

## **SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SOLID WASTE ACTIVITIES**

**April 25, 2006**

**5:30 PM**

Chairman Roy called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Roy, Lopez, Osborne, Forest

Absent: Alderman O'Neil

Messrs.: K. Sheppard, J. McLaughlin, T. Arnold, K. Clougherty

Chairman Roy addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Discussion relative to absentee landlords and the possibility of charging market rates for services for refuse pick-up.

Chairman Roy stated let's go to page 3 of the agenda and start with Joanne's letter to myself.

Kevin Sheppard, Deputy Public Works Director, stated the last time this Committee met we provided a spreadsheet of recommendations that the Committee that was put together regarding our solid waste issues here in the City. Based on that spreadsheet we went back and gathered a little bit more information and we are providing it here or Joanne actually put this letter together. She has done some more research into it and trying to define Item 1, our customers, and there are some other issues and if you prefer we can take them one at a time.

Chairman Roy replied yes please.

Mr. Sheppard stated the first item being solid waste customers. Right now the City's policy or the Highway Department's policy has always been any trash put at the curb we will pick up, meaning if it is a multi-family or condominium association or apartment building if it is at the curb on the day of collection we will collect it. One of the issues that the Solid Waste report identified was perhaps the City should start identifying who our customers truly are, such as many other towns and cities do throughout the state and the region. We took a look at it or the Committee took a look at it and as you can see right under solid waste customers,

our customers that we feel definitely could be served are the single family residential, city offices and buildings, commercial properties, which this Committee has discussed in the past, limiting them to two toters provided they do recycle and small non-profits under the same caveat, that they be limited to two toters and recycle. Some of the other customers that we currently serve are the multi-families, six units and above and condominium associations, six units and above. Some condominium associations right now have private service. I would say a majority of them do but there still quite a few that are bringing their stuff to the curb and we collect it because that is our current policy. If you look on the next page, the focus group recommendations that were developed, if the City was to define non-customers, this is a potential list of non-customers that perhaps the City should take a look at if we want to cut back on solid waste collection costs, disposal costs and have a clear policy for all homeowners within the City. The multi-family residential larger than six units...one of the reasons we looked at our collection policy is typically we are looking at the commercial versus homeowners and what we define in the commercial sector is greater than six units. Typically that is not a unit that is lived in by the homeowners but typically owned as a business and for profit. Commercial properties are very similar. That is typically for profit. Condominium associations, one of the issues with them is we do get large amounts of solid waste brought to the curb every week by these associations and I don't believe...I believe the focus group didn't believe that they were really set-up to be a customer for solid waste collection, similar to perhaps plowing, sewer and other services that the City offers. Private streets are very similar to the condominiums. They were set-up as private streets to be associations. They really don't receive City services so, therefore, the focus group defined them as potential non-customers. The last one would be private schools. What we would like to do is start discussing with this Committee who our customers really are and who our customers may not be.

Alderman Osborne stated since I became an Aldermen and I first said three families or more I was thinking about if we get three families or more then the two family and single family homes would kind of fall in line with the three family. Can you tell me what the percentage is that the two families and single families have added on since that time? Do you have some sort of an idea of how good it is going without forcing anything or not?

Mr. Sheppard asked in regards to...

Chairman Roy interjected Alderman are you talking about the use of toters.

Alderman Osborne stated yes I am.

Mr. Sheppard stated Joanne can probably discuss that a little bit.

Joanne McLaughlin, Recycling Superintendent, stated I would say that when that program was initiated we found that there really wasn't much of a difficulty in getting people to buy the toters. I would also remind you here that according to the City Tax Assessor's Office, single family and two family residences are considered residential and three family and above are considered commercial properties so even defining the six here as the Committee has recommended I think we are still allowing quite a bit of leeway for a lot of the families.

Alderman Osborne asked have you found many two family and single family homes buying toters.

Ms. McLaughlin answered yes we have.

Alderman Osborne asked how much of a percentage. I know you can't give me an exact percentage but I mean do you find that it is going real well with it?

Ms. McLaughlin answered I find that there are neighborhoods that it seems to take off in.

Alderman Osborne asked more so north.

Ms. McLaughlin answered quite a bit north but actually other places too. A lot of people are finding it very useful to have that one toter because it has a lid so things aren't blowing around and it is easy. People are pleased with that set-up.

Alderman Osborne asked are we going to be talking about going forward with all residences having toters this evening.

Ms. McLaughlin responded I don't know if that is part of the discussion.

Chairman Roy stated later on that was going to be one of the...that is on the long-term implementation of the focus group but that is not part of our customer list.

Alderman Forest stated I have some questions and I have asked this before mainly because I am assuming your drivers notice it and I know I do when I go by and see blocks near the highway and some along Bridge Street and all of that that have the toters but there are 25 or 30 of them. I guess we are going to be addressing that tonight to limit that for your drivers are we not?

Mr. Sheppard replied the single families and say under six units as we are discussing I don't think that is really an issue. If we start seeing 40 toters, that is typically a condominium association or a private street and people are bringing

their stuff out. For single families, one toter is more than enough. I know in my neighborhood I have a toter. I have a 95-gallon toter and that is more than enough for my family. I think what you are saying is a lot of those areas that have 40 toters could probably be defined as non-customers.

Alderman Forest stated personally I think we have done well on the toter program. I notice it in my neighborhood and in my ward and all over the City but the thing is some of the tenement properties that don't have landlords that live there are really I think abusing the toter system. Again, they are cleaning up their area and I have no question that some of these people that I have seen are cleaning up their area but again we haven't really set a limit. We still pick them up or you still pick them up and I guess that is one thing we are going to be discussing tonight.

Chairman Roy stated one of the reasons we are talking about limiting our customer base is naturally financial and fairness. When you look at the toter usage for single family residences is there an average – if you took 10 homes how much weight is provided by those 10 homes versus one 10 unit multi-family?

Mr. Sheppard replied I went through and did a quick calculation. Based on the tonnage that we collected last year and the approximate number of units we serve, my estimate was about 3,000 pounds or a ton and a half or a ton and a quarter per unit per year. Right now we are paying approximately \$61/ton.

Chairman Roy stated so it is safe to say that each unit using that average of 1 ½ tons you are quickly at \$96/unit, whether it is a single family home or a multi-family.

Mr. Sheppard replied correct.

Alderman Lopez asked are you telling me now that the multi-family residences are not considered in our group. Is that what I am reading?

Mr. Sheppard answered that is what we are here to discuss. If the Committee and the Board of Mayor and Aldermen choose to set a policy on who our customers are and who our customers aren't. Our policy right now is anything that is at the curb or anyone that puts their refuse at the curb on the day of collection we will collect it whether it is a 20 unit building or a single family.

