

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (UNFINISHED OR PENDING MATTERS)

A. Update on Greenspace/Open Space Preservation:

Mr. Gerry Carvey, Chairperson of the Rochester Hills Land Preservation Task Force, updated the Committee on the progress of the Clinton River/Trailway Open Space Project Steering Committee.

Mr. Carvey invited Committee members to attend a “walk of the trail” on Saturday, January 26, 2002 at 1:00 PM beginning at the Yates Cider Mill.

The Steering Committee will also be holding their first public visioning session at the Older Persons Center on Wednesday, January 30, 2002 at 7:30 PM. Environmental planners with the Oakland County Planning and Economic Development Services will be conducting the presentation. The Public has been invited to share thoughts and help prepare a plan for enhancing and preserving open space along the Clinton River.

Mr. Carvey anticipates the Steering Committee will wrap-up their work by April and have a final report to present to the Communities.

(Exit Mr. Carvey)

B. Update on Gateways Project:

Mr. Don Westphal advised that a Design Review Committee has been established. The Committee has created two questionnaires that are ready to be distributed to the Community. Mr. Westphal indicated that the Review Committee is as far along as they can go without a clear understanding of the goals for the project.

Mr. Ken Bryant showed the Committee some base plans the Design Review Committee has come up with for gateways at M-59/Crooks; South Blvd./Rochester Rd.; Auburn Rd./Dequindre; Livernois/South Blvd.; and Dutton at Paint Creek Trail.

Members discussed at length distribution of the questionnaires. CDV Committee is to be updated on the progress of the survey.

(Exit Mr. Westphal, Mr. Bryant, Mr. Rizzardi and Ms. Millhouse)

C. Approval of Solid Waste Recommendations Report:

Resolution

MOTION by Hill, seconded by Duistermars,

Resolved that the Community Development and Viability Committee hereby receives and files the **Recommendations Report** regarding Solid Waste prepared by Resource Recycling Systems, Inc., dated 10/24/01,

Ayes: Barnett, Duistermars, Hill, Cosenza
Nays: None
Absent: Kaszubski

MOTION CARRIED

Resolution

MOTION by Duistermars, seconded by Hill,

Whereas, Rochester Hills City Council charged the Community Development and Viability (CDV) to study the issue of curbside recycling and solid waste disposal,

Whereas, CDV created a Solid Waste Ad-Hoc Committee directing the Committee to prepare recommendations for waste management strategies that would be cost effective for the City;

Whereas, the Solid Waste Ad Hoc Committee's made recommendations to CDV in the **Recommendations Report** as prepared by Resource Recycling Systems, Inc.; dated October 24, 2001;

Whereas, Resource Recycling Systems, Inc., and the Solid Waste Ad Hoc Committee collectively reviewed the report and refined it further as mutually agreed;

Whereas, Joint Meetings of the Solid Waste Ad Hoc Committee and CDV were held to review the recommendations and discuss the options, with recommendations;

Whereas, it was the consensus of the Solid Waste Ad Hoc Committee and is the consensus of the CDV Committee that Option #1, an exclusive contract with a preferred hauler, is the best option for the City because it will achieve the largest cost savings possible for the City while reducing the impact of truck traffic and trash collection on City streets.

Whereas, CDV also believes Option #1, an exclusive contract with a preferred hauler, will result in the greatest improvement in collection services for all residents while increasing collection of recoverable materials such as recyclable and yard waste;

Now Therefore Be It Resolved that CDV recommends that City Council proceed to implement a comprehensive solid waste management system that would rely on a single preferred hauler for collection of solid waste, yard waste and recyclables for all residents in the community.

Ayes: Barnett, Duistermars, Hill, Cosenza
Nays: None
Absent: Kaszubski

MOTION CARRIED

Chairperson Barnett advised the Recommendation Report will be presented to City Council at a Work Session on February 6, 2002.

7. NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

A. AD-Hoc Committee – Pathways

Mr. Paul Davis will be contacting previous members of the Bikepath Committee to form an Ad-Hoc Committee on Pathways.

B. Review of City Local Road Policy

Members previously received copies of the City of Rochester Hills Local Road Policy. Mr. Davis asked the Committee to review the Policy and consider modifications be made to the following:

- Increase the \$4,000 cap on costs to property owner.
- Replacing concrete roads with concrete.
- Type of drainage system.

Mr. Roger Rousse advised that a Local Road Tour is being arranged by his department for City Council.

8. NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting will be on Thursday, February 28, 2002 at 5:30 PM.

9. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, Chairperson Barnett adjourned the meeting at 8:05 PM.

Minutes prepared by Lisa K. DeLeary.

MINUTES of a **Special Rochester Hills City Council Work Session** held at the Rochester Hills Environmental Education Center, 1115 West Avon Road, Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan, on Wednesday, February 6, 2002.

In accordance with the provisions of Act 267 of the Public Acts of 1976, as amended, the Open Meetings Act, notice was given that a Special Rochester Hills City Council Work Session would commence at 6:00 PM on Wednesday, February 6, 2002, for City Council to discuss solid waste issues.

1. CALL TO ORDER

President Dalton called the Special Rochester Hills City Council Work Session to order at 6:03 PM.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: President John Dalton; Members Bryan Barnett, Melinda Hill, Barbara Holder

Absent: Member Jim Duistermars
Member Lois Golden (*Arrive 6:55 PM*)
Member Gerald Robbins

QUORUM PRESENT

Others Present: Pat Somerville, Mayor
Marc Ott, City Administrator
Beverly Jasinski, City Clerk
Kurt Dawson, Assessor/Treasurer
Scott Cope, Building Director/CDV Committee
Roger Rousse, DPS Director/CDV Committee
Frank Cosenza, CDV Committee
Michael Kaszubski, CDV Committee
Karin Bickle, Chairperson, Ad Hoc Solid Waste Committee
Lynn Jenkins, Ad Hoc Solid Waste Committee
Mildred Knudsen, Ad Hoc Solid Waste Committee
Rea Siffring, Ad Hoc Solid Waste Committee
Thomas Stevenson, Ad Hoc Solid Waste Committee
Glenn Thompson, Ad Hoc Solid Waste Committee
Jim Frey, Resource Recycling Systems, Inc.
Dawn Furlong, Resource Recycling Systems, Inc.

No Resolutions were adopted.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS - (Non Agenda Items)

No member of the audience provided comment(s) regarding any Non-Agenda Items.

4. DISCUSSION – regarding Solid Waste Issues (A0262).

President Dalton indicated the discussion of the solid waste issue would be turned over to Bryan Barnett, Chairman of the Community Development and Viability (CDV) Committee.

Member Barnett explained the CDV Committee has been discussing this issue for the past two (2) years. He introduced the members of the Citizens Ad Hoc Solid Waste Committee, the CDV Committee, and Jim Frey and Dawn Furlong, from Resource Recycling Systems, Inc., who were the consultants on this project.

Member Barnett provided a brief history of the background concerning the solid waste issue. He explained the CDV Committee, under direction from the City Council to address the many resident complaints and concerns received regarding this issue, formed the Citizen Ad Hoc Solid Waste Committee. He stated the Ad Hoc Committee met for six (6) months, and did a tremendous job gathering background information and data from other communities. The Ad Hoc Committee reviewed the various options of handling solid waste within the community, and presented their recommendations to the CDV Committee.

Member Barnett stated the CDV Committee discussed the recommendations with the Ad Hoc Committee, and brought in Resource Recycling Systems to work with the Ad Hoc Committee to further define the recommendations. The revised recommendations were reviewed by the CDV Committee and approved for presentation to City Council.

