

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording  
Channel: 6 - ATXN  
Recorded On: 5/25/2017 6:00:00 AM  
Original Air Date: 5/25/2017  
Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[12:50:15 PM]

May 25, 2017 city council waste management policy working group

[12:58:06 PM]

[ ♪ music ♪ ]

[1:02:24 PM]

>> Pool: before we get started let me ask if anybody in the audience -- we don't have any speaker sign-up or anything, but if there's anybody who wanted to say a few words -- I think we were gonna make room for Melanie today, but I don't see her here today. Okay. [ ♪ Music ♪ ] >> Pool: well, all right. I'll go ahead and call this to order. Leslie pool, councilmember for district 7, and this is our last scheduled meeting for the waste management policy working group. And today is Wednesday, may 23rd -- I'm sorry, Thursday, may 25th, and it's just after 1:00 P.M., about 10:3 P.M. And we're in city hall on west second street. I've called us to order and before we get started this afternoon and before we go into our topics of conversation, which we have quite a few, we've got a lot of ground to cover, for someone -- first I wanted to recognize Larry schooler. Larry has been our facilitator for these meetings and has done this

[1:04:25 PM]

work for the city previously, and today is his last facilitation with the city of Austin. He's temporarily moving to Florida with his family, and we hope to see him back here really, really soon. He's had a long tenure with the city, and, Larry, we will absolutely miss you. And I appreciate the extra efforts that he brought to the table in order to prepare us for these sessions and to conduct them with a real elegance. I really appreciate that, Larry. So thanks so much for all you've done for the city >> Thank you very much, councilmember. Appreciate that. >> Pool: And good luck in your next adventure and hope to see you back. >> As do I. [ Laughter ] >> Pool: One of these days. I also wanted to thank Ashley fisher. Is she out in the hallway there? >> Tried to escape. >> Pool: Many of you know is also leaving the city -- there she is, hey, Ashley. Many of you know is leaving the city to serve as publisher of the Austin monitor, which is a really great new assignment for her. Ashley, thank you so much for your service to the city, and thank you for making our work on this issue easier to accomplish. You and your staff have been really organized and have been a great support to the efforts of my staff and the other council offices. So thank you so much. And good luck on your new assignments. We'll look forward to seeing your name. Is there a mast head I guess for the Austin monitor? We'll look for your name on the line-up of all the staff. Congratulations to both and you

Larry. >> Thank you. >> Pool: All right. Let's get started today. We have a lot of ground to cover. We have landfills, biosolids, and special events. So, Larry, I'll kick it over to you. >> Thanks, councilmember.

[1:06:25 PM]

Great to be with you all for this swan song of sorts. [ Laughter ] And I do want to let y'all know how much a pleasure it has been to work with folks in this organic both on this process and I've certainly worked with people in this room on many other projects over the eight years I've been in this roll and the two years I was with councilmember -- thank you for making this such a great place for me to be and for my family to be and for what you do to make the city a great place to live. We have four presentations that staff wanted to make, and given what councilmember pool said about this being the last scheduled meeting, I think it's pretty imperative that we try to get through the presentations within about 30 to 45 minutes, including questions and answers. So as to give the working group enough time to hear feedback from y'all and to deliberate themselves here in what's expected to be their last meeting. So it might seem a little odd in my last facilitation to sort of crack the whip a little more but I'm not afraid to do so. I'm not going to get fired, I don't think. And so if I am a little more of a task master, that's the reason. It's not that I want to stifle discussion by any means but just that I want to help the group get their work done. Again, four presentations with a goal of finishing, you know, before 2:00 with all of them, including questions and answers, and so I'll kind of keep my eyes on the clock for that and then we'll go back into full group discussion as we have before. So I believe that our chief sustainability officer is going to go first. She's got the slides that say greenhouse gas emissions and waste management and I think she's joined by Zack. >> Thank you. I'm the chief sustainability officer and I am joined by Zack, the climate program manager, and also woody from

[1:08:27 PM]

resource recovery, senior planner. We will try to move through the information we have to share with you quickly. I do want to thank you for asking us to come and share this information. I do think it's important context for you as you undertake your deliberations. So if we could go to the next slide just to give quick context as a reminder in the community climate plan or adopted policy goal is to reach net zero community wide greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 adopted by council in June of 2015. We did have a collaborative process that went into creating the plan and there are people in the room that helped us with that on the technical assistance group focused on material and waste management. >> So in terms of greenhouse gas emissions in our community -- again, Zack, climate program manager with the city of Austin. This is the baseline community carbon footprint, all emissions occurring in the entirety of Travis county. In 2010, those were estimated to be 14 million metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e. Over 50% of those emissions come from electricity generation and use, second largest is transportation emissions. So all the transportation of all goods, services, people. The important one to think about in the context is waste and landfill being 3% of the total. That's reported emissions of methane and carbon dioxide from landfills in Travis county. Today when we're thinking about greenhouse gases there are numerous different greenhouse gases but the two we're focused on are carbon dioxide and methane. I put on there -- code of warning potential as one. Different gases in the amounts create different amounts of warning in

[1:10:32 PM]

atmosphere. >> The other one, burning fossil fuels is methane. Methane is natural gas which we burn in our houses which can come from fossil fuels but can also come from an aerobic digestion of inorganic material which creates methane is released. >> Important to know about methane is it has a potent effect of warming. It has between 34 and 86 times the warming power sort of per amount than carbon dioxide it's important to capture and destroy methane. These are the four major sectors of the community climate plan that correspond with the major sectors of emissions in our community. We had a technical advisor group that worked for about six months made up of nonprofits, waste management companies, city staff, Austin resource recovery staff, sustainability staff that created actions and strategies in this plan for the four major strategy categories are listed there. Organics diversion, purchasing, methane management, reduce, recycle everything we can in the community inspect the full community climate plan there are about 40 or so specific actions that are listed out in those categories. So now getting into the details of emissions from landfills, so this is just a diagram, a picture of generally what's happening in a landfill. Trash and material, organics, all sorts of actual are buried underground and when they get buried underground there's no oxygen present. When there's no oxygen present organic materials are digested and turn into carbon dioxide and methane. When you have gas being generated underground essentially you have wells that are sort of straws that

[1:12:33 PM]

are poked into the landfill and then you basically have a fan or blower and pull on those wells and the methane and CO2 generated underground is then pulled out. So then -- the other thing that's denoted on here is that there are also ground water monitoring wells, which are typically outside of a landfill, to collect any -- anything that would happen to leak out below the landfill into the ground water. Landfills are highly regulated by the TCEQ and EPA, making sure all gases and liquids are properly managed is an important thing. So once methane and CO2 comes out of wells that are in a landfill, you can -- numerous things can happen with that gas that comes out. Because it's methane like the natural gas you burn in your house it can be burned for energy. So the first picture here is a picture of a landfill gas generator. Two of the landfills in our community have landfill gas -- that we know of have landfill gas generators, so they're pulling the gas out of the landfill, running it through a generator, creating electricity that they're selling back to the grid. The other option is to flare the gas, essentially you can take the gases that pulled out, light it on fire, and then it turns into CO2 and the methane is destroyed, which is good. But the energy is just wasted, just given off as heat and light into the atmosphere. The third thing there, the picture of the little robot goggle looking thing, it's also important to note that any landfill even if you have landfill -- for gas, wells, collecting all the gas you can, there is going to be some amount of leakage that happens because you can't capture every single molecule generated so most all landfills have some amount of methane that's leaked to the atmosphere. >> My name is Woody, with Austin resource recovery and my role today is share with you some of the publicly available information that characterizes the landfills.

