

CITY OF WEST LAFAYETTE
COMMON COUNCIL
MINUTES
March 1, 2010

The Common Council of the City of West Lafayette, Indiana, met in the Council Chambers at City Hall on March 1, 2010, at the hour of 6:30 p.m.

Mayor Dennis called the meeting to order and presided.

The Pledge of Allegiance was repeated.

Present: Bunder, Burch, Dietrich, Hoggatt, Hunt, Keen, and Thomas.

Also present were City Attorney Burns, Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes, Assistant Superintendent of Parks Ainsworth, City Engineer Buck, Police Chief Dombkowski, Street Commissioner Downey, Fire Chief Drew, Human Resources Director Foster, WWTU Director Henderson, and Director of Development Poole.

MINUTES: Councilor Keen moved for acceptance of the minutes of the January 28, 2010, Pre-Council Meeting, and the February 1, 2010, Common Council Meeting. Councilor Burch seconded the motion, and the motion passed *viva voce*.

COMMITTEE STANDING REPORTS

STREET, SANITATION, AND WASTEWATER TREATMENT UTILITY

Councilor Bunder presented this report, which will be on file in the Clerk-Treasurer's Office.

PUBLIC SAFETY AND ORDINANCE

Councilor Keen presented this report, which will be on file in the Clerk-Treasurer's Office.

PURDUE RELATIONS

There was no report from the Purdue Relations Committee.

PARKS AND RECREATION

Councilor Hunt presented this report, which will be on file in the Clerk-Treasurer's Office.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Councilor Thomas presented this report, which will be on file in the Clerk-Treasurer's Office.

PERSONNEL

There was no report from the Personnel Committee.

BUDGET AND FINANCE

There was no report from the Budget and Finance Committee.

REPORT OF APC REPRESENTATIVE

There was no report from the APC representative.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

West Lafayette Community Beautification Award

Councilor Keen presented the West Lafayette Beautification Award to Howard Zalkin who lives on Dubois Street.

Police Officer of the Year Award

Police Chief Dombkowski and Police Merit Commission Vice President Corrigan presented the Police Officer of the Year Award to Detective Jonathan M. Eager.

Appointment to the Traffic Commission for District 5 - Council

Councilor Keen nominated Kathleen Mills to the District 5 seat on the Traffic Commission. The motion to appoint Ms. Mills to the Traffic Commission was made by Councilor Dietrich and seconded by Councilor Burch. The motion passed unanimously *viva voce*.

FINANCIAL REPORT

Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes reported that the 2009 fall settlement was received last Friday. This satisfies the tax revenue requirements upon which the 2009 budget and, in part, the 2010 budget have been based. The County remits property tax collections as of the cutoff date, December 11, 2009. They include both the collections that were a result of the 2009 levy, as well as collections of prior levies that were delinquent. The apportionment sheets are being examined, as that allocation determines how much of the collections can be kept, in terms of the 2009-2010 budget. The extended 2009 temporary loans from the Wastewater Utility to the General Fund and Parks & Recreation Fund will be repaid this month. In reviewing our net certified assessed valuation, and as the Auditor releases more information, it is of note that, while West Lafayette's tax base grew 2%, as far as properties outside West Lafayette, they fell 2%. There was a decline outside of West Lafayette in real estate valuations, although ours continued to grow, most notably our business personal property assessed valuation grew very strongly, more than 2.5 times greater than what the County grew. That's remarkable, given the size of our tax base. Our TIF Districts have continued to grow, and the message is very strong that West Lafayette has weathered this economic period very well. It shows signs of continued investment, and we need to continue to feed that growth, because it clearly makes West Lafayette a unique location in the County. The expired warrant listing has been filed with the Council. It affects payees who have checks that are more than two years old as of December 31 in the year the checks were issued. By State statute, those are cancelled, but payees still may claim these proceeds over the next five years. The State Board of Accounts reports for February have been filed with the Council, along with the annual investment report for 2009.

LEGAL REPORT

City Attorney Burns stated that his report is on file. He is available to answer any questions.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Ordinance No. 28-09 (Amended) An Ordinance Amending The General Provisions And Service Charges For Refuse And Garbage Collection In The City Of West Lafayette (Submitted by Councilor Bunder)

Councilor Keen read Ordinance No. 28-09 (Amended) by title and moved that it be passed on second and final reading, and that the vote be by roll call. The motion was seconded by Councilor Burch.