Alderman Lopez asked how many toters do you require a six-unit building to have.

Ms. McLaughlin answered the ordinance states that there must be a number sufficient to contain all of the trash.

Alderman Lopez asked what is sufficient for six.

Mr. Sheppard answered that is a difficult question. I think typically six totes would handle six units but there are places in the City and I am sure everyone has seen them where six totes isn't adequate and I think that is why the ordinance was left a little bit vague, to leave the discretion up to us. If there is an area that is consistently piling up the totes, as well as additional trash on the side it gives us the ability to deal with that.

Alderman Lopez asked why couldn't we have a policy on the six units that they must have these totes and if we have pick up extra trash they would be charged.

Chairman Roy answered I believe that may be from the driver's standpoint a logistical nightmare of deciding...

Alderman Lopez interjected it wouldn't be a nightmare if we had a Compliance Officer.

Mr. Sheppard stated we will get to that. One of the proposals that we have here is that it would be difficult to implement any of this stuff without a Compliance Officer.

Alderman Lopez stated I really don't...well I know it is a tough thing but I think on the six units we have to get stronger and make stronger policies. That is how you are going to clean up the neighborhoods. We visited the neighborhoods and I have seen 12 totes out there and three truckloads of garbage. Something is wrong. If they need 20 totes out there, that is what they should have. Somebody has to make sure that they have enough totes in these multi-families and then we will get into the bulky stuff later.

Mr. Sheppard stated we currently do some enforcement but it is a part-time job.

Alderman Lopez replied you don't do any so don't talk about it.

Chairman Roy stated one of the things that this customer list would help us do as a City is to define what should be private pick-up and what should be public pick-up. Right now it is if it is out there the Highway Department picks it up and some of the costs have gone outrageously through the roof. So people who decide to live with the 20 totes and drag them to the curb are avoiding the private pick-up at a cost and making it an unfair advantage for them versus the people in the smaller or single-family homes that are using the same service respectfully.

Alderman Lopez responded I understand that but I think that some strong policies have got to be made. That is the whole key and then enforcement is the second. If you aren't going to enforce anything, don't make any policies.

Mr. Sheppard stated we agree.

Alderman Lopez stated you have to remember that six units is a commercial type property and they serve a lot of people living in those apartments. I still think that we have to make some type of policy because that is the big issue in all of the wards.

Alderman Osborne stated I just wanted to go over the prices for the people who are watching at home. We can probably give them a little knowledge, especially the single-family homes and the two family homes. These toters for a 95-gallon are \$50 and the 65-gallon I believe is \$47. They are guaranteed for 10 years. They are wonderful because the lid on them won't blow around. We have a lot of problems in my ward with barrels rolling down Lake Avenue because of the weight of the barrels. You will find that the barrels you are buying now you are spending probably \$15 to \$20 per barrel anyway and they don't hold up as long. Actually these toters are a better value than what you are buying now and you can always use the barrels that you have now for leaves in the fall. Put the leaves in there so they can pick those up because you can't put them in plastic. It is a great bargain for the homeowners out there. I have two of them myself, two of the large ones, and I am a single family home. I fill both of them. I have seven people in my home. They are wonderful. I wish they were here in the 1950's.

Alderman Lopez stated there are no restrictions right now for somebody to...let's say a commercial person wanted to advertise on his toter. He can advertise on his toter can't he? There is no policy that he can't.

Mr. Sheppard replied I guess there is not. I don't believe there is any policy that prevents that.

Alderman Lopez stated the Weed & Seed Program bought over 60 of them for the inner City. That might be an incentive for commercial property or real estate people to look out. They could advertise their companies on the toters and maybe provide them for people who can't afford them. I think there is a whole avenue approach there but again somebody has to work on it. I understand that. That is one way to get a lot of toters out there.

Chairman Roy stated at this time Kevin if you are all set with defining the customer list, what I would look to do is accept a motion from this Committee that we establish our customer list per the recommendation of the Highway

Department to include single family residential, city offices and buildings, commercial properties, small (limited to two toters provided they recycle), non-profits, small (limited to two toters provided they recycle), multi-family residential, small (six units or less) and condominium associations, small (six units or less) that front City property. That is my belief of where we should define our customer list. Every one we have excluded has become a true commercial enterprise.

Alderman Lopez asked why do we limit them to two toters. We have proven that they need more.

Mr. Sheppard answered I guess it is our opinion that if they need more than two toters they probably should be on a private collection. They shouldn't be receiving the City collection whereas they are a commercial and for profit business. What we are trying to do is assist the small commercial properties here in the City with their refuse collection if necessary but we believe if they start generating enough trash they really should be paying for private collection.

Alderman Lopez asked let me see if I understand you. If I am a small commercial and I use more than two toters then you are going to require me to have a dumpster.

Mr. Sheppard responded we would ask you to go to private collection.

Alderman Lopez asked there is no room to make it three. What if I can use three?

Mr. Sheppard stated it is a decision of the policy of this Committee and going to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. It is going to be a policy of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. If they choose to make it three, that is something they can do.

Alderman Lopez replied sometimes I wonder if we just make too many policies that are restrictive to the people who are doing it because you are out there...whether or not it is you physically but you are out there with a small business and saying I would like to have three and I can survive on three but I can't survive on two because I have to...there has to be some flexibility someplace.

Chairman Roy stated one of the considerations if I could answer that and I do agree that we need to be sympathetic to small business, but one of the considerations of the focus group was when you get to three toters the storage size match a small commercial roll off so people could go ahead and have a small

dumpster in the same space as they could have three toters whereas places that were limited in size could have two but possibly not fit that small steel dumpster.

Alderman Lopez asked so you are telling me that two toters fills a dumpster.

Chairman Roy answered three toters would fill a dumpster.

Alderman Lopez asked three.

Mr. Sheppard answered a small dumpster yes.

Chairman Roy stated yes a 2' x 6' dumpster.

Alderman Forest stated I have a comment to follow-up on what Alderman Lopez said. I know, well it was my ward but it is not there anymore because my ward was moved over two blocks but some of the little mom and pop stores in my ward, you know two toters, the large ones would be all right because they don't have a place for dumpsters. We have a couple of social clubs that could use the two toters. What is happening now in some of the social clubs that I see along Kelly Street and Amory Street or Belmont Street...every Friday they stack up about 150 to 250 cases of liquor or beer that they have used during the week and I know your drivers...I have seen your drivers there for half an hour loading the trucks. The toters would take care of their trash and if they recycle they would be breaking up these cardboard boxes and help the City and themselves also.

Mr. Sheppard responded right and that is where the enforcement would come in.

