

POSSIBLE MOTION

I MOVE to award a contract to Alaska Pacific Environmental Services (APES) for all aspects of the Solid Waste Management Services and authorize the Municipal Administrator to execute a contract with Alaska Pacific Environmental Services.



City and Borough of Sitka

PUBLIC WORKS

100 LINCOLN STREET • SITKA, ALASKA 99835
PHONE (907) 747-1804 • FAX (907) 747-3158

To: Mayor McConnell and Assembly Members
Mark Gorman, Municipal Administrator

From: Jay Sweeney, Finance Director *JS*
Michael Harmon, Public Works Director *MH*
Gary E. Baugher Jr., Maint. & Operations Supt.

cc: Robin Koutchak, Municipal Attorney

Date: October 13, 2015

Subject: Approval of Municipal Solid Waste Services Contract

Background

The City and Borough of Sitka contracts with private business contractors to perform municipal solid waste (MSW) collection, disposal services, and recycled materials processing. The existing contract has ended and the Municipality must award a new contract. The bidders were requested to provide our current service level with an additive alternate to include a curbside commingled recycling program.

The Public Works Department advertised for Qualifications (RFQ) for Solid Waste Management Services in accordance with the City and Borough of Sitka (CBS) procurement and bidding policies. This RFQ sought qualified contractors to provide solid waste services to include collection of refuse and recyclables, solid waste transfer, baling of recyclable materials (either source-separated or commingled), transport of waste and recyclables off-island, waste disposal, and processing/marketing of commingled recyclable materials. Bids were opened for this project April 17, 2015. Two responsive and responsible bids were received as indicated in the following list:

BIDDERS
Alaska Pacific Waste Services (APES)
Alaska Waste

Analysis

The Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) met on September 30th, 2015. The following motions were approved unanimously by the SWAC:

- Motion one: to award the contract to Alaska Pacific Waste Services;
- Motion two: to award the Solid Waste Management Services contract with the proposed rate structure without commingled recycling.
- Motion three: to maintain the transfer station operation of six days a week (current system) and keep the 200# free disposal for the residential customers.

Based on the proposed contract rates, it is clear that consumer rates will need to increase by 21.3% to cover the cost of service. For this reason, the SWAC unanimously voted not to include

the curbside commingled portion of the contract with additional cost increases (an additional \$10.94 per customer per month) for the services.

The term of the Contract shall commence on **October 15, 2015** and end at the end of the day **October 16, 2025**. With mutual consent, the CBS has the option at the end of the (7) seventh year to consider extending the initial (10) ten year term for an additional (5) years. The maximum term of this Contract will be (15) fifteen years. The CBS will have the option to add curbside commingled recycling within the first (5) five years of the contract. If the CBS chooses to implement curbside commingled recycling the commingled rates proposed by APES will include an annual CPI adjustment.

Fiscal Note

Costs in the proposal submitted by APES, while most responsive, still represent a substantial increase over existing contract charges. For example, the cost of transfer station operations will increase by \$7.32/ton, or 22.7%. The cost of off-island transportation will increase by \$17.43/ton, or 15.0%.

In addition, the Solid Waste Disposal Fund has essentially been generating no accretive cash flow. Cash flow from operations has barely been enough to pay for debt service. As a result, cash in the fund is not growing.

Accordingly, award of a new contract to APES makes an increase in solid waste user fees essential. If the contract is awarded without a follow-on increase in solid waste user fees, which will be in the range of a 20% increase, the solid waste disposal fund will rapidly deplete its available undesignated working capital, which is approximately \$350K. Not awarding a contract is not an option as it will result in MSW not being collected.

A related note is that the last time solid waste user fees were raised was in 2005. Ten years have passed without a user fee increase; costs of operations now make a fee increase imperative.

Recommendation:

Award a contract to Alaska Pacific Environmental Services (APES) for all aspects of the Solid Waste Management Services, and authorize the Administrator to execute a contract with Alaska Pacific Environmental Services.

Memo

Thru: Mark Gorman, Municipal Administrator

To: City and Borough of Sitka Assembly

From: Jay Sweeney, Chief Financial and Administrative Officer

Date: October 21, 2015

Re: Necessity for Awarding Solid Waste Disposal Contract Prior To Introduction of Ordinance Increasing Solid Waste User Fees

On October 27th, the Assembly of the City and Borough of Sitka will be asked to accept a proposal for solid waste disposal services, vote to award a contract for such services, and direct the Administrator to develop and execute the written contract form for the services.

In order to pay for the costs associated with the new contract, the City and Borough of Sitka (CBS) must raise solid waste user fees, which is accomplished by ordinance. The reason fees must be raised is that solid waste costs under the new multi-year contract will rise substantially. As the fiscal note in the contract memorandum, states, some component costs associated with the new contract are increasing over 20%.

Why bring a contract award request forward before raising user fees? The answer is that the current contract has expired and the CBS is operating under a month-to-month extension, cancellable by either party with notice. To ensure continued solid waste disposal service, it is important to act now to award the contract.

The solid waste utility has enough working capital to operate under a new contractual cost structure for several months, thus providing time to prepare and vet an ordinance proposing an increase in solid waste user fees. Eventually, however, solid waste user fees must be raised or all of the working capital in the solid waste utility will be expended.