[1:14:34 PM]

And this is information collected and developed in the climate plan, and annual updates that come to council. Each one of the largest generating -- large landfills across the country have to report a large bit of data to EPA, which then they roll up into something called flight, EPA flight, facility large -- >> Facility level greenhouse gas. >> Thank you. And what we're sharing with you here is some of the information for the last few years, including not only those landfills in Travis county but also the landfill in Williamson county.

Here's the gas collection system and what the flow rates are. The landfills also report -- pushing the wrong button. The total amount of greenhouse gases that they're releasing. These are important -- calculated numbers, modeled numbers and are also reported based on flow rate, meters, flow meters on any emissions that may be turning energy. This is information actually reported by the landfills and the people in the room can probably explain better about how these numbers are calculated based on the modeling over years of disposals and the characterization of what's deposited and how it degrades over time. >> So in terms of emissions from -- associated with landfilling be, the first one we just talked try to is emissions actually generated inside of the landfill and then come off the landfill. The other things that really important to take into account is transportation. Because we use fossil fuels to -- for the majority of transportation in our community, we just did some really back of the napkin sort of comparison calculations here of different scenarios of transporting waste to three

[1:16:34 PM]

different landfill sites. So this is assuming that, you know, we have ten trucks making four trips going from downtown to different landfills and it's assuming that they're all using fossil diesel and all getting 1 million per gallon. You could have different assumptions but it shows the further a truck goes the more CO2 it generates. You can reduce emissions from transportation by using alternative fuels, like natural gas or methane or renewable energy to run an electric truck. So you can reduce the emissions that way. The second way is just to have less trips and/or shorter trips. I guess the last thing that's important to take into account is the numbers here you see are less than 10,000 metric tons, and the emissions on the previous slide were in the 50 to 100, over a hundred thousand metric tons. Even though it may seem like there's a lot of trucks on the road, the emissions associated with transporting material is probably less than the emissions that are actually occurring at the landfills. Like I said the emission factor being used for diesel here is 10.2 kilograms of CO2 were gallon of diesel. If you use a less carbon intensive fuel that reduces emissions right there. >> Last couple of slides here. We felt like we wanted to add some additional department of as well around environmental but also social impacts, so sustainability and just about the environment, it's also about social and economic issues as well. We don't necessarily have as much data to share with you as we did about the greenhouse gas Egyptians but just to note that there are truck traffic impacts to these neighborhoods, creating more congestion and potentially some issues there adjacent to the neighborhoods where these landfills are located, depending on the population and the density. And then other neighborhood impacts we could expect to see such as odors, dust,

[1:18:37 PM]

particulates and other air pollutants depending on fuels and potential ground water pollution, litter and pass. We don't have a lot of data on that but we wanted to note there are other potential neighborhood and community impacts. In conclusion, just to kind of wrap up the environmental considerations, if you want to factor those into your decision-making process, we could be thinking of minimizing the neighborhood impacts locally. We could be thinking about minimizing the amount of fossil fuels used for the transportation to the landfills and then maximizing the capture, destruction, and beneficial reuse of methanes that generated on-site at the landfills. And that is our last slide. >> Councilmember? >> Alter: Thank you. For the slide on page 5 of our handout, I think it's slide 10, where there's quite a bit of variation in the CO2 emissions, is that largely because just one is an older landfill and has more stuff there so it's generating more, or is there something about the processes that are different or the degrees of recomputer

that explain that -- recapture that explain that? >> I think it's probably best a question directed to the landfills themselves. It's data that they report on their -- for each one of the landfills. >> Alter: Because it would be relevant if we -- I don't know that this is the case scientifically, but if we had to choose between a certain number of landfills and they had different capacities for the same amount of stuff in terms of how much the emissions were, we would want to factor that in. That's why I'm trying to understand. >> Council, do you want to hear from [indiscernible]? >> Thank you. I'd very much like to address slide 10. The black line there in the middle is representing Texas disposals systems and it is not because we're an older landfill. We're actually a much younger landfill than the other two. The reason that it appears

[1:20:37 PM]

this way is because the model that this is a projection, this is not a measurement, it is -- it's a very clumsy model that does not take a lot of things into did the, like the type of cover used, the local organics diversion programs going on, liquids in there, the amount of dry [indiscernible] That you're achieving, the reason -- and it credits -- gives you a lot of credit for installation of additional wells. We're installing all the wells we need to keep up with the gas, but we've been so successful with our organics diversion program that we're not generating enough gas in reality to justify a waste -- gas to energy plant just yet. We're very much looking forward to utilizing that but currently we collect and mitigate and so this formula, it kind of penalizes you for doing well in avoiding gas generation. So in reality, I would say we feel very certain that those much older and larger landfills are producing much more greenhouse gases than a younger landfill that has always had aggressive organics diversion program and has incredible soils that -- and daily cover practices that entomb the waste and prevent the migration of gas. So I have a detailed scientific explanation. I'm happy to provide to you it's in writing. Because we've dealt with the problems with this projection, which doesn't take into account local factors. >> Alter: Okay. I would like to see that but what you're saying, and I'm sorry if I had the lines

[1:22:37 PM]

confused over who was who. So you're saying that this is exaggerating the amount of gas emissions that are projected? >> Absolutely. >> Alter: Because of the formula and you have different procedures. >> Yes, ma'am. >> Pool: And is this -- I don't know if Adam can answer or maybe our staff. You've got the EPA logo on there and cfr, the federal regulations. This is a federal -- is this driven by federal rules and calculations? >> Yeah there's a federal greenhouse gas reporting rule for point sources in the United States. >> Pool: So we don't have to add to our agenda of things to fix the calculations for -- [laughter] >> No. >> I think what he's getting is there are two methodologies basically but which you can report emissions. One methodology is using calculations, which you put in inputs and it gives you a number. The second option is collecting flow measurements and having actual concentrations and reporting more specific measured numbers of the landfills, of the landfill emission, gas emissions. I think the landfills that are reporting lower emissions are the ones that are measuring reported measured data. >> Pool: You would say those are closer to the actual emissions levels? >> I don't know about national. >> No, actual. >> Oh, actual. >> Pool: Yeah, actual. >> The ones that are recovering and producing energy are all -- there ISES are our closed landfill, which does not and it's -- and the wilco landfill also does not generate electricity. >> Pool: Thanks. >> Alter: I missed part of what you just said. So you're saying that they -- the ones that are on here at the lower level are also the ones that you have measurements that it has lower CO2, not just the