Chairman Roy stated the key to still accepting the small commercial and the small non-profits is that they would have to recycle. So they would also be assisting the City in not only covering its new arrangement with our recycling contractor but helping the City gain revenues back. So instead of ruling out all commercial and non-profits, if you have a social club that had normal every day garbage but went through cases upon cases of glass beverage bottles, that would be something that could be recycled and then a percentage of that revenue would come back to the City, not to mention all of the cardboard that would not be thrown away in our waste system saving us \$64/ton.

Alderman Lopez stated I have one other question. What if you found a business, a small business that had no place to put a dumpster?

Mr. Sheppard responded we have looked at that and there are private companies that do provide curbside service in place of say the City so those businesses could probably purchase toters or refuse cans and get a curbside service from a private

company if they didn't have room for a dumpster. Private service isn't provided strictly for dumpsters.

Alderman Lopez stated the only thing I worry about sometimes is that these people pay taxes and sometimes we put more restrictions on them to make them do things. Are there provisions in here, Mr. Chairman, where in certain situations this Committee could waive from two to three in certain circumstances if it is proven that there is no place to put a dumpster?

Chairman Roy stated one of the things that I have looked at in the past and discussed with the Highway Department is like when we went to the two family or more having toters is having some type of variance process, whether it is called a variance or some other legal term, that they could come in front of this Committee or the Board or even potentially the Planning or Zoning Board and have a chance for recourse if under no circumstances they could comply with the law like we do with our housing codes and building codes. Part of going forward would be a request of the Solicitor's Office to work with Highway and come up with what is your definition, what is the simplest rule for this that we could go ahead and give people an alternative instead of making it absolute.

Alderman Lopez asked so it would be like an appeal process.

Chairman Roy answered exactly.

Alderman Lopez stated I think that is needed sometimes. We have to be very strict but there are sometimes where you have to appeal to a Board and go out there and physically look at the situation and say the guy is right.

Mr. Sheppard stated I think that is a great idea.

Chairman Roy stated you mentioned the tax situation, Alderman, and this could be interpreted as more fees for those people that we are ruling out. Some of that is a consideration but in looking at our program the people weaned out would actually gain a tax benefit if we were to limit...the argument was used in bag and tag people only putting out their percentage of garbage per year so if you took the larger commercial entity, instead of throwing out 1 ½ tons per unit or family, they are throwing out 20 or 30 tons, they are a much higher burden on the taxpayer than your single family or your under six family per unit cost. So you may actually see a decrease in taxes to some of those larger commercial properties because the system would be fair.

Alderman Lopez stated I would just encourage everybody to get the toters.

Chairman Roy stated we are going to get to that soon. So would a motion be on the floor to accept the Highway Department's recommendation and the focus group's recommendation to establish a customer list?

Alderman Osborne stated I wanted to go back to the subject of the small dumpster. You said you went out there and measured the small dumpster.

Mr. Sheppard responded based on the volume of the dumpsters...

Alderman Osborne interjected it holds three 95-gallon toters.

Mr. Sheppard stated the small dumpster we looked at could hold roughly three 95-gallon toters.

Alderman Osborne asked and you want to limit it to two toters. Wouldn't it be better to make it three?

Mr. Sheppard answered I think as Alderman Roy mentioned once you get to three it is pretty much the same as a small dumpster. Typically you can fit a dumpster where you can fit three toters.

Alderman Osborne asked so they would have to go to the next largest size of a dumpster. If you allowed them three they would have to get to the next size of dumpster.

Chairman Roy stated the belief is that by broadening that amount you would end up with more volume and less fairness.

Alderman Forest moved to recommend to the full Board approval of the solid waste customer list as provided in the letter from Joanne McLaughlin. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Lopez asked would there be an appeal process.

Chairman Roy answered I would look to entertain a second motion and ask that at our May 2 meeting when this comes to the full Board that the Solicitor...it could be as simple as a homeowner or a property owner or a commercial owner would have to come in front of this Board and our decision would have to be approved by the full Board giving it two steps of checks and balances.

Alderman Lopez stated the only thing I would say is not so much coming before the Board but I think this Committee would have to view the site so that we know what we are looking at.

Mr. Sheppard stated we could provide pictures.

Chairman Roy stated that would also tie into one of our later conversations, which kind of brings us back to enforcement and having someone who understood the parameters of what solid waste is and the size of dumpsters and that knowledge to make the recommendation to come before this Committee and say they really could use a dumpster or there is no possible way.

Alderman Lopez asked we have six categories right.

Mr. Sheppard answered yes.

Chairman Roy stated the four on the first page of Ms. McLaughlin's letter and the two on the top of the second page.

Alderman Forest stated along the lines of what Alderman Lopez was saying about enforcement I know we have a process as far as summonses and we are going to be changing some of that but a recommendation along that line is we have some hardcore absentee landlords that we can summons all week and they are still not going to change but there should be some process in there of starting with a warning and then working its way up so by the time it gets to the point where there is court action or whatever there is a paper trail to get them there. There are some landlords right now that I know I call every week about and there is a paper trail that has been going on for like six years. We do need a process to get it from Point 1 to the courts.

Chairman Roy replied absolutely and that is why I think under enforcement and why we asked for such a long meeting this evening, when we get to enforcement I think we need to address all of those issues and that is why the Solicitor's Office is here – to guide us and tell us what the steps need to be.

Chairman Roy called for a vote on the motion to recommend approval of the solid waste customer list as presented. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Roy stated Kevin one thing we did not talk about at the Committee level but that I would like to make public...naturally people are watching MCTV and our *Union Leader* reporter is here is the phase in of this program. We are in the budget season now and implementation and possibly what happens to those toters and again in the spirit of fairness if people did go out and buy 20 toters what will be the recourse.

Mr. Sheppard replied I guess that is a good question as far as what you do with the existing toters that these customers own. They did purchase them from the City and whether they continue on with a private service that collects those toters...there has been talk about the City trying to purchase them back and selling them as a used toter but that is something that would have to be budgeted for.

Chairman Roy asked could you for May 2 come up with what a possible purchase of that and potential fiscal impact...this may be offset by savings to the City so a potential buying one toter back at \$40 would be far less in what we are picking up in garbage through the year in that toter. If you could give us the pluses and minuses of what to do. I would like to see people use toters but if they are going to go to private there has to be some way to differentiate between City pick up and private pick up that works for staff.

Alderman Lopez stated you lost me. I just want to make sure that I understand. If somebody bought a toter you want to buy it back because...

Chairman Roy interjected they are no longer on our customer list.

Mr. Sheppard stated if there is an existing person that we collect from or a business that we collect from and based on the policy that is set we are no longer going to be collecting from them the question was what do they do with their toters now that they have bought them. I know one thing we discussed was a possible buy back program for the toters.

