

ALLEN COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Board Meeting:

Present:

Chair: Linda Bloom, Vice Chair: Don Gerardot, Karen Goldner, Maye Johnson

Also Present:

Tony Burrus: Director; Bill Fishing: District's Attorney

Call to Order

Linda Bloom: Called the meeting to order at 10:31 a.m.

Approval of March Meeting Minutes

Karen Goldner: Motion to approve March minutes.

Maye Johnson: 2nd

Motion passed 4/0/0

DIVERSION CREDIT ORDINANCE

Tony Burrus: I've placed the Diversion Credit ordinance on the agenda at the request of Ms. Goldner.

Karen Goldner: I'd like to make a motion that the ordinance be amended to delete 2-1-2-1G – the part that the processors don't receive recyclables directly or indirectly from any entity that transferred its municipal solid waste out of the district for final disposal, nor itself transfer municipal solid waste out of the district for final disposal. This would allow Diversion Credit to any processor that met other qualification regardless of final resting place.

Maye Johnson: I am inclined to 2nd only to have further discussion. Is this a way to deal with better to look into a study? I want to make sure I'm making the right decision. Where am I? (to atty)

Bill Fishing: I think you seconded the motion.

Maye Johnson: I'm for a study – is that a second?

Bill Fishing: No it is an entirely new motion.

Maye Johnson: A better approach would be to do a study utilizing an outside consultant to take a look at the whole issue. At that point a better decision can be made.

Karen Goldner: I second the motion. Timing is a concern. Our job is discussion. This language is new. The timing is too coincidental with the upcoming City's procurement of a Trash Contractor. This sets Solid Waste District as an impediment to effective and efficient recycling and the competitive removal of Solid Waste. Solid Waste District put themselves in a position of being a problem and then others must work around them. Is that what the Solid Waste District should want to do? That's my opinion of what we've done with this ordinance. I think studying is better than ignoring it but timing and resources to study when in fact would have been the smarter to have studied it in the first place.

Tony Burrus: I understand the perception is that we have developed something that may impede the processing. The ordinance has been in place since 2003 with the exception of the change in 2010. The waste stream has shrunk: 60% of the waste stream is industrial, 21% is commercial and the rest is residential. You have the one of the smaller customers saying "you need to make a change in your business practices to effectuate us." So we welcome the study. We aren't here to impede anything. Our intent is to foster recycling post consumer materials and making into new products. If Diversion Credit is not achieving that then that is something we need to look at.

Karen Goldner: Let's be clear. The ordinance has been in existence since 1993. It was after 17 years – in January of this year that this limitation was put in. Perhaps there was extensive study, I'm new to the district and may be unaware of it. If so, I'd like to see it. I've not even been told who requested this change. To make people think that this is a long standing ordinance is simply incorrect. What I'm proposing is to return us to what the ordinance has been prior to 2010. The fact is this change creates unlevel playing field. If the point is to protect the Solid Waste District budget then perhaps that's a good enough reason to do it. I disagree. It has philosophical and practical ramifications with which I disagree. If the whole point of this organization is to protect our revenue then there are all kinds of things we should be doing differently. The fact is our revenue stream and our mission is diametrically opposed. Every pound or ton of e-waste or whatever diverted from the landfill reduces our income. That is the way it is supposed to be.

That is what we should be doing. What this ordinance does is say recycling is OK as long as one company does it – not so much OK when the other company does it. We are going to set up a system – a governmental system that creates an advantage. When we approve a claim we approve the largest payment to Serv All: \$32,000 - typical of every month. I don't think one company should be allowed that over the other. I don't view it as the role of government to say one company can have an advantage over the other – that is my philosophical problem. My practical problem is that it creates a very unlevel playing field.

I don't think one unit of government should be creating obstacles for another unit of government. Our taxpayers deserve better than that.

Don Gerardot: I asked for it. I feel it's not the Solid Waste Management's problem that the City Of Fort Wayne has this problem. I believe the City can work around this with this in place just as it is.

Linda Bloom: All in favor of studying the program say eye.

Karen Goldner: I'm not in favor of out of pocket expenses to study this. I am in favor of utilizing the staff.

Maye Johnson: Do we have the staff/

Tony Burrus: I think we do but I can't meet the time frame needed. I'd prefer to have an outside source then our neutrality is never questioned.

Maye Johnson: How much might this cost?

Tony Burrus: I'm not sure but based on previous studies I'd guess no less than \$20,000.

Maye Johnson: My concern is this body stays as neutral as possible on issues. At the same time I'm not sure this staff has the capabilities of doing that. I think it is an important issue and deserves that kind of attention. \$20,000. I don't see as that great of an amount to do a study and make the right decision. That is fair to all the Allen County taxpayers and people who use the system.

Linda Bloom: We have a motion and a second. All in favor.....

1/3/0

Motion dies

Karen Goldner: I am in favor of examining the issue and I'm not opposed to consultants per se. But I don't see that all the information in the world is going to change the decision of the district. I don't see any point in paying for information when it won't change the outcome.

DIRECTORS REPORT:

Tony Burrus: Website Statistics are included in your packet
Trash to Treasure was held on the 17th at the Library this year. We moved it from Science Central and had 73 participants and many spectators. For Earth Day we also tried something different instead of using the Fort Wayne Newspapers. We used a publication called Trash Talk. We'll alternate periodically. We are still working on major projects. Within the next few weeks we'll have a South East trailer site near or at Southgate Plaza. It is a replacement for the closed Walmart trailer. And we are looking at some sites further out... requiring a worthwhile investment on our part.

Karen Goldner: Do we do any analysis of the cost effectiveness of the trailers?

Tony Burrus **We are looking at that.** We do have some data to share with you.

Linda Bloom: I thought we'd done a study of that already that resulting in adding a trailer.

Tony Burrus: yes.

Karen Goldner: I'd like to see that. My other question is that at the advisory committee meeting 2 months ago there had been discussion of some sort of pulling of information together of all the programs to allow more of an analysis of all the programs.

Tony Burrus: I just had that discussion at staff this week. We hope to have it in the next couple weeks. We have set a deadline.

REVIEW OF CLAIMS:

Maye Johnson: Motion to pay claims

Karen Goldner: 2nd

Motion passed 4/0/0

Meeting Adjourned: 10:51