[1:24:39 PM]

projections? >> The reporting that's shown on the EPA website, it shows that those landfills are collecting flow data and sampling and more measurement, more specific data to come up with lower numbers. And the higher bar on the chart is displayed because it's using their estimation calculation, not measuring specific. >> Alter: So these are capturing two different methods? >> Yeah. And they're both in compliance. >> Alter: Both in compliance but they are two different measures, one is a projection and one is based on real data. >> Yeah. >> Alter: And what Mr. Gregory is suggesting, if we had the real data, which they don't have -- >> It might show a different thing. >> Alter: It might show it difficult. Is that correct? Okay, thank you. >> Pool: Questions for y'all and then we can go to see if anybody else does and then we can go to the next briefing. Does the landfill gas collection and usage approach where it's anaerobic, does it allow for oxygenation at all or has that never been a consideration? >> I don't know what that means. >> Pool: I was looking for a way to make it anaerobic. When you compost the refuse it turns into soil on a smaller scale. Maybe this kind of trash doesn't break down as quickly as vegetable waste. >> Sort of what Adam was discussing landfills today are pretty much entombed so oxygen is kept out as well as moisture and that does for anaerobic decomposition. >> Pool: Introducing oxygen would not aid the decomposition or reduce the amount of methane that comes out? >> What you're getting at if you keep the organics out of the landfill and compost them in an anaerobic setting with oxygen then you don't generate methane. >> Pool: So if we're better

[1:26:39 PM]

at separating out the organics, then we have a much better outcome? >> Yeah, definitely. >> Pool: And then I was just going to say, on the top of page 6, which is the transportation emissions, councilmember kitchen is heading up an effort on electric vehicles and so forth and I think you mentioned that it may be possible to have alternative fuels in the trucks. >> Yeah. >> Pool: Is that something that's happening already, or is that still -- >> Yeah. I'm not -- we would have to -- we'd have to hear from the hollers about how far that technology has come. I'm not sure if a plug-in electric waste hauler truck is available right now. It might be. If it's not now it's probably coming soon. >> Kitchen: I was going to say the city adopted a plan for electric, starting with smaller vehicles. I know our city was looking at that, you know, our fleet is looking at that but it would be interesting to understand from -- you know, from our haulers what the potential is in the future. And if there's ways in which the city can support that. The challenging we're looking at right now -- challenge we're looking at right now is focusing primarily on bus systems. But, you know, as we become aware of and look more to available funding, it would be interesting for us to understand what the potential is. >> I want to suggest that we go ahead and move on to the next presentation and if anything else comes up we can ask it after the presentations are concluded. Thanks to the sustainability. >> Thanks. >> I think that takes us to biosolids with -- okay. >> Pool: While they're coming up -- can you hear

[1:28:40 PM]

me? This is on in the atrium so if it's getting crowded in here you can sit out in relative comfort in the atrium too. >> All righty. I'm Daryl Slusher, assistant director with Austin water. I'm here to help answer questions later, our presentation is gonna be done by Judy Musgrove to my right. She's the division manager, process engineering with Austin water, been with the utility for 25 years. Judy? >> Good morning or it's afternoon, isn't it? I'm here to talk to you about biosolids process. I'm not sure how much time my

presentation is so I'll probably talk pretty fast. First a quick run through of the process of how biosolids work. It's kind of small to see that but the biosolids begin their journey as sludge in the bottom of the clarifiers at the south Austin regional plant and the wall numbering creek wastewater plants, pumped over, thickened, digested and water. Digestion turns our sludge into biosolids with the regulatory designation of class B. This transformation happens through anaerobic digestion, a process that significantly reduces pathogens, psrp. The biosolids then either land applied to fields or mixed with yard waste delivered by arr and made in a compost. The other Texas cities I thought you might want to see how they're treating their biosolids. We're on top there, compost and class B land application. Dallas, Denton, El Paso, Fort Worth -- I mentioned den, to they're not the same size but doing 100% compost

[1:30:40 PM]

but they are a small city. The city of Austin prides itself as not going to the landfill as an option. We have that option available to us but haven't used it in at least 30 years that I'm aware of. We started the dillo dirt program in the '90s and were cutting edge at that time, land applying and making compost and both considered beneficial reuse so we were touted as leaders in the environmental community, beneficially reusing 100% of our biosolids, which was unusual back then. Non-texas cities, Boulder, Denver, Eugene, Portland, they're all doing a variety of things but a lot of them are doing land application. So why are we here today? We went before council in August with a proposed contract to handle the biosolids at Hornsby. Council postponed the request, asking us to go back to water and wastewater and zero waste advisory commissions and work with them to develop policies and ensure our contract fits with those policies. A joint working group was created out of those two commissions, a group of six came up with a recommendation of 11 policies. The triangle was the -- upside down triangle was the lynchpin of those policies and resolved around the high arcky of the uses. Class a compost is the goal without incineration and other ten policies address testing, screening, emergency conditions, odors, labelling, dillo dirt use, piloting new technology, came in indication with other departments. So they addressed a variety of policies. Austin water's goal is to treat the sludge and then move the material offsite as efficiently as possible. We're committed to being environmentally Progressive as possible while remaining

[1:32:40 PM]

operationally effective. The city is growing and so is the amount of sludge produced so whatever methods we choose to reuse our biosolids we have to make sure it can handle the biosolids we have now and those yet to come. Our concern is if the market doesn't exist in Austin for 100% of our biosolids going to dillo dirt quality compost. We've had a lot of difficulty in selling it but we do agree we should ask for proposals to convert 100% of the biosolids into compost. We recommend to council that contractors be allowed to propose a diversification in the type of compost produced to broaden the categories of buyers they will have for the compost. This will also give us additional responders for the rfp. Austin water would ask for an inventory management plan as part of the proposal for the compost and any compost produced will immediate to make the class a requirements using the process to further reduce pathogens, pfrp and need to be screened before final use. This is our schedule. It's -- it looks long, but we have a lot of things -- steps we have to follow. If we get policy direction in June, then we're going to ask for input from stakeholders and the two commissions, water, wastewater, zero waste advisory, through the months of July and August with a typical process of purchasing -- starting at that point and then ending with a recommended proposal going back to the two commissions. Hopefully by December and January. That would give us time to go to

council and then have a new contractor on-site by April, giving us a transition period to move from one contractor to another. In order for us to keep on schedule and any revisions to the Austin -- the lobby ordinance, anti-lobbying ordinance that council wishes to have in place for this solicitation would need