Alderman Lopez asked why would we buy them back.

Chairman Roy stated I am just trying to make it fair...so the public knows what their available options are. If we buy them back at \$10 and it makes sense or at \$20 and it makes sense we could resell them to...

Alderman Lopez interjected are you saying they can't use them for private pick-up.

Mr. Sheppard stated they potentially could but what Alderman Roy was trying to get at was we would want to differentiate their toters from the City toters either by color or shape. Obviously we can't prevent people from using the toters for private pick up.

Alderman Lopez asked do we really want to get into that. I mean if I have 10 toters and I am not one of the customers anymore and I want to get rid of them and put in a dumpster couldn't they provide a list at the yard or on the Internet saying

this guy has toters for sale in case anybody wants to buy them? Do we want to get into picking them up and driving around? That just doesn't make sense.

Mr. Sheppard answered again that would be a policy of the Committee. I think it would be difficult to work with. Let me ask Joanne. What does she think?

Ms. McLaughlin stated we have required that those people do buy toters so we went around on this quite a few times but in keeping with the idea of fairness since we did require them to buy them we should pro-rate some kind of buy back program. That has been mentioned. Mostly again just to try to be fair to people.

Alderman Lopez replied but again you could also, if somebody wanted to sell them you could provide their name and address and put it on the website or something.

Mr. Sheppard stated I think that is a good option also.

Ms. McLaughlin stated it is really a decision for the Committee.

Chairman Roy stated the toters are currently private property so instead of just saying you absolutely have to keep it as we change this customer list, you could either have the option to sell it at a discounted...and I am just making suggestions sell it at a very discounted rate back to the City or sell it to some individual or use it for some other purpose.

Alderman Lopez asked can I interrupt for a second. Do you know how hard it is to get money out of the City? Kevin, what is your comment on that?

Kevin Clougherty, Finance Director, answered E-bay.

Chairman Roy stated that could be the recommendation. I have no problem with that. I am just looking for fairness so the public would know all of the alternatives.

Alderman Osborne asked do you know approximately how many you would be getting back if this was implemented.

Mr. Sheppard answered quite honestly no. We do have a list of who they have been sold to but even from that it may be difficult to figure out. Perhaps we could come up with a rough number. That could be an option for perhaps as Alderman Lopez stated tracking where there are toters and as customers come in give them that list and give them that option.

Alderman Osborne asked how many have you sold to date.

Ms. McLaughlin answered probably about 8,000.

Chairman Roy stated while we are on the toter subject, Alderman Osborne was going in the direction regarding the use of toters and if we would like to continue down that line one of the recommendations that came out of the focus group or was made at the focus group was that by a certain date we implement only toter use. I believe Alderman Osborne was mentioning that barrels could be reused. As we implement this system that may also be a good time for, as the Finance Director said, E-bay and private lists and private sales giving people options to sell their toters to other individuals. We may want to set a date. I have always looked at the date of January 2007 for worker's compensation reasons that we implement a toter only pick up. I would put that out to the Committee as to their feelings on implementing a toter only pick up.

Alderman Osborne asked can we go over this just a little bit, the reason why we are going with one and two families outside of worker's compensation and so on and so forth. What is the big factor in doing this? You said that it was coming along quite well with single families and two families. I guess the word spreads out on how good they are. Has it slowed down with one and two families or is it still kind of moving along?

Mr. Sheppard answered I believe it is still moving along based on what I have seen and the customers coming into the Highway Department and purchasing toters.

Alderman Osborne stated I don't think it was so much the one and two families that were the big problem out there because in my ward I have a lot of multi-families and this is why I kind of pushed that at the beginning because my alleys were loaded with bags all over the place. In the wintertime it would snow and bury them. You know what it was. I don't think the one and two families, unless there is a good reason to do this, that is why I am asking this question Kevin or Joanne. Is there a good reason why we should go to one and two? What is the reason we should do that?

Mr. Sheppard replied well I think it was discussed a little bit earlier as far as toters go. I am not too sure we need to be there as quickly as January 2007 but if we keep our eye on...I don't think we want to move too fast on this whole program. One of the issues I was going to bring up is just this change right here is going to be very difficult, I believe, because we are going to have to have a notification process and follow-up with enforcement. What I would like to do is at the next meeting come back with a schedule or an implementation plan for the enforcement of this new policy. This isn't something that is going to happen in a month or two

months. I think we are going to have to get out there and educate our customers and notify our non-customers or the customers we presently have who won't be a customer in the future. It is not going to be an easy process. I am sure there will be plenty of upset customers. What I would like to do is come back at the next meeting with a schedule and a plan for implementation of the policy.

Alderman Osborne stated I think we should wait until it comes to a point where it is just getting less and less of the one and two families that are interested and if there is a reason to do this out there. If you see a lot of two families that are messy all of the time and their garbage is always in the alley or some sort of a reason for it. I think the big ones are three families and up.

Mr. Sheppard stated we may see after implementation of this policy, a lot of that cleaned up and that is what our hope is.

Chairman Roy stated one of the concerns that I have had as Chairman is as people replace their barrels they are going out and spending that \$20 and \$30 on a barrel and they are going to be the person that if we give them a phase in date may go to the Highway Department and spend the \$47 or \$50 on a toter instead of over the next year to two years buying a number of barrels. I don't mind whatever the date is. I would just like to capture the people buying new barrels so that they are helping the City progress towards this. That is the only reason for the phase in date.

Alderman Osborne replied I think it would take more of an education to this than anything else. That is why I read this off to everybody out there to go down and get yourself one of these because you will never be sorry that you did. You have to educate and put it out there to them – the cost and the guarantee of 10 years. It is only costing them \$5/year to own that 95-gallon toter. You can't get anything any cheaper than that and once they have it, it is the best thing since sliced bread.

Mr. Sheppard stated as far as that goes we sell up to two toters at the Highway Department due to our problem with storage so anyone can purchase up to two toters at the Highway Department on Maple Street. Any quantities above that we ask them to go to the drop off on Dunbarton Road. That is where they can also purchase the toters.

Alderman Forest stated I can understand the mandatory part of the toters. One of the questions I have and this should be looked into...I think the major problem we are having with these pick-ups and over abuse of the system itself are the apartment houses with three or more or even two families that are owned by corporations or enterprises or whatever it is. I believe, and I have seen it, the owner occupied three tenement and a lot of the ones in the City are...I mean they

are getting to be fewer and fewer but I think we should be making some exceptions for the three tenements that are owner occupied because they take care of their apartments. They may get two toters per apartment and I think we can limit it to that. It is the corporations that are really abusing the system by doing what they are doing and circumventing the tax rate and getting more out of their tax dollar than the average owner occupied or single family dwelling. I think we should be looking into the exception of some of these.