REFERENCE MATERIAL
FROM THE
SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(SWAC)



Summary of the current and proposed Municipal Solid Waste and Recycle Programs City and Borough of Sitka

The City and Borough of Sitka (CBS) advertised a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Solid Waste Management Services. This resulted in two contractors, Alaska Pacific Environmental Service (APES) and Alaska Waste submitting their proposals. APES' proposal provides the most reasonable costs to the CBS.

Below is a summary of CBS' current and proposed operations for the MSW and Recycle materials.

Current Contract

Municipal Solid Waste (MSW)

MSW is collected by truck, transported to the transfer station and loaded into containers. The containers are taken to Alaska Marine Lines (AML) where they are shipped to Seattle. In Seattle, the containers travel to the Roosevelt Landfill in western Washington by rail.

The transfer station is open six days a week and every residence can take 200 pounds of solid waste to the transfer station for free. This is a cost that is paid by the City and Borough of Sitka (CBS) and made up in the billing of residents.

Sawmill Creek Road Recycle Center

Recycle materials are taken by the residents/businesses to the Recycle Drop off Center on Sawmill Creek Road. That material is then trucked to the scrapyards bailing site located at the Gary Paxton Industrial Park. After it is baled, it is shipped out in 40-foot containers to a Material Recovery Facility (MRF) station in Seattle. At that point it is separated, and then a value (credit) is given for the commodity. The credit is subtracted from the Republic invoice for transportation and disposal of recycling material.

Scrap Yard

Scrap metal and vehicles is collected at the Gary Paxton Industrial Park and shipped to Seattle via AML barge. The contractor receives half of the value (credit) given for the commodity and CBS receives the other half. The contractor pays for all operations and costs for operating the Scrap Yard.



Summary of the current and proposed Municipal Solid Waste and Recycle Programs City and Borough of Sitka

Proposed Contract Changes

Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) – VOTED DOWN BY THE SWAC

- The contractor is proposing that the transfer station be open to the public for three days a week, Thursday – Saturday, instead of six days. (Customer rate reduction of \$.02 per pound)
- The contractor is proposing doing away with the 200 pounds of free waste every month for residential customers. Every pound not charged is subsidized by the rate payers. (Approximate annual cost \$43,400)

Sawmill Creek Road Recycle Center - VOTED DOWN BY THE SWAC

- If commingled recycling is selected the Sawmill Creek Road recycle center will not remain in operation.

Commingled Recycling - VOTED DOWN BY THE SWAC

- Will be mandatory for residential customers and commercial customers.
- Residential customers will be provided an additional can, 48 or 96 gallon for curbside pickup.
- Commercial customers will be provided a container depending on their situation and recycling needs.
- The contractor will collect the recycling can every other week.
- Curbside recycling is available for all recycled products with the exception of glass. Glass products may be delivered by residents/businesses to a designated drop off site.

Scrap Yard

- Hours of operation and consumer rates will remain the same.
- CBS will pay for all costs to operate the scrap yard.
- CBS will receive 100% of all commodities received for the sale of scrap metal.



Frequently Asked Questions regarding the Upcoming City and Borough of Sitka Municipal Solid Waste Changes

- 1. Will there be an additional cost for Municipal Solid Waste (also known as garbage or trash), or will the cost remain the same as we are currently pay?** *City and Borough of Sitka (CBS) staff is projecting that the rates for municipal solid waste will have to be increased by approximately 21.3% to make the solid waste fund sustainable. This rate increase is based on adding NO additional services. Refer to the "Proposed Rates" table in the packet.*
- 2. Will there be an additional cost if we were to add a curbside recycling program?** *Yes, CBS staff is projecting that the costs of adding curbside recycling would increase the monthly proposed rates by approximately \$10.94. This would be added on to the proposed 21.3% increase for municipal solid waste to a total monthly cost to the customer. Refer to the "Proposed Rates" table in the packet.*
- 3. How often will the municipal solid waste (MSW) be collected?** *Municipal solid waste will be picked up every week just like it is currently.*
- 4. How often will the curbside recycling be collected?** *Every other week.*
- 5. Will my MSW pickup days remain the same?** *MSW pickup days should not change.*
- 6. What size of containers will we have for both curbside and MSW?** *The containers will be either 48 gallon, 96 gallon, or 350 gallon. If curbside recycle is the chosen option, every residential account will have two containers: two 48 gallons, one for recyclables and one for MSW or two 96 gallon container one for recyclables and one MSW. The commercial accounts will have an additional container for recycling depending on their situation and needs.*

7. **How will the curbside recycling work?** *Both residential and commercial accounts will put out the second container for an every-other-week pick-up of their recyclable materials.*
8. **What are the items that will be collected with curbside recycling?** *All recyclable material with the exception of glass.*
9. **Will curbside recycling be mandatory?** *Commingled recycling will be mandatory for all customers.*
10. **Will glass be included with the curbside recycling program? If not, what will I do with my glass?** *Glass will not be collected curbside. Glass has the potential to contaminate commingled loads of recycle and has no value. CBS will continue to have a drop off location. The glass will be ground up and repurposed to cover biosolids at the Sitka landfill.*
11. **If we have curbside commingled recycling will the Sawmill Creek Road recycle center remain open?** *No*
12. **Will the transfer station be open the same hours as it currently is?** *To reduce the customers rate by \$.02 per pound the contractor proposed a decrease in the number of days the transfer station will be open to the public. Their recommendation was to go from being open 6 days a week, Monday-Saturday, to 3 days a week, Thursday - Saturday.*
13. **Will there be any composting or any other additional programs?** *The community survey issued in April 2014 indicated a low interest in composting and other additional programs. Additional information is available at www.cityofsitka.com, Public Works Department, document titled 'Interim Solid Waste Management Plan Report'.*
14. **Will there be changes for the Scrap Yard?** *Hours of operations and consumer rates will remain the same.*