[1:34:42 PM]

to be adopted by mid-september for us to stay with this schedule about orientation we'll be with the -- otherwise, will be with the existing anti-lobbying ordinance. That's all I've got. >> Alter: As I'm understanding, you need policy direction now with respect to the biosolids contract? You need resolution of the ordinance no later than September if we're going to change it for this contract? >> That's our schedule, yes. >> Alter: Okay. >> There's, you know, different ways to kind of move our schedule around. We have -- the zero waste advisory commission and wastewater commission meet on the same night so I have them split apart one month and the next month. If we had a special meeting we could kind of squish that in a little bit. But, yes, to meet the schedule we have right now mid-september would be a great time to have a resolution on the anti-lobbying ordinance if there was a change to it. >> Alter: What are the constraints on the current contract with respect to that? >> The current contract is in holdover phase and it's through the end of March 2018. So we have until then. >> Alter: So it seems like a big part of this debate is over what kind of biosolid product went at the end. Can you go into a little bit more detail to help me understand, when you say other compost products, what some of these trade-offs are. I'm hearing you're not able to sell the dillo dirt so we might want to diversify the market we're appealing to. I'm not understanding what the range of options are for those other materials and what the trade-offs of those materials versus the dillo dirt might be in terms of odor or other things I don't know about for neighbors or

[1:36:42 PM]

other stakeholders that we'd be concerned with. >> Well, right now, the contract we have right now is for land application class B and also composting. And we -- >> Can I interrupt really quick. Can you say in there who the contract is with so I can understand. >> Synagro. Part of our agreement with them was that it would be an agricultural use compost because we didn't want a competition with the dillo dirt. We didn't want them selling to the same people we sell to and hurting our sales even more. So they developed a compost that was attractive to the farmers that would use it on their fields and they developed quite a market for that. Synagro is here. They can probably speak to that more than I can. They've been using that compost on our site and we've had no odor complaints and there's been no problems with it, as far as we know. We haven't heard any complaints from any of the landowners that have taken it on. But it meets class a. It's just -- it's not cured as long as the dillo dirt is cured. We keep dillo dirt on sight when we can't sell it it's on-site for quite a while but it cures for eight to nine months or more and so that's quite a lot of time to have curing piles sitting on-site. But we don't necessarily -- we're not proponents of the agricultural market necessarily. We -- compost can be as a designated use for any market. It could be right-of-way for txdot, it could be land for the farmers, it could be, you know, any designated use. So -- but we would like the contractor to be able to have the option. Now, our -- the best proposal may be hundred% high quality compost. If they have a market that would be fine. We just want to open it up

[1:38:44 PM]



to as many respondents as possible to have the best solution for the city, and it just makes sense to us that diversification is better than having all your eggs in one basket and the type of compost you're using. >> Alter: If you limit it to only dillo dirt then we're limiting the applicants who would be trying to -- >> Well, I think anybody could do only dillo dirt. The problem is the price will go up because they'll have to give it away or truck it somewhere. I just don't think the market is in Austin area for hundred% dillo dirt. We've had a hard time selling it. >> Alter: Do we have uses for that dillo dirt internally? I know I ran a park project we used dillo dirt and I know it's not on the scale of some of these things but we were charged for that, and it was for a city park. I mean, how does that work? >> We've tried. We've marketed it to our -- you know, other departments, as free, come get it, we'll even deliver it. It's been difficult to get anyone to use it. I don't know. I don't know if they don't think about it for there's not that many uses for it, but we've talked with the parks director and she's encouraged them to use it. And we do have a agreement with parks. They use it in the planting of their new trees. It's just not enough for what we produce. We have a lot of biosolids in our site. >> Alter: Sure. >> And the city use wouldn't be you have no even make a dent in what we've got coming in. >> Alter: But you are doing that with -- within the city. >> Right. >> Alter: And you're not charging other departments within the city? >> We have several donations that we give dillo dirt to. >> Alter: Okay, thank you. >> Go ahead. >> Pam with synagro. Just to reiterate what Judy said, as a marketer of compost, we find it most

[1:40:45 PM]

desirable to have access to multiple markets. As you guys know, it's a law of supply and demand. The more potential users you have the more you can drive value from the product and if you only can have one product and one market to go into, you don't have redundancy, you have a higher risk program, you have lower reliability, and each of the uses is unique but beneficial. I mean, soil blending is one of the things that maybe wasn't mentioned that is a great use to restore topsoils, as well as, you know, highway restoration projects, mine reclamation, agricultural use and horticulture and regional use. They're all good in high uses of the compost, and, you know, why limit yourself and make it more difficult or more expensive when they're all good? >> Council, I know Mr. Dobbs wants to speak. I think it might be prudent to get through the other presentations first. What would you prefer? Any preference? Go ahead, Mr. Dobbs. >> Thank you. I'll keep it brief. I just want to make sure we clarify that -- maybe early on, as we're learning about this we spoke in terms of everything needed to be dillo dirt. I think as we move forward there's -- everything has to be that exact quality and style of compost. You know, that we recognize there are other valid types. And I want to flag this here. Our major concern is that there's stuff that everybody calls biosolids and everybody recognizes as being biosolids. There's stuff that everybody calls compost and recognizes as compost. There are some materials that are in kind of a gray area, where some people would consider them to be compost materials and other would consider them closer to biosolids. And what we're concerned about is just making sure that the city of Austin has a bright line that reflects our values and our interests

[1:42:46 PM]

so that we are, you know, raising everything to that level. Whether that's -- dillo dirt would clear that. There are other products that would as well. We want to make sure we're -- and we're totally happen to see a diversity of products because we recognize the need for diversity in the market. But we just want to make sure that we're clear that we're not saying everything has to be dillo dirt. We're just saying that everything has to be compost and the city of Austin needs a definition of that that meets our interests. >> Garza: I have

a quick clarification question. For the -- this slide that gives -- so the current -- remind me. The current contract is -- some of it is the land application and the rest goes to compost. And the current contract is with synagro for the land application senator. >> They do both. >> They do both. What was the change that came before council that kind of spurred all this? >> The contract expired in November, and so we were trying to get another contract established. We were able to hold that contract over until the end of March, but we can only hold over -- purchasing did answer that better than me, but we're just still under the current contract. >> Garza: I thought there was some change to it that spurred this conversation, that there was going to be more land application? >> No. We -- well, we went for a request for proposal allowing anyone to propose anything. We're just looking for the best option. It could have been more class B land application. At the time we just were going to continue with what we've been doing but the best proposal was hundred% compost so that's what we brought forth. Since then we've realized we were a little out of touch with the community and that everyone is pushing more for 100% compost and we're fine with that and so our next proposal would be a request for proposal -- rfps will be for 100% compost. >> Councilmember, also think

[1:44:47 PM]

about the sales of dillo dirt dropped dramatically over the last few years and that was one of the reasons we brought this new contract forward and asked for a broader range, asking them to tell us how to best handle these. >> Garza: Okay, thanks. >> Alter: But the proposed contract that got nixed was for 100% compost? >> Correct. >> Alter: And by some definition? And what definition -- you know, what was not -- what was proposed that doesn't fall under somebody else's definition? >> I'll try to jump in. >> Mostly in answer to that question, I feel like this issue that came before uses is sort of represented of the confluence of all the things we've been talking about because we were being told it was 100% compost but there's a lot of uncertainty about how that was happening. There was claims they were making compost kind of to Mr. Dobbs' point with an ill-defined specifications in four to six weeks and we were all sort of saying, well, how are you going to do that? And then that became proprietary information that we couldn't get access to, so that's where this anti-lobbying came in. It really came down to what Andrew Dobbs just said, we didn't feel -- there wasn't strong enough language or protection, so to speak, that we would actually get a compost that we felt comfortable with. It felt like they were doing what they needed to do to make sure they could sell it but not giving -- at least not in the language we saw assurances that it would meet strong definitions. I want to mention that we have the commission representations from the joint commissions but I'm pretty sure this came back to Zack as a full commission and idea we had an additional set of things we commented on this so I'd love to see that just because I know this is -- was that we're looking at but I think we did make additional comments on these