Alderman Osborne stated I just want to rebut Alderman Forest's statement. The trouble there is if you give some exceptions to some of the three families...I know where he is coming from. I know a lot of people that own three family homes in my ward and they keep them up very nicely but there is always a time, right now especially when real estate is turning over so fast everybody is trying to make the dollar out there and buying these three families up and turning around for a \$10,000 profit and so on and so forth so it is going to be very hard to keep up with all of these three families because of the way they are selling and who else is going to own it after this guy that was taking care of his property? God only knows. We have to make a line somewhere here. It is three families or more. We can't deviate from that.

Alderman Forest replied but I think we have to Alderman.

Chairman Roy stated at some point we can move in that direction. Kevin and Joanne definitely know what the flavor of the Committee is and what the issues are. Kevin or Joanne if you would like to address the bulky pick up eligibility and fee structure.

Ms. McLaughlin stated the intent of the bulky program is to offer a service to residents that need furniture collected and need a way to get rid of furniture when they replace furniture and these materials do not fit in the regular packer truck. That is what the bulky program was initially instituted for. What we are finding now is after evictions or after renters move the property managers and the property owners are calling the Highway Department and putting all of the contents of an apartment on the curb for pick up. That just is...first of all it is something that that truck is not made for and secondly it interrupts the...it is usually on the sidewalk and it is a right-of-way violation and it usually stays there for many days at a time. What we are trying to do with this and what the focus group has recommended is that we limit the bulky pick ups to two free pick ups per year per address with a limit of five items. We believe that the average family probably won't replace more than two rooms of furniture in a year so that gives them plenty of opportunity to dispose of these items at no cost just for scheduling a pick up. The problem comes when you have, as I said, these multi-families that are abusing the system and just calling for very large pick ups at the curb.

Chairman Roy stated as Joanne was just saying one of the problems we are having is large amounts of bulky pick up – people moving out of multi-families and the policy of the Highway Department has always been if it ends up on the curb we will go and take care of it. That, again, is setting an unfair balance between people who abuse the system and the normal use of the system, which is its design. I would be looking for a recommendation or a motion from this Committee to send to the full Board that we restrict the bulky pick ups as per the department's request, that there are two bulky pick ups per year per address and additional bulky pick ups would be charged by the bulky permit fee schedule as part of the attachments.

Alderman Osborne asked how are you going to police this.

Chairman Roy stated again enforcement. We are getting to that position.

Mr. Sheppard stated this is something that we would have to track internally on a spreadsheet by address.

Ms. McLaughlin responded that is why we need the Compliance Officer position.

Alderman Osborne asked so two bulky pick ups you said. So you are talking about a refrigerator or stove or couch or whatever?

Ms. McLaughlin replied the appliances are totally different. People have to pay a fee for that. If you have a couch that you need removed, we come and do it for nothing. There is no fee associated with that now and what the focus group has recommended is that we limit bulky pick-ups to two pick-ups per address per year with each bulky pick-up having a limit of five items. That means the average homeowner can get rid of the equivalent of ten couches for no cost. We are asking that beyond that we should be charging.

Alderman Osborne asked how much of that do you have. How much more than twice a year are you doing now?

Ms. McLaughlin answered we have a real problem with multi-families where people move in and out and where there are evictions that...property managers probably constitute about 80% of our bulky pick-up calls.

Alderman Osborne stated so it is not going to hurt a lot of the people.

Ms. McLaughlin responded not at all Sir.

Alderman Lopez stated I am a firm believer...I don't know about two. I don't think any of these multi-family owners throwing everything out in the street ought to get any. We have sent trucks up to a tenement on Somerville Street and I think it took them four and a half hours to clean up the street. That owner ought to be charged.

Ms. McLaughlin responded part of this recommendation is to limit it to, as we are suggesting in the Solid Waste Program, to apartments of six units or less. That is part of the restriction.

Alderman Lopez stated I know the Committee looked at it but why. I mean if someone is throwing refrigerators and everything else out there like couches and beds and we have to send trucks up there that spend three hours and we don't charge this guy?

Ms. McLaughlin responded that is correct. That is the current policy.

Alderman Lopez stated now think about what you are saying. You are going to give me two. How many times do I throw a bed out or a couch? You are giving him special treatment.

Mr. Sheppard stated Item 2 on your agenda, I think, is something that we need to when we come back to the Committee address. When we run into situations like that I think we need to be charging a fine or a market rate versus actual cost for picking up something like that. A lot of times we will find piles of stuff at the curb and our guys will spend a half an hour picking it up. Is that fair? People want it off the curb. They don't want it sitting there while we send out a warning and send out a fine and two weeks later maybe it is taken care of. They want it taken care of immediately. If we do need to react to something like that, there needs to be something in place that allows us to fine that person a reasonable fine above the actual charges and that is something that we can work with the City Solicitor on or through ordinances, which we would have to work on developing fines for situations such as that.

Alderman Lopez stated one of the areas where the owner of those apartments, they pay taxes so you do know who they are and maybe the City Solicitor could work that out. It could be a special tax like we have the central business tax. I don't know if it can be done. I am just saying that it costs you \$500 to go and clean up because some property owner threw it all out in the street. There has to be some mechanism where we charge this individual. It is only fair.

Mr. Sheppard stated we have to make it so it hurts so it is not common that they do that. We have to make it so that it is not \$100 where a private sector might cost

them \$300. We have to make it so that it deters them from wanting to throw stuff in the street and that is what we would work with the City Solicitor on.

Chairman Roy stated one thing you will find is that not all multi-family owners abuse the system. It is those that abuse the system that have the highest cost to the City and an unfair advantage from the taxpayer.

Alderman Lopez stated if the public didn't know before, they know now because my son-in-law said hey will they pick up a couch and I said it will cost you \$25 and now you are telling me it is free. You told everybody you could do it twice a year for free.

Chairman Roy responded yes which for people who live in the City it is a very nice service to be able to not worry about hiring a private contractor at a much higher fee for that one or two times a year that they need something. It is the ones that abuse the system and literally clean out a whole apartment and our staff spends hours there picking up and there is no recourse. So without a basic policy of two free and then a charge, there is no way to track it and no policy set. Right now it is on the curb and the Highway Department picks it up and keeps the other constituents and neighbors happy.

Alderman Lopez asked if I called you Kevin and said come on over I am going to give you \$300 to take all of this junk away...

Mr. Sheppard asked me personally or the Highway Department.

Alderman Lopez answered could we use the Highway Department for that.

Mr. Sheppard stated in my opinion I don't think we should get in the business of doing private refuse collection.

Alderman Lopez stated one other comment if I may. Going back to the toters it might be better to try and work out with Home Depot and other places to sell the toters. Now you have to go to the Highway Department and get a little slip and run over to the dump. People don't want to do it.