Mr. Jim Frey provided a brief slide presentation on the analysis and recommendation for collection of solid waste, recycling and yard waste within the City of Rochester Hills. He indicated Resource Recycling began by reviewing the materials and data gathered by the Ad Hoc Committee, and combined that with background data regarding how solid waste and recycling is handled in Southeast Michigan. He explained the methods of handling solid waste, recycling, yard waste and household hazardous waste in nine (9) other municipalities were reviewed.

Ms. Dawn Furlong explained out of Sixty-one (61) Oakland County communities, Thirty-five (35) communities have municipal contracts. She explained the communities without municipal contracts are more rural communities lacking the resources and/or manpower to put such a program together. Mr. Frey noted the Thirty-five (35) contracts represent approximately Eighty (80%) Percent of the residents in Oakland County.

Ms. Furlong stated many residents moving into a community without a municipal contract were often surprised there was no contract. She noted there was limited competition for waste hauling services, particularly in the rural communities, and some waste hauling companies do not provide service in all communities. She stated contracted services provided cost-savings to the community, and the services can be tailored to meet the needs of the community. The community would decide if household hazardous waste, yard waste recycling, Christmas tree collection, or a leaf collection program should be included in the contract.

Ms. Furlong stated a Cost Analysis Comparison was conducted among the communities with contracted services. The survey indicated some of the contracted services included recycling and yard waste collection, while others also included household hazardous waste collection. She explained the cost per household in Madison Heights is about Ninety (\$90.00) Dollars; however, their contracted services only included a four (4) week leaf collection program, and their residents have to take their household hazardous waste to a collection facility in Detroit if they want to participate in the program.

Ms. Furlong noted the cost per household in Highland Township is approximately One Hundred Fifty-four (\$154.00) Dollars; however, they have a payback from their recycling program that helps pay for the household hazardous waste program every other year. She stated Lake Orion and Orchard Lake pay for commercial collection from businesses and included that in their base price.

Mr. Frey stated the various municipally contracted programs were reviewed, and then a contracted services program was assembled for the City, at a price of about One Hundred Thirty (\$130.00) Dollars per household. He indicated the price included a combined service of solid waste collection, recycling collection and processing, and yard waste collection. He explained household hazardous waste service would be available on a scheduled basis. He stated the municipal services category was added, which is the cost of trash collection at municipal buildings, because it provides a better rate when bundled in with the other contract.

Mr. Frey indicated a cost for "education" was included, which covers program administration consisting of fee collection management responsibilities, contract management, contractor accountability, invoice review, and education regarding recycling, yard waste, and proper use of the trash collection service.

Mr. Frey stated the budget for the proposed municipal contract was projected at approximately Three Million, One Hundred Thousand (\$3,100,000.00) Dollars. He indicated the current projected waste hauling cost for the City of approximately Five Million, One Hundred Thousand (\$5,100,000.00) Dollars, was determined based on the subdivision rate, the non-subdivision rate, the number of households, service shut-downs for residents residing out of state during the winter, and additional recycling and yard waste charges. He noted a comparable rate of all residents contracting all available services was projected to be over Six Million (\$6,000,000.00) Dollars.

Mr. Frey discussed the alternatives that might preserve choice, including zones in the community and further licensing of haulers. He indicated the primary emphasis was on using a single hauler, collecting solid waste at the curb, recyclables on a weekly basis, and weekly yard waste pickup during the growing season (Spring to Fall). He stated the single hauler would work closely with the municipal officials and complaints would be dealt with that day. He stated the City of Rochester Hills is quite close to two (2) service providers who could give favorable pricing on solid waste disposal and recycling processing.

Mr. Frey indicated the Recommendation included more than one (1) contract, due to the fact only one (1) company could offer the landfill option with a bundled contract, and there was only one (1) company that could offer the recycle option. He suggested the City would contract with a disposal service, allowing more haulers to bid on the collection service, rather than just those haulers who owned landfills. He stated part of the Recommendation included a contract with a disposal facility, a contract with a recycling facility, and a contract with the compost facility. He stated the recommendation included a separate contract for household hazardous waste because it was a simple service to contract for.

Mr. Frey stated the basic reason savings would be realized was that the City was taking on the responsibility of handling the money. He stated the reason the hauler could provide favorable pricing was because they would send a single bill to the City every month instead of sending out individual bills. The City would develop the mechanism for paying the bill, resulting in no bad debt or non-payment problems.

Mr. Frey stated for a community the size of Rochester Hills he recommended having two (2) people to handle administration, clerical, monitor the contractor, handle complaints, review the contractor's performance, and work on education for the residents. He suggested an advisory or oversight committee also be established to meet periodically to monitor the program and advise staff and City Council on how the program was working.

Mr. Frey discussed the Technical Work Plan that was devised to implement the recommended program, which would take approximately Twelve (12) months to accomplish, and would include:

- Preparation of bid specifications
- Development of a management system and a funding mechanism
 - compiling data on the parcels
 - mechanism for charging, i.e., winter taxes or quarterly billing
- Issuing bid documents to vendors
- Evaluating the bids and recommending contractors
- Negotiating the final contract documents
- Revise the Ordinance
 - the current Ordinance has a different system for solid waste collection
- Training staff, and
- System startup
 - contractor notice to proceed

- educational materials
- distribution of recycling bins and trash bins

Mr. Frey responded to the question of what happened if the contracted hauler went on strike or went out of business. He explained the contract would contain a performance bond, which would allow the City to instantly access the performance bond, and contract with another hauler to provide the service. He noted some contractors are union, which guarantees workplace safety, and health and benefit packages. He stated there was a risk of a strike; however, the contractor is obligated by the contract to perform the service. He stated the contractor could bring other companies in to operate the trucks and provided the contracted services.

Mr. Frey stated a "customer service function" would be included in the bid specifications and a process would be established to resolve complaints, such as a missed pickup. He indicated a specific number would be called, which could be at the City Offices. He stated the contract would require a log be maintained of complaint calls and their resolution. He noted the contract would also include a "liquidated damages" clause, which would provide fines to be assessed to the contractor for any incident not timely resolved.

Ms. Furlong stated nine (9) communities had been contacted and none of the those communities had any severe problems with their contracted haulers.

Member Barnett noted the Committee had discussed dividing the City into quadrants with designated pickup days. Mr. Frey stated the Ordinance could be revised to designate a particular pickup day for each quadrant in the City; however, this would be detrimental to the cost savings. He explained the hauler would have to travel to the City on several different days, causing the routes to become inefficient. He stated many haulers would not consider a contract specifying pickup in that manner.

Member Hill noted the Committee had been requested to eliminate the number of days trash sits on the streets. She stated by dividing the City into quadrants, the potential exists for having garbage sitting on the streets five (5) days a week.

Rea Siffring, 971 Dutton Road, stated what the Ad Hoc Committee had agreed upon as its first choice was a recommended hauler, and they did not believe the quadrant system would work. She noted many residents live out of state for four (4) to six (6) months and currently do not pay for trash collection during those months. She suggested preserving the person's choice for those who opt out of trash service altogether. She explained some residents have a business in the City and do not want to pay for trash service at both locations.

Lee Zendel, 1575 Dutton Road, stated he had reviewed the Recommendations Report and asked the following questions:

- What the related costs would be if the location of the recycling center is different from the location of the landfill; and the cost of the recycling hauler separating the recyclables at the curb.
- Whether a single hauler would actually mean fewer trucks driving on the City roads, noting the amount of trash would be the same, and the trucks would be fuller and heavier.
- Whether the landfills would do business with the City if they were owned by losing bidders.
- Why quarterly reports had not been filed by the three (3) licensed haulers as required by the Ordinance.
- Whether studies had been conducted regarding the purported damage being caused by the trucks in traveling on the City's roads and streets.
- Whether the size of the City made a difference in the cost of the pickup.
- Whether the recycled materials are being disposed of in landfills, thus eliminating the need for a recycling truck.
- Whether the estimated number of households was accurate and how apartments, condominium complexes and mobile home communities were

- accounted for, as many of those complexes use dumpsters rather than curbside pickup.
- Whether haulers would be willing to bid without knowing which landfill, recycling facility or composting facility they would have to haul to; and what happens if the nearest landfills are substantially higher in price.
 - Whether the haulers would agree to a five (5) year, fixed price contract.
 - Whether those sections of the City that have curbside trash pickup twice a week would agree to once a week service.
 - Whether the Committee discussed with the City Attorney the City's ability to revoke existing licenses for all losing bidders.
 - Whether the winning bidder has enough available equipment and staff to handle the entire City.
 - Whether the City was prepared to enforce compliance of any breach of contract.
 - Whether a "health officer" has ever been appointed as required by Ordinance to perform routine inspections on trucks, file a report with the City, and distribute the appropriate educational materials.

Mr. Zendel stated he did not support the recommendation of a single hauler for the City. He indicated there were many significant differences in the communities, i.e., size of homes, size of lots, average age of city residents, or average income, which could explain the price differences indicated in the Recommendations Report.

Member Barnett stated the recommendation was a citizen-driven proposal and many of Mr. Zendel's questions could not be addressed until additional data is gathered.

Rev. Dr. Pamela Whateley, 1600 N. Livernois, commented that the projected savings per year per household would not apply to those households currently paying less than the report indicates. She stated she knew of other communities who do not complain about their single haulers because the haulers found subtle ways to get even.

Tom Stevenson, 708 Riverbend Drive, referred to a recent article appearing in the Rochester Eccentric which stated the Ad Hoc Committee had ignored the leaf burning issue. He stated the Ad Hoc Committee would like to recommend a leaf burning ban; however, they had not determined any good alternatives at this time. He suggested an ad hoc committee be formed to address that particular issue.

Dot Wolff, 1160 Clopton Bridge, stated her current recycler picks up all items and throws them all into one (1) truck. She questioned whether any recycling was actually be performed.

Rea Siffring stated the recycling is being done because the materials are separated at the disposal facility, not at the truck.

Curtis E. Agius, 2833 Crooks Road, Suite 100, Troy, stated he is owner of Trash Taxi which is a waste hauling company currently servicing some areas of the City. He stated there are many advantages to a one-hauler system, if the right hauler is picked. He explained it would be safer to have fewer heavy trucks driving through the subdivisions. He suggested the contracts be based on performance, and consideration should be given to the company's safety record. He stated as an independent hauler, his company would not be able to bid on a City-wide contract, because the level of his business income would prevent him from obtaining a Three Million (\$3,000,000.00) Dollar bond. He noted the two (2) landfills located in Oakland County would be closing in three (3) years. He stated in the Fifteen (15) years he has been in business, he has never seen a performance bond cashed in.

Member Barnett stated the Recommendations Report was not a final plan, and the next step would be to enter into a contract with the Consultant and allow the Consultant to continue gathering information and to determine answers to the many issues discussed at this meeting.

Member Golden thanked the Ad Hoc Committee for their time and hard work. She noted some of the options could be costly, and questioned whether the Committee had

considered holding a public forum or sending out surveys to get community input on this matter.

Member Holder stated she was concerned about the amount of additional staff that would be required to handle waste hauling billing. She suggested a better method may be to include it on the tax bills as she did not believe monthly billing would work well. She requested Mr. Zendel provide Council Members with a summary of his concerns.

Member Barnett questioned the additional staffing requirements and if the cost of additional staff was considered in the plan.

Mr. Frey stated the collection of fees could be handled through the tax system or a quarterly billing. He indicated some of the costs are included in their estimate; however, a decision would have to be made by the City. It was suggested the fees be added to the water bills, helping to defray the cost of mailing.

Member Hill requested Mr. Frey and Ms. Furlong address some of the comments and questions asked during the discussion.

Mr. Frey referred to the comments about whether the industry would be willing to contract with the City, and stated he was confident with the industry's ability to respond. He stated Resource Recycling Systems would be willing to continue researching the cost issues to narrow down the numbers. He noted the figures contained in the Recommendations Report were very conservative numbers.

President Dalton questioned what the next step would be in the process and the costs associated with the next step.

Member Barnett thanked the members of the Citizens Ad Hoc Committee for getting involved and for their hard work.

Member Barnett stated the next step would be to continue working with Resource Recycling Systems, Inc. on a retainer basis of Five Thousand (\$5,000.00) Dollars a month to start putting the contracts together, gathering additional information, working with the Administration regarding the feasibility and cost of additional staff members, and making a determination of whether the plan would be worthwhile to the residents.

Mayor Somerville thanked the Citizen Ad Hoc Committee for their hard work, and suggested the Committee discuss the billing procedures with the Assessor/Treasurer as it was quite an involved process and could be very expensive.

5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No other business was presented.

6. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss before Council, President Dalton adjourned the meeting at 7:17 PM.

JOHN DALTON, President
Rochester Hills City Council

JUDY A. BIALK,
Administrative Assistant to the City Clerk

BEVERLY A. JASINSKI, Clerk
City of Rochester Hills

- 11a. 2002 Budget Amendments (A0030)** (Members received a copy of a City Council Agenda Summary Sheet dated April 30, 2002 from Bob Spaman, Finance Director, with attachments)

Mr. Spaman provided a brief review of the proposed Budget Amendments which reflect the first four and one-half (4-1/2) months of activity, as well as some general housekeeping items. He explained some Fund Balances were not changing although some line item corrections had been made.

(i) Public Hearing

President Dalton **opened** the Public Hearing at 8:01 PM.

Lee Zendel, 1575 Dutton Road, questioned the proposed increase in Fund 226 in the amount of Forty-five Thousand (\$45,000.00) Dollars. He stated the increase represented a Purchase Order issued prior to this budget amendment, and noted a previous Purchase Order was issued for the same item in the amount of Five Thousand (\$5,000.00) Dollars. He stated both Purchase Orders totaled Fifty Thousand (\$50,000.00) Dollars, which is the limit for Professional Services. He felt the Forty-five Thousand (\$45,000.00) Dollars Purchase Order represented a continuation of the first Purchase Order, resulting in a split Purchase Order. He felt City Council should make a policy decision about a single waste hauler based on the information received to date, and his comments made at the February 6, 2002 Work Session, before the consultant put a contract together.

Member Hill clarified the item was not a split Purchase Order. She explained the first Five Thousand (\$5,000.00) Dollars was for the consultant to work with the Ad Hoc Citizen Committee and finalize the report brought forward to Council at the February 6, 2002 Work Session. She stated many questions brought forward at the Work Session related to cost issues, which had not been determined at that time. She stated the Forty-five Thousand (\$45,000.00) Purchase Order represented a separate request for the consultant to bring together figures for possible contracts to determine the cost to the City. She explained without those figures, a true determination could not be made of whether a cost savings would be realized by utilizing a single hauler, and a final decision could not be made at the Council level.

Member Barnett clarified the Forty-five Thousand (\$45,000.00) Dollar amount was based on a per month fee charged by the consultant to conduct the cost figure analysis. He stated his reference in the February 6, 2002 Work Session Minutes about "the contracts being written" referred to the fact City Council wanted firm cost figures before taking any direction. He stated in order for the numbers to be obtained, the next step was to continue forward with the cost figure determination. He indicated purchasing decisions followed the proper channels through the Fiscal Department to provide the proper controls. He clarified contracts were not being written up, but rather the information required to determine accurate numbers was being gathered.

Member Golden indicated mention was made at the Work Session about additional work with the consultant; however, she did not recall the item coming before City Council for approval. Mr. Spaman indicated that amount did not require City Council approval.

Member Golden noted the February 6, 2002 Work Session was well attended, and this issue has been followed closely within the Community. She stated the issue about hiring a consultant at a cost of Seventy-two Thousand (\$72,000.00) Dollars had come before City Council previously and was not approved. She suggested this item be postponed and scheduled for a future Council Agenda to provide an opportunity for the residents to speak on this issue.

Member Duistermars stated the Community Development & Viability (CDV) Committee had reviewed Requests for Proposal (RFP's) for this issue in 1999. He indicated the issue came back up after the Ad Hoc Citizen Committee completed their work and made their recommendation.

Mr. Spaman stated Resource Recycling had been given a contract for the initial phase of Five Thousand (\$5,000.00) Dollars. He indicated it was later deemed important to begin the next phase, and the CDV Committee felt it made sense to utilize the same vendor. Member Duistermars noted the existing RFP had not expired; therefore, a new RFP was not required. Mr. Spaman noted when the contracts go out, various tasks are identified, and it makes sense and is not uncommon to continue working with the same consultant.

Member Duistermars explained the Ad Hoc Citizen Committee completed a portion of the work included in the original RFP; therefore, the work was no longer required of the consultant. He stated because the existing RFP had not expired, the consultant was allowed to readjust their contract, resulting in the Forty-five Thousand (\$45,000.00) Dollar Purchase Order.

Mr. Spaman explained the consultant indicated it would take six (6) to nine (9) months to complete the work, at a cost of Five Thousand (\$5,000.00) Dollars a month.

President Dalton indicated he believed the Five Thousand (\$5,000.00) Dollar a month, nine (9) month project was discussed at either the work session or a regular Council meeting.

Member Hill stated it was brought up at the February 6, 2002 Work Session. She noted the City continually receives complaints about solid waste issues. She explained Council had agreed to come to a resolution about solid waste issues; however, citizens were requested to begin the work rather than hiring a consultant. She stated the citizens did their work within a six (6) month period, brought back extensive information, and indicated a consultant was necessary to conduct the next segment of the research to present a viable case to utilize a single hauler in this Community. She indicated a final

decision could not be made about potential cost savings and other important issues until the work is completed.

Member Golden noted the Forty-five Thousand (\$45,000.00) Dollar contract may have been mentioned at the Work Session; however, it was not Council's policy to take action at a Work Session. She suggested items like this should be scheduled on a Regular City Council Agenda for discussion.

Member Robbins noted this was a Public Hearing regarding Budget Amendments, not a discussion or a debate of whether a particular item should be approved.

President Dalton **closed** the Public Hearing at 8:20 PM.

(Recess: 8:20 PM to 8:32 PM)

President Dalton stated the City Clerk had researched the Minutes during the recess, and noted no action was taken at the February 6, 2002 Work Session. He indicated the Minutes did not address specific terms of the contract.

Member Barnett agreed Council would not have taken any action at a Work Session; however, the direction of Committee was included. He clarified the Committee followed the proper budgetary procedures as specified in the Ordinance.

Whereas, the Community Development and Viability Committee recognized the 1998 Special Assessment District cap of Four Thousand Dollars (\$4000) that had been reduced from Ninety percent (90%) of the total project cost; and

Whereas, the Community Development and Viability Committee is expected to provide a recommendation to the City Council that takes into consideration current market costs for road improvement projects; and

Whereas, the Four Thousand Dollars (\$4000) cap on the last three Special Assessment District Projects accounted for forty one percent (41%), thirty seven percent (37%), and thirty three percent (33%) of the total project cost.

Whereas, the average rate of inflation since 1998 has remained in the three percent (3%) range.

Whereas, an inflation calculation on the value of Four Thousand Dollars (\$4000) in 1998, adjusted on an annual basis of three percent (3%), would equal Four Thousand Seven Hundred Seventy Six Dollars (\$4776) in 2003.

Now Therefore Be It Resolved that the Community Development and Viability Committee recommends that City Council proceed to implement a cap on Special Assessment District Projects to forty percent (40%) of the total project cost with a not to exceed limit of Four Thousand Seven Hundred Seventy Six Dollars (\$4776) per developable lot. Such limits would be effective for Special Assessment District Projects initiated after January 1, 2003.

Ayes: Barnett, Hill, Cosenza, Kaszubski
Nays: None
Absent: Duistermars

MOTION CARRIED

8. NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

Solid Waste

Mr. Rouse recently received notice that the North Oakland Hazardous Waste Consortium is reinitiating their Hazard Waste Program after being dormant for a year. Mr. Rouse explained that the original grant failed to pass.

The estimated cost for the City's portion would be Forty Six Thousand Four Hundred Dollars (\$46,400). The previous approved amount in the Solid Waste Program Budget was Thirty Eight Thousand Six Hundred Dollars (\$38,600). Mr. Rouse requested direction from CDV Members as to whether or not they thought the City would want to support the program and place it in the 2003 Budget. Members concurred to have Mr. Rouse place the funds in the 2003 Budget.

A. Regular Meeting – June 27, 2002

Resolution

MOTION by Hill, seconded by Duistermars,

Resolved, that the Minutes of the Special Community Development & Viability Committee held on June 27, 2002, be approved as presented.

Ayes: Barnett, Duistermars, Hill, Cosenza
Nays: None
Absent: Kaszubski

MOTION CARRIED

B. Regular Meeting – July 18, 2002

Resolution

MOTION by Hill, seconded by Duistermars,

Resolved, that the Minutes of the Regular Community Development & Viability Committee held on July 18, 2002, be approved as presented.

Ayes: Barnett, Duistermars, Hill, Cosenza
Nays: None
Absent: Kaszubski

MOTION CARRIED

6. COMMUNICATIONS

None presented.

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (UNFINISHED OR PENDING MATTERS)

A. Solid Waste Update

Mr. Cope advised that the City Attorney is currently reviewing three (3) draft Requests for Proposals (RFP's) on solid waste services, marketing of curbside recyclables, and marketing of composting and curbside yard waste. Mr. Cope intends to mail the RFP's out the first week of September. Mr. Cope advised that the bid numbers received would be good for a period of six (6) months. The remaining RFP's to be prepared are for the collection of waste and various options that the City Council will need to make decisions on.

Mr. Cope stated the project is on schedule and within budget with Resource Recycling Systems, Inc. (RRSI). The project is budgeted at forty five thousand dollars (\$45,000.00) for nine months.

A. Regular Meeting – August 22, 2002

Resolution

MOTION by Hill, seconded by Kaszubski,

Resolved, that the Minutes of the Community Development & Viability Committee held on August 22, 2002, be approved with the following amendment:

Page 3, Storm Water Update – replace the wording “Three Million Dollars” “(\$3,000,000)” with “**three (3) mills.** “

Ayes: Barnett, Hill, Cosenza, Kaszubski

Nays: None

Absent: Duistermars

MOTION CARRIED

6. COMMUNICATIONS

Chairperson Barnett provided members with copies of the Ad-Hoc on Burning Issues Final Report. Chairperson Barnett asked the Committee Members to review the report and to be prepared to discuss this issue at the October Committee Meeting.

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (UNFINISHED OR PENDING MATTERS)

A. Gateways Committee Update

Members discussed the preliminary cost estimates received for the three (3) different levels of gateway designs. Members discussed the possibility that some of the work be completed by City staff, and to solicit for private and corporate sponsors and donations to help defray the costs.

Mr. Anzek will obtain information on other types of sign material and pricing information. Mr. Rousse will investigate the Walton Boulevard site location, at the western border of the City, to see if the City would be able to use the same boulevard location.

B. Update on Solid Waste

Mr. Cope advised that the Request for Proposals (RFP) for Disposal had been mailed out. Five (5) companies attended the pre-proposal meeting. The RFP due date is October 9, 2002. The RFP for Collection is being reviewed and prepared.

8. NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

None presented.