activity.

President Holzheimer Gail – Just to be 100% clear, when the main truck is full, could you send one person with that truck to the recycling center and the other two would then continue with the pick up service.

Director Smith – That is correct.

President Holzheimer Gail – I had only one other question. I know this budget was not in the budget book because we're using it out of the energy grant. I don't know at what point but I would like to see it in the budget book, the recycling program, even if it is in its own separate fund, just so we can have those numbers as part of the budget. That's one comment.

In the position worksheets I noticed there was a third of a position also assigned for a coordinator. Is that part of one of your time's?

Mayor Cervenik – That it not related to recycling whatsoever. That's Brian Iorio who is working on our different energy, is overseeing along with some public service people the installation of the solar panels and other items like that.

Asst. Director Bock – Some of the items are listed underneath the Engineering budget this year and we will be going over those when we go over the Engineering Dept. budget. Some of those items are a cost for the 1,000 bins that we put in. There's costs for office supplies, safety equipment, uniform cost, will be in the Engineering budget and those are reflected there.

Mayor Cervenik – The fuel and maintenance will be reflected in the motor maintenance line item for fuel, gasoline. If you've noticed, due to predictions last week or two weeks ago that we're going to be paying \$5 a gallon and the information today that it is not going to be that high. In any case we added \$175,000 to 2010's expenditures on gasoline, so we don't run out.

Our budget does not also contain depreciation. It does in our CAFR, depreciation is.

Councilman Langman – The two trucks and it is my understanding that the back up will be used everyday, is that correct?

Director Smith – That is correct. At any point in time when the truck 400, the recycle truck, is in route to the recycle center then this truck will be utilized. When truck 400 is back within the city, then the crew would switch back specifically to truck 400.

Councilman Langman – I've gotten a couple of inquiries from residents and they're wondering why don't we use the larger truck and then you can just make one trip. If you can explain the details why you don't feel that would be a good way to go.

Director Smith – Two reasons and I know that had come up at the last council meeting, that question was raised. Obviously the smaller truck is more fuel efficient, although it does carry less. Number two, all three employees at this time are licensed to drive the smaller truck and they do take turns, both with driving and with collection. Then being a brand new vehicle in comparison to a used vehicle. One of the other components will just be the sheer size. The current truck, I've heard it referred to a lot of different names as the little rabbit and it is just very convenient on the streets as far as the collection and getting in and out of traffic where the larger truck will not nearly be as convenient.

Councilman Langman – When we began the program, we looked at staffing for the truck, I know some people questioned whether we would need three instead of two, etc. But in practical means if we have an extra truck while somebody is driving the primary vehicle down to Twinsburg, that's at least two and a half hours by the time you get there and unload if there's delays and so forth. So back to we have a two man crew, a driver and loader. When it was originally proposed, we need three for one and now you're saying for at least a third of the day, maybe a little less, we can get by with two. Can you explain that a little more please?

Director Smith – That is correct. As far as the two man crew versus the three man crew, currently that is how we're operating is the smaller truck is in route to the facility, the other two employees are utilizing a one ton dump truck in order to collect. The truck has sides on it and the impacts we have is we are not able to compact. That's causing some loss of space both in the container, although we do some after the fact compaction, but there is absolutely no reason to add if there's any thought that I'm going to come back and request another employee so we end up with a three man crew throughout the day, no that is certainly not the case. Based on having the overtime coming into check. We struggled during the first week when we had to opt with a two man crew because one of the employees suffered an off duty injury. During that initial week that was some of our largest overtime consumption of the entire project. The intent is to eliminate as much overtime as practical, if not all, non-emergency type overtime. Then free up additional time during the day when the crew can perform some other duties, whether it just be typical cleaning on the vehicle or outside of the vehicle with regards to rubbish complaints or other cleaning aspects.