Mr. Sheppard replied our long-term plan is to get out of the toter sales business. It is not a moneymaker for us. There is a small administrative fee on it. One of the concerns in the past was that once it does go out to K-Mart and Home Depot instead of \$50 it might be \$75 but I think we have to get out of that business.

Alderman Lopez responded I think so too and I think it is convenient. People will go there and buy it and put their stuff in it and wheel it out.

Mr. Sheppard stated if there is a requirement and an ordinance requiring those in the City I think we will find some of those local hardware stores and Home Depot and K-Mart carrying them.

Alderman Lopez asked do we have the right to negotiate with them and give them our sources and give the toters.

Mr. Sheppard answered I don't think we can guarantee the price that we...

Alderman Lopez interjected no I am just saying.

Mr. Sheppard stated we can work with them.

Chairman Roy stated that is also a great responsibility for our Solid Waste Enforcement Officer to accomplish.

Alderman Osborne stated getting back to Alderman Lopez's statement here I thought of that also a long time ago. I asked Mr. Frank Thomas about something like that. In my own mind I was saying to myself to put the City and what the residents are paying out there for these toters, they are not going to get them at HD or Lowe's or whatever for that kind of money. These people have to work on a certain percentage of mark-up. I have been in retail all my life and I know they are not going to get them for \$50 so the harder we make it for these people out here to get these toters or the more they have to pay for them the harder it is going to be for us to get them to get these toters. We have to be kind of careful before we go out there and start retailing these toters.

Mr. Sheppard stated but it may be possible that we are the resource. Maybe we sell them but also Home Depot and K-Mart sell them because there are people who while they are at Home Depot they are going to pick up a toter.

Alderman Osborne asked do you think they are going to want to pay \$15, \$20 or \$30 more for it when they can get it for that much less at the Highway Department.

Mr. Sheppard answered I know people who for convenience sake if they are at Home Depot...

Alderman Osborne interjected they would pay that much.

Alderman Lopez stated it might be cheaper at Home Depot.

Alderman Osborne stated no. One more follow-up. On the items or this two time pick-up that we were talking about, I think basically what about the thought of limiting items at one time rather than just trying to give them two pick ups. I have a place up on Central Street that I have had a lot of problems with. It wasn't so much an absentee landlord. They gave it to a management company and I had a lot of problems...I had stuff piled sky high in the yard. I went up there physically one time and took it out of the yard and put it on the curbside because the people across the street couldn't take it anymore. Maybe by limiting the amount of items that you tell them that they can do...if they have something that is like 15 or 20 or they are emptying...what happens there and I don't want to take up too much time but what happens is the tenants move out and they leave all of the furniture. They leave everything in that apartment. They don't care and then this company has to go in and take it all out of there and put it on the curb. If they know they can only put two or three articles out there at one time then they are going to say well I can't put them out because they aren't going to pick them up. They are going to have to do it themselves and get the articles down to the dump on their own or whatever it might be. I think if we limit it to so many articles where it might be three or four or whatever you come up with, I think that is a better answer than just saying two times a year.

Chairman Roy stated what we have done is limited it to five items and on the sixth item the fee structure would kick in so that if there was a situation where someone put out too many items like that then the first five would be free and then the fee structure would kick in so that all of those extra items would actually be a revenue source and a quality of life issue to clean up. We don't want it just to sit there but we want to have some recourse of trying to get it back to the City.

Alderman Osborne replied true but I have been in my ward 66 years and I know what is out on those curbs. I don't think there are too many people that abuse this situation. There are only a few. If we can tackle that in that manner then I think we will be better off than what we are talking about now and limiting it to two pick ups for everybody because 90% of people put one couch or a couple of articles out and that is it.

Chairman Roy stated at this time I would look to call for a vote on that or a motion.

Alderman Forest asked what is the motion.

Chairman Roy answered that we accept the recommendation of the focus group to limit the bulky material to two pick ups per address per year and implement the preliminary solid waste fee schedule.

Alderman Forest moved to accept the recommendation to limit the bulky material to two pick ups per address per year and implement the preliminary solid waste fee schedule.

Chairman Roy stated some of our customers would fit into that legitimately and it would weed out the 10% that are not.

Alderman Osborne asked couldn't we just look into what I said first.

Chairman Roy replied the answer was that there is a limit of five items per time.

Mr. Sheppard stated the recommendation is to limit it to two times per year and at each pick up a limit of five pieces.

Alderman Forest stated not everybody is going to throw out two couches and four chairs and six tables every year. This wouldn't apply to the people who don't abuse it.

Alderman Lopez stated well single family homes won't abuse it.

Chairman Roy stated if it is the will of the Committee we can set a different level but at some point we have to set some level that takes care of the majority of the City and allows the Highway Department to go ahead and look at who the abusers are and give them a fee structure that we can back up with legitimate ordinances and fines so that the abusers aren't taxing the system.

Alderman Osborne asked why don't we just back it down to three articles and leave that twice a year out of there and try that for a pilot program and take it from there.

Chairman Roy asked three items, unlimited pick-ups free for any residents and then if they go over that implement the fee structure.

Alderman Osborne answered if anybody is going to pile out 15 or 20 articles they deserve to take it out there on their own. It is one of those things. The City can't do it. If we only say we can have three at a time out there and they have 15 what are they going to do with the other 12? They aren't going to have the time, the once a week or whatever it is to put three out at a time.

Chairman Roy stated the spirit of it is to limit people who should be hiring a private hauler for 15 items. That is almost everything on the first floor of an average home.

Alderman Osborne asked how often does this happen. How often do you get this mess like up on Central Street?

Mr. Sheppard replied I would say probably every week we have something bad somewhere in the City.

Alderman Osborne asked every week.

Mr. Sheppard answered yes.

Alderman Osborne asked most of them in the inner City.

Mr. Sheppard responded I wouldn't necessarily say it is always the inner City but it is throughout the City we find people moving out with large amounts of trash.

Alderman Lopez stated I am torn between saying yes and absolutely no only because I don't think you can compare multi-families with single residences. That is the problem I have. I don't know, Mr. Arnold, can you separate it if it is a multi-family, which is considered commercial versus three items? I guess what I am saying is would it be a separate policy for commercial, six tenements and three tenements versus single family homes can have three items?

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated the Board could do that if it desires. I think the key is how you define address. Is an address a building? Is an address an apartment? Is an address one condo within a condo complex? You have to be careful how you define address.

Alderman Lopez stated I am sort of like Alderman Osborne. What do you do when you go there and you have three items or five items and the guy in the six tenements has twenty items? Do you leave it?