[1:46:47 PM]

11 recommendations. >> I see commissioner's hand. Somebody needs to hand her the microphone so she can be heard and then council I really recommend we move to the next presentation. >> The agreement of the joint working group came up with is what you have in your packet today and that was -- is actually very much in line with what the utility is requesting right now. They're within the guidelines that was developed by this joint work group. After this joint work group created the guidelines and voted on them we took them back to respective commission and the water and wastewater commission voted it through and zero waste made their own personal changes to it which I don't feel is a very good representation of partnering

between the two detergents to be quite honest -- departments, to be quite honest. >> I wanted to respond to councilmember Garza's question about the difference. My understanding is the difference is currently the city is doing part of the work and synagro is doing part of the work and that the new contract would have synagro doing everything. Is that not -- that's my understanding. >> Good point. But I guess we forgot -- I Pruettt to mention that we stopped doing dillo dirt quite a while ago. Sell enough to get rid of it so we now still have 16 curing piles on-site that could be dillo dirt that are made by city forces, taking up all of the olded and a little bit of the new pad where synagro is using the rest of it but that's correct. Originally, with the contract we're under now, we had -- we were using the old pad and they were using the new pad. But now the new contract it would be hundred percent by contractor, just because we aren't marketing geniuses and we can't seem to sell our product. So it just made more sense to farm it all out. Thank you. >> Yeah, so I think that basic issue of whether or not there should have been a policy discussion about privatizing something that

[1:48:48 PM]

the city was doing in-house was another issue that came up with that. >> Thanks to Austin water. We'll move to Austin resource recovery presentation on special service, be which is the board picture of a truck. [ Laughter ] >> Good afternoon, commissioners, Jessica king, Austin resource recovery. The question posed to you regarding Austin resource recovery specifically is regarding the provision of waste management services for special events. Currently a lay of the land of where we are right now. Events that are not official city cosponsored events, contract for their own trash and recycling services with their own preferred vendor. We, arr, does offer but we do not require services to events that are cosponsored by the city of Austin. And just one more thing to clarify what I mean by cosponsorship because it's so not clear, when we look, when the department looks at cosponsorships we are looking at a resolution that has been passed by council specifically stating that it is a city cosponsored event. So there is documentation clarifying that. So arr's special events services include coordinating dumpster service using contracts, providing litter abatement services, managing trash diversion containers and street sweeping. These services are provided by the department, which enables the city council to wave the fees associated to those services. And there's a resolution back in 2009 related to the background, and this evolved during discussion about how to green events and originally when the zero waste resolution had passed

[1:50:48 PM]

and the city was moving towards a zero waste community, the idea of requiring special events to have recycling services and other greening initiatives was discussed and there was significant discussion around the fact that city cosponsored events did not provide those services at the time. One -- couple of key recommendations during that resolution discussion was in order to green activities at events, especially with regards to recycling, is paring containers, making sure that you have a recycling container next to a trash container. And in particular monitoring those containers. Education outreach in advance, things like that were also discussed. But the key thing that kind of brought the issue to a head was the services required from a staffing perspective to monitor those containers. And so the resolution came through that said Austin resource recovery please provide services to the special events for recycling and the idea was to test and evaluate some of the recommendations that were provided at the time, which included providing services to monitor the containers. Because if anybody knows, I've been one of those people who had to dig out of the recycling bins, but people do not -- they don't care, as they're walking through whatever

container is there, they're just throwing. So it gets a little -- the contamination issue, especially with regards to organs or composting becomes a heightened issue so we wanted to make sure that was clear. So the policy consideration in front of you now is should the department continue providing waste management services for special events? There are clearly pros. It allows private vendors to compete, to provide services for these events. Because as the department has admitted, we are competing with services in the area. Events have grown significantly, as you all well know, over the years with the city, so we are in competition with these private service providers. The cons, if arr is not

[1:52:50 PM]

allowed to provide or no longer directed to provide service for these city cosponsored events in particular this would eliminate the ability to wave fees for those events. So I want to draw your attention to a table that we discussed and that we've prepared. It was requested -- and this is also online so I apologize for the small font, but if I could draw your attention to kind of midway through, south by southwest is something we haven't talked about. We know that the ability for the department to provide coordinated services for a variety of events is that ability to wave and that is a key component. Previously there was discussion about why would the city want to -- want -- why would an event want to use city services or coordinate -- or have coordinated services by the city? There are a variety of reasons. Namely, especially with small events you tend to deal with a very small staff who don't have the time to manage every single detail related to an event. They're stretched thin. And to be able to say, oh, that's one more thing I don't have to worry about, that is a huge relief that I've seen amongst some event organizers. But the way of the fees, we've possessed our fees, it's clear anyone who wanted to compete could easily have an edge against us to bid at a lower rate and submit a bit to those event organizers to go with a lower see if that is an option. Again, the city does not require any event organizer to utilize city services for their special event. South by southwest is a unique situation. Because of the mix and minimal of how that -- mingle of how that event occurs, it is in a downtown urban core so little bit more detail. There's about 210,000 of litter abatement, what that means is our guys on the ground, cleaning up, street sweeping, during south by, these guys are awesome. They are basically 23 hours a day and on the ground 23 hours a day providing services to keep the city as

[1:54:50 PM]

clean as possible. So they're not just located in the urban core either. They do end up having to spread out a little bit beyond the designated area, and we do a lot of coordination with municipal court for areas like Rainey street outside of the central business district, but that's where the heavy weight is. Dumpster service for the downtown area is ramped up under the downtown contract, which is currently held by Texas disposals systems. So those facilities that require additional dumpster service we increase the number of reyou cycling dumpsters as well as the number of trash dumpsters for facilities located within that defined district. That is under the contract service area. And so that is handled by the current service provider, which is Texas disposal systems. If south by or if the city were not directed to continue providing services for these events, we would have a big challenge in the south by situation because of how expansive that particular event is. And then of course all the other smaller events that have challenges on their own right. So I'm available for questions. >> It's not really my place to ask one, but I have to say that on 28 I was a little confused. So I'm going to challenge my colleague on my last day. >> Sure. On your last day. [ Laughter ] >> Because it says -- I'm assuming under pros what we're talking about is the continuation of arr providing the service, and so I didn't understand what it meant that continuing to provide the service

would remove us from competition and allow for private vendors to compete for the service. >> Yeah. I guess -- and so the complaint by service providers was that we were a competition. We were competition for them. So by being directed to not provide service, then we would eliminate that concern. >> By being directed to not provide service? >> Exactly. >> So that -- okay.

[1:56:50 PM]

>> So that's written wrong. That's the clarification there. >> So this is a set of pros and cons for not being -- having arr not provide the service anymore? >> That's correct, yes. >> Okay. Little slow on my last day. [ Laughter ] Questions for Ms. King? >> Alter: Sorry. >> Councilmember alter. >> Alter: Sorry. So it seems like this is a lot about south by and their particular -- can you tell me a little more about some of the particularrators with south by? Because it seems more than just a question of whether we can waive the fees. I mean part of what makes south by such an incredible addition to our community is the way it galvanizes all sorts of other things around, it which it would be hard to hold, you know, south by accountable for that but then if you have all of these having to do the services at once, we could end up with some really [indiscernible] Streets which could create all sorts of problems. So, I mean, there's another solution that is solved by this other than the fee waivers, which I think is part of the reason why council in past has opted to do this. So can you I will lum naught a little more some of those dynamics for us? >> In terms of south by specifically? >> Alter: I mean if I'm looking at this, that is -- I mean, that that's the one that's of significance that you would be concerned about. >> Mainly because if the department is no longer providing those services, we would have to be very clear about who would. In the downtown area for litter abatement services so the distinction between the dumpster service, which I think brought this issue to light, litter abatement services is straight cleaning and litter control containers. So to have a private entity do that in a situation where there are not clear boundaries and how far, who goes where, there's a lot of

[1:58:52 PM]

confusion that could occur. There is some there is some now usually when formula one was in town the very first time, there were clear and distinct boundaries. It was clear, if you were the event organizer for that event that took responsibility for the area, you were responsible within that boundary. But with south by, it is spread across the city. And there are -- there are situations where there are boundaries, but then you start to deal with -- because of the flow of traffic and not cars, but people, the movement of people from one event to another, and the overlay of all those events creates some confusion, so theoretically, the ideal situation is to have one service provider provide that level of cleanup in the area. And from the dumpster perspective, that's what we do. Litter cleaning and street cleaning perspective, that's how we handle things, too. Did that help? I'm not sure -- >> Alter: It does. I'm just trying to understand why we're being asked to deal with this question, because it doesn't -- I'm not sure I understand -- I guess I'd like to better understand what the alternative is to arr, providing -- I understand there may be debate over whether the city wants to wave fees for it, but I'm not fully understanding the private alternative to this and how that would play out for that situation, which seems to be -- I'm not really decision sure making adecision over waste issues is a proper role for council. >> I think you've hit the big issue of south by. I think the rest of them are much more minor, but that's a big service that south by could, if we didn't provide that service, they would have to go get that from the private

[2:00:54 PM]

vendors, and I think that's the issue, is why is the city providing that service for that event. Council has chosen in the past to say, city staff, we're going to waive the fee, and you're going to provide the service. The question we're asking this panel, and eventually city council, do you want us to continue that policy, or should south by be required to -- we would have to be seriously engaged in making sure that the service is provided adequately, but should they be provide to seek that service from private vendors? That's the question. >> Alter: But south by is not one model. I mean, it happens at one time period, but it's not a model -- >> That's right. >> Alter: -- In the same way that -- >> That's right. But they do have services that they would have to acquire for their events that we provide for free now, essentially. So they would have to do -- we would still clean downtown streets. That's our function. But there's some things that south by would have to seek service from the private vendors if council chooses to go that path. >> And just generally, the question was posed by the service providers, why is the department providing services for special events. That was something that was discussed heavily at this air waste advisory commission, and you have commission members that could speak to that. >> It's certainly possible to continue this discussion with people like commissioner bland and commissioner height, you have one presentation left. So I'd rather the discussion take place after that occurs, despite the fact I know there are important comments to be made, if that's okay. So Ms. King and Mr. Goode, I think Mr. Scarborough will be last, and then we will come back to folks that wanted to weigh in.

[2:03:00 PM]

>> Good afternoon, councilmembers, members of the work group, James Scarborough, purchasing office. I was asked to -- just to facilitate your discussions, do a very quick overview of the items that kind of brought some of these policy issues to the concern of council and to this work group, just to perhaps give you some consideration as we go into these final discussions. So very quick. Particularly for arr, we brought forward a solicitation for citywide refuse circling, organics and special waste collection. This solicitation was issued back in June of last year and closed the end of July in 2016. We brought forward an rca to council on December, as well as February twice, and ultimately the item was not approved. The current contract with republic is on holdover and is good through December 31st of 2017. The next contract is for the expansion of residential organics collection program. This solicitation was issued back in may of 2016 and closed at the end of June of that same year. Staff brought a -- an item to council in March, and this -- excuse me -- 2017. This item has been postponed indefinitely. The offer is still valid. The current contract, the pilot, is on holdover through October of this year. The next contract is for residential dumpster collection for duplexes and fourplex customers. This solicitation has not been issued. It is on hold until the policy decisions of this work group, the current contract, with waste management is on hold over. It is good through November of this year. For Austin water, the management of biosolids

[2:05:01 PM]

reuse solicitation was issued in April of 2016, closed middle of may that same year. Staff brought rca to council in August, twice in October, and in December of 2016. Ultimately, that item was withdrawn. Current contract is on holdover and is good through March 2018. Finally, for the sale of removal of compose material, solicitation was issued March of 2016, closed in may, same year. Staff brought item to council in August, twice in October of 2016, and the item was subsequently withdrawn. The offers have expired. There is no current contract currently, there are 14 compost piles that need to be removed. There was a

recent fire in may, just a few weeks ago, to reduce the risk of further fires, staff were involved in selling of the two oldest piles. This was done under emergency exemption. This was done this week. To mitigate future risks on the very short-term, staff intend to issue a small-dollar solicitation, has issued, to sell just two more piles. The solicitation closes. Offers are due by middle of June, June 13th, 2017, specifically. >> Pool: James, can you go through these? You mentioned republic was the first one, and organics by gosh were the second. >> Yes. For the expansion of residential organics collection program, the current contractor is organics by gosh. For the residential dumpster collection for duplex and fourplex customers, current contractor is waste management. And for management of biosolids reuse, current contract is synabro. >> Pool: Then the last one. >> Last one, there is no

[2:07:01 PM]

current contract. We are just selling -- yes. >> Pool: So synagro is managed on a biosolids, organics by gosh is residential organics and public is citywide refuse. >> Yes, ma'am. >> And citywide refuse is just from the city facility. Is that correct? When you talk about citywide refuse, that's referring to the city facility's refuse, because we don't do the commercial? You mention here selling it. Is there a reason we can't just give the dirt away and not have to host it? >> I'd have to defer to our colleagues at Austin water. >> We -- once we screen the curing piles, we have a fee schedule that lists \$10 a cubic yard for dirt, so we can't just give it away because it's actually got value. So -- once it's screened. What we've been doing is selling the curing piles, which do of some value, or they did, but we -- so we've been advertising those, just enough to get us some room on the pad to be able to move around. We've got actually 16 piles, and we need to sell some of those. And so we've got a small solicitation out. >> Alter: But like UT has lots of land, and I mean -- >> We can give it away to a worthy -- like a non-profit, yeah, we do that we've been -- all they have to do is apply to us, and we evaluate their request, and then we've been giving -- like the peace conservation

[2:09:02 PM]

society got some dirt recently. But the problem is, they have to come pick it up or hire a trucking company to get it, so that's kind of been the problem up to this point, if it's a non-profit, they typically don't have their own trucks, and it's difficult for them to pick it up. >> Alter: But if we're having trouble because we're storing it and there are people who could use it, I mean, we have the trucks, I mean -- >> Well, we -- Austin water doesn't have the trucks, but, yes, we've thought about, you know, trying to, you know, do something where we could hire trucking companies -- it's just -- it's not -- our core business is treating wastewater and treating sludge, and it's just difficult for us to deal with this other end of it, that it would be -- seem like it's a good division point to push this off on a company to handle the marketing and selling. But, I mean, we could give more away in donations if we had the worthy, you know, people to get it. But, again, it just makes a small dent in what we've got to -- you know, what we've got to get rid of. We've got -- these piles are huge. So ... >> Other questions? Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: I appreciate the difficulties that they're having with, you know, giving it away. Maybe it would be helpful if you could help us understand -- you don't have to do this now, but maybe provide to us more information about what non-profits we have had contacts with. So -- >> Yes. We can do that. We have records of all the non-profits that have been getting dididirt and how much they received. >> Kitchen: I'm curious if anyone asked for some dididirt but hasn't been able to receive it, and what the barriers are. You just mentioned some barriers, but it would be helpful for us to understand which organizations we're talking about. >> Okay. >> Councilmembers, if I can clarify, it comes up from time to time in procurement,

[2:11:03 PM]

the question of disposition of surplus property, and the giving away of government property. Typically, regulations would prescribe that this property be sold. When it's given away, typically there's a question is to who it was given to, what were the grounds of the gifts, and were there opportunities for others to partake in that gift. So in this case, if we were to contemplate anything other than competitive sales, we would need to consult with law and applicable statutes. >> Kitchen: That would be helpful. I'm familiar with those kind of constraints, but I think it could be a useful question, probably wouldn't take an inordinate amount of time to determine what the scope of the possibilities would be. >> Very good. >> Alter: Does aid also -- I mean I don't have the -- I'm not sure that I'm connecting with dots of, you know, how much there is and how much could be used in places across Austin, but it seems to me that we're hiring somebody, that we're paying to do something, that we could somehow be giving away and at the very least be helping people in our own community, and they're not based in Austin, and they're getting the benefit. I'm just -- >> Kitchen: We have, as part of our request for proposals, the fact that we wanted to continue the donations that we've been doing. But the most we've ever given away one year has been 10,000 cubic yard. One pile is 8,000 cubic yards. So it's just -- and that's over the course of a year we gave away 10,000. It's just -- the volume isn't there emphasis. >> Alter: Okay. >> Any other questions for purchasing before we let them -- is that a question, Mr. Gregory? >> I've got two questions. Would it be possible to do some sort of auction process, if we untethered

[2:13:03 PM]

ourselves from the fees established by council, similar to surplus property, how it's frequently auctioned off through a service for that material, because you could perhaps get more people interested, and the ability to buy more material at different prices with an auction type -- online auction type of deal. And also, another question, with the ifb that came out on Monday, I believe, for the purchase of 8,000 cubic yards, will the anti-lobby ordinance apply to that? >> We don't have the anti-lobby ordinance in that because the estimate was that it wouldn't be high enough to go to council, and we were advised that it didn't need to have -- >> Well, it's money going to the city, so I don't think it would have to go to council regardless of the number, but -- so it's just in the past, that has been the case, but there -- it's been insisted by the staff that the a. L. L. Would apply. I'd request clarification to those who received the notice of the solicitation, that the anti-lobby ordinance will not apply to this ifb if that's the case. >> We can clarify. There's two different issues here. One is the amount of the resulting contract falls under the -- the amount that would -- staff would typically take items to council. The other issue is that this is a sale, so it's a revenue. It's not an expenditure contract. So the point being raised -- it's been raised in the past, do expenditure -- excuse me -- to revenue contracts need to be brought to council. And we have, staff have, historically brought revenue contracts to council as a matter of practice. If council has other direction in that regard, then, you know, staff is

[2:15:03 PM]

willing to listen. But so as to be consistent, we have applied anti-lobbying to both solicitations for expenditure contracts and to solicitations for revenue contracts. So that might be something that council wants to consider, if they do not want to apply anti-lobbying to revenue contracts. But the current anti-



lobbying ordinance provides staff the discretion to apply when there is a question, and we have applied it to be consistent for both expenditure contracts and for revenue contracts, just to add that clarification. >> So it would apply in the case Mr. Gregory is speaking of. >> Under that one circumstance it would, but because the amount of sale is small, it will not. >> I see. >> So it is not. We fielded that question already, but we'll be glad to make that clarification again in this solicitation. Anti-lobbying does not apply to it. >> To this particular ifb -- >> To this particular one. >> Okay. >> Because we're talking about an active solicitation, I have to caution that verbal comments about an active solicitation should not be relied on. We are glad to make that clarification -- slittations are iterative processes. They change while they're on the street. To say something affirmatively about it at one point is kind of a reliance on the information that is currently available at that point. It could change. We are glad to make that clarification in an amendment to that solicitation. I just -- any time we talk about a current solicitation on the street, I have to make that -- >> Understood. There was another question he raised about the possibility of an auction. >> When we do these solicitations now, as an invitation for bids, it is an invitation for a sale, so the offers that are being submitted to us are in an amount of how much the offer will -- will pay to the city for this material. That is -- that is just a more traditional model of a

[2:17:05 PM]

reverse auction where offers put in a price -- excuse me, not a reverse auction, a regular auction, where offerors put in a price. That is available to local governments in Texas. It has not been a process that we've applied yet, but it is an established process. We just -- if we do apply it, it will be the first time we have applied. >> Would you need council direction to do so or -- >> We may need council direction on that, but we'll have to consult with the statute. Again, though, given small amount of the -- of the contract, it would not raise to level of bringing it subsequently to council for authorization. >> Okay. I'm looking just for questions that James needs to answer, so I'll go to councilmember alter. >> Alter: I just had one question. You said that revenue contracts usually come to council? >> Yes, ma'am. >> Alter: Okay. So then why didn't the simple recycling contract come to council? >> Which one? >> Alter: The simple recycling contract. The textile. I was told the reason it didn't come to council is because it was a revenue contract so I'm trying to understand. >> Typically -- I will need to look into details for that, councilmember, but typically, we won't bring them to council if the suspended -- the amount of the revenue does not exceed the council authorization, if city manager's authorization threshold. So if the amount of revenues that the city would receive is a small amount, we would -- and it's less than the 58,000 per year that we would normally observe to bring items to council, then we would observe that same amount for revenue-generating contracts. >> Alter: Okay. Well, in that particular case, though, it was more than that, at least from what I'm understanding, of the legal -- I mean, we had an executive session so I can't go into that. Maybe we can talk about it