COMMON COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES, MARCH 1, 2010, CONTINUED

Mayor Dennis asked for those who wish to speak to the ordinance address their unique issues and not repeat what earlier speakers have said. He requested that speakers limit their comments to approximately two minutes.

Councilor Bunder explained the changes in the ordinance, that the amended version is shorter and simpler. It was substituted for the previous ordinance at Thursday's Pre-Council meeting. The 48-gallon container was changed to a 50-gallon container. Service charges, Section 67.20, are now \$9 per month for one container, \$13 per month for each 96-gallon container. This change in philosophy will stop metering trash and offer tiers of trash service. He added that the committee has attempted to honor the Mayor's request to keep the base rate the same. He thanked the working group headed by Councilor Hunt for its perseverance and creativity.

Councilor Hunt stated that the work group was diligent in its efforts. There was much commitment and responsibility to the task. She moved to implement the ordinance to be effective August 1, 2010. The motion was seconded by Councilor Hoggatt.

The roll call vote on the amendment to add an implementation date of August 1, 2010:

AYE

Bunder

Burch

Dietrich

Hoggatt

Hunt

Keen

Thomas

The amendment to Ordinance No. 28-09 (Amended) passed, 7-0.

Councilor Keen read Ordinance No. 28-09 (Amended) by title and moved that it be passed on second and final reading, and that the vote be by roll call. The motion was seconded by Councilor Burch.

Mayor Dennis called for discussion from the Council.

Councilor Bunder stated that there was a petition presented to Council, which was in the Council mailboxes. He asked for clarification as to how this enters the record. Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes replied that the petition needs to be filed with the Clerk-Treasurer, so that it can be included in the record. Mayor Dennis said he would provide the Clerk-Treasurer with a copy.

Mayor Dennis asked for public comments.

Mr. Earle Nay (600 Elm Drive) said that he has been a resident of West Lafayette since 1961, and that he has followed this issue for years. He approves the ordinance and encourages all to support it. He questioned whether the 96-gallon container could be considered three properly sealed 30-gallon containers, since 96-gallon containers are somewhat difficult for older persons to manage. He stated that his family would be willing to pay more for the 96-gallon equivalent if it means that good service continues. He urged passage of the ordinance, amended as he suggested.

Mr. Thomas Kessler (479 Maple Street) said that he supported the original version of the ordinance and was not concerned about the slight increase in the base fee. He supports the

current version with the \$9 fee remaining. His interest is in seeing that his subsidy of the disposal costs of some of the rental properties in his neighborhood stops.

Mr. Bill Warner (3320 Cinnabar Street) said that he is strongly in favor of the ordinance for a variety of reasons. As Mr. Kessler noted, Mr. Warner said that we have the opportunity for the fees charged for trash service somewhat commensurate with the amount of service that people are using. He is also concerned about the Mayor's statement in the op-ed piece in the *Journal and Courier*, wherein the Mayor reported that there was enough revenue coming in to the Utility to fund current trash and recycling costs. Mr. Warner said that we all know that the current \$9 per month fee does not bring in enough revenue to fully support the trash and recycling services, and that means, to him, that the sewer rates are higher than they need to be. Excess revenue from the sewer rates is being used to subsidize the trash service and keep that \$9 trash fee artificially low. He thinks that is not the right way to do it, particularly for those customers in the City who pay sewer fees but are not eligible to use the subsidized trash service, mostly businesses. Those people are paying more than they need to be paying for sewer but aren't getting any benefit from the subsidized trash service. They get penalized again, because they have to hire private contractors to haul their trash away at market rates, much higher than the \$9 per month subsidized trash fee. He supports the proposal and urges Council to pass it.

Ms. Judy Tudor (2208 Rainbow Drive) said that she was representing her 90-year-old mother and herself, both lifelong residents. Her mother sent an email, supporting Mayor John Dennis' view in his *Journal and Courier* op-ed piece. Her mother opposes the ordinance and believes that if it is not broken, don't fix it.

Ms. Vyjayant Manian (3535 Hamilton Street) said an average American family generates about 100 pounds of trash per week, about three pounds per person per day. Over a lifetime, a 150-pound person will leave behind 90,000 pounds of trash for their children, compared to about 1,100 pounds per family in Europe. If we had second thoughts about cutting down on our trash and paying for what we use, this is a fine way to go about doing it.

Ms. Diane Damico (128 Blackhawk Lane) said she thought there was an elephant in the room, because Mayor Dennis came out very strongly against Pay As You Throw and at the last public meeting, he had some things to say about that. There are also rumors that the Mayor could somehow stop the ordinance going through, even if it had passed. She asked the Mayor to talk about this. If there was some clause of vetoing, maybe the City Attorney could speak to that. She wanted to be sure that the comments were directed to that as well. She asked, if the ordinance were to pass, the Mayor would be able and willing to veto it. Mayor Dennis responded that he would talk procedurally, that any legislation is subject to veto from the Executive, and this legislation is no different. Ms. Damico asked how it works, is it that there is no action taken to approve it or is there an action. Mayor Dennis explained that, after the roll call, the vote is reported by the Clerk-Treasurer, and the legislation goes to the Mayor for signature. After signing, it is formally enacted and becomes part of the City legislation. Should the Mayor choose not to sign it, then it is not formally enacted. The Mayor has 10 days in which to sign any legislation; if it is not passed, then either at that meeting or the next monthly Council meeting, there has to be a motion to override the veto. For that to occur, the vote in favor of override must be the majority plus one, 5 votes. Ms. Damico asked if that were for any ordinance. The Mayor confirmed that it is for any legislation. Ms. Damico asked if there were a veto, would the current ordinance stand. Mayor Dennis said that the legislation on the books continues to be in force. Ms. Damico reported that the current ordinance has problems, among them that a trash receptacle can only be between five and 20 gallons, with solid handles, no

plastic. It also says that the Mayor needs to enforce the Code. She asked if the Council has to go through a process to correct that, or does the City not enforce. Mayor Dennis said an ordinance could correct those and other issues.

Ms. Judy Rechberger (1201 Wiley Drive) said that three of her rental properties were inspected on Friday, and she was surprised that there was a recommendation but not a requirement to use the cans. When she asked about the price of the cans, she was told that they are \$70 each. She asked if people were aware of the cost. She reported that the cost seems excessive, considering that all of her rental properties have cans anyway, and it would seem to her that, if the City wants the cans to be used, the City should provide the cans, such as was done in the City of Lafayette. For a lot of older people, the size would be a problem, and \$70 is rather excessive from her perspective.

Ms. Mary Cook (owner of Harry's Chocolate Shop and a member of the Pay As You Throw work group) said that rental property of more than four units comes under a different heading from individual ownership. An individual house rented to a family is considered the same as an owner-occupied dwelling.

Mr. Charles Rausch (160 Burke Court) said that the administration of the program is more top-heavy than what is being done currently. If the City can continue the current program with more money, there should be no more administration. He stated that it could be more user-friendly, keeping the way it is and paying a little more.

Ms. Loren Olson (928 North Chauncey) said that she is very pleased with City services and is looking forward to having weekly recycling instead of every other week, and that will facilitate things a lot. She hasn't done very much for this effort, a little, but she stated that an extraordinary amount of work has gone in to this ordinance. It is very important to her that there are not big reasons not to do this, that that work should be rewarded, because it's important for citizens to be involved and to work on a proposal. If as much work has gone into this and it doesn't pass without some further reasons, it doesn't reward people to get involved. Ms. Olson felt that it would be a great thing, it would help the community. Compared to the really big issues facing our country, our community, our state, this is such a little thing that she felt it should be looked at in those terms.

Mr. Sam Haynes (713 Avondale Street) said that Ms. Olson made didn't make sense to him, because if people put hard work into bad things, that doesn't mean it needs to be rewarded. Mr. Haynes said he supported the Mayor's position.

Ms. Mia Lewis (935 North Chauncey Avenue) said that, for most people who don't use more than that amount of trash each week, it will stay the same. She also pointed out that there is a false dichotomy being set up. One issue is does the trash need to pay for itself, and the second is should we have a trash system that encourages people to recycle and to use less trash. In the Mayor's article, he stated that somehow, if the rates are kept the same, it's okay for the trash not to pay for itself. But if we change it, then all of a sudden, the trash has to pay for itself. If there's plenty of money coming in, then we could have Pay As You Throw without charging anyone, maybe even lower the rates for those who have less trash. Either the trash has to pay for itself or it doesn't, and if you decide that it doesn't, then there's really not an issue of having to raise the rates. She asked that we not compare raising rates and not raising rates; that's not the issue. The issue is whether we are setting forth a system that is going to encourage recycling. Because, if you look down the road, it is going to become more and more expensive to use the landfill system. Eventually, this system is going to save money for individuals and for

the City. If you keep it the way it is now, and you encourage people to be able to put out as much trash as they want, an unlimited amount of trash for \$9 a month, you're just kicking down the road the whole issue of what we will do when these rates really go up.

Ms. Mary Cook (owner of Harry's Chocolate Shop and a member of the Pay As You Throw work group) said that she agreed with the last two speakers, that there are two completely different issues. When she read the ordinance presented in October, it was clear to her that there was only one consideration given to Ordinance No. 28-09, and that was what the previous speaker mentioned. Ms. Cook's involvement took the direction of cleaning up the very outdated piece of legislation. She suggested that the Council might take a step back and amend the ordinance to five areas. The City would have a cleaned-up piece of legislation that leaves a \$9 rate and the 20 hours of meeting time from the workgroup came together with; meets EPA and OSHA standards that are more current; gets rid of the 22-gallon galvanized can—those kinds of issues. She said that the legislation could pass tonight, and then take a step back, and with a clean, enforceable, understandable ordinance with a group that wants to bring a different issue, a different mindset to this topic. She feels there are two polar opinions and two polar directions this ordinance has gone. Ms. Cook indicated that, for all the time, all the discussion, all the City's involvement, it would be too bad to lose everything for five simple ideas.

Ms. Paula Irmen (328 LaGrange) said that she might be one of the few people who has moved to West Lafayette from a community that used trash stickers. She said she has no problem with recycling, for those who want to do so. Ms. Irmen said that the stickers were "a colossal pain." Stickers are an inconvenience, she said. Elderly people have difficulty comprehending the concept of having to put trash out with stickers. How would trash be policed. It is difficult, and she does not support stickers.

Mr. Josh Burgett (owns property in West Lafayette) said that he was in Germany last fall, and he noticed that there were no public trash cans, because people would use them for residential trash. He addressed the question of subsidies, noting that people subsidize everything—roads, schools, etc. These are subsidies for public good, and trash pickup is one of those things. Students in this City are here, and they're the reason the town is here. While there might be some inconvenience with having them here, if they weren't here, the economy of the town would go away. He said that maybe it's one of the things that we've got to deal with in this town, a little bit of extra trash once in a while. Don't enact the ordinance; just raise the rates if you have to, he said.

Ms. Susan Gerard (210 Dehart Street) said she has been in West Lafayette, coming here from Indianapolis. She reported that the curbside recycling, and brush and trash pickup is great. Her Indianapolis friends called the people here "farm people." Ms. Gerard stated that "farm people" are wise to look ahead and balance their budget every month. There is great wisdom in "farm people." If we don't start fostering what you have and what you produce, there's more than the next 5, 10, 20, 30 years ahead, and when we talk about the learning that goes on at Purdue, the students aren't just learning their academics, they're learning to be people and citizens, to take care of themselves, to clean up for themselves, to realize what their own budgets and restraints are, and what their actions produce. Even a community that looks progressive that is a small town, that's a thinking town, and a town that takes care and might take a bold step, might have thought recycling was insurmountable then. She felt the ordinance is a good step to think about what is used and where it is put for later. West Lafayette would look good taking that first step.

Ms. Ellen Schweitzer (419 Meridian Street) said that she wondered about policing the trash cans, because sometimes college students will use her trash cans or put their trash on the

ground. Dumping in alleys is already a problem. If the current cost isn't covering expenses, costs may have to increase. But that will add to financial stress. Her bedridden mother generates a lot of paper. Her hope is that things can remain nice, covering costs without burdening, which is what will happen without proper handling.

Ms. Falon French (130 East Navajo Street) said if this were a burdensome system that no one liked, that didn't work, there would be one or two bad case studies, not 25% of the U.S. population using a system like the one proposed. It is different. It will be a change at first, but that doesn't make it bad. She supported the ordinance.

Ms. Robin Pickett (1805 Summit Drive) said that she supports the Pay As You Throw program, because she is afraid not enough people think about their trash. Perhaps with a different program, people will.

Mayor Dennis asked for comments from the Council.

Councilor Hunt thanked the people who served on the workgroup. She clarified that the 96-gallon can is the only one which will be paid for, if one opts for that tiered service. The can has a serial number, a logo, and a lift bar on it. Purchasing the cans from the City provides the paper trail to know who has which service. Mr. Jim Treat, who is the City's financial consultant, stated that the fees collected now, which have not been increased in 17 years, are essentially \$200,000 less than the cost for the Street Department to provide the services. A business plan was seriously considered, but Mr. Treat suggested that what was needed were scenarios. He recommended a tiered system, but the committee recommended lowering the fees he suggested. There will be a recycle education session on Wednesday, April 21, from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at the Lilly Nature Center. Councilor Burch is working with Councilor Hunt on that program, and they welcome suggestions for content.

Councilor Burch said that she likes to know the sources of statistics people use. She read a statement from Daniel K. Benjamin, professor of economics at Clemson University and senior associate of the Political Economy Research Center, who wrote an essay, "Eight Great Myths of Recycling." One of those myths is that our garbage will bury us. Professor Benjamin says, "Trash is an interstate business, with 47 states exporting the stuff, and 45 importing it. Indeed, the total land area needed to hold all of America's garbage for the next century would be only about 10 miles square." She stated that she could not, in good conscience, vote for the ordinance and betray the trust of her constituents.

Councilor Hoggatt said that it's good to take a step back and realize how great of a community we live in, when this is the big issue. And this is a big issue, basically the only item on the agenda. Everyone is here to talk about how we're going to throw away our trash, not gang violence, not a corrupt Police Department, not huge issues that other communities have to deal with. If this passes, West Lafayette will be a great community. If this does not pass, West Lafayette will still be a great community. Either way, things are fine. It's good that blood pressures get up on little issues like this, it's great. In addressing certain issues, there are some key things, not mutually exclusive goals, as far as balancing the trash budget and having recycling goals. Everyone has different goals, but his goal is to create equity in the fees. How can we close an existing budget gap by giving control back to the residents. If there are creative solutions that over 7,000 other communities have found to create equity in school fees, how we pay for roads, or in any other systems that people talk about subsidizing, he asked to hear them. This is the only system he's seen; it's been well-tested, in place for over a decade or two. The City is behind on the game, but the benefit is that we are learning from the other

communities. Our uniqueness is what generated the ordinance; it wasn't cut and pasted from other communities' legislation. In 81% of communities, illegal dumping did not increase at all. In 19% communities, there was a slight increase, but the vast majority reduced illegal dumping with good enforcement within six months. Mr. Hoggatt is working with City Attorney Burns to develop an ordinance which will include specific language for illegal dumping. The Neighborhood Resource Team is capable and ready to enforce this. The other key element in the 19%, where there are 7,000 pay-as-you-throw communities, there are 7,000 different ordinances. Straight unit pricing, where stickers are placed on every bag, is used in many communities. The West Lafayette workgroup decided that was not a good idea for our community. Dr. Thomas Kinnaman, an economics professor at Bucknell University, analyzed the implementation of a pay-as-you-throw program in Charlottesville, Virginia, similar in size to our city, a university town. One of the findings in that report was that it was an error to implement straight unit pricing. With a hybrid system, such as proposed here, there is an 89% reduction in illegal dumping. So the 19% has been decreased by 89%, and with aggressive enforcement, even with a slight spike, we can get rid of it. Mr. Hoggatt stated that this can work in West Lafayette. Our citizens are smart enough to do this. Our Sanitation Department employees are smart enough to do this. He said that the pot of money that subsidizes the trash ordinance is part of the Wastewater Treatment Utility. This is the same pot of money that the proposed stormwater tax would go into. A \$4 stormwater tax imposed on the citizens can't be avoided. Additional trash fees can be sidestepped by throwing out 50 gallons or less of trash. He suggested that stormwater fees might not be \$4, if people paid for their large items and extra trash, and that might mean a stormwater rate of less than \$4.

Councilor Burch asked Councilor Hoggatt how he will answer his constituents, the Purdue Student Government Senate Committee on Government Affairs, which has asked Councilor Hoggatt not to adopt this ordinance. Additionally, she asked Councilor Hoggatt whether this ordinance could be tabled, and that she and Councilor Hoggatt could work on compromises.

Councilor Hoggatt said that the PSG Senate Committee on Government Affairs email was primarily concerned with illegal dumping. They quoted *The Wall Street Journal*, which was quoting the EPA estimates on the 19% increase. He said that he wished the Student Government had contacted the Council more than a couple hours before tonight's Council meeting. He stated that the vast majority of the 19% increase had straight unit pricing; this ordinance does not do that. The research indicates that a hybrid system, illegal dumping drastically decreases. Councilor Hoggatt said he would be happy to work with everyone. This ordinance has gone through the EPICS committee, the Go Greener Commission, and now through another workgroup. There are a lot of constituents who have been waiting a long time for this legislation. He asked the Mayor if he had read Dr. Thomas Kinnaman's report or other reports, or the "Indiana Pay-As-You-Throw Toolkit" which is distributed by Governor Mitch Daniels. Mayor Dennis indicated that he had not. No other single system works better and is proven by research as is this one.

Councilor Dietrich said the influencing factor for him has been the volume of contacts, personal and email, he has received. It is interesting to him that there is no organized group against the ordinance, but that there is such numbers of people who want to see what impact comingling trash has before further changes.

Councilor Keen said that he agreed with Councilor Dietrich. One of Councilor Keen's concerns is that some version of this ordinance should be passed at some point, but not this version. Now is not the time to be increasing fees. He raised questions: (1) page 1, item (b) and item (e)—who decides what "useless material" is; who decides what "aesthetic value" is; (2) 67.03—

COMMON COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES, MARCH 1, 2010, CONTINUED

implies that one could use any “suitable” container anywhere in the City; (3) 50-gallon containers that have one handle versus two; (4) 67.07—“inconspicuous location” needs clarification; (5) item (d) on page 4—where does the un-gathered trash go, what is the process. These, he said, are all vague and should be addressed before its passage. He said that the City should get it right before it is passed.

Councilor Hoggatt said that the definitions came from City Attorney Burns. Further, he suggested that Councilor Keen should have brought these concerns before the time of the final vote.

Councilor Thomas said that he commends Councilor Hoggatt for his presentation. He has heard again and again how complex the proposed ordinance is, yet West Lafayette was voted one of the smartest communities in the United States. He believes the citizens can figure this out.

Councilor Bunder thanked Mayor Dennis. He said that he has material going back to 2008, when the Budget and Finance Committee proposed an increase in the trash fees.

Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes stated that the reference to the City administration calling a meeting to raise trash fees refers to the Clerk-Treasurer approaching the Budget and Finance Committee to address the issue that an additional trash fee of \$3 per month was incorporated into the revenue for the 2008 budget. That was done in 2007. At that time, the sanitation function was operating out of the General Fund, MVH Fund, and Wastewater, because portions of those labor forces were under the supervision of the Street Commissioner. Her feeling is that the biggest accomplishment of the work session in 2008 was finally gathering, from all sources, the resources, making it transparent how sanitation was being funded, and giving policy makers the option to make a decision. A number of people have received the sanitation cost and revenue reports that the Clerk-Treasurer is required to prepare. Those reports were miraculous in that the costs never increased. No one questioned that. She commended the current administration and Street Commissioner Downey for working to make those costs much clearer to policy makers. But numbers don't substitute for policy makers. The City's financial advisor did participate and provide guidance to the workgroup. He received an email from Councilor Hunt, asking him specifically to assist with advice on trash fees that would provide revenue to completely fund sanitation services. That was his charter, not to answer the questions, “What's the shortfall?” or “Is it essential to increase fees now?” His job was to provide policy makers with options. All the Council members were copied on that email, so you know he was asked a specific question. City Code requires that the financial consultant provide an annual financial review to the Board of Works and the Council. He meets with the Board of Works and he meets with the Council. That is an excellent time to review utility finances.

The roll call vote:

AYE	NAY
Bunder	Burch
Hunt	Dietrich
Hoggatt	Keen
Thomas	

The vote on Ordinance No. 28-09 (Amended) on second and final reading was 4-3.