Mr. Sheppard stated I think that is when we started talking about working with the City Solicitor's Office as far as piles of junk or trash or bulky stuff left at the curb that haven't been scheduled and aren't out on the correct day as far as enforcement.

Alderman Lopez stated I know the focus group did a lot of work on this and they are to be commended for it but I think that the multi-families sort of get the whole benefit so to speak.

Chairman Roy stated if it is the pleasure of this Committee, we could actually define, as the Solicitor said, an address as...I will use mine, 608 River Road, Unit 1 as an address and Unit 2 as another address, and Unit 3 as a third address

allowing, if it was a three family, three different addresses, six pick ups, 30 items per year. What we are looking to do is take care of the abuses and no matter where we set the limit on addresses or numbers or amount of pick up we need to...the majority of the City falls well within an acceptable range. The 10% that doesn't falls way outside an acceptable range.

Alderman Lopez asked but in doing this are we just voting the concept and then the City Solicitor is going to get involved or are we voting the policy.

Chairman Roy answered we are voting the policy and then it would have to be enforced with an ordinance that would come on May 2 and be reviewed by, I believe, Bills on Second Reading and then go back to the Board.

Alderman Lopez asked is there any reason why the City Solicitor wasn't involved in this document.

Chairman Roy answered we didn't want to tax the City Solicitor's Office until the flavor of this Committee and the full Board came to light. There are a number of ordinances and a number of things that would have to be written so that if the flavor of the Board wasn't there or the spirit of the ordinance wasn't established, we didn't want them spinning their wheels.

Alderman Lopez stated well at this stage of the game I just don't know what ordinances are going to be in place.

Alderman Forest stated I think mainly what we are doing is voting on the concept of all of these recommendations and then I believe the City Solicitor, along with staff, will be looking at what ordinances we need to implement for this. I don't think we are going to be writing ordinances tonight.

Alderman Lopez stated that is the question I had. Is this a concept that is going to go before another Committee and come back here or are we voting for a policy. I think the Chairman said a policy.

Mr. Sheppard stated the way I am interpreting this is right now we are looking for you to set some policies for us so that we can actually put this down in writing and put an implementation plan together and come back to this Committee with a formal policy and ordinances. Quite honestly there is no way we could have ordinances by May 2. I know the Chairman would like that but I think what we need to do is come back to this Committee.

Alderman Lopez stated I don't mind seconding the motion as long as there is some difference between multi-family commercial buildings and single families so that

when you look at this thing and say okay that multi-family is not going to throw 20 items out there without being charged but the single family owners can throw a couch out there and that is it.

Mr. Sheppard responded we didn't want to start developing these policies and ordinances until we had a good feeling of what this Committee and the BMA felt. Once we get that feeling and everyone agrees that is the direction we want to go in, I think that is when we can develop the policy and the ordinances and come back.

Alderman Lopez stated my feeling is that these multi-families that throw beds and dressers and everything out there ought to be paying something.

Alderman Osborne asked Kevin can you come in with my recommendation as well with three and leaving the amount of pick ups out of there and come in with a fine or whatever...I don't know exactly. The City Solicitor in back of us must know or you know I guess. It happens a lot in my ward so we go out and take pictures and it takes about 10 days to do all of this but I think education again is a big...I think once they know they can only throw three pieces out there that's it. They just have to stick to it.

Mr. Sheppard stated what we are trying to find is a policy. If you are asking us to develop Policy A and Policy B and then come back to this Committee and vote again I guess we could do that. Tonight we are trying to determine a clear direction for us to move forward on. As far as the recommendation of limiting it to three and unlimited pick-ups, I think Chairman Roy mentioned that I believe limiting it to two and up to five items will take care of 80% to 90% of our customers. To say unlimited pick up, yes I know the multi-families aren't going to put out three items every week but you are going to see a lot of these multi-families that are going to put out a lot of items if somebody moves out. Once people move out they will call and put out three.

Alderman Osborne asked but you have the same problem both ways don't you. If you implement what you are talking about here they still can throw out more.

Mr. Sheppard answered they are going to be limited to two pick ups a year. Beyond that they are going to be responsible for disposal. If they don't, then we are going to have to work towards like I said earlier an ordinance with the City Solicitor for enforcement of that.

Alderman Osborne asked so we can still do what I am talking about and what you are talking about. That is what I am trying to say. It doesn't make much difference. You have nobody to police it.

Mr. Sheppard stated our point tonight is quite honestly items 1 and 2 we don't feel we can implement unless we get Item 3.

Alderman Osborne asked can you do what I am saying and I can work with the City Solicitor also. We don't have the time to go through all of this tonight.

Chairman Roy stated I believe from the Committee's standpoint I do have a motion and Alderman Lopez seconded it.

Alderman Forest asked have we involved Eddie, Pat and Bob with Corcoran in some of these suggestions seeing they have some expertise in this from the business they were in to start with. Were they involved or is this just a City side thing?

Mr. Sheppard answered this was done back in 2004 with that focus group, which consisted of Aldermen, the Highway Department, and a consultant that we brought on board that knows solid waste.

Chairman Roy stated I know from negotiations they have read this and are actually in a position to help us out implementation wise with the multi-families and other things. What I would like to do is call for a vote on the motion.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked can we clarify the motion.

Chairman Roy stated it is to accept the recommendation with Alderman Lopez's comments.

Alderman Lopez stated it was to accept the recommendations understanding that this is a work in progress to identify the difference between single family, multi-family and the ordinance to be developed.

Alderman Osborne asked are we still going to get into what I...

Chairman Roy interjected yes I am going to ask and since we had a first and second that motion will pass...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected wait a minute. I have two different people giving me the contents of the motion here.

Alderman Forest stated well I made the motion.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied well he is restating the motion so one person needs to give us the motion.

Chairman Roy asked Alderman Forest can you read your motion please.

Alderman Forest stated the motion that I made was to accept the recommendation on bulky pick up to twice a year and then Alderman Lopez recommending referring it to the Solicitor for an enforcement ordinance which would come back to us. That is the motion.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked and that comes back to this Committee.

Alderman Forest answered yes and then we would vote on it.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked you want an ordinance prepared by the Solicitor.

Alderman Forest answered yes.

Alderman Lopez stated they are going to identify the difference between multi-family and single family.

Chairman Roy asked are you clear on the motion Carol.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered yes.

Chairman Roy called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman Osborne being duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman Roy stated we do have one item of mandatory necessity that we get to but I would ask Kevin and Joanne to work with Alderman Osborne who can also work with the City Solicitor and maybe work in parallel with that last motion. I just believe we need to get something moving forward and if it is Alderman Osborne's I am fine with that. We do need to start figuring out what the cost to the City is and taking care of the 90% of the people that do right by the system. At this time I would like to jump ahead in the agenda...

