

5. COMMUNICATIONS

Vice Chair Duistermars made the appropriate introductions. **Ms. Patricia Turner, 2407 Culbertson**, submitted information related to the health hazards resulting from leaf burning.

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (UNFINISHED OR PENDING MATTERS)

- **Presentation from Ad Hoc Solid Waste Citizen Committee**

Ms. Karen Bickle, Chair of the Ad Hoc Solid Waste Citizen Committee, presented the final report. The report, which has four (4) sections, follows definitions used in Oakland County's Solid Waste Plan.

The first section outlines household hazardous waste (HHW) issues. It contains two (2) options:

- enhance current information and include additional material in City Welcome Packet
- enhance current information, include additional material in City Welcome Packet and set up Household Hazardous Waste Drop off Program

The report included information from seven (7) other communities that have a Drop Off program. The Ad Hoc Committee suggests that a City Council member of the CDV Committee attend the next two (2) meetings of the North Oakland Hazardous Committee Group to hear presentations from vendors.

The second section outlines recycling and reuse issues. The Ad Hoc Committee recommends that the CDV Committee review the current Ordinance 3-14.06 through .07 for changes, possible gaps and enforcement.

The third section outlines composting of yard waste, leaves and fallen limbs. The Ad Hoc Committee would like to recommend a ban on burning, but cannot until other options are available to dispose of leaves. SOCCRA is open to allowing contractors to haul leaves into the Rochester Hills site if the contractors are authorized by the City.

The fourth section outlines solid waste issues. The Ad Hoc Committee recommends a reduction in the number of trucks and number of days trash is put out and would like haulers to be more responsive to complaints. It contains five (5) options for solid waste disposal with pros and cons.

Ms. Bickle stated that the Ad Hoc Committee would be happy to make any other presentations or answer questions. Vice Chair Duistermars thanked the Ad Hoc Committee for their work.

Ms. Hill recommended that the report and related information be maintained in the DPS Department. She suggested that the Committee read the report in detail and bring discussion back to the next meeting.

- **Road Report/Discussion**

Mr. Erickson gave an update on the status of the Major Road Program. There is a meeting next week with the engineering firm, the DPS Department and the consultant to finalize the scope of work which will lead to a final proposal price. It will include the two (2) alternatives: a four (4) lane boulevard versus a five (5) lane road. Mr. Erickson confirmed with Oakland County that Adams between Auburn and South Boulevard will be a five (5) lane road. He is concerned that the County has not put in any money toward this project and the City has put up the money to date for consultant fees. Mr. Erickson further noted the City will be buying the right-of-ways, and performing the final design and construction, etc.

He stated that the Hamlin Road alignment project is not able to move forward because of the issue of a five (5) lane road versus a four (4) lane boulevard. He has requested a Special Work Session with City Council in March to discuss how to proceed with the Adams and Hamlin Road projects and to discuss the Boulevard Policy. These are immediate issues. Also, the Dequindre by-pass (east of the Cider Mill) project is also coming. The "clock is ticking" on the money that's available out there.

Ms. Hill stated she does not want to see Council change the policy based on "dollars and cents". The new Council has not seen or heard the public input on the roads that the previous Council had heard. She would like to see new public hearings held if the Road Policy is going to be changed.

Mr. Erickson recommended that the Thoroughfare Plan Update of 2003 be moved up to 2002 to include a Capital Improvement Plan for the next twenty (20) years to clearly understand the financial implication as the City moves forward.

7. **NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS**

- **Discussion of Establishment of Gateways Ad Hoc Citizen Committee**

Mr. Anzek suggested that the Planning Department work on a review of how to start a Gateways Ad Hoc Committee that will include the objectives, funding, etc. He will make a report to the CDV Committee at the next meeting.

- **Discussion of the Van Hoosen Jones Stoney Creek Cemetery Rules**

Vice Chair Duistermars noted that the review of the Van Hoosen Jones Stoney Creek Cemetery Rules was brought to his attention this morning. The Committee commenced the review and discussion.

5. COMMUNICATIONS

Vice Chair Duistermars made the appropriate introductions. **Ms. Patricia Turner, 2407 Culbertson**, submitted information related to the health hazards resulting from leaf burning.

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (UNFINISHED OR PENDING MATTERS)

- **Presentation from Ad Hoc Solid Waste Citizen Committee**

Ms. Karen Bickle, Chair of the Ad Hoc Solid Waste Citizen Committee, presented the final report. The report, which has four (4) sections, follows definitions used in Oakland County's Solid Waste Plan.

The first section outlines household hazardous waste (HHW) issues. It contains two (2) options:

- enhance current information and include additional material in City Welcome Packet
- enhance current information, include additional material in City Welcome Packet and set up Household Hazardous Waste Drop off Program

The report included information from seven (7) other communities that have a Drop Off program. The Ad Hoc Committee suggests that a City Council member of the CDV Committee attend the next two (2) meetings of the North Oakland Hazardous Committee Group to hear presentations from vendors.

The second section outlines recycling and reuse issues. The Ad Hoc Committee recommends that the CDV Committee review the current Ordinance 3-14.06 through .07 for changes, possible gaps and enforcement.

The third section outlines composting of yard waste, leaves and fallen limbs. The Ad Hoc Committee would like to recommend a ban on burning, but cannot until other options are available to dispose of leaves. SOCCRA is open to allowing contractors to haul leaves into the Rochester Hills site if the contractors are authorized by the City.

The fourth section outlines solid waste issues. The Ad Hoc Committee recommends a reduction in the number of trucks and number of days trash is put out and would like haulers to be more responsive to complaints. It contains five (5) options for solid waste disposal with pros and cons.

Ms. Bickle stated that the Ad Hoc Committee would be happy to make any other presentations or answer questions. Vice Chair Duistermars thanked the Ad Hoc Committee for their work.

Ms. Hill recommended that the report and related information be maintained in the DPS Department. She suggested that the Committee read the report in detail and bring discussion back to the next meeting.

- **Road Report/Discussion**

Mr. Erickson gave an update on the status of the Major Road Program. There is a meeting next week with the engineering firm, the DPS Department and the consultant to finalize the scope of work which will lead to a final proposal price. It will include the two (2) alternatives: a four (4) lane boulevard versus a five (5) lane road. Mr. Erickson confirmed with Oakland County that Adams between Auburn and South Boulevard will be a five (5) lane road. He is concerned that the County has not put in any money toward this project and the City has put up the money to date for consultant fees. Mr. Erickson further noted the City will be buying the right-of-ways, and performing the final design and construction, etc.

He stated that the Hamlin Road alignment project is not able to move forward because of the issue of a five (5) lane road versus a four (4) lane boulevard. He has requested a Special Work Session with City Council in March to discuss how to proceed with the Adams and Hamlin Road projects and to discuss the Boulevard Policy. These are immediate issues. Also, the Dequindre by-pass (east of the Cider Mill) project is also coming. The "clock is ticking" on the money that's available out there.

Ms. Hill stated she does not want to see Council change the policy based on "dollars and cents". The new Council has not seen or heard the public input on the roads that the previous Council had heard. She would like to see new public hearings held if the Road Policy is going to be changed.

Mr. Erickson recommended that the Thoroughfare Plan Update of 2003 be moved up to 2002 to include a Capital Improvement Plan for the next twenty (20) years to clearly understand the financial implication as the City moves forward.

7. **NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS**

- **Discussion of Establishment of Gateways Ad Hoc Citizen Committee**

Mr. Anzek suggested that the Planning Department work on a review of how to start a Gateways Ad Hoc Committee that will include the objectives, funding, etc. He will make a report to the CDV Committee at the next meeting.

- **Discussion of the Van Hoosen Jones Stoney Creek Cemetery Rules**

Vice Chair Duistermars noted that the review of the Van Hoosen Jones Stoney Creek Cemetery Rules was brought to his attention this morning. The Committee commenced the review and discussion.

Ms. Millhouse submitted the report on Gateways to the Committee and then presented an overview. It was designed to build the thought process. She highlighted the following:

- The Master Plan describes three (3) types of gateways.
- Gateways are public relation tools for the City to market the Community.
- The Planning Dept. has requested for funds to implement the Comprehensive Gateways Plan within the Capital Improvement Program.
- An estimated cost of \$250,000 per year for four (4) years beginning in 2002 has been requested for the design, construction, and maintenance.
- The question before the Committee is: should there be a Design Review Committee; when and how should it be established; who should serve on it; and what is its role.

The Committee commenced discussion, particularly the role of the consultant. The consensus of the Committee was to move forward. The Planning Department will prepare a Request for Proposal (RFP) in search of a consultant and prepare a list of vendors for the next meeting.

- **Discussion of Ad Hoc Solid Waste Citizen Committee**

Chairperson Barnett opened the floor for discussion. He stated the Citizens Ad-Hoc Committee did a thorough job and has finished their task. Ms. Hill suggested the City hire a consultant and move forward with the plan presented by the Citizens Ad-Hoc Committee. Chairperson Barnett encouraged the Committee to review the Citizens Ad-Hoc Committee report presented at the February meeting and be prepared to add/delete to the scope of services at the next meeting.

7. NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

- **Requests of Administration**

None.

- **Next Meeting**

The next meeting will held April 26, 2001 at 5:30 p.m.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Barnett adjourned the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Denise Mertz.

I:\City Council\Standing Committees\Community Development & Viability\2001\040501 Special CDV Minutes.doc

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (UNFINISHED OR PENDING MATTERS)

- **Discussion of Establishment of Gateways Ad Hoc Citizen Committee**

Mr. Anzek distributed the Request for Proposal (RFP) for a consultant to develop a Comprehensive Gateways Plan in compliance with the City's procurement proceedings. Ms. Hill questioned if M-59 & Crooks should be a Level 1 gateway. She also suggested Livernois/South Boulevard, Rochester/Orion Roads, and Adams/Dutton be considered for Level 1.

The Committee consensus regarding the consultant was the Committee should select the consultant and allow the consultant to have some input as well.

Mr. Anzek distributed a list of potential vendors to be considered for the RFP. He suggested the Committee review the list to add/delete vendors. Ms. Hill suggested a screening letter be sent to see which vendors have had experience with community gateways and if they would be interested in the City's RFP. Mr. Anzek said he would follow up on her suggestion.

- **Discussion of Ad Hoc Solid Waste Citizen Committee**

The Committee along with Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Thompson recapped the past discussions and reviewed the Ad Hoc Solid Waste Citizen Committee's report submitted at a prior meeting.

Mr. Cope will inquire about the Statute of Limitations for a Request for Proposal (RFP). Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Thompson will evaluate the proposal from Resource Recycling Systems, Inc.

Mr. Duistermars will inquire with members of the defunct Ad Hoc Solid Waste Citizen Committee to see if they would like to participate with the chosen consultant.

7. NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

- **Citizens Nominations to CDV Committee**

Ms. Hill asked if the Committee had any citizen nominations. Council deadline is May 9, 2001. Mr. Anzek knew of one gentleman that sent in an application.

- **Requests of Administration**

None.

- **Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held May 24, 2001 at 5:30 p.m.

Mr. Barnett and Mr. Duistermars reported on **Community Development & Viability Committee (CDV)** issues:

- The Solid Waste Ad Hoc Committee presented their recommendations to the CDV Committee; information will be coming forward to City Council in the near future. Their recommendation will include utilizing a consultant to proceed with the process. City Council originally made a determination not to utilize the services of a consultant; they chose to form a Citizen Solid Waste Ad Hoc Committee. The work performed by the Ad Hoc Committee has been extremely valuable and has decreased the scope of a consultant resulting in a savings to the City if Council makes a determination to hire a consultant in the near future.
- The household hazardous waste collection initiative concept, an interlocal agreement with other north Oakland County communities for the purposes of making grant application and implementing the initiative; will be coming forward to Council for their consideration.

Minutes of a Special Meeting of the **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT & VIABILITY COMMITTEE MEETING** held at the Rochester Hills Municipal Building, 1000 Rochester Hills Drive, Conference Room 223, Rochester Hills, Michigan, on Thursday, May 17, 2001, at 5:40 PM.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Barnett called the meeting to order at 5:40 PM

2. ROLL CALL

Council Members Present: Bryan Barnett, Melinda Hill
Council Members Absent: Jim Duistermars

QUORUM PRESENT

Administrative Staff Present: Paul Davis, Acting Director, Public Services
Administrative Staff Absent: Ed Anzek, Director, Planning Department
Scott Cope, Director, Building Department

Others Present: Linda Davis, Grant Procurement

Special Presenter: Martin J. Seaman, Manager
Oakland County Solid Waste Management Planning

3. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A Quorum was present.

4. NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

- Discussion of possible involvement with North Oakland Household Hazardous Waste (NO HAZ).

Mr. Martin J. Seaman of the Oakland County Solid Waste Management Planning Division provided a presentation regarding the North Oakland Household Hazardous Waste (NO HAZ). He referred to the NO HAZ Program Status Summary provided the members prior to the meeting. He indicated he has made at least three (3) presentations before the Citizens Ad Hoc Committee regarding this issue, and Tom Stevenson was officially designated by the Mayor to serve on the North Oakland Hazardous Waste Consortium. All cities that were not already included in another waste program were invited to participate in the NO HAZ program.

Mr. Seaman explained they had a grant application that is due May 31, 2001, and he was requesting a resolution of support from all the communities that would like to be involved. The resolution is not binding and is not to be considered an inter-local agreement. The resolution is just to make the best possible case in the grant application. The grant is through the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality

(MDEQ) and is actually being submitted by Oakland County. Mr. Seaman indicated Independence Township had passed a resolution in favor of the Consortium and had agreed to host a permanent site.

Mr. Seaman explained part of the proposed grant budget was for set up at the permanent and satellite locations, including site preparation, safety barriers, interim containment, traffic controls and signage. A Project Manager would be hired to oversee the project. The operations themselves would be completely contractual due to liability reasons. Grant requirements allow up to two (2) years to spend the monies with a five (5) year commitment after that. This grant application contains an eighteen (18) month grant period, starting this Fall and running through the end of the following year.

Mr. Seaman explained the rotation of the satellite locations and the potential physical location of the satellite and rotating locations. He explained fire stations are the preferred location because they have the best built-in controls. The same protocol will be used for each location to provide consistency.

Mr. Seaman clarified that the communities that support the Consortium are also supporting the entire program, not just the Grant program, but the additional five (5) years after as well. The waste hauler will be reviewed periodically, and it is possible the same hauler will not be used for the entire program. Financial considerations would also be a part of the hiring of the waste hauler.

Mr. Seaman explained the Preliminary Budget Forecast, which indicates the number of households in a community that participate directly affects the costs for that community. The members discussed the reallocation of costs if one community did not stay with the program for the entire time period. It was noted hazardous waste disposal is one of the most expensive types of service that could be provided. There have not been any grant opportunities for this service since 1993. A Consortium would provide a stronger candidate for being awarded the grant.

Mr. Seaman stated one reason for working with the County in this process was to assist in the development of a "take back" program, which would run parallel with the NO HAZ program. The County will help to identify businesses that would take back motor oil, computers, batteries, etc. This will help defray costs because these items will go to those businesses at no cost, rather than being included in the community's individual hazardous waste day. Mr. Seaman indicated promotional costs were included in the grant application. Educational costs are a component of those costs. The potential for fund-raisers with certain types of items were discussed among the members.

Members discussed the policing of this service between communities that are not part of the Consortium. Some communities will allow non-residents to participate for a fee. The most common procedure would be that the first drop-off is free; however, there will be a fee for subsequent drop-offs. The members discussed the possibility of businesses over-utilizing the drop-off points. It was pointed out this was a "resident only" program. Mr. Seaman noted the reason they utilized fire stations for the program

was to eliminate unwanted items from being left during the night at unmanned permanent sites and to cut down on abuse by "resident businesses".

Mr. Seaman concluded the community does have hazardous waste and there was a liability to the water supply, children, etc., because these items were stored in the residents basements and garages. This program would provide the correct protocol for disposal of the items. He explained signage for the program would be permanent and the costs for disposal are actual costs for the hauler to dispose of the waste.

Mr. Seaman stated the County's commitment was for the entire seven (7) years. The accounting books would probably be kept by a CPA firm rather than by County staff. The County does not intend to subsidize this program over the long-term. The administrative costs will be spread out among the participating communities.

Mr. Seaman again explained the Consortium was looking for a resolution of support to turn in with the grant application. He stated if the Committee did not feel they wanted to be a part of the program, or they did not believe the City would want to participate, they should not offer support at this time. The County did not want to lose support after the grant application was submitted.

Mr. Barnett stated he would like the City Staff to have the opportunity to review the plan and the budget before the City made any commitment.

Mr. Seaman suggested the City could participate but did not have to host a satellite location. Ms. Hill questioned the criteria used in establishing the satellite locations. Mr. Seaman explained the process by which the locations were chosen. In part, they were based on population centers and the proximity of the sites already committed.

The Members discussed the cost of the program based on different scenario's, the time period of the grant, and during the five (5) years after the grant is completed. Mr. Seaman reminded the members the more communities that participated, the lower the costs would be per community.

Mr. Seaman was asked if he thought this type of program might some day be handled "curbside". Mr. Seaman indicated it was not likely. He noted most of this type of waste was generated by residents cleaning out the basement, the garage, or cleaning out an inherited home, which is not a routine activity. Hopefully, the schedule of this program would allow everyone an opportunity to properly dispose of these materials.

Mr. Seaman indicated the inter-local agreements would most likely be ready for the participating communities in July, 2001. Ms. Hill noted the benefit and need of a program of this type, but clarified that the City would have to review the program and the cost of the program against the City's budget.

Ms. Hill indicated she was willing to move the Community Development and Viability Committee resolution of support to City Council and to request it be added to the

Agenda for City Council for next week. Mr. Barnett supported Ms. Hill's motion and clarified for the record that it was a motion for a resolution to support a household hazardous waste collection initiative.

Resolution

MOTION by Hill, seconded by Barnett

Whereas, the northern cities, villages and townships in Oakland County are committed to protection of the natural environment and preventing toxic materials from entering our waterways and landfill resources; and

Whereas, to accomplish this goal there is a need to provide regular and easily accessible household hazardous waste collection services to North Oakland County residents; and

Whereas, an opportunity now exists to create an interlocal agreement with other North Oakland local governments and the Oakland County government to directly address the problem of household hazardous waste collection; and

Whereas, the interlocal agreement will assist in obtaining economic benefits without placing an undue burden on any one community in creating a series of coordinated ongoing household hazardous waste collection drop-off points at regular local locations, and

Whereas, the interlocal agreement will also assist in the support to make a capital grant application for household hazardous waste collection and in contracting with hazardous waste material handlers,

Now Therefore Be It Resolved, that we support the household hazardous waste collection initiative concept and authorize staff to explore an interlocal agreement with other North Oakland County communities for the purposes of making grant application and implementing this initiative.

Now Therefore Be It Finally Resolved, that the Community Development & Viability Committee recommends City Council review this Household Hazardous Waste Collection Initiative at their next regularly scheduled meeting, being May 23, 2001.

Ayes: Hill, Barnett
Nays: None
Absent: Duistermars

MOTION CARRIED

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (UNFINISHED OR PENDING MATTERS)

A. Discussion of Establishment of Gateways Ad Hoc Citizen Committee

Deb Millhouse discussed the possibility of sending out Request for Statement of Qualifications (RFQ's) forms to determine interest of vendors in submitting a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Gateways Project. Another alternative could be to utilize the RFP's to determine interest. Using the RFP's directly would save time and move the project along. She noted this was an unusual project because it was so specialized. Due to the fact they were looking for experienced vendors, she suggested just utilizing the RFP, which would speed up the process.

Members discussed the formation of a Design Review Committee, developing a means of putting money into the project by working with developers and corporations within the City, and whether the Strategic Planning Implementation Committee could provide some help in getting support for the Gateways Project.

Members authorized Deb Millhouse to proceed with the RFP to receive proposals. She will update the Committee when the RFP's have been sent out. The "Scope of Service" section of the RFP should reflect there are three (3) levels of the Gateways Project.

B. Discussion of Ad Hoc Solid Waste Program

Scott Cope stated he had researched the issue regarding Resource Recycling Systems and indicated he had discussed the matter with Jean Farris, Purchasing Manager, and she had verified it would be acceptable to make a reduction in the scope of work without going through the entire process again. Members discussed what the scope of work should be, how the NO HAZ program would tie in, or whether they should consider joining with SOCCRA or some other organization. Mr. Cope indicated he would follow-up with Resource Recycling to review the last proposal in view of the final report of the Citizen's Ad Hoc Solid Waste Committee. He will also follow up with Jean Farris to make sure the plan is acceptable when modifying the scope of work with the existing RFP.

7. NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

A. Discussion of Pathways.

Members discussed whether the Pathways Committee should be reinstated. It was noted review would be needed of the City's pathways with respect to ADA Regulations. This committee was an advisory committee that worked with DPS and on the Master Plan.

B. Discussion of NO HAZ.

It was noted City Council passed the resolution regarding the NO HAZ Program at their May 16, 2001 meeting. The County will be moving forward on the grant application. The resolution was merely an indication the City of Rochester Hills was interested in being part of the team should the grant occur.

C. Discussion of New Resident Members.

Members discussed the fact the next meeting of the CDV will be the first meeting to include the two (2) citizen representatives. Nominations have been made by City Council and appointments will take be made at the June 6, 2001 Council meeting. The citizen representatives will be appointed for either a two (2) year or three (3) year term.

D. Next Meeting Date

The next Regular City Council Community Development & Viability Committee is scheduled for June 28, 2001 at 5:30 PM.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Barnett adjourned the meeting at 6:30 PM.

Further Resolved, that the Community Development and Viability Committee accepts the Gateways RFP Schedule, and desires the Planning Department to proceed according to that schedule.

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

MOTION CARRIED

Chairperson Barnett thanked Deb Millhouse, the Planning Department and Paul Davis for their work on this project and noted it would be followed up on the July Agenda.

B. Update on Solid Waste Plan.

Mr. Cope distributed two (2) letters to the Committee Members:

1. His letter dated June 11, 2001 to Mr. James Frey of the Resource Recycling Systems, Inc.
2. His Memorandum dated June 28, 2001 regarding Mr. Frey's response to his letter.

Mr. Cope explained Mr. Frey had completed his review of the Ad Hoc Solid Waste Committee's report and had indicated it was a good report with a number of options. Mr. Frey noted there did not appear to be a clear consensus on a recommended or preferred option. Mr. Frey suggested the City use Option #2 outlined in Mr. Cope's June 11, 2001 letter. This would include facilitating some meetings with the CDV Committee and the Ad Hoc Solid Waste Citizen Committee to review the report; then facilitation of a "brainstorming" session to determine how the City wants to proceed, and from that session, determining a scope of work and clear direction to take. Mr. Frey anticipated this would take from three (3) to five (5) meetings and estimated the cost at Five Thousand (\$5,000.00) Dollars.

Members noted at a prior meeting costs were expected to be around Two Thousand (\$2,000.00) Dollars. Mr. Cope explained the increase in costs was approximate and was due to the number of options available in the report and the number of meetings required to discuss this matter.

Chairperson Barnett provided a brief history of this issue for the new members on the Committee. He explained Council Members have received numerous complaints from the residents about the escalating costs of trash pickup; problems with the amount of trucks on the City streets due to the different schedules of the haulers, and hazardous waste recycling problems. He stated Mr. Frey had previously presented a scope of services and an associated dollar amount that Council was not comfortable with. They decided to utilize a citizens committee to delve into the issue.

Chairperson Barnett explained the citizens committee had looked at five (5) different options, from a single hauler contract, all the way to no change at all. The various options were ranked according to preference, and the CDV Committee is now attempting, with the aid of a consultant, to finalize this matter.

Mr. Cope noted Mr. Frey had recommended City Council members be involved in the meetings to provide input before Council is asked for final approval of a plan. Members discussed the fact the CDV Committee had three (3) Council Members on the committee who would provide information to the other Council Members. Members also discussed the additional number of meetings recommended by Mr. Frey, and whether that might be too many meetings.

Resolved

MOTION by Duistermars, seconded by Hill,

Whereas, the Community Development and Viability Committee has reviewed the solid waste report prepared by the Ad Hoc Solid Waste Citizen Committee, and

Whereas, a copy of the Ad Hoc Solid Waste Citizen Committee report was forwarded to Mr. James Frey of Resource Recycling Systems, Inc., on June 11, 2001, and

Whereas, the Community Development and Viability Committee concurs with Mr. Frey's analysis of the report and his conclusion to proceed with Option #2 of the report.

Now Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Community Development and Viability Committee instructs Scott Cope, Director of the Building Department, to request the Administration to proceed with Option #2 of his letter to Mr. James Frey of Resource Recycling Systems, Inc., dated July 11, 2001.

Further Resolved, that Mr. Scott Cope request the Administration to proceed with a purchase order to Resource Recycling Systems, Inc., in an amount not-to-exceed Five Thousand (\$5,000.00) Dollars and to pursue any necessary resolutions that are required.

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

MOTION CARRIED

Members suggested contacting Mr. Frey to schedule a meeting with the members of the Ad Hoc Committee and the CDV Committee.

MOTION by Hill, seconded by Barnett,

Resolved, that the Minutes of the City Council Community Development & Viability Committee Regular Meeting held on May 24, 2001, be approved as presented.

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

MOTION CARRIED

4. **COMMUNICATIONS**

No communications were presented.

5. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS (UNFINISHED OR PENDING MATTERS)**

A. Update on Solid Waste Plan.

Mr. Cope stated Chairman Barnett and he and had tentatively scheduled a meeting with the CDV Committee, the Ad Hoc Citizen Solid Waste Committee and Mr. Frey from Resource Recycling to discuss the options from the Ad Hoc report.

Mr. Cope stated Jean Farris was in the process of setting up the Purchase Order for Mr. Frey's consultant fees. Members discussed the appropriate procedure for the authorization of that Purchase Order. Member Hill noted there were budgeted monies allocated for activities related to the Solid Waste Plan. Members agreed the Department holding the budgeted monies would be allowed to authorize expenditures with the support of the CDV Committee. Members concurred a request to Administration to proceed would be the best solution.

Members discussed their availability to attend the August 13, 2001 meeting. Chairperson Barnett stated he felt the participation of the Ad Hoc Citizens Committee would be beneficial.

Mr. Cope noted it was Mr. Frey's proposal to hold five (5) review sessions with the Ad Hoc Citizens Committee, at a cost of Four Thousand, Six Hundred (\$4,600.00) Dollars, and Four Hundred (\$400.00) in actual travel expenses. A plan of action would be developed at the review sessions and would allow input from the citizens. Mr. Frey's intent was to develop a plan of action that would be supported by both the citizens and the CDV Committee. Chairperson Barnett asked the members if there were any others

who should be included in these review sessions. The Members believed the combination of the Ad Hoc Committee and the CDV Committee would be sufficient.

Members discussed the appropriateness of five (5) review sessions and suggested the fourth (4th) meeting be held to prepare a presentation and the fifth (5th) meeting be scheduled for the presentation to City Council. Members decided the schedule could be discussed at the August 13, 2001 Special Meeting. Mr. Cope agreed to discuss the schedule with Mr. Frey to determine whether it was Mr. Frey's intent to charge a fee for the presentation to City Council or whether that was part of the package.

B. Update on Gateways Project

Mr. Anzek stated Friday, July 27, 2001 was the deadline for RFP submittals. He indicated seven (7) proposals were received, which were very thorough and included a project time, a schedule, costs fees, and other data necessary for the Committee to make an informed decision. Mr. Anzek noted the deadline for the "shortlist" was August 13, 2001. Ms. Hill suggested copies of the "short list" proposals be provided CDV Members.

Chairperson Barnett thanked Mr. Anzek and Ms. Millhouse for keeping this project on schedule.

7. NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

A. Property Maintenance Ordinance.

Mr. Cope stated a Property Maintenance Ordinance was being investigated and considered. He indicated there were several types of maintenance, including rental property maintenance, pre-inspections for resale of residential homes; as well as exterior inspections of homes. He stated they were currently in the information gathering stage, and the matter would be brought before the CDV Committee before the end of the year.

Mr. Anzek explained a committee consisting of members of the Fire Department, the Assessing Department, the Planning Department and the Building Department had been formed and they were constantly discovering more data to consider. He stated they were reviewing model legislation, ordinances, how other communities dealt with this issue, and legal issues as well.

Chairperson Barnett asked if there was a certain circumstance that had indicated a need for this Ordinance. Mr. Cope stated it went along with the "re-development mode" the City is currently experiencing. He noted well-maintained property attracted people to a community. He stated the initial scope was for rental properties, and commercial and industrial exterior sites. He explained the City of St. Clair Shores required pre-sale inspections for all residential properties as a method of handling this issue.

Minutes of a Special Joint Meeting of the **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT & VIABILITY COMMITTEE MEETING** and the **AD HOC CITIZEN SOLID WASTE COMMITTEE** held at the Rochester Hills Municipal Building, 1000 Rochester Hills Drive, Conference Room 110, Rochester Hills, Michigan, on Monday, August 13, 2001, at 6:15 PM.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Barnett called the meeting to order at 6:15 PM

2. ROLL CALL

Council Members Present: Bryan Barnett,

Council Members Absent: Jim Duistermars (*Enter 7:20 PM*)
Melinda Hill

Citizen Representatives Present: Frank Cosenza
Citizen Representatives Absent: Michael Kaszubski

NO QUORUM PRESENT

Administrative Staff Present: Scott Cope, Director, Building Department
Paul Davis, City Engineer

Administrative Staff Absent: Ed Anzek, Director, Planning Department

Ad Hoc Committee Members Present: Lynn Jenkins
Keith Jones
Mildred Knudsen
Rea Siffring
Thomas Stevenson
Glenn Thompson

Ad Hoc Committee Members Absent: Karin Bickle (*Enter 7:20 PM*)
Mark Rowland

Others Present: Jim Frey, Resource Recycling Systems, Inc.
Dawn Furlong, Resource Recycling Systems, Inc.

3. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A Quorum was not present.

Because no quorum was present, Chairperson Barnett asked the Members present if they would like to continue with an informal discussion. The Members agreed they would continue with an informal discussion. Chairperson Barnett noted the balance of the Agenda would be suspended until a quorum was present.

Discussion on Solid Waste Proposals:

The individual Members of the Ad Hoc Citizen Solid Waste Committee introduced themselves and provided a brief history of their involvement in the Ad Hoc Committee to the Members of the Community Development and Viability Committee and the facilitators present.

Lynn Jenkins stated he became involved because he had many complaints about the waste disposal system used by the City and the burning of leaves in the community. He felt a total waste disposal plan should be the ultimate goal of the City.

Rea Siffring stated she had been involved in the fight against the incinerator proposed for Auburn Hills, which led to her involvement with the Ad Hoc Committee. She noted the many problems experienced by the residents in dealing with the waste hauler contractors on their own.

Keith Jones stated his subdivision had experienced many problems with the waste haulers and other disposal problems, including the fact recyclables were not timely picked up. They currently had three (3) different haulers operating in their subdivision.

Mildred Knudsen stated while she was on the Township Board, much time had been spent on the landfill issues and problems. She explained landfills are not necessarily the best or least expensive way to handle trash. She was on the Solid Waste Management Committee when the incinerator was proposed. She stated at that time a recycling program was considered in order to reduce the amount of landfill and the need for the incinerator. She felt it was very inefficient to handle waste with three (3) different haulers and the number of trucks on the City's roads. She thought using the City as a negotiator with a waste hauler would result in a better price for all the residents. She was also very interested in the Household Hazardous Waste problems and issues.

Chairperson Barnett provided a brief history on the make-up of the CDV Committee, and stated the CDV Committee had discussed and analyzed the results of the Ad Hoc Citizen Solid Waste Committee report. He explained all the information had been provided to Mr. Frey. He stated the CDV and the Ad Hoc Committees would be meeting with Mr. Frey to develop a specific plan for the CDV Committee to present to City Council.

Mr. Frey stated he had reviewed the materials provided him and complimented the Ad Hoc Committee on the thoroughness of their report. He explained his company was familiar with all the options proposed and was able to help write adaptive ordinances, change licensing structures, issue specifications for service, write and negotiate contracts for those services, interview haulers, and evaluate contractors to see how well the program is working.

Mr. Frey they now needed to identify a specific strategy and work on the implementation steps needed to carry out the strategy. He explained the purpose of the next few meetings would be to come to a consensus and develop a recommended plan of action. Mr. Frey noted they would also have to consider the legal aspects of any plan they develop.

Mr. Frey then proposed the materials be reviewed for information and discussion purposes. He stated they would review hazardous waste first because it appeared to be a top priority, then discuss composting, recycling and solid waste. He felt this order of discussion would address the easier issues before they tackle the solid waste issue.

Mr. Frey referred to the Ad Hoc Committee Goals specified in their report to the CDV Committee dated February 22, 2001. He stated those "goals" could be translated into "decision criteria". Mr. Frey strongly supported education as part of a successful program. He agreed the residents needed to understand what the choices were and how the program would work. He briefly referenced the comments in the report dealing with Household Hazardous Waste, recycling, composting and solid waste.

Mr. Frey discussed the available landfill capacity in the area, noting in the very close region, the available landfill capacity is rapidly depleting. He stated he had been out to several of those facilities and interviewed the haulers and landfill operators, and it was recognized some facilities would have to close in a few years. He noted some facilities may be expanded; however, there may only be "premium" space and they will not accept all trash. Mr. Frey noted one feature of the infrastructure in Oakland County that will grow will be the capability to transfer solid waste. He explained private haulers will run sixty (60) to seventy (70) miles to a landfill. He stated a better solution is a transfer station, utilizing fewer trucks and compaction.

Members discussed the relation of the number of trucks to the size of the population. Mr. Frey stated that one (1) transfer trailer would eliminate five (5) trucks. Mr. Frey believed they could "bundle" composting, hazardous waste and recycling into a single solution, although there are some solutions for hazardous waste being proposed through the North Oakland County Hazardous Waste Program.

Mr. Frey stated he would like to discuss the Household Hazardous Waste issue. He noted the split vote between Options 1 and 2 of the report, and suggested they had a simple solution with the development of the North Oakland County Consortium. He stated the state had responded favorably to the proposed grant for this issue.

Chairperson Barnett explained Marty Seaman from the Oakland County Solid Waste Management Planning Division had provided data to the CDV Committee about the NO HAZ program; a consortium had been formed, and Rochester Hills had signed a resolution of intent to participate in the consortium. The participating communities would schedule household hazardous waste collection dates, while sharing expenses and being funded by a grant.

Dawn stated there were also plans in process to place a permanent site for the drop-off of Household Hazardous Waste, to be located in Independence Township. She pointed out although it might not be geographically convenient for all the participating communities, it did provide a place to go to drop off hazardous waste.

Mr. Frey explained the background work was completed in order to submit the grant application and a "non-official" recommendation has been received. He stated many other counties in the area have already received this grant, and he expected this project would be funded as well. He stated the most important feature of the program was the fact the residents could drop off at any participating community site.

Members discussed the length of the grant funding and how the program would be maintained after the grant funds were utilized. Mr. Frey explained the primary use of the grant funds would be operating costs for the first two (2) years. Consequently, out-of-pocket costs for each community would be low for that portion of the project. He stated there was a seven (7) year time frame for the project, and budget costs would be forthcoming for years three (3) through seven (7).

Members discussed the need for this project to be reviewed by the City Attorney. Dawn Furlong explained the problems encountered by Oxford and some other communities when they were fined several hundred thousand dollars for putting pesticides and other household hazardous waste into a landfill. She agreed the liability issues for which a community could be held responsible needed to be reviewed and addressed.

Mr. Frey stated the City now had a very clear choice for the disposal of Household Hazardous Waste. He felt participating in this program would be less costly than anything the City could undertake on its own. He stated it has been proven in other communities that the residents themselves will not pay for the disposal of these items.

Chairperson Barnett explained the City has not signed any contracts or reviewed the NO HAZ program with the City Attorney at this point.

Mr. Frey suggested the Members discuss the composting issue, referring to the Ad Hoc Committee's report of February 10, 2001 on this issue. He noted the proposal to ban burning, and the need to adopt some other type of disposal plan prior to any such ban. He discussed the fact some communities would not collect grass clippings or would not conduct fall leaf pickup. He explained some communities liked fall leaf pickup programs to keep streets and drains clear. Some communities allow their haulers to pick up yard waste during the Fall as long as it is bagged properly, and the haulers are contracted to take that waste to a compost center.

Mr. Frey stated it was hard to set a schedule for fall pickup of yard waste because some trees did not drop their leaves as quickly as others. He noted the State did have a ban on yard waste going to landfills that is effective during the complete growing season. Mr. Frey discussed the relationship with SOCCRA and its location in the City. He felt

that site was a potential asset for composting services, as long as the proper site management is maintained.

Members discussed the problem with the large number of oak trees in the community and the length of time it takes for oak leaves to decompose. They discussed the problems encountered with the burning of leaves around schools, and the many violations that occurred with residents burning trash and other yard wastes with the leaves. Members discussed the fact composting facilities were able to facilitate decomposition of various yard materials. It was mentioned that some communities provide free mulch to its residents from wood materials that are ground up.

Mr. Frey referred to the Ad Hoc Committee's report on recycling and the licensing difficulties that can be encountered with this issue. He noted the many concerns expressed by residents with respect to this issue and the possibility of "tweaking" the Ordinance and the licensing system. He stated this was not the norm in Southeastern Michigan and many haulers were not familiar with or set up to respond to recycling. He noted it was the large areas with one contractor who were successful with licensing on this issue. He stated when multiple haulers are utilized, it is usually the poorest in compliance that sets the standard. Mr. Frey stated some approaches with ordinances, education, and enforcement action, coupled with market choice, can be effective.

Members discussed the problem with the City's Ordinance that required residents to sort recycling; however, it did not require the hauler to keep it separate. Some of this problem could be corrected through consistency in the Ordinance and licensing.

Mr. Frey agreed with the Ad Hoc Committee's report that cost and convenience were very important to a successful recycling program. He recommended a "bundled" approach to licensing, whereby the recycling is offered inclusive of the trash collection costs, rather than a separate fee. He noted "add-on" fees generally caused a recycling program to fail.

Members discussed the problem with a hauler who will not provide these services. Mr. Frey suggested a good licensing structure is required. Mr. Frey discussed the situation in communities bordering Indiana where haulers come across the border and ignore all licensing requirements of Michigan based on the "interstate commerce clause". He stated the licensing structure needs to have a provision that requires haulers to provide the service. Mr. Frey suggested the disposal contract could be separated from the collection contract, allowing the residents to save on reduced fees at the landfill.

Mr. Frey discussed the various levels of recycling utilized throughout the region, including source separation (which is what SOCCRA does); two-stream commingling (which separates paper and bottles and cans), and single-stream recycling (where paper, bottles and cans are mixed together). There is facility located in Roseville that offers single-stream recycling. Oakland County is reviewing the possibility of locating a similar facility in the County.

(Enter Member Duistermars – 7:20 PM)
(Enter Karin Bickle – 7:20 PM)

There now being a **QUORUM PRESENT**, Chairperson Barnett elected to continue the on-going informal discussion and return to the regular Agenda at the completion of the discussion.

Continuation of Discussion:

Mr. Frey discussed the number of recyclable items that cannot be picked up curbside. Member Duistermars stated a potential solution to that problem with the NO HAZ Program.

Chairperson Barnett thanked the Members for their participation in the discussion. He advised the Members the CDV Committee had contracted with Mr. Frey and his team to facilitate five (5) meetings. It is currently anticipated one (1) of those meetings will be in front of City Council with a presentation. Members agreed to meet again on Monday, August 27, 2001 and again on Monday, September 10, 2001. Both meetings will begin at 6:00 PM.

Return to Regular Agenda Items:

QUORUM PRESENT

4. **COMMUNICATIONS**

No communications were presented.

5. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS (UNFINISHED OR PENDING MATTERS)**

A. **Consultant Facilitated Discussion Regarding Solid Waste Proposals.**

All discussion under this Agenda item was held informally due to the lack of a quorum. A continuation of this discussion will be resumed at the next scheduled joint meeting of the CDV Committee and the Ad Hoc Citizen Solid Waste Committee.

6. **NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS**

No new or miscellaneous business was presented.

7. **NEXT MEETING DATE**

A Special Joint Meeting with the Ad Hoc Citizen Solid Waste Committee and Mr. Frey from Resource Recycling Systems is scheduled for Monday, August 27, 2001 at 6:00 PM.

The next Regular City Council Community Development & Viability Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 23, 2001 at 5:30 PM.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Barnett adjourned the meeting at 7:50 PM.

Minutes prepared by Judy A. Bialk.
I:\City Council\Standing Committees\Community Development & Viability\2001\081301 CDV Minutes.doc

Minutes of a Special Joint Meeting of the **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT & VIABILITY COMMITTEE MEETING** and the **AD HOC CITIZEN SOLID WASTE COMMITTEE** held at the Rochester Hills Municipal Building, 1000 Rochester Hills Drive, Conference Room 110, Rochester Hills, Michigan, on Monday, September 10, 2001, at 6:00 PM.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Barnett called the meeting to order at 6:15 PM

2. ROLL CALL

Council Members Present: Bryan Barnett, Jim Duistermars, Melinda Hill
Council Members Absent:

Citizen Representatives Present: Frank Cosenza, Michael Kaszubski
Citizen Representatives Absent: None

QUORUM PRESENT

Administrative Staff Present: Ed Anzek, Director, Planning Department
Paul Davis, City Engineer

Administrative Staff Absent: Scott Cope, Director, Building Department

Ad Hoc Committee Members Present:: Karin Bickle
Lynn Jenkins
Rea Siffring
Thomas Stevenson
Glenn Thompson

Ad Hoc Committee Members Absent: Keith Jones
Mildred Knudsen
Mark Rowland

Others Present: Jim Frey, Resource Recycling Systems, Inc. (enters 7:00 PM)
Dawn Furlong, Resource Recycling Systems, Inc.

3. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A Quorum was present.

4. COMMUNICATIONS:

No communications were presented.

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (UNFINISHED OR PENDING MATTERS)

A. Consultant Facilitated Discussion Regarding Solid Waste Proposals

Ms. Furlong, from Resource Recycling Systems, opened the discussion on the five (5) Solid Waste Plan Options that the Ad Hoc Committee has chosen.

Ms. Furlong had reviewed the selected choices, and the pros and cons for each choice. Ms. Furlong stated all the pros and cons have valid issues. The Committee will need to be aware these may be issues with any contractor and someone will have to monitor the contract closely.

(Enter Mr. Frey 7:00 PM)

Committee members engaged in discussion on how to determine what the residents will want. Mr. Frey stated a decision or policy will have to be made by the Committee to determine the dominant theme for the selection criteria. Mr. Frey discussed various techniques to use as tools to base the selection criteria on.

Mr. Frey began discussion on the Committees first choice, Option Five (5), a non-exclusive contract with a preferred hauler. Mr. Frey offered the following variations he would make to Option Five (5) if this is the option of choice. These variations would make the contract more attractive to the hauler:

- Take recycling system responsibility off the hauler and have a city-wide single contract for recycling. Bid out separate.
- Determine and divide the City by days of the week for pick-up.
- Take on the billing system for the hauler.

Member Hill asked how other communities handle the costs, and whether they provide the billing service or not. Mr. Frey said that approximately two-thirds (2/3) of the communities that have an exclusive contract are set-up as funded by all, or a portion of, millages.

Mr. Frey stated the value of a millage approach is that all assessed property owners pay.

Members engaged in discussion on complaints and how complaints could be handled. Mr. Frey explained that under the contract, there would be very clear specifications of service defined as well as consequences of violation. Mr. Frey stated that once a good system is implemented, the majority of the complaints should disappear.

Members discussed what options Mr. Frey is to prepare for the next meeting. Mr. Frey will bring back to the Committee his best recommendation and detailed information on the Committees two (2) most preferred choices:

- First (1) Choice - Option Five (5), a non-exclusive contract with a preferred hauler.
- Second (2) Choice - Option Four (4), an exclusive contract with one hauler.

Mr. Frey will provide the information by September 24, 2001 for the Committee to review prior to a Special Committee Meeting on October 1, 2001.

(Exit Member Duistermars)

6. NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

A. Pathway Discussion

Paul Davis, City Engineer provided a brief update on pathways.

7. NEXT MEETING DATE

The next Regular Community Development & Viability Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 27, 2001 at 5:30 PM.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Barnett adjourned the meeting at 7:45 PM.

Minutes of a Regular Meeting of the **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT & VIABILITY COMMITTEE MEETING** held at the Rochester Hills Municipal Building, 1000 Rochester Hills Drive, Conference Room 110, Rochester Hills, Michigan, on Thursday, September 27, 2001, at 5:30 PM.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Committee Member Duistermars called the meeting to order at 5:53 PM

2. ROLL CALL

Council Members Present: Jim Duistermars, Melinda Hill
Council Members Absent: Bryan Barnett (enters 6:20 PM)

Citizen Representatives Present: Frank Cosenza, Michael Kaszubski
Citizen Representatives Absent: None **QUORUM PRESENT**

Administrative Staff Present: Ed Anzek, Director, Planning Department
Scott Cope, Director, Building Department
Paul Davis, City Engineer

Administrative Staff Absent: None

Others Present: Deborah Millhouse, Deputy Director of Planning
Bob Srogi, Facilities Operations Manager

3. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A Quorum was present.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None

5. COMMUNICATIONS

No communications were presented.

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (UNFINISHED OR PENDING MATTERS)

A. Update on Solid Waste Plan.

Mr. Cope received the Options Summary Report from the Consultants, Resource Recycling Systems, Inc. (RRSI), and provided the Council Office copies for distribution to Committee Members. The Committee is to review the report for the Special Meeting on October 1, 2001.

Minutes of a Special Joint Meeting of the **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT & VIABILITY COMMITTEE MEETING and AD-HOC CITIZEN SOLID WASTE COMMITTEE** held at the Rochester Hills Municipal Building, 1000 Rochester Hills Drive, Conference Room 110, Rochester Hills, Michigan, on Monday, October 1, 2001, at 6:00 PM.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Barnett called the meeting to order at 6:10 PM

2. ROLL CALL

Council Members Present: Bryan Barnett, Jim Duistermars, Melinda Hill
Council Members Absent: None

Citizen Representatives Present: Frank Cosenza, Michael Kaszubski
Citizen Representatives Absent: None **QUORUM PRESENT**

Administrative Staff Present: Scott Cope, Director, Building Department

Administrative Staff Absent: Ed Anzek, Director, Planning Department
Paul Davis, City Engineer

Ad Hoc Committee Members Present: Lyn Jenkins
Keith Jones
Mildred Knudsen
Rea Siffring

Ad Hoc Committee Members Absent: Karin Bickle (Enters 6:17 PM)
Glenn Thompson (Enters 6:40 PM)
Mark Rowland
Thomas Stevenson

Others Present: Jim Frey, Resource Recycling Systems, Inc.
Dawn Furlong, Resource Recycling Systems, Inc.

3. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A Quorum was present.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None

5. COMMUNICATIONS

Member Tom Stevenson submitted letter to be read in his absence. Member Barnett will read letter in discussions of the Solid Waste Proposal.

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (UNFINISHED OR PENDING MATTERS)

A. Consultant Facilitated Discussion Regarding Solid Waste Proposals

Ms. Siffring reaffirmed her recommendation regarding reading Cato Institutes Report regarding trashing Government Run Waste Hauling Program. Ms. Siffring distributed copies for Consultant and Citizen Members. Ms. Knudsen reminded members of another report previously submitted that took a different position.

(Enter Member Bickle – 6:17 PM)

Mr. Frey provided the Committee his Options Summary for the two (2) clear choices the Committee has chosen. Mr. Frey and Ms. Furlong have defined these choices with additional focus and detail based on their expertise and experience. The Summary provides detailed descriptions of the two (2) proposed options with some of the advantages and disadvantages for each choice.

Mr. Frey stated the Committee needs to refine and focus on the choices and make the necessary adjustments and fine tuning before moving forward. If the Committee is completely satisfied with choices as presented, then development of a timeline and task list for implementation is needed for recommendation to City Council.

Mr. Frey reviewed the detailed descriptions of Choice One (1) – A non-exclusive contract with a preferred hauler:

- **Objective** – Provide residents with an option for some costs savings, improve collection services for those residents and increase collected materials such as recyclables and yard waste for all residents while still allowing residents a choice to contract with own waste hauler.
- **Features** – Residents can choose own waste hauler; City contracts with a preferred waste hauler; City licenses other pre-selected waste haulers for service on specified days; City contracts with: a single recycling service for all residents; a recycling facility; a single yard waste service; for other related services; City bills residents for recycling, yard waste and household hazardous waste; City bills residents who choose preferred hauler; licensed haulers bill residents who have signed up with them; City coordinates complaints with its own contractors; licensed haulers and their customers handle their own complaints.
- **Advantages** – Residents choose own waste hauler; some savings will be achieved over status quo; all haulers are relieved of the service requirement for recycling and yard waste; recycling and yard waste services are improved; subdivisions may negotiate own contract.

- **Disadvantages** – Waste hauling service provider not guaranteed a specific number of clients making the bidding process unpredictable; very heavy road usage continues; slower start-up for residents – not a cohesive plan; City will need to address administrative billing changes; may require additional staff or changes to staffing to handle residential complaints; residents cannot avoid fees.

(Enter Member Thompson – 6:40 PM)

Mr. Frey reviewed the detailed descriptions of Choice Two (2) – An exclusive contract with a preferred hauler:

- **Objective** – Achieve largest cost savings possible for City and greatest improvement in collection services while also increasing collected materials such as recyclables and yard waste for all residents.
- **Features** – City contracts with: a single waste hauler for collection; a landfill or transfer facility for disposal; a single recycling service provider for all residents; a recycling facility for processing recyclables; a single yard waste service provider for all residents for other related services. City bills residents for all services; City pays contractors monthly, and City coordinates complaints with its contractors.
- **Advantages** – Consistent high quality service at lowest cost; significant reduction in total costs for all citizens except those that do not use any service; much lower complaint levels and little if any at Council level; ability to design collection services, (i.e. regular “white goods”/bulky items/appliances collection, special pick-ups for elderly and invalids); minimize road usage; reduces number of trucks in a subdivision.
- **Disadvantages** – No choice for residents; City will need to address administrative billing changes; potential challenges if company goes out of business or is involved in a buy-out; eliminates competition with small companies; may require additional staff or changes to staffing to handle residential complaints.

Mr. Frey received and answered questions clarifying each option.

Chairperson Barnett read into the record a letter from Member Stevenson. Member Stevenson reviewed the Options Summary provided by RRSI and his option of Choice is Choice Two (2) – An exclusive contact with a preferred hauler. Mr. Stevenson feels this choice does the most good for the majority of the residents.

Committee engaged in discussion of merits of each option as presented and expressed their choice. The majority of the Committee selected Choice Two (2) as this best meets the original goals and objectives of the Committee of reducing the number of trucks on the roads and providing the lowest cost to the residents.

Resolution

MOTION by Hill, seconded by Duistermars,

Whereas, the Community Development and Viability Committee appreciates the work done by the Solid Waste AD-Hoc Committee.

Resolved, that the Community Development & Viability Committee supports the consensus of the AD-Hoc Committee.

Be it Further Resolved, that RRSI proceed with Choice Two (2), an exclusive contract with a preferred hauler, and present detailed plans, timeline and task list information in order to make a presentation to City Council.

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

MOTION CARRIED

Committee set a Special Joint Meeting for Monday, October 29, 2001 at 6:00 PM to review a complete final recommendation report from RRSI.

Mr. Frey will include in his final report projected cost analysis for various programs and personnel. Mr. Frey will provide the Committee with the final report at least a week before the next meeting.

Chairperson Barnett thanked Mr. Frey, Ms. Furlong and the AD-Hoc members for their hard work on this project and continued enthusiasm and commitment.

7. NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

None.

8. NEXT MEETING DATE

The next Regular City Council Community Development & Viability Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 25, 2001 at 5:30 PM.

Special Joint Meeting with AD-Hoc Solid Waste is scheduled for Monday, October 29, 2001 at 6:00 PM

9. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, Chairperson Barnett adjourned the meeting at 7:40 PM.

Minutes prepared by Lisa K. DeLeary.

Minutes of a Special Joint Meeting of the **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT & VIABILITY COMMITTEE MEETING and AD HOC CITIZEN SOLID WASTE COMMITTEE** held at the Rochester Hills Municipal Building, 1000 Rochester Hills Drive, Conference Room 110, Rochester Hills, Michigan, on Monday, October 29, 2001, at 6:00 PM.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Barnett called the meeting to order at 6:05 PM

2. ROLL CALL

Council Members Present: Bryan Barnett, Jim Duistermars, Melinda Hill
Council Members Absent: None

Citizen Representatives Present: Frank Cosenza, Michael Kaszubski
Citizen Representatives Absent: None **QUORUM PRESENT**

Administrative Staff Present: Scott Cope, Director, Building Department
Roger Rouse, Director, Public Service
Administrative Staff Absent: Ed Anzek, Director, Planning Department

Ad Hoc Committee Members Present: Karin Bickle
Lynn Jenkins
Thomas Stevenson
Glenn Thompson
Ad Hoc Committee Members Absent: Keith Jones
Mildred Knudsen
Mark Rowland
Rea Siffring

Others Present: Jim Frey, Resource Recycling Systems, Inc.
Dawn Furlong, Resource Recycling Systems, Inc.

3. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A Quorum was present.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None

5. COMMUNICATIONS

Chairperson Barnett noted the corrected final report from Resource Recycling Systems, (RRSI) Inc. was received and distributed to members on Friday, October 26, 2001.

Chairperson Barnett read a letter from Ad Hoc Member Rea Siffring into the record. Ms. Siffring favors freedom of choice by the residents and suggest that the Council revamp the Ordinance to encourage more competition. Ms. Siffring votes no for city-managed waste service.

Ms. Dawn Furlong, RRSI, stated she faxed the final report to Ad Hoc Member Mr. Keith Jones. Mr. Jones had indicated he had some comments. Chairperson Barnett noted that he has not received any communications from Mr. Jones.

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (UNFINISHED OR PENDING MATTERS)

A. Solid Waste:

Mr. Jim Frey, RRSI, reviewed the Final Recommendations Report with the Committee.

Mr. Frey explained the Cost Analysis Tables One (1) through Five (5):

- Table 1 – Oakland County Municipalities that Contract for Waste Services. Table includes number of households and yearly rates per household for weekly collection of waste, recyclables, and yard waste. Rates vary from \$93.84 (4 weeks of yard waste collection only) to \$154.00.
- Table 2 – Projected Current Cost of Service for Rochester Hills Without Recycling. Table includes: type of customer – standard “subscription”; subdivision “subscription”, and households with no service (e.g. vacation). Estimated number of households; Charge per household per year; and Total cost per year by customer type. Rates vary from \$0 (no service) to \$225.00.
- Table 3 – Projected Current Cost of Service for Rochester Hills With Recycling. Table includes same as Table 2. Rates vary from \$0 (no service) to \$265.00.
- Table 4 – Projected Budget for Rochester Hills Municipally Contracted Program with Recycling, Yard Waste Collection, Household Hazardous Waste, Management and Education Program and Waste/Recycling Service to Municipal Buildings. Table includes: cost breakdown for each household for each service. Rates for Household Service \$115.00; Hazardous Waste \$50.00; Management/Education \$7.00 for a total of \$130.00 per households serviced.
- Table 5 – Projected Savings to Rochester Hills Residents with Municipal Contracting. Table includes: type of customer – Savings over current no recycling costs and savings over comparable program costs; Projected Municipal Contract Costs (from Table 4); Estimated Current Cost (from Table 2 and 3); and Projected Savings to Rochester Hills Residents.

Mr. Frey reviewed and answered questions from the Members on the Recommendations detailed descriptions of Choice Two (2), An Exclusive Contract with

a Preferred Hauler, the selected option that best met the original goals and objectives of the CDV and Ad Hoc Committees.

Members discussed at length recommendation Six (6) – City bills residents for all services. The City would collect the necessary funds through either a service fee administered through the City's billing system or as a refuse millage, as provided by State Law.

In recommendation Seven (7) – Program management, administration and education, Mr. Frey explained that the recommendation of two (2) city staff positions to manage the program, Contract Manager and Recycling Coordinator, is based on practices of other communities. These positions are especially important for the implementation stage.

Mr. Frey reviewed the Technical Work Plan that details the project work plan with estimated time frames. Mr. Frey reviewed the following tasks; objectives; activities; task deliverables; and timelines in detail:

- Task 101 – Preparation of Bid Specifications
- Task 102 – Development of Management and Funding Mechanism
- Task 103 – Issuing of Bid Documents
- Task 104 – Bid Evaluations
- Task 105 – Contractor Recommendations
- Task 106 – System Startup

(Exit Member Duistermars 7:20 PM)

Mr. Frey stated that RRSI is prepared to support this process from now through the first couple of months of implementation. RRSI is prepared to give a not-to exceed total cost estimate for these services in the \$5,000 per month range. This amount would include all services from now through implementation including writing job descriptions, hiring and training of personnel.

Ms. Hill asked all members to review Mr. Frey's Recommendations Report in detail, mark changes and return to Mr. Scott Cope in the Building Department by Thursday, November 15, 2001. The CDV Committee will review at their November 29, 2001 meeting.

Ms. Hill reiterated that it was the consensus of the Committee that a Preferred Hauler System was the option of choice.

7. NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

None.

8. NEXT MEETING DATE

Regular Meeting – November 29, 2001 at 5:30 PM

9. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, Chairperson Barnett adjourned the meeting at 7:30 PM.

Minutes prepared by Lisa K. DeLeary.

Approved as presented at the November 29, 2001 Community Development & Viability Meeting.