

PAYT WORK GROUP
MINUTES FROM DEC. 2, 2009 MEETING
Minutes were recorded by two separate attendees.
7:00p.m. to 8:15 p.m. recorded by Paul John Sliker.
8:15p.m. to adjournment recorded by Peter Gray.

Attendees: Ann Hunt, Gil Satterly, David Downey, Bill Warner, Sharon Burgett, Peter Bunder, Peter Gray, Pat Riley, Diane D'Amico, and Mary Cook.

Ann H. summarized:

- *Mayor has received a lot of comments on stickers.
- *we are on an agenda for March 1st; the agenda day will be about 10 days before the council day.
- *Final Draft of ordinance on February 18th— need a plan for completing it.
- *Tomorrow is the pre-council meeting, Monday is the council meeting. We need precise wording completed for Monday's meeting.
- *We will certainly get feedback from the council at the two meetings

Peter Gray discussed his latest numbers:

- *Peter G will send out the chart file via email— all but \$100,000 is covered in what we're paying. The last couple years we've exceeded the 9 dollars (fee) but before that we were not.
- *4735 per household is the hard number on accounts

Discussion as to members' ideas and suggestions:

- *Sororities and fraternities not recycling enough, especially young people in the 20's and 30's. Ideas for getting these people to recycle more include groups encouraging recycling— for example, competition between Greek organizations.
- *If people know the difference between color of glass it would help the recycling process. This also goes for mixed paper and newspaper.
- *David Downey: co-mingling glass and plastic produces no revenue but also eliminates a trash bill.
- *Even though a co-mingle eliminates a trash bill, we're losing revenue by not separating brown and clear glass. If we are able to separate more it would generate more revenue (varying from time to time)
- *David Downey: even if you separate all 13 materials, some revenue you'll get some revenue you won't.
- *This recycling process is a 3 sort: glass/plastic in a bin, all papers in a bin, and all metals in a bin.
- *It's true it's easier for members to throw in 1 box. But it's bad because it generates no revenue for city. However the positive side is that the city will pay no tipping fee.
- *Recycling cycle is now once every 2 weeks. Will coming more often improve recycling? Changing the cycle to once a week, if co-mingling wouldn't have to increase labor.
- *Improved service with reeducation and getting people on board with recycling
- *The issue with co-mingling— where's the break point?
- *Diane: it is worth separating out bottles. The issue is will people actually do so?
- *Purdue wants to co-mingle because they're not concerned about revenue but more concerned with getting certain materials out of trash.
- *Once a week might increase cost of labor. (2 man 2 trucks currently) (It could be 1 man and 1 truck if it was done once a week)
- *Is it seriously worth looking into into recycling once a week? Will citizens become confused?
- *A full 55 toter will be less of a problem for the average citizen rather than a 95 toter.

*Cost: how many trips the worker has to take from back of truck to curb and back.

*75 cents to dump per can, multiplying x 32.

*major concern: forcing everybody to buy a new can.

*state has cancelled all environmental grants for equipment .

*other concern: who becomes the size police? not the trash people. if we develop a standard there will be no issue..

*another concern: the city will pick up to 56 gallons. Option to control own bill— research has proven a tweak will increase recycling. But were making people pay to do that. Another thought— how much more will education help?

*toter or not toter? standardize the size or not?

 (Recorded by Paul John Sliker,Purdue University,College of Liberal Arts,Professional Writing major)
 (continued by Peter Gray)

Mary pointed out that Peter Bunder authored the proposed ordinance change and, as such, was not bound to change the ordinance at all before the second vote.

The first vote passed 4 For & 3 Against.

Peter B. responded that his intent was to tailor the proposal around the recommendations of this Work Group. He listed 3 overarching goals of the proposal.

1. Help the City financially
2. Increase recycling
3. Do so in an equitable manner

Additionally, he said there would be a metered trash system. What that system is needs to have some sort of consensus from this group. Peter B. made a point that the responsibility for the proposal has now shifted to the Work Group.

Other comments Peter B. made concerning the writing of the original proposal:

- The conversation about a metered trash system has been going on for over a year.
- The 32 gallon can size was picked because that was most prevalent in other cities.
- The can size can vary depending on the fixed fee.

The question was raised about citizens who could not afford a fee increase. Both Mary and Ann commented that the current ordinance already provides an avenue to assist people in that situation.

Pat voiced a suggestion from his neighborhood that a resident could choose his monthly fee by choosing the size container that he will use. For example, the standard size would be covered by the base fixed fee, a larger can owner would pay an additional \$3 in his monthly bill for the larger can.

More discussion on stickers.

Bill asked David how the stickers would effect his operation.

David responded that they would definitely add time to the routes. If there was not a sticker a call would need to be placed to the office to document the fact. If a resident would confront the workers, a supervisor would need to be called to scene. There is a process to follow when disputes arise and that process can take many days to complete for each incident. By far, the easiest thing to do would be to just raise the flat fee.

All group members are to respond to each item on Ann's draft proposal that she will resend to all after tonight's meeting. All members are to be sure to propose

- 1. a base volume**
- 2. a base fixed fee**
- 3. a fee for items above the base volume**

Sharon asked David to reiterate the basic break out of the \$900k budget. David pointed out that the department provides 3 collection services:

1. Trash
2. Recycling
3. Brush / Leaves

Each comprises approximately a third of the budget; thus, \$300k for each of those services.

The next meeting will be 16 December 2009 at 7:00 PM at City Hall.

8:15 p.m. on respectfully submitted by Peter Gray

(Two versions compiled and edited by Mary T. Cook, 12-16-2009)