Alderman Osborne interjected I just want to say that the one and two families why should they have to suffer because somebody is abusing it with five and six items. I just can't comprehend that.

Chairman Roy responded just a very quick answer to that; right now they are suffering because of the taxes and the higher fees that are charged by Highway in solid waste disposal for the 10% abusing the system. That is where we are trying

to limit that. If I could I would like to skip ahead in the agenda to other pertinent timely solid waste issues. I have that as page 7 of 17. Kevin, if you would like to talk about our renewal of contracts.

Alderman Lopez asked are you going to skip...

Chairman Roy interjected we are going to skip ahead. This is something that has to be done and presented to the full Board in May. It is the Municipal Solid Waste Transfer and Disposal Contract renewal with Waste Management.

Mr. Sheppard stated back in 1996 the City entered into a long-term contract with Waste Management to dispose of our solid waste. That cost was transfer and disposal from their Auburn facility and we retained the price based on their bid and that was tied to an annual CPI increase with a maximum of 4% per year. That contract was for 10 years.

Alderman Forest stated we are having a hard time finding out where page 7 of 17 is.

Chairman Roy stated it is page 4 of Joanne's letter.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated it is page 4, item 1.

Mr. Sheppard stated back in 1996 the City entered into a contract with Waste Management. Other than the yard waste and recycling at the time, which we entered into there was also a contract for the transfer and disposal of our curbside solid waste. A lot of Aldermen probably realize that the solid waste that is picked up at the curb is brought to Waste Management's facility in Auburn and then we pay them to transfer that to their Rochester facility and dispose of it. That contract was a 10-year contract that is up this July. We need to give them a 30-day notice if we plan to renew it. The City had a 10-year contract, like I said, which is expiring and the City has the ability to extend that to four five years terms. What we are looking for tonight is the recommendation of this Committee to extend that to the first five-year term on the contract. We feel that the prices we are getting on that contract per ton are great prices. They provide a great service. Our truck has been able to go into that facility and dump with no problems and compared to other prices that we have seen out there in the state, even based on the 4% cap that we have seen every year we would recommend extending this contract.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne it was voted to recommend the extension of the contract with Waste Management, Inc. for transfer and disposal of solid waste for one five-year term.

Chairman Roy stated if we could Kevin go to the Solid Waste Compliance Officer and your concerns as we are in budget sessions.

Mr. Sheppard stated perhaps we should have put the Solid Waste Compliance Officer as the first item only because the first two items that we discussed, it is our opinion that it would be very difficult to enforce any of those items without a Solid Waste Compliance Officer. A Solid Waste Compliance Officer would not only be enforcing that but enforcing our existing litter ordinances in the City. We feel with the implementation of the first two items you are going to see a savings in curbside tonnage, therefore, a savings in disposal costs. Can we quantify that amount right now? Probably not until the program is implemented but it is our opinion that Item 3 ties in with Items 1 and 2.

Alderman Forest asked didn't we pass this already.

Alderman Osborne stated yes it was supposed to be implemented in April wasn't it.

Chairman Roy stated just to update the Committee, this is currently in Bills on Second Reading. The funding for this was not appropriated pending what we had for a snow removal budget. We exceeded I believe by a few thousand dollars that snow removal budget so there is no funding for this and we need to, as a Board, put this back onto the budget table.

Alderman Lopez asked can we hear from the Chairman of Bills on Second Reading.

Chairman Roy answered yes.

Alderman Duval stated as a new member of the Board I am not entirely familiar with the history and discussion related to this specific position or the need for it but I do know that part of the inner City ward that I represent is certainly in need of additional services with regard to keeping our neighborhoods free of debris and whatnot. I also feel very strongly and I have had this discussion briefly with Alderman Roy and Alderman Osborne to a certain extent that the position I think if we are going to move forward with it serious consideration should be to put together a plan so that the position from the get go is performance based and funded to a very large extent, at least in the first year, if not totally by fees...I feel very strongly about that. I am not inclined to just support or recommend creating a position for the sake of creating a position. I think that the people should come together and discuss the main initiatives for the position, the main responsibilities and craft a position with responsibilities specifically relating to these areas of concern that we have all agreed to and expressed – conditions that are very real

and exist in our City's neighborhoods. If the Bills on Second Reading Committee members are so inclined, I would like to recommend that we move that, at least for discussion purposes, to the Finance Committee and see if we can have a real thorough discussion on the benefits of creating that position.

Chairman Roy stated we are running extremely low on time.

Alderman Osborne stated I worked kind of hard on this one. How long has it been now, Kevin, a couple of years or a year and a half anyway? I am sure this position is well worth it. It pays for itself really and it helps clean up the City like Alderman Duval has suggested and so on. I have no problem with this position at all. It is not going to hurt the budget. In the long run it is going to help it.

Alderman Forest stated we have created this position. The full Board has passed the position. I believe it was sent to Bills on Second Reading or whatever it was. The position has been defined. I think the problem was at the time that Highway did not have the funds and we did not fund it and that is why it is where it is.

Chairman Roy replied correct. The reason it is here in front of us is we are now looking to help it along in the funding process.

Alderman Lopez stated I think it is important and I would like to move that we refer this to the full Board and approve the Compliance Officer and let the Chairman of Bills on Second Reading deal with it and sort of marry everything up. I think the recommendation from this Committee is that we sanction the Compliance Officer.

Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Roy stated I have one comment. While we have been discussing this position I added into the Mayor's proposed budget and it makes a 1 cent difference per \$1,000 on someone's home. I asked Kevin...this is a quality of life issue. It may create revenues but if it does not create one cent in revenue it will definitely help our tax base in the center City with the enforcement and the quality of life but I asked Kevin what it takes for a change in the tax base to fund this position.

Kevin Clougherty, Finance Officer, stated one cent on the tax rate, back of the envelope, \$50,000. It would be \$50,000.

Chairman Roy asked so if this position helps us with \$50,000 it pays for itself over the year. I would like unanimous support to move the motion.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked can I just clarify because you were saying the full Board and then the Finance...is the recommendation to fund the position to the Finance Committee.

Alderman Lopez answered that is correct and then the Chairman of Bills on Second Reading will have to take some action in his Committee.

Chairman Roy called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Lopez stated I would like to make a motion on page 4, item 2. I would like to table that.

Chairman Roy asked the anti-scavenging ordinance.

Alderman Lopez answered yes.

Chairman Roy asked leaving it tabled in this Committee.

Alderman Lopez answered yes.

Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Roy called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Roy stated if we could just have a quick report on the downtown toter collection zone. That is a budgetary item for Intown.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne it was voted to table the Downtown Toter Collection Zone item.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee