

Colclasure, James

From: Krivit, Dan <Dan.Krivit@Foth.com>
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2014 8:25 AM
To: Gates, Jim
Subject: THANKS. I WILL GET BACK TO YOU EARLY NEXT WEEK...----> RE: Solid Waste Program discussion

Jim,

Thanks. This is helpful. I will get back to you early next week.

Have a nice weekend.

Dan Krivit, Senior Project Manager
Foth Infrastructure & Environment, LLC
Eagle Point II
8550 Hudson Boulevard North, Suite 105
Lake Elmo, MN 55042
Direct Phone: (651) 288-8509 / Cell Phone: (612) 616-7739
General Phone: (651) 288-8550 / Fax: (651) 288-8552

Dan.Krivit@Foth.com

<http://www.Foth.com>

Go Green, keep it on the screen. Please do not print this email unless necessary.

From: Gates, Jim [mailto:jgates@BloomingtonMN.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2014 7:52 AM
To: Krivit, Dan
Subject: FW: Solid Waste Program discussion

Dan,
Attached is the template sheet for the Solid Waste Program intended to be brought forward on 7-28-14.
FYI.
Jim

From: Moore, Lynn
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2014 4:55 PM
To: Gates, Jim; Keel, Karl; Eiler, Jim; Lee, Larry
Subject: RE: Solid Waste Program discussion

Please review updates from Mark's directions. I am not able to "high-light" methods as he asks. The chart I added is from MPCA's metro projections – has the %'s.

If there is a good chart of the makeup of single-family waste stream, let me know. I don't know of one.

Lynn

From: Gates, Jim
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2014 3:18 PM
To: Moore, Lynn
Cc: Keel, Karl; Eiler, Jim
Subject: RE: Solid Waste Program discussion

Requested input from Equipment. Have not received a response yet. I'm sure they're busy on rain/flooding work.
Jim

From: Moore, Lynn
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2014 2:48 PM
To: Gates, Jim; Keel, Karl; Eiler, Jim
Subject: RE: Solid Waste Program discussion

What's the answer to these:

- ❖ Indicate that CNG /LNG truck engines are about \$x K more expensive per truck? –and fuel savings return can be long??
- ❖ Is there good information that LNG / CNG actually do reduce carbon footprint over the newer generation diesels?

Let me know, Lynn

From: Gates, Jim
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2014 11:03 AM
To: Bernhardson, Mark; Keel, Karl; Lee, Larry; Moore, Lynn
Subject: FW: Solid Waste Program discussion

Exec. Team,
Mark, thank you very much for your comments! Very helpful!

Karl is at Met Council TAC this afternoon, and Lynn is not available until this afternoon as well, and tomorrow morning is Exec Staff. We could meet from 2:30 to 3:30 tomorrow afternoon, but I will not have much for new "product" to discuss by then.

Thus would like to **postpone** this afternoon's normal meeting time to next Thursday afternoon at 2:30. I'll send out a meeting notice shortly.

We can sure meet tomorrow too, and discuss a proposed program, but a "scalable" program after the push for an "educational" first phase is workable from my perspective.

Thoughts by others?

I think we're close enough now to re-engage Foth to kind of put the wraps for a solid waste program together, but we only have Council approval for \$9900 from the initial RFP available presently. I'm going to contact Dan Krivit to discuss putting a deliverable program together by our July 28th Council Study Session , and what an estimated cost may be.

Obviously, thoughts are welcome.

Thanks.
Jim

From: Bernhardson, Mark
Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2014 1:12 PM

To: Lee, Larry; Moore, Lynn; Keel, Karl; Gates, Jim

Subject: Solid Waste Program discussion

1. Thanks for redoing and sending out !!
2. I had reviewed the other material over the weekend on June 7th – and had meant to email some earlier the week of 6/9 but just now finally getting to converting my 6/7 hand written comments to something more legible as well as sharable.
3. General Comment –
 - In the material – the three approaches as I understood them for each of the three land uses :
 - Improved educational approach and leave the current collection system in place where each person gets to use the hauler of their choosing (and perhaps as part of the education – see if there can be more encouragement for each neighborhood to organize – with city assistance. The email today is illustrative of both the difficulty that can be found in doing so – as well as a cautionary tale on how independent homeowners are with their garbage service)
 - Go back to what was done in the 1990's when the City contracted for the recycling portion of the waste stream only.
 - Go to fully organize collection of the full stream (Trash / recycling / yard waste – and add organics)
 - My original thought was that the three approaches was a bit different – again for each of those uses
 - Improve the educational approach
 - An approach that is “scalable” to a full organized approach over the period of a few years – one step at a time and getting that well in place before going to the next. (“The Wedge”)
 - ✓ Education and Contract for recycling city wide
 - ✓ Trash collection
 - ✓ Organics when in a better position to do so
 - Going to a fully organized approach all at the same time – adding organics as part of that. (“The Big Bang”)
4. While my #2 and #3 steps could be a variant of your number #3 – am a bit concerned that your #2 begins to look like a half way measure and that staff does not want to eventually get to being fully organized for at least the single family residential –by showing two options to get there – it may lessen that perception –but look forward to further discussion of those three. (Need to keep in mind – given that nature of solid waste collection for multiple residential –that has dumpsters and C/I with dumpsters – both of which may collect in some cases on a more than once a week basis – the path chosen – by at least some maybe more the first approach)
5. Specific materials:
 - Template
 - City Sustainability Vision – Should be up top – either instead of or at least ahead of the organizational one
 - Community Vision
“To build and renew the community by providing services, promoting renewal and guiding growth in an even more sustainable, fiscally sound manner.”

 - “protecting and enhancing Bloomington's environmental, economic and social assets for ourselves and future generations.”

 - (Not sure of the source of the “City’s Sustainability “ language – so just curious where to locate. Also would be curious on the source of the revolving graphic – which I think does a good job of showing the sustainability elements being interrelated.)
 - In the three areas of Sustainability that comes next
 - ✓ Can those items that can be measurable to a degree at least – be hi-lited in color – and perhaps somehow separate / color those items that result in a significant impact on the goal of being sustainable – to distinguish from ones that are either not that significant / measurable / or are “nice” but not sustainable??

✓ In addition to underlining each are – could they be bolded as well (ie Aesthetics)

✓ Society

- ✚ Can the topic of ability to select service provider be added in
- ✚ Also – something like the impact on the city longer term of decisions that create substantial negative community reaction ?? (or something to that effect)
- ✚ Noise –
 - ❖ equally as loud and school buses daily during the school year??
 - ❖ Newer ones have a side loading “feed” that appears to be quieter than the “hydraulic arm”
- ✚ Collection Issues – (instead of litter) – concern related to litter from top loading more automated trucks - although rear loading and “Transfer vehicles” have similar issues.
- ✚ “Attractive and Smell nuisances” – food waste (even composting) are attractive to wild animals and the smell if left for more than a week can be offensive to neighbors.

✓ Environment

- ✚ Capitalize – Landfill / Pollution etc
- ✚ Reduce pollution –
 - ❖ Split between fewer trucks and different fuels
 - ❖ Indicate that CNG /LNG truck engines are about \$x K more expensive per truck? –and fuel savings return can be long??
 - ❖ Is there good information that LNG / CNG actually do reduce carbon footprint over the newer generation diesels?
 - ❖ Trips / Reduced Pollution of 6-8 trips per day in a community where there are probably 500k trips is not really measurable – and even spread over the week is about 1-2 trips per day savings on streets that typically carry 2-300 trips per day (is there a way to get how many miles that these trucks but on per day just in collection(and not transfer trips (as going to one hauler may increase either the number of trucks they have collecting on a day – and/ or more transfer trips ??)
- ✚ Reduce fuel – is there good data on that of diesel vs CNG/LNG – beyond the natural gas industry that shows significant savings ?

✓ Economy –

- ✚ Regroup / reorder the costs – somewhat in order of their city magnitude to a degree – ie trash / recycling / yard / organics first and have a separate grouping for the non regular collection (curbside / appliances / construction / hazardous ??) –
- ✚ Not sure how property taxes fit into this – but there is the cost of our having to charge more fees for great administration and educational efforts that should be noted?

➤ Hierarchy of solid waste management – can this be reduced in size – but still legible

➤ Three land use types – Is MF generally only weekly or do larger complexes have more frequent collection ?? Same questions with C/I If so can they be listed as a range from daily ?? to weekly depending on level and type of waste generation?

➤ With the space freed up by shrinking the triangle – is there room to put a bar style graphic as to an estimated percentage of waste stream that is trash / recycling / yard / organics – at least for the SF one?

• Memo for 7/28/14

➤ Need to add in sections

- ✓ Attachments (and determine which they will be)
- ✓ Issues for the Council is requested to decide
- ✓ Over all vision items and program goals

- Citizen Survey – agree that data is important –but in the present form may not best convey the information that is key
- Need to come to concurrence on what the three approaches are as noted above.
- Is there a role for use of voting technology on this item at the study meeting ?
- Issues such as:
 - ✓ Number of haulers possible
 - ✓ How to bid out the community for:
 - Recycling
 - Trash
 - Yard
 - Organics
 - ✓ Flat vs area prices if more than one hauler (and issues of different prices in different places)
- Curbside collection direction

6. Drizzle Approach - focusing on available data presentation and what may or may not be expected from it with a possible revised program
- Short memo to explain what is being drizzled out with the theme that the data may not show large gains for a major change – so that the basis for doing so may need to be beyond that. (Is that all the results there are – for what maybe lots of pain??)
 - Week #1 – Initial Memo explaining the “drizzle” and its purpose – early information and seek feedback prior to the 7/28/14 (Not the one that will be for 7/28/14) plus template
 - Week #2 – “Data sets / commentary “ for Pavement impact / fuel usage / pollution / noise
 - Week #3 –
 - “Guess which one yields the most recycling (or the hazards of saying that Organized Collection does)” and related issues
 - ✓ Organized ones may have better data ?
 - ✓ A function of the income level (More cash – more purchases – more trash ??)
 - ✓ Single stream results in 40? % more recycling (Mpls just went to it- 15-20 years after the private haulers introduced it. This is actually an argument to a degree that the private providers being individual competitive and not being “regulated” actually did result in more recycling that under the organized setting because a regulated area is often slower to respond to new items. Some are still using rear loading trash trucks – so more labor intensive and therefore cost more)
 - ✓ Realistic level of recycling as opposed to proposed “targets” of some “zero waste” communities (and whether that means no more land fill – which may be achievable – if all the waste is directed to HERC – or if it means 100 % non trash – ie all is either recycling / yard or organics compost)
 - ✓ Issue of increased recycling if weekly vs bi-weekly –any data on that increasing it – or
 - ✓ Smaller waste containers causing increase in recycling – or just more contaminated recycling
 - “ While the average may go down some (and not a lot) – there are still some whose price may go up” (Karl touched on this in the article in the Sun Current)
 - ✓ Taking the individual data provided and plot those against the state and Maplewood contract data – and see if any current ones fall below those lines
 - ✓ Magnitude of potential savings in relation to other household expenses.
 - ✓ The items that can add to the cost
 - No land fill – all non recycled or composted to HERC
 - Organics Collection
 - Solid Waste organizing / contracting monitoring costs
 - Is this a city service and do we bill or is it a set price and contractors bill (and if so – if more than one hauler – will they accept an equal price or does there become some cross subsidy issues ??)

↓ LNG / CNG

↓ Does more recycling / Yard waste / organics – cost more than trash hauling in considering the additional processing costs not offset by materials resale – over the land fill or HERC costs??

↓ Others ??

- Week #4 – Approaches – step by step and all at once
- Study Session (7/28/14) material

Thanks !! MEB

From: Gates, Jim

Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2014 7:22 AM

To: Bernhardson, Mark; Keel, Karl; Lee, Larry

Cc: Moore, Lynn

Subject: Solid Waste Program discussion

Solid Waste Executive Team,

Have folks had a chance to review the information delivered over the last month or so? The most recent package of information was delivered 6-5-14. We canceled last week's meeting. Lynn and I have not received comments to date on the material sent to folks

We do not want to lose momentum in the delineation of a Solid Waste Program for a Program delivery date in late-July.

Lynn's suggested revisions have now been included in the attached Council memo.

Let me know if we should cancel this week's discussion meeting.

Thanks.

Jim

IMPORTANT NOTICE

This communication including any attachments, (E-mail) is confidential and may be proprietary, privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender, permanently delete this E-Mail from your system and destroy any copies. Any use of this E-Mail, including disclosure, distribution or replication, by someone other than its intended recipient is prohibited.

This E-Mail has the potential to have been altered or corrupted due to transmission or conversion. It may not be appropriate to rely upon this E-Mail in the same manner as hardcopy materials bearing the author's original signature or seal.