Mayor Dennis thanked the members of the Go Greener Commission and those who worked on the committee, including the Councilors. He said that he agreed with Councilor Hoggatt, that if

this issue concerns us to the point that it takes a lot of time at a Council meeting, we live in a great community. However, he said that the City is not ignorant to citizen needs. Adjustments are being made. The process that everyone says is excellent is being improved. Co-mingled weekly recycling is being instituted. Recycling opportunities are increasing by 100%. This process has made the City aware that there are a lot of things that things can be done better, operational issues can be improved. He stated that he does not support the ordinance as written. He said he would not sign the ordinance as it is proposed.

Ordinance No. 05-10 An Ordinance Requesting An Additional Appropriation, Perimeter Parkway Fund (Prepared by the Clerk-Treasurer) **PUBLIC HEARING**

Councilor Keen read Ordinance No. 05-10 by title and moved that it be passed on second and final reading, and that the vote be by roll call. The motion was seconded by Councilor Burch.

Councilor Keen moved to open the public hearing on Ordinance No. 05-10. The motion was seconded by Councilor Burch. The motion passed without objection.

Mayor Dennis opened the public hearing and called for comments.

Ms. Mary Cook asked what the ordinance was. Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes answered that is an opportunity for the City Engineer to update everyone on the Perimeter Parkway Project and how it operates.

City Engineer Buck said that the fund is dedicated to provide the revenue funding for the perimeter parkway, the ring road around the Purdue University campus. Grant money and reimbursements from the Federal Highway Trust Fund through INDOT are deposited for future use on this project. The first construction phase of Harrison Street from Jischke Drive [formerly Intramural Drive] to Marsteller and Sheetz will be widened to a four-lane project. That will be bid in October 2010, with construction to begin in 2011 with completion in 2012.

Ms. Cook asked how long until the road gets to Chauncey. Mr. Buck answered that Phase IB will begin after the Harrison Street widening, depending on reauthorization by Congress.

Councilor Keen moved to close the public hearing. Without objection, the public hearing was closed.

Councilor Keen moved that Ordinance No. 05-10 be passed on second and final reading, and that the vote be by roll call. The motion was seconded by Councilor Burch.

There was no further discussion.

The roll call vote:

AYE
Bunder
Burch
Dietrich
Hoggatt
Hunt
Keen
Thomas

Ordinance No. 05-10 passed on second and final reading, 7-0.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMUNICATIONS:

► Councilor Hunt said the color for flowers this summer is “hot yellow.” Ms. Lynn Layden of the Beautification Committee will provide additional information later.

► Councilor Hunt thanked the Police Department for their extra speed patrols in the area of construction on Northwestern Avenue.

CITIZEN COMMENTS:

► Ms. Mary Cook presented an updated version of the ordinance for trash that considers EPA, OSHA, and standards for safety to Ordinance Committee Chair Councilor Keen for consideration by that committee. Councilor Hoggatt and Councilor Hunt are also on the committee.

► Mr. Tom Price, the Clerk Craft Director for the American Postal Workers Union at the Lafayette office of U.S. Post Office, received notice on January 22 from the Postal Service that they were initiating an area mail processing study of the Lafayette Post Office. What the plan is, if they so decide in their study, would be to move the mail processing from the Lafayette processing out of the main post office on 26 to 63+ miles to Indianapolis, process it there, and move it back. The consolidation plan could result in slower, less reliable mail service to the 479 area. Mail would have to be collected earlier. The American Postal Workers Union might lose 35-44 local jobs. There are two other unions which also might lose positions. The reason given for the changes is increased efficiency. Bloomington is the only other Indiana community where this has occurred. The Bloomington employees clock in in Bloomington, drive to Indianapolis and run their own mail on Indianapolis' equipment, then drive back to Bloomington to clock out. They get travel pay. There is the possibility that there will no longer be a Lafayette cancellation. Additionally, local personal services would be diminished. Mr. Price requested that the citizens and Council contact the federal representatives, Senators Lugar and Bayh, and Representative Buyer, to stop this Area Mail Processing (AMP) study proposed for Lafayette, Indiana, and keep our mail service here in town.

► Mr. Thomas Kessler said that he was disappointed at the outcome of the Pay As You Throw proposal, and to express his thanks to those who worked so hard. He thanked Councilor Hoggatt for his comments. He said he would consider his subsidy.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business at this time, Councilor Burch moved for adjournment, and the Mayor adjourned the meeting, the time being 8:19 p.m.