Councilman Langman – A couple more follow up questions. I reviewed the notes on the initial discussion and I know we didn't talk hardly at all about back up trucks and so forth. I'm assuming that the crew will have some time off during the year, they're not going to work all year, all day, all the time. What if somebody calls in sick and we're in this scenario. How would we cover? Who would cover the shortfall in manpower?

Director Smith – That would be someone out of the Engineering Dept. They've already been, I don't want to necessarily say trained, but they're familiar with the truck. They've been on the truck just to see how it operates in the event that would occur. The other thing, a lot of it boils down to the timing and the day of the week. On the Monday, Wednesday and Friday routes, I believe the collection is a little heavier and Tuesday, Thursday section is lighter as far as an area. So a lot of it is going to depend on just timing and the circumstances associated with that.

Councilman Langman – If somebody actually takes a vacation and somebody from the Engineering Dept. will cover those days, however long it would happen to be?

Director Smith – If need be. We would probably make the determination based upon what it will look like for the day, how heavy the day was going to be and where we stood from an overtime standpoint at that juncture. If it would be beneficial to put an employee on or just have the crew work some additional time.

Councilman Langman – I would just comment that if we did do that and had to do that for additional time, then obviously those costs should be associated with the program rather than, you're taking somebody away from some other task in the Engineering Dept. I would like to be kept posted on how that all develops because we're pulling somebody away, again that's taking away from their primary duties.

Just going over the first month's cost avoidance and revenue, that will bring us to about, if we extrapolated that over 12 months, that would bring us about 105-108,000 for the whole year. My comment is that, I think we need some more data, at least a quarter's worth of data to get a better sense of where we are with some of these numbers. I know we all want the program to succeed and we want tonnage to get up there to where we have been in the past, but we don't have those numbers quite yet. I think a quarter's worth of data would be valuable before moving forward with this purchase. Thank you.

Chairwoman Minarik – I am going to recognize Councilman Van Ho as being here.

Councilwoman Jones – Director Smith, with the new truck you said this would need a CDL license for those drivers to drive, would all three of them be licensed with that? My second question to that, are there any specific requirements that they need to be able to follow before they actually apply for that? What is the cost of that process?

Director Smith – As far as the CDL license this particular unit would require a CDL. All three employees are currently in the process of obtaining one. I'm not aware of anything, any further training outside of the CDL that is necessary. Just becoming familiar with the equipment, becoming familiar with the maintenance schedule for this particular piece. That would come from Motor Maintenance Supt. Spisak. As far as the cost, I'm not familiar with the cost, I'll defer that question to Asst. Director Bock.

Asst. Director Bock – In order to obtain a CDL the average cost is \$400-\$450, somewhere in that area and that involves a couple testing procedures and a driving test at a State facility.

Councilwoman Jones – Is this just they go and take the test? I know you said they're in the process. Can you just explain that whole process, is it just the one day like your normal driving test, or how does that work?

Asst. Director Bock – They go for a written temporary license for a CDL and that's done in Mayfield testing center. That's a written test. Upon completion of that, there's some videos and other literature that they can study and prepare for the driving test. Then I believe most of the guys go to the Willard Ohio location to take the test. Generally renting the vehicle that is available there, there's a cost involved there. Then they take a walk around pre-inspection of a truck that they have to pass to show that they know the operation of the truck and certain things that have to be checked. If they pass that, then they actually take a driving test with a State certified driving instructor and they have to pass that test.

Councilwoman Jones – When they go through the process, if for some reason they don't pass, do they have to go through that process again or just the part that they didn't pass?

Asst. Director Bock – I believe they would take the part that they did not pass.

Councilwoman Scarniench – Now that we're going to have the truck, are we thinking about being able to pick up at the condominiums? I did have a couple of people on Saturday ask me, particularly from Benton Village. We see the yellow bins but we don't have them. Are we looking to be able to do that for the condos?

Asst. Director Bock – Some of the condos provide a little difficult, unusual, in that they don't have frontages directly in front of their units in order to place their bins for collection. We're going over a couple of different scenarios for those areas as to whether it is bags. We asked them to get the blue bags. Kenwood Village is an area that blue bags kind of works better. There's a couple up in the Georgetown area with some of the condominiums up there that we'd be able to do that. The Lloyd Rd. condominiums is another area and the ones on Babbitt and of course Benton Village. We're kind of looking into that and trying to figure out the best scenario to include those because we definitely need the tonnage that is involved there.

Councilman Langman – One thing I forgot to mention Director Smith, I know we talked about education being critical to the success of the program. To that end, are we still projecting that we need about 4,000 tons to really make the program go or is that level of recycling has that fallen based on the updated budget?

Mayor Cervenik – What I presented to you really has, even if you want to add the cost of somebody coming off another job to take care of vacation time, it is not going to exceed \$13,000. With 3500 tons, we have a break even right there and that is only \$50,000 as revenue. The numbers we have right now at minimum we're going to exceed 100. This is the first year doing this program, I have been very conservative in the estimates. I see us actually profiting or whatever you use, cost reduction of the

tonnage will actually make us be successful for a long time to come. The education part of it is still very important part of it. We're applying for the grant, we should get it. A flyer will go out. There are things on our website. I don't want to stop at 3500, I just used it to show how this program does make sense. I would like to see us get 5,000 tons.

Councilman Langman – I would be happy to hit three.

Mayor Cervenik – So would I.

Councilman Langman – My point is, Director Smith, back when we had these discussions before, we talked about education and I asked you specifically if we could see some of that material before it goes out and that didn't happen. I'm not pleased by that because I saw the materials and I think the nine of us could have added something to that effort, especially since we do have close relationships with the residents. So I do want to know, are we going to do anything on the web on a more permanent basis to boost the profile of the program so it can be the success we all want?

Director Smith – Any input you would have on the web or any other literature is certainly welcome. With regards to the web information, I know the Mayor and myself visited the twelve member communities with the consortium to see what type of literature and what type of promotion they were actually offering. I know that's how some of our website information was developed. With regards to the flyer, we did have dialogue on that and that's going to be the intent of our application to the Waste District for potentially the \$3500 that will be utilized for literature.

Councilman Langman – Okay, so I will ask again, can we see that before whatever goes out?

Director Smith – Yes.

Mayor Cervenik – I think we should have a Sustainability Committee, we can all sit down and write it together so we make sure we include everything in there you like.

Chairwoman Minarik – Another one?

Mayor Cervenik – Yes, you're going to have to do another one.

Councilman Langman – That's all very nice Mayor, but I would appreciate it if I ask a question, if I can get the information timely instead of after the fact.

Mayor Cervenik – I think you usually do councilman.

Chairwoman Minarik – We do need to get moving into the real budget hearings. Mr. Beck, do you have any questions.

Mr. Jeffrey Beck – 25540 Chatworth. I'm against the purchase of another recycling truck at this time. We're two months into the recycling program but we are just starting to get our arms around it. When recycling was proposed, we were told it would end up being a self-sustaining program that we may even make some money on. The numbers I got tonight show just that. But if we keep spending funds on something we may or may not need at this point, before we understand the true cost of this program, then we're not being watchdogs of the taxpayer money. We need to walk before we run on this and frankly any other program the city enters. Right now we're still in the walking stage. I'm looking at the numbers here and we're averaging 40 tons a week, which equates out to a little bit more than 2,000 tons a year. If you use the 2,000 number instead of the 3500 ton number, we're upside down. We may get to, I think it is 74 tons a week, to break even here, and we may get there but we're not there yet. I would like to see council hold off on purchasing another truck until we can get our arms around the cost of this program. Thank you.

Chairwoman Minarik – First of all Mayor in response to your comment to Councilman Langman. I had asked prior to this meeting if we would have this spreadsheet you past out tonight days before, all right. I'm just saying.

Mayor Cervenik – I believe there was an email sent to the Director and again, the courtesy of a copy of to me who was working on this did not receive it until Board of Control time from the Director. I would have sent this earlier.

Chairwoman Minarik – Last week I had asked, so Councilman Langman does has a point that we don't get information all the time enough in advance.

Director Smith – Was it on this particular request for this spreadsheet?

Chairwoman Minarik – I had asked for numbers last week, if we would have information, days before and we got it five minutes before the meeting. That being said, I have some questions now. Is it possible to get a 12 months of the index, the recycling price index? I'm sure it fluctuates up and down. I would like to know if perhaps that's a seasonal reason why it is jumping up so high now, is it going to go down possibly, so that we can have a better idea of what to expect for the summer versus the winter. I don't know but it would be nice to see a 12 month index if that was possible.

The new truck that you're asking for, what is the estimated miles per gallon? How much did you estimate for fuel for that? Another question I had was, I saw that the VASJ bins are still up at St. Joe's. Do you have any idea Mayor when they're going to be pulled because that was one of the primary reasons that you encouraged us to adopt this program.

Then when it comes to this CDL license, Director Bock, who is going to pay for the training of the three people? Will there be a proficiency bump in pay because they now have more qualifications? When they're taking their tests, who is picking up the recycling? On the rear loader that we want to get, based on the September meeting, I thought rear loaders had to have a three man crew? When the smaller truck is going to Twinsburg, this rear loader will only have two men. I have a question, do we really need three men on the truck at the time? There's a lot of questions but we need to get moving for the budget hearings, thank you.

Asst. Director Bock – On the CDL testing, the men can schedule that on weekends, there's no loss of employees when they're taking the test. The other question on the proficiency, there's none in the budget for proficiency, these are non-union positions and they're not entitled to a proficiency at this time. If they should go union or something later down the road and that's built into their negotiations and so forth, then it becomes an issue, but right now, proficiencies are not an issue.

Chairwoman Minarik – Who is paying for the CDL tests?

Asst. Director Bock – Right now the training is on their own, they can get the materials from the Library, they study them at home. There is no training cost at this time.

Chairwoman Minarik – I thought you said it was \$400-\$450?

Asst. Director Bock – That's generally paid for by the employee. I would like to be able to help them with that cost, obviously. The training is an advantage to us, but that's generally up to the employee to cover that cost themselves.

Director Frey – Your question on the recycle bins. The Diocese of Cleveland has sent a letter to the City of Cleveland requesting that those bins be removed. The last I was aware from the School President, they were awaiting for a response from Cleveland. I know there has been some back and forth between the Diocese and the City regarding the condition of the parking area that the bins have been placed in and the damage to that. I think there's some information we're not necessarily involved with or would not be involved with, but the formal request has been made by the Diocese to remove the bins and I think they're awaiting resolution between the City of Cleveland and the Diocese to take care of that.

Chairwoman Minarik – Director Smith, what about the recycling index, can we get that?

Director Smith – We can get you that information. I'm not sure exactly what that number varies on. My gut tells me there's a lot of factors that would contribute to that. I'm not clear that looking at the past 12 months will be any type of indicator, but it can't hurt.

Chairwoman Minarik – I'm not sure either because of a lot of it could have to do with the economy.

Councilman Wojtila – Question on the contract with Kimble, is that fully executed?

Director Smith – Yes it is.

Councilwoman Scarniench – The email that we received on January 14th kind of answered most of the questions that everybody keeps asking. I would suggest everybody go back and re-read it. My question to Director Smith, if we don't buy this truck, what happens if the truck that we have breaks down?

Director Smith – That obviously is a concern and we wanted to be prepared for when that happens because it is probably just a matter of time, although truck 400 is new and anything obviously could happen, whether it be an accident or some type of mechanical failure. We did check with several local leasing companies and that's where we came up with a price to lease it of between \$5,000-\$6,000 per month. They're unwilling to do a daily lease on a garbage type truck.

Councilwoman Scarniench – The fact that this whole program is like a five year contract, so we're talking about \$6,000 a year, spread over the five years for the cost of this truck. I understand why some people say no, but I also understand for having a trash collector in my family for 41 years knows that this is the best thing for us to do because you need that truck in case something happens. Then what you're looking at is downtime for the employees also and what do we do? Tell them we're not going to pay you because we're not working? I don't know how that works. The biggest problem would be our residents. We do not want to cut their service at all. We're trying to encourage them to do this and every week I see another one here and there that wasn't there the week before. I'm fully in support of this truck.

Mayor Cervenik – I need to correct a statement. I believe you said one of the main reasons we started the recycling was because the bins were being removed from VASJ. Actually that wasn't the main reason. When we negotiated our trash contract, we had in the back of our mind that by doing it based more on tonnage than a few per household that we could recycle and save that \$39, \$40 and \$41 a ton as it escalates. Really to actually save money on the trash collection and to bring back a program that our residents really do want. We want to make sure that we can continue to give them this program.

Councilwoman Scarniench – My impression was the removal of the bins was another way to encourage us to adopt the program, not necessarily the main reason.

Mayor Cervenik – Wherever our residents take recycling, if they were to continue to take it to the bin, we still save tonnage, we still save the \$39 a ton. At the time we started this program, we weren't sure we were going to get any revenue at all, we were basing all upon just the tonnage savings. Then getting into the Consortium after talking with the City of Cleveland that didn't work out well, now we get revenue as well. The program has become much more acceptable to the administration than it did when we first started.

Chairwoman Minarik – I do think it would be nice to have at least 3 months of recycling under our belt. Take a hard look at the numbers and that will result in some overtime, but in your email Director Smith, you indicated as they get familiar with the route the overtime is going down anyway. I would ask the Committee to consider just waiting another month and a half until we have more numbers that we can wrap ourselves around, take a hard look at this. Right now it seems that we're dumping more money in. We underestimated the bins, had to order more bins. We bought a truck and now we have to buy another truck. Now our guys are going after CDL licenses. I would like to see what the recycling price index is, it may not have anything to do with it. But from September until now, the prices have almost tripled. Does that mean that they might drop again by two-thirds? I don't know. I would encourage the committee to go just a little bit slower on this and wait another month and a half. Director Smith, if that truck does go away that we're looking at now and the Committee does decide to do that and you go back to Manassas, let me know, I have family in Manassas and I'll hitch a ride.

With that being said, we do need to get to the budget hearings. I would not ask the Committee, what do you want to do? Would you like to move it to full Council with recommendation and passage? Or hold it until perhaps after the budget hearings, get more questions answered? Or after we have our hands around some numbers? Or, what would you like to do?

Councilwoman Scarniench moved Ord. (221-11) to full Council without a recommendation for passage. Councilwoman Jones seconded.

Councilwoman Scarniench – We're talking about two weeks from now and there will be more numbers but I don't see any reason why we should hold off on this.

Councilman Langman – Are we going to discuss the motion, can we do that?

Chairwoman Minarik – Yes, thank you.

Councilman Langman – I'll say it again. I think that given the program and all the various changes that number one that says to me that we probably did it too fast to begin with. Number two, that cries out that you need more data before moving forward. My colleague says she sees more bins everyday but the trend is down. I don't know whether that holds or not. That's why more data is required. If you just go off the first month's worth of revenue and cost avoidance, we're not anywhere near the figures that were

Sustainability Committee

January 24, 2011

Page 9

presented here. Can we get there? I believe that we can. But that will be a substantial capital outlay that we've made for the program. I'm comfortable keeping this here in committee until we get a full quarter's worth of data. Thank you.

Chairwoman Minarik – Any other discussion? Call the roll.

Roll Call on Motion:

Yeas: Holzheimer Gail, Jones, Scarniench

Nays: Langman, Minarik

Sent to full Council without a recommendation for passage.

Council President Holzheimer Gail moved to adjourn. Councilwoman Scarniench seconded.

Yeas: Unanimous.

Meeting adjourned.