MEMORANDUM

To: Solid Waste Advisory Committee

From: Michael Harmon, Public Works Director
Gary Baugher, Maintenance and Operations Superintendent
Jay Sweeney, Chief Finance and Administrative Officer

Date: September 15, 2015

Subject: Solid Waste Management Services contract award.

Background:

The Public Works Department advertised a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for Solid Waste Management Services in accordance with City and Borough of Sitka (CBS) procurement and bidding policies. This RFQ sought qualified contractors to provide solid waste management services to include collection of refuse and recyclables, solid waste transfer, baling of recyclable materials (either source-separated or commingled), transport of waste and recyclables off-island, waste disposal, and processing/marketing of commingled recyclable materials.

Bids were opened for this project on April 17, 2015. Two responsive and responsible bids were received, as indicated in the following list:

Bidder
Alaska Pacific Waste Services (APES)
Alaska Waste

Analysis:

The bid contained different services, which could possibly come from different bidders. The attached spreadsheet shows the current cost and the bids from Alaska Pacific Waste Services (APES) and Alaska Waste. Public Works proposes to award a contract to APES for all services.

Recommendation:

Award a contract to Alaska Pacific Environmental Services (APES) for all aspects of the Solid Waste Management Services.

Solid Waste Management Proposal Evaluation

Monthly Rates

	Current Cost		Contractor #1		Contractor #2	
			APES		Alaska Waste	
	Without Commingled Recycling		Without Commingled Recycling	With Commingled Recycling	Without Comingled Recycling	With Commingled Recycling
32/48 Gallon Cart	\$	20.71	\$ 26.20	\$ 33.16	\$ 41.32	\$ 45.49
96 Gallon Cart	\$	32.31	\$ 43.14	\$ 43.81	\$ 52.42	\$ 56.40
350 Gallon Tub	\$	95.97	\$ 104.49		\$ 133.21	

Transfer Station Operation

Per Ton

	Current Cost		Contractor #1	Contractor #2
			APES	Alaska Waste
Current Operation	\$	32.30	* \$27.98	\$ 34.00

*Assumes reducing days of operation from 6 days per week to 3 days per week

MEMORANDUM

To: Solid Waste Advisory Committee

From: Michael Harmon, Public Works Director
Gary Baugher, Maintenance and Operations Superintendent
Jay Sweeney, Chief Finance and Administrative Officer

Date: September 15, 2015

Subject: Solid Waste Management Services contract award – Commingled Recycling

After reviewing the proposal for the Solid Waste Management Services it is apparent consumer rates will need to increase to cover the cost of the service. The attached spreadsheet utilizes our current rate structure with an increase of 21.3% for both residential and commercial users.

The current Solid Waste Management Services contract does not offer curb side commingled recycling. The attached spreadsheet shows the rate increase of \$10.94 in addition to the proposed 21.3% increase if curb side commingled recycling was added to the Solid Waste Management contract. Commingled recycling will include all recyclable material with the exception of glass. A drop off location will still remain in operation for the recycling of glass products.

The recycling drop off center at 802 Sawmill Creek Road will not remain in operation if commingled recycling is selected.

Recommendation:

Award the Solid Waste Management Services contract with the proposed rate structure including commingled recycling.

OR

Award the Solid Waste Management Services contract with the proposed rate structure without commingled recycling.

Solid Waste Management Proposal Evaluation

Proposed Rates

Proposed Rate Structure					
	Current Rates	Rates Without Commingled Recycling		* Rates With Commingled Recycling	
	Customer Rate	Increase Amount from Current Rate	Customer Rate	Increase Amount from Current Rate	Customer Rate
32/48 Gallon Cart	\$ 25.00	\$ 5.32	\$ 30.32	\$ 16.26	\$ 41.26
96 Gallon Cart	\$ 42.00	\$ 8.94	\$ 50.94	\$ 19.88	\$ 61.88
Apartments/Harbor	\$ 38.00	\$ 8.09	\$ 46.09	\$ 19.03	\$ 57.03
Islands	\$ 19.00	\$ 4.04	\$ 23.04	\$ 14.98	\$ 33.98
350 Gallon Tub	\$ 170.00	\$ 36.18	\$ 206.18	\$ 47.12	\$ 217.12

* NOTE: Residential rates are increased \$10.94 for the addition of curbside commingled recycling.

MEMORANDUM

To: Solid Waste Advisory Committee

From: Michael Harmon, Public Works Director
Gary Baugher, Maintenance and Operations Superintendent
Jay Sweeney, Chief Finance and Administrative Officer

Date: September 15, 2015

Subject: Solid Waste Management Services – Transfer Station operation

The Solid Waste Management Services contract currently operates a Transfer Station located at 101 Jarvis Street, 6 days a week, Monday – Saturday, for refuse disposal. Residential customers that pay a monthly refuse on their current utility bill for road side pickup are able to utilize an additional 200 pounds of free disposal a month when delivered to the Transfer Station.

An alternative rate has been proposed to operate the Transfer Station by decreasing the days of operation from 6 days per week to 3 days per week, Thursday – Saturday and discontinuing the 200 pounds free disposal for residential customers. See attached spreadsheet for rates.

Recommendation:

Maintain the Transfer Station operation of 6 days a week and keep 200 pounds free disposal for residential customers.

OR

Reduce the Transfer Station operation from 6 days to 3 days a week and remove 200 pounds free disposal for residential customers.

Transfer Station Operation

Per Ton

Calculated from APES proposal

Current Cost/Rates

	Contractor Cost	Customer Rate
Current Operation	1.6 cents/lb	6 cents/lb

Proposed Cost/Rates

	Contractor Cost	Customer Rate
	2.1 cents/lb	8 cents/lb

Proposed Alternate

	Contractor Cost	Customer Rate
Decrease operation from 6 to 3 days	1.4 cents/lb	6 cents/lb
Discontinue 200 pounds free disposal for residential	1.4 cents/lb	6 cents/lb
Decrease days to 3 and remove 200 pounds free	1.4 cents/lb	6 cents/lb

Tori Fleming

From: Mooney, Philip W (DFG) <phil.mooney@alaska.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2015 10:50 AM
To: Mellissa Cervera-Bean; danderson@akpacific.com; rjparmelee@gmail.com; andrew@sitkawild.org; michelleputz@yahoo.com; twojuncos@icloud.com; stashinc@ymail.com; scottbrylinsky@gmail.com; precisionboat@gmail.com; jstelzen@gmail.com; nosam.m.hael@gmail.com; jonathan.s.kt@gmail.com; 'hackett.phyllis@gmail.com'; maclanekerry@yahoo.com
Cc: Tori Fleming; John P. Sweeney; Mark Gorman; Michael Harmon; Gary Baugher
Subject: RE: Packet for Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Meeting on September 30, 2015

All-

I regret I cannot make the meeting tonight. I do appreciate that others have sent in comments so I can focus mine a little better:

1-All aside, I am a supporter of recycling. I also support common sense across the board and often am frustrated that it takes ordinances and regulations with enforcement because common sense seems to have been lost. While I consider Sitka a progressive thinking community on many fronts, we, as a community have not been so when it comes to bears/garbage or even ravens/garbage. Many individuals of this community have put forth considerable time and effort to solving and reducing the ability of bears, ravens, dogs, wind, etc. from scattering garbage across the landscape, as well as reducing the habituation of animals to it as a food source. I give a lot of credit to Public Works and other City staff, SCS, Straiger-Pacific Waste, and other organizations/individuals throughout the last three decades to change that situation by collaboration on equipment design, ordinances, pick-up schedules, and other adaptations. I don't know how many hours SPD has put in on bear calls and/or the bear/trash ordinance enforcement efforts over the last 3-4 years, but it has to be significant. If you consider the diversion of limited SPD staff/coverage to tackle the majority of calls in the evening-night-early morning hours with progress towards a successful resolution (that should result in a reduction of this effort over time), we (the community) do not have much to show for that effort and money. Believe me, I appreciate what SPD staff have been doing and how frustrating it is for them to go out an "chase" bears through the neighborhoods night after night.

This was the scenic route I took to second Andrew Thoms's third comment point of recycling /bears. I'll expand that to more than just bears. All of us have seen ravens scattering garbage from upright totes and 350 gal cans where the lids are flipped open/caught by the wind or stuffed too full to close. If we want a second container we need to solve the original issue; both in engineering design, pick-up strategy to minimize the exposure of recyclables/trash, and community attitude.

2-I have nothing but kudos for the operation of the transfer station and the accessibility of it by the public. That said, I don't have enough information to comment on 3-4 day closure but am open to ideas about efficiency if that is the question. I recognize that efficiency doesn't necessarily dovetail with accessibility and this is particularly a sensitive issue if you have some waste you need to discard outside of normal neighborhood pick-up. That's why I think the City/community does get a fair and positive "return" for the "free" 200 lbs monthly (delivered) to the transfer station. Some of you would be surprised at how much trash is dumped in harbor/city/parks/boat launch/Starrigavan campground...and not to mention road turnouts, Nelson Logging road, Granite Creek, Sandy Beach, Green lake road, etc. I think eliminating the "potential" 200 lbs will cost the community more in what will likely result in more dumping behavior. Again, I think overall this is a small portion of community residents that dump garbage like this, but the clean-up costs do affect the greater community as well as contribute to bear/raven issues too.

I appreciate the dialogue and work and different viewpoints towards practicable solutions. Thanks.

Phil

From: Mellissa Cervera-Bean [mailto:mellissa.cervera@cityofsitka.org]
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2015 11:52 AM
To: danderson@akpacific.com; Mooney, Philip W (DFG); rjparmelee@gmail.com; andrew@sitkawild.org; michelleputz@yahoo.com; twojuncos@icloud.com; stashinc@ymail.com; scottbrylinsky@gmail.com; precisionboat@gmail.com; jstelzen@gmail.com; nosam.m.hael@gmail.com; jonathan.s.kt@gmail.com; 'hackett.phyllis@gmail.com'; maclanekerry@yahoo.com
Cc: Tori Fleming; John P. Sweeney; Mark Gorman; Michael Harmon; Gary Baugher
Subject: FW: Packet for Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Meeting on September 30, 2015

Hello everyone,

Please see Kerry Maclane's comments/questions below.

From: Kerry MacLane [mailto:maclanekerry@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2015 11:40 AM
To: Mellissa Cervera-Bean <mellissa.cervera@cityofsitka.org>
Subject: Re: Packet for Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Meeting on September 30, 2015

Please forward to Gary and the SWAC group:

Filling in for Michelle Putz on SWAC, I had some questions. I understand that the time constraint may preclude getting this information prior to tomorrow's meeting.

I'm mainly interested in the jobs/economic development aspect of the commingled recycling.

At present a very small percentage of our municipal solid waste (MSW) is voluntarily recycled and sent pre-sorted to Washington. The commingled program would pay an Alaska firm to collect a much larger % of our MSW as mixed recyclables and ship to Washington. In the packet for tomorrow's meeting we are shown expenses but no income or waste data. So, here are some of my questions:

Will the comingled recycling result in jobs in Sitka?

What is the extra recycling cost for? Another set of containers? Another truck?

After these initial expenses, can we expect this cost to decrease by the next bid cycle in 2 years? (Assuming the value of the recycled materials remains the same as it is now.)

What is the anticipated increase in the percentage of the MSW that will be recycled?

What are the estimated savings realized for shipping less waste to the landfill and more recyclables and are they incorporated into the proposed costs?

Kerry E. MacLane
P.O. Box 1665, Sitka, Alaska 99835
907.747.7888, office
907.752.0654, cell

On Monday, September 28, 2015 8:39 AM, Mellissa Cervera-Bean <mellissa.cervera@cityofsitka.org> wrote:

Kerry,

please see Leah's questions and Gary's response down below.

Mellissa

From: Gary Baugher

Sent: Friday, September 25, 2015 10:38 AM

To: Leah Mason <nosam.m.hael@gmail.com>; Tori Fleming <tori.fleming@cityofsitka.org>

Cc: Mellissa Cervera-Bean <mellissa.cervera@cityofsitka.org>; danderson@akpacific.com; phil.mooney@alaska.gov; rjparmelee@gmail.com; andrew@sitkawild.org; michelleputz@yahoo.com; twojuncos@icloud.com; stashinc@ymail.com; scottbrylinsky@gmail.com; precisionboat@gmail.com; istelzen@gmail.com; jonathan.s.kt@gmail.com; Michael Harmon <michael.harmon@cityofsitka.org>; John P. Sweeney <jay.sweeney@cityofsitka.org>; hackett.phyllis@gmail.com

Subject: RE: Packet for Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Meeting on September 30, 2015

Leah,

I tried to answer your questions below. If you have any other questions do not hesitate to e-mail or call. Thanks!

From: Leah Mason [<mailto:nosam.m.hael@gmail.com>]

Sent: Friday, September 25, 2015 3:08 AM

To: Tori Fleming <tori.fleming@cityofsitka.org>

Cc: Mellissa Cervera-Bean <mellissa.cervera@cityofsitka.org>; danderson@akpacific.com; phil.mooney@alaska.gov; rjparmelee@gmail.com; andrew@sitkawild.org; michelleputz@yahoo.com; twojuncos@icloud.com; stashinc@ymail.com; scottbrylinsky@gmail.com; precisionboat@gmail.com; istelzen@gmail.com; jonathan.s.kt@gmail.com; Gary Baugher <gary.baugher@cityofsitka.org>; Michael Harmon <michael.harmon@cityofsitka.org>; John P. Sweeney <jay.sweeney@cityofsitka.org>; hackett.phyllis@gmail.com

Subject: Re: Packet for Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Meeting on September 30, 2015

Dear Gary,

Am I correct in thinking that the major change between this month's packet and last month's packet is the decision to cease operations of the recycling center in exchange for commingled recycling at the curbside?

This is one of the items that has changed. We will still have the need for a drop center for the glass as it will not be collected in the curbside recycle program. There were also some adjustments in the proposed rate structure spreadsheet. The adjusted proposed rate structure numbers are also reflected in the questions and answer pages.

Is there any additional information available regarding reasoning/rationale for this change? If it is decided by the SWAC Group to go with co-mingled recycle then there will probably not be a need for the drop off center with the exception of glass drop off. If it is decided to stay with status quo then we will need to keep the recycle center open as it is currently.

Thanks in advance,
Leah Mason

On Sep 24, 2015, at 1:23 PM, Tori Fleming <tori.fleming@cityofsitka.org> wrote:

Good afternoon,

Document for the Solid Waste Advisory Committee meeting for September 30, 2015 are attached.

Thanks you,
Tori

Tori Fleming
Contract Coordinator
City and Borough of Sitka
100 Lincoln St, Sitka, AK 99835
907-747-1803
907-747-3158 fax

tori.fleming@cityofsitka.org

****Please update your address book to reflect my new email address****

<SWAC packet 9.23.15.pdf>

Tori Fleming

From: Mellissa Cervera-Bean
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2015 12:16 PM
To: Mooney, Philip W (DFG); danderson@akpacific.com; rjparmelee@gmail.com; andrew@sitkawild.org; michelleputz@yahoo.com; twojuncos@icloud.com; stashinc@ymail.com; scottbrylinsky@gmail.com; precisionboat@gmail.com; jstelzen@gmail.com; nosam.m.hael@gmail.com; jonathan.s.kt@gmail.com; 'hackett.phyllis@gmail.com'; maclanekerry@yahoo.com
Cc: Tori Fleming; John P. Sweeney; Mark Gorman; Michael Harmon; Gary Baugher
Subject: FW: Packet for Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Meeting on September 30, 2015

All,

Please see Kerry's email below.

From: Kerry MacLane [mailto:maclanekerry@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2015 11:59 AM
To: Mellissa Cervera-Bean <mellissa.cervera@cityofsitka.org>
Subject: Re: Packet for Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Meeting on September 30, 2015

For the SWAC;

- Overall:

Typically when communities institute curbside recycling the amount of MSW decreases and the amount of recyclables increases over time as it becomes a community norm. (This results in cost savings.) I believe the SWAC should support the recycling bid because, taking the long view, it is the **right thing to do**. It is highly unlikely the Assembly will approve the recycling component because it is coming on top of a 21% increase.

- Recycling Jobs (checking for understanding):

The contract jobs of bundling the recyclables would increase (more material = more labor).

Picking up recyclables will require additional labor.

Reduced hours at the Transfer Station would reduce jobs there but the employees would likely be used in other aspects of the contractor's operation.

A city employee would do the scrap metal/car recycling (costs offset by metal sales).

- Reduced Services:

The 200 "free" lbs/mo at the Transfer Station should not be discontinued. It is not really free, it incorporated into the cost of doing business and discourages illegal dumping. If hours are to be reduced at the Transfer Station they should be half days, thus allowing businesses (contractors, etc.) to function efficiently. In 2013 28% of MSW hauled to the Transfer Station is "self-hauled (2014 CBI report).

- Bears:

Recycling should be treated like garbage is now to avoid bear problems.

Kerry E. MacLane
P.O. Box 1665, Sitka, Alaska 99835
907.747.7888, office
907.752.0654, cell

On Wednesday, September 30, 2015 8:25 AM, Mellissa Cervera-Bean <mellissa.cervera@cityofsitka.org> wrote:

Please see Jonathan Kreiss-Tomkins email below.

From: Jonathan Kreiss-Tomkins [<mailto:jonathan.s.kt@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2015 3:10 AM

To: andrew thoms <andrew@sitkawild.org>

Cc: Tori Fleming <tori.fleming@cityofsitka.org>; Mellissa Cervera-Bean <mellissa.cervera@cityofsitka.org>; danderson@akpacific.com; phil.mooney@alaska.gov; Richard Parmelee <rjparmelee@gmail.com>;

michelleputz@yahoo.com; Carolyn Servid <twojuncos@icloud.com>; stashinc@ymail.com; Scott Brylinsky <scottbrylinsky@gmail.com>; Mike Litman <precisionboat@gmail.com>; Jay Stelzenmuller <jstelzen@gmail.com>; Leah Mason <nosam.m.hael@gmail.com>; Gary Baugher <gary.baugher@cityofsitka.org>; Michael Harmon <michael.harmon@cityofsitka.org>; John P. Sweeney <jay.sweeney@cityofsitka.org>; Phyllis Hackett <hackett.phyllis@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Packet for Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Meeting on September 30, 2015

There's no doubt that the proposal for curbside recycling is dead on arrival.

I think this may be partly attributable to how these rates are framed.

For both 48-gallon or 96-gallon households, curbside recycling is an extra \$11. That's unacceptable. DOA.

But let's critically analyze the units we're talking about.

In the curbside recycling scenario, a Sitka household gets a 48-gallon cart emptied every week plus a second 48 gallon emptied every other week for \$41.26/mo. In effect, the customer gets 72 gallons (average) of total waste trucked away every week.

(I'm assuming 48-gallon carts because my understanding is that those 32-gallon carts were improvised as a temporary situation and are being phased out. If this assumption is inaccurate, the logic of what follows is weakened.)

Households that get 96 gallon of waste trucked away every week under the current system are going to get 144 gallons (average) of waste trucked away every week.

My point on framing is if we look *inclusively* at these numbers and these units, their meaning changes.

Sitka has 2,704 residential solid waste customers. 69 percent (1,876 households) use 96-gallon containers and generate up to 96 gallons of waste/weekly. The way these rates are framed and visually laid out, it's easy to presume that all 1,876 of these 96-gallon/week households will chose to pay for 144 gallons waste/week capacity.

Let's consider this presumption.

If Sitka opts for curbside recycling, these 96-gallon/week households will have a choice. Some will opt for 144 gallons/week of waste capacity. Some will opt for 72 gallons/week.

This is the important part: for those 96-gallon/week Sitka households that chose to go from 96 gallons/week to 72 gallons/week (instead of 144 gallons/week), they will **save money** with a curbside recycling program.

If these 96-gallon/week households choose to pay for 144 gallons/week of waste capacity, they will **pay more money** under a curbside recycling program.

Again, some of these 96-gallon/week households will chose to go to 72 gallons/week; some will chose to go to 144 gallons/week.

How many to each?

Make your own estimate.

I made a recycling spreadsheet-calculator just for the occasion.

Type in your estimate in cell J-10, and watch the other numbers on the spreadsheet change. Like magic!

Statistics (assuming a Gaussian distribution, a.k.a. "bell curve") would suggest a .66/.33 split between 72 gallon/144 gallon.

If we chose a curbside recycling scenario and assume a .66/.33 split, 54% of Sitkans would see their solid waste bills increase and 46% would see their solid waste bills decrease (relative to a status quo system).

I encourage you to play around with the calculator in advance of this evening's meeting.

In addition, there are two factual questions, the answers to which will affect my own perspective on whether we as a community should pursue curbside recycling:

- What is the assumed diversion rate in the curbside recycling scenario, and how does an increased or decreased diversion rate (relative to assumed diversion rate) affect revenues, and would increased or decreased revenues (relative to assumed revenues) affect rates?
- Does the City still pay a contractor (e.g., the role Norm Campbell was hired to fill for years) to manage the recycling drop-off center? If so, how much is the contract, and is contract paid with Solid Waste Fund money?

A big thanks to the Public Works Department for moving us along this far. We're close!

Jonathan

On Wed, Sep 30, 2015 at 12:52 AM, [andrew thoms <andrew@sitkawild.org>](mailto:andrew.thoms@sitkawild.org) wrote:

All:

I'm out of town and won't be at the meeting today.

I did want to pass along some of my comments:

- 1) On the co-mingled proposal, I'm not seeing where the benefits are weighing out costs on this. Generally I'm all for recycling but I recognize that some part of recycling is to catalyze the markets to utilize recycled materials and then demand for those materials increases and become valuable or pay for themselves. I don't think that as a community Sitka is big enough to affect that change. At \$10/month increase for putting together a co-mingled recycling program and picking up at each house, I don't think it works right now.
- 2) On the mandatory nature of the co-mingled recycling: I don't know how this would work. We have had a lot of issues over the past years trying to figure out how to enforce a garbage/bear ordinance and haven't necessarily been successful with enforcement.
- 3) On the issue of recycling and bears: I think that environmentally, we would be creating a larger problem if we pursued mandatory co-mingled recycling than we would solve environmental problems. Having another container along the streets with 2 weeks of garbage would just create more potential for attracting bears. Whether it is grease on pizza boxes, sauce in the bottom of

aluminum cans, or fermenting juice in plastic jugs, there will inevitably be waste food and smells that bring in bears. It only takes one experience and next every recycling toter on the street is tipped over and contents are spread along the road as the bear (plus cubs even), looks for more of that...

4) Transfer Station Closed 3-4 working days of the week: I'd like to know more about how much the transfer station is used Monday to Thursday and how its closure on those days might affect those users. I'd assume that the people using it those days are businesses and if there is a heavy volume those days, would they have to stop working or delay? I'm especially thinking about builders who might be hauling waste those days. If someone looked at who the users are and they can work around it, I could live with it but I would hope that there would be a bit of analysis.

5) First 200 pounds free/ or with fees: I am not in support of getting rid of the first 200 pounds free. This was put in place to encourage people to use the transfer facility rather than dumping along roads or in parks (which then could become other costs to the city). I think that this is still needed.

6) Recycling Program: I believe it should stay as-is with people dropping off cardboard, plastics, glass, aluminum, and tin at the current facility.

I hope that you all can integrate these comments into the discussion and I am sorry that I can't be there.

Andrew

Andrew Thoms
Executive Director
Sitka Conservation Society
Box 6533 Sitka, Alaska 99835
SCS Office: Phone: (907)747 7509 Fax: (907)747 6105
email: andrew@sitkawild.org Web: www.sitkawild.org



Like us on Facebook!

Please, join or renew your membership today.

For over 45 years, Sitka Conservation Society has been protecting the Tongass and building more sustainable communities with the support of members like you.

From: Tori Fleming [<mailto:tori.fleming@cityofsitka.org>]

Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2015 1:23 PM

To: Mellissa Cervera-Bean; danderson@akpacific.com; phil.mooney@alaska.gov; rjparmelee@gmail.com; andrew@sitkawild.org; michelleputz@yahoo.com; twojuncos@icloud.com; stashinc@ymail.com; scottbrylinsky@gmail.com; precisionboat@gmail.com; jstelzen@gmail.com; nosam.m.hael@gmail.com; jonathan.s.kt@gmail.com; Gary Baugher; Michael Harmon; John P. Sweeney; ['hackett.phyllis@gmail.com'](mailto:hackett.phyllis@gmail.com)

Subject: Packet for Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Meeting on September 30, 2015

Good afternoon,

Document for the Solid Waste Advisory Committee meeting for September 30, 2015 are attached.

