

December 4, 1991

TO: City Services Committee  
City Council

From: Greg Trainor, Utility Manager

Re: Minutes of Meeting

The City Services Committee met on Tuesday, December 3, 1991 at 2:30 PM. Present were Jim Baughman, John Bennett, Conner Shepard, Mark Achen, Dan Wilson, Ron Lappi, Jim Shanks, Greg Trainor, Sandi Glaze, Tim Woodmansee, and Darren Starr. Also present as guests were Steve and Elaine Foss.

1. The Ten Year financial plan ("SanSum.js") for the sanitation Fund was discussed among the Committee and rate proposals for 1992 were reviewed. The Committee agreed to recommend to the City Council for their December 18 regular meeting to increase the sanitation rates for residential customers from \$7.00 per month to \$7.50 per month effective January 1, 1992 and to increase commercial rates by 7% effective the same date. The Senior Citizen discount of \$1.00 per month will remain in effect. Other residential rates within the community range from \$7.25 to \$11.45 per month.

2. The Committee reviewed the eight (8) commercial trash customers which the City serves outside of the City limits. This was done as a result of two complaint letters from United Waste and Waste Control about the City serving these customers.

The current City policy is as follows: The City Sanitation Department does not solicit commercial customers outside of the City limits, although, on advice from legal counsel, we are not restricted from doing so. If we are asked to give a price quote outside of the City limits, the City first looks at the location to determine if it would be an inconvenience for us, if it is adjacent to the existing City limits, and if we are currently serving customers in the area. If it appears to be convenient, adjacent to existing city limits, and near other customers we submit bids with other private commercial haulers.

The Committee felt that this policy was reasonable, that the eight existing customers was not an unreasonable number, and that these commercial customers help to keep our residential rates as low as possible.

3. The current one-year hunting lease with Dick Beagley on the Somerville Ranch has expired. The Committee discussed renegotiating an additional one-year lease with Mr. Beagley, at

the current rate of \$20,000 per year, or opening the process up to bids. After considerable discussion of all past efforts, the Committee recommended that the lease with Mr. Beagley be extended for another year with the lease rebid for the 1993 season.

The Committee's reasons were as follows:

A. Mr. Beagley's lease performance has been satisfactory as well as the rate of \$20,000 per year.

B. Reopening the lease for bid would reopen, as well, considerable heated and divisive discussion on the whole issue of individual vs. guided hunts on the Ranch.

C. By the 1993 season there will be a recommendation on the ultimate use of the Somerville Ranch and the City's participation in the "Slopes of the Mesa Conservation Area" which will resolve many of the multiple use questions for the area.

4. Public Works staff received an offer to purchase a portion of the Somerville Ranch-that section below the rim at Kruzen Springs. The "offer" was for \$118 per acre. Again, after considerable discussion, the Committee expressed several recommendations: That the Council was not adverse to selling the Somerville Ranch assuming that other City objectives were met, such as preservation of the water rights. That it was, however, unwilling to sell PIECES of the property at prices well below the market value. That they were willing to continue participation in the joint effort with the BIM and other land owners in the area that might result in purchases being made by the BLM and uses of the area by many interests.

The Committee recommended that the offer be rejected and that staff not present any additional offers to them that were not for the entire ranch nor at rates below what the City considers market value.

5. Finally, Steve and Elaine Foss reviewed for the Committee a very detailed annual report on the Curbside and Drop-Off pilot project. A copy of the annual report is available. Steve and Elaine have been the force and labor behind the two-year pilot program and have, virtually, funded this effort with their own private donations. Some resources have been available from the Energy Office to man the Drop-Off sites and some capital funds were donated by the City to modify a trailer for hauling recycled materials. In February of 1992 the second year of this effort could end as Steve own resources are exhausted. This program, due to Steve and Elaine's dedicated volunteer efforts, has been very successful as measured against the participation rates of residents in City neighborhoods (80%), the amount of recyclables collected per household (38 lbs compared to the nation-wide average of 25 lbs per household), and the very positive responses from neighborhoods receiving this service.

In addition to a review of the annual report, a proposal was presented to the City by Mr. Foss to provide this service to all City neighborhoods at a rate of \$1.05 to \$1.11 per household. Public Works staff was directed by the City Manager to review Mr. Foss's pro-forma financial projections and analyze expense projections at costs similar to what City costs would be. it was felt by the Committee that City-wide recycling could be provided at a rate initially at Mr. Foss's projections but that, over time, with equipment replacement costs and increased labor cost, rates would probably be nearer to \$1.50 per month.

The Committee felt that this might be the time for a serious consideration of a city-wide curbside program. The price per household is competitive. There seems to be community support. Because of Steve and Elaine's educational, one-on-one, efforts the existing participation and volumes are high. Also, due to Steve and Elaine's efforts, public relations of the program are also high-participants like what Steve and Elaine are doing.

The Committee closed its discussions with the following recommendations:

1. Review Mr. Foss's financial projections.
2. The Committee to report to the Council at the December 18 regular meeting on this subject.
3. Discuss with the rest of Council the proposal and to elicit public discussion, via the media, on what people might be willing to pay per month. (The Fosses are conducting a survey on this subject of the Spring Valley and Downtown routes.)
4. Staff to prepare a review and arrange for further detailed discussion with Council.