



Date: February 14, 2019

To: Mayor and City Council

From: Energy and Environment Commission

Subject: Review and comment on staff recommendations for Residential Recycling and Organics Collection Request for Proposals

Situation:

The current contract for citywide residential recycling collection expires at the end of 2019. At Council's direction, staff released a request for proposals for a new residential recycling contract in coordination with a request for proposals for a new citywide organics collection contract. The staff recommendation for each contract was presented to the Energy and Environment Commission on February 14, 2019. Below are questions staff asked the EEC to respond to as well as general comments.

EEC Commissioner Comments:

- What are the advantages of shifting curbside recyclable collection from bi-weekly to weekly? Who benefits from this change? What are the collateral benefits/costs of the proposed change? What is the cost of this change? Is the proposed increase in level of service (LOS) worth the increase in cost?

Jackson – There is a demand for weekly recycling pickup. With organics recycling, we don't want to store for two weeks due to smell. So [organics recycling] has an advantage for the weekly benefits. The collateral cost is trucks. More trucks will force a discussion on organized hauling. The cost is not insignificant, but I think it's worth it to reach the goals.

Horan – People share with me that they throw away their recycling that doesn't fit into bin. We will capture more than what fits into the bins.

Seeley – I echo Horan's comments.

Satterlee – Agreed

Manser – Agreed

Glahn – It's not worth it.

- What are the benefits of a recyclables collection vendor that fixes their fee vs. one that floats their fee based on their processing costs? What are the benefits and challenges to the City's customer base if cost changes?

Jackson – Like the predictability in an annual set fee. For choosing between different vendors set cost versus market rate adjustments, the Commission is not qualified to answer this as it's not an environmental question.

- Are the vendors bidding the recyclable collection contract equally vigilant about monitoring for contaminated recyclables and driving customer behavior change? How should this factor into vendor choice?

Commissioner Horan – [Education] should factor high in choice for recycling collections provider.

Seeley – Even though we've been recycling for many years, there is still a need for education and should be a factor in the consideration. I feel Eureka does education well and feel comfortable they could tackle the education need.

Manser – Agreed

Fernands – Education is always important.

Satterlee – Agreed and like the proposal of multiple education touchpoints. Likes the idea of a fee for someone who puts contaminates in multiple times.

Bayardo – Yes! Recycling for dummies should be implemented. It's important to invest time and money into this.

- Should the City allow residents to “opt out” of the curbside recyclable and/or organics program? Is the City prepared to levy the costs of the program on to all impacted residential properties to ensure higher participation rates?

Jackson – Yes. The recommendation from the EEC last July was to implement an all pay system and would stand by that recommendation.

Horan – Agreed

Seeley – Agreed

Satterlee – Agreed

Manser – Agreed

Fernands – Agreed

Lanzas – Agreed

Glahn – Prefer an “opt out” decision

- Should the City be concerned with the business practices of the vendor it selects to provide this service? Who will monitor this aspect of the contract? How should this factor into vendor choice?

Jackson – Things that we want to monitor was put into RFP.

Satterlee – Like that Eureka had a Race & Equity component and aligns with Edina's values and policies.

Seeley – Agreed

Fernands – Agreed

Lanzas – Fleet of trucks that would reduce emissions should be monitored.

- The total monthly cost to residents of the current level of service (LOS) (Bi-weekly Recycling) is much lower than the total monthly cost to residents of the recommended LOS (Weekly Recycling + Organics Collection). Compare the cost increase from current to proposed. Is the increase in service worth the increase in cost?

Jackson – This is one of the goals to reduce waste. One of the incinerators in the County will close and there is a need to reduce the amount to landfills and incinerators, we push out the cost to landfill. We are expecting the metro area population to grow by 500,000 by 2030. If we can reduce the amount that goes into landfill and incinerator, it reduces the long-term costs. It is important to get people to recycling more and recycling organics now. There will be prohibitive cost in the future if we don't start now. We're really excited about reducing the amount of waste to that goes to landfill.

Seeley – When incinerating trash, the organics in the trash make the [incinerating] process less efficient. It's worth getting food waste out of the trash.

Satterlee – I agree with Chair Jackson. I know there will be pushback in community. Important for an excess funds or revenue be given back to the payers.

Manser – Totally agree it's worth the extra cost. The PR will need to be in full force.

Fernands – I agree and think it's a great idea.

Lanzas – I'm all for it.

Glahn – Not worth the cost.

- Final comments:

Jackson – Thank you. This has been a long term goal and excited to see it come to fruition.

Horan – Very excited about this. Excited about the vendors chosen, because they do good work.

Seeley – Ditto

Satterlee – Excited this is moving forward. Kudos to staff and working group that has been working very hard on this.

Manser – This the driving topic as to why I joined the commission. Happy to see it moving forward.

Fernands – I'm very happy about this.

Lanzas – I'm excited.