Thanks you,
Tori

Tori Fleming
Contract Coordinator
City and Borough of Sitka
100 Lincoln St, Sitka, AK 99835
907-747-1803
907-747-3158 fax
tori.fleming@cityofsitka.org

****Please update your address book to reflect my new email address****



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com

Tori Fleming

From: Leah Mason <nosam.m.hael@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2015 8:17 AM
To: Jonathan Kreiss-Tomkins
Cc: andrew thoms; Tori Fleming; Mellissa Cervera-Bean; danderson@akpacific.com; phil.mooney@alaska.gov; Richard Parmelee; michelleputz@yahoo.com; Carolyn Servid; stashinc@ymail.com; Scott Brylinsky; Mike Litman; Jay Stelzenmuller; Gary Baugher; Michael Harmon; John P. Sweeney; Phyllis Hackett
Subject: Re: Packet for Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Meeting on September 30, 2015

Dear all,

The meeting tonight conflicts with the arrival of my mother (after close to 24 hours in transit). So, upon reflection on the timing I'm going to have to miss the meeting too. Need to get her home and into bed.

My comments on where we're at are necessarily short- lucky you!

I agree with Jonathan - the existing framing is problematic. Thanks for putting in the time to put together the calculator, Jonathan.

Aside from that:

1. It is always going to be cheaper to move to recycling earlier rather than later. The cost of the transition will not get magically smaller if we wait.
2. With a declining tax base, there may not be another opportunity to get it done.
3. Education was always going to be a key point in making commingled work. The existing bear problem would benefit from a wide-scale program about food waste.
4. We're moving closer at the international level, to getting a system in place for costing and managing greenhouse gasses and this will target methane pretty quickly. Our unsorted waste will start attracting penalties for whomever is taking it and that is likely to add costs or end the contract. Something to keep in mind.

Please accept my apologies for not being able to be there,
Leah Mason

On Sep 30, 2015, at 3:09 AM, Jonathan Kreiss-Tomkins <jonathan.s.kt@gmail.com> wrote:

There's no doubt that the proposal for curbside recycling is dead on arrival.

I think this may be partly attributable to how these rates are framed.

For both 48-gallon or 96-gallon households, curbside recycling is an extra \$11. That's unacceptable. DOA.

But let's critically analyze the units we're talking about.

Mellissa Cervera-Bean

From: Scott Brylinsky <scottbrylinsky@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2015 8:09 AM
To: Gary Baugher
Cc: Tori Fleming; Mellissa Cervera-Bean; danderson@akpacific.com; phil.mooney@alaska.gov; rjparmelee@gmail.com; andrew@sitkawild.org; michelleputz@yahoo.com; twojuncos@icloud.com; stashinc@ymail.com; precisionboat@gmail.com; jstelzen@gmail.com; nosam.m.hael@gmail.com; jonathan.s.kt@gmail.com; Michael Harmon; John P. Sweeney; hackett.phyllis@gmail.com
Subject: Re: Packet for Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Meeting on September 30, 2015

To All,

I am out of state this week. My comments on the packet:

First, I would like to thank Public Works for putting together thorough and well thought out materials for our consideration.

As far as the decision points before us, my overall opinion is that we should stay with the existing system, rather than add commingled recycling, and/or reduced transfer station hours and elimination of the free disposal of 200 pounds/ mo.

Reasons are:

1) Reduced transfer station hours and eliminating 200 pounds free disposal: My concern is that if these are put into place the community would experience increased illegal dumping along side roads throughout the road system. High expense to clean up and a lot more trash along side roads that wouldn't get cleaned up.

2) Mandatory commingled recycling: the community generally does not accept "mandatory" anything unless there is a life-safety component. Who will enforce and how will they enforce? I believe commingled recycling would, for practical purposes, remain a voluntary program. I'm concerned that long-term diversion rates would not be materially improved enough over the current system to justify the higher costs.

I, personally, would welcome the program. But I also believe the additional monthly fee for "commingled," along with multiple rate increases for other services in the coming years will financially stress many households, and where we have a choice we should not be adding costs.

Thanks to all for your hard work,
Scott Brylinsky

On Monday, September 28, 2015, Gary Baugher <gary.baugher@cityofsitka.org> wrote:

Thanks Scott!

From: Scott Brylinsky [mailto:scottbrylinsky@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, September 25, 2015 6:03 PM

To: Tori Fleming <tori.fleming@cityofsitka.org>

Cc: Mellissa Cervera-Bean <mellissa.cervera@cityofsitka.org>; danderson@akpacific.com; phil.mooney@alaska.gov; rjparmelee@gmail.com; andrew@sitkawild.org; michelleputz@yahoo.com; twojuncos@icloud.com; stashinc@ymail.com; precisionboat@gmail.com; jstelzen@gmail.com; nosam.m.hael@gmail.com; jonathan.s.kt@gmail.com; Gary Baugher <gary.baugher@cityofsitka.org>; Michael Harmon

<michael.harmon@cityofsitka.org>; John P. Sweeney <jay.sweeney@cityofsitka.org>; hackett.phyllis@gmail.com

Subject: Re: Packet for Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Meeting on September 30, 2015

I will be out of state next week.

Will send in any comments I have.

Thanks,

Scott

On Thu, Sep 24, 2015 at 1:23 PM, Tori Fleming <tori.fleming@cityofsitka.org> wrote:

Good afternoon.

Document for the Solid Waste Advisory Committee meeting for September 30, 2015 are attached.

Thanks you,

Tori

Tori Fleming

Contract Coordinator

City and Borough of Sitka

100 Lincoln St, Sitka, AK 99835

907-747-1803

907-747-3158 fax

tori.fleming@cityofsitka.org

****Please update your address book to reflect my new email address****