[2:19:06 PM]

later, but -- >> We're glad to provide you with Dallas. >> Alter: It was my understanding we would meet that threshold. >> We will provide that. >> Alter: Thank you. >> I'm assuming this is simple recycling? Is that what -- >> It's more of a comment. >> All right. Hold is for just a second if you would. Anything else? Commissioner white. >> So this is about the -- the indefinitely proposed -- postponed organics by gosh contract. Is there any sort of limitation -- I'm asking the question about it -- is there any limitation how long that can be postponed and still accepted by the city? >> We establish a period of time that offers are to be -

- to be held by the offerors, and the baseline period of time is -- I believe it's 180 days. But when items take longer to authorize, we can ask the offerors if they're willing to hold their offer for additional periods of time. So that's what we've done in this case. We've just asked them to hold their offer for an additional period of time. They're not obligated to do so, and sometimes they do not wish to do so, because they're mobilizing resources. They're -- they're holding their readiness for a long period of time. Typically, however, you don't want offerors to hold their proposals for extensive periods of time. You want to do it within a relative, reasonable period of time after the conclusion of the competition. >> If I may clarify really quickly, that's a good question, because what we're trying to point out is all the other contracts are going out for bid again. That's the one in question. What do we do with that? All the other ones that are listed are going out for a new solicitation, based on the working groups, and then the council's input on what to do with the new solicitations. That one is in question, what do we do with that? The rest of them are done, we're resoliciting, so

[2:21:09 PM]

that's a good question. >> Thank you for that. I'm just wondering, what is the date that has been agreed to currently? >> I'll have to find that. >> Okay. >> Because that's associated with their current offer, so we'll have to find out what that is. >> Okay. >> Councilmember alter, if you have something -- >> Alter: They were not for Mr. Scarborough. Sorry. >> All right. >> I have a follow-up question to that. On that note, are y'all looking for -- it's not one of the seven questions that's been listed as a directive as a working group, but I am sort of curious, are you waiting for a specific policy recommendation on that -- on that open -- or on that open contract, from this group? Because, again, it's not one of our questions, but it does feel like it's kind of just up in the air. >> It was not one of the original questions because it was not brought up as a concern for the past solicitations. However, there have been substantial Q and A in this discussion, so new topics or new emphasis have arose during this discussion. It may be in addition to then, but it wasn't then originally part of the questions. >> Council delayed that, so we certainly are going to need to do something with it, either reject it and start over or bring it back forward. >> So would you want us to weigh in on that question, reject or -- >> Sure. >> I guess I would encourage the working group to do that, so that we can have some clear direction there, because that one its, as mentioned, up in the air, as opposed to the rest, which will go through the process. >> All right. Anything else to be clarified on the purchasing side? Thank you, sir. >> Thank you. So, group, as I understand it, the three primary questions that staff would like to get some feedback on today, and from -- I'm looking at assistant manager

[2:23:11 PM]

Goode to make I'm right, 5a, should materials be directed away from future landfill solicitations I believe is one. 5e is the preferred policy for biosolids management, I believe is 2. And then 6a, should Austin resource recovery provide special services, perhaps a fourth would have to do with a contract in question. So councilmembers, I mean, there's different ways we can do this. We obviously have a fairly small amount of time to tackle multiple questions, so either you can take each question in turn and get comments in response to each, or you can encourage sort of more wide-ranging back and forth. But it is important to staff that we get to all those, so I wonder what your pleasure is, processwise. >> Pool: I -- today, joining us is Melanie McAfee who and is here specifically to speak on landfills and direct effect it has on her. I'd like to take up that question 5a at the top. >> First. Okay. So I'd ask group members to be mindful of that, that we'd like to stay on that topic here in the beginning, then move to other topics as we can. Ms. McAfee, if

you'd like. >> All right. Thank you, Leslie. Well, I'm going to make it short and sweet because I know there's not much time, but I would like to leave the task force with just a few documents that I have for you to look over. The first being just the long, long history I have had with waste management. A sad way of looking at it is, from '81, when they came, I came. We came the same year. So over half of my 62 years, I have been fighting, and had waste management as a neighbor. And the history will show

[2:25:12 PM]

that they've not been a good neighbor to me. And it's -- it's been a long 30 years. So I think a lot of the history has been lost and forgotten because there's, you know, new council people, new mayors. So the landfill is taking a tremendous amount of waste now. They just got a permit mod to increase their taking in capacity, like 62%. So within the last years, odors have been a huge issue, and not a lot has -- have people talked about odors, but we get questions all the time. And before I came, I talked to my staff, and they live with this. And so they know, when the wind comes, when it rains, when it's really hot and muggy, I mean, they're experiencing what happens to be so close to a landfill. So there are problems, and back in '81, there was just a few houses, but there's thousands now. It has grown quite a bit out there, and besides the odor, the buzzards and all the other things that go with such a massive landfill, the size and the height, it's just unbelievable. I invite y'all to come out and see it, and smell it. And I feel like all of us have paid quite the price. >> Well, council, fossils obviously, if there are questions for Ms. McAfee, that's appropriate. Waste management, would you like to hear questions from them first? Waste management.

[2:27:12 PM]

>> Good afternoon, I'm with waste management, the company. I guess to speak to, I guess, the current situation for Austin community landfill, as Ms. McAfee said, we became owners and operators of that landfill in 1981. It operated prior, with two previous companies. The landfill is about 420 acres, in total size. About 180 of that is actually the permitted operations. On any given day, there's about an acre of that that's active, that's the day's receipts of trash. I guess the influx or increase in waste that's been spoken of is a direct result of another landfill closing, a republic site that was formerly right next to ours. I think it's obvious to everyone it closed two years ago, almost two years ago. So there are only two landfills in tarrant county at the moment, and so ours is -- >> Pool: You mean Travis county. >> You said tarrant. >> I'm from tarrant county, so that's a habit. So there's two landfills in Travis county at the moment, and so our site has taken an increase in waste. But I guess I would say, and there was an earlier graph about gas and its omissions. We have an extensive gas extraction program. We have 128 wells. So we collect the gas that's physically, you know, within our technical ability. The site is heavily monitored. We haven't received any violations related specifically to our operations. We are sensitive to that. Landfills certainly are -- carry a stigma and are objectionable. There's no denying that. But landfills are a part of the infrastructure currently, and so as an owner and operator, we take people's concerns very seriously. We follow the rules. We go above the rules in many cases. So we're an open book. We invite -- we have tours quite frequently. We would welcome anyone to visit our operation and ask whatever questions they see fit to, and we'll provide

[2:29:13 PM]

all the information we can. So, you know, we are a proud owner and operator of landfills. It's not everything we do but a big part of what we do. We're a large hauler and will be a cyclical in the country, but we also own about 178 landfills in the country and this is one of those. It has about eight years, depending on the amount of material that comes in every year, we have about eight years of remaining life and the landfill will close. So it's somewhat of the natural evolution of older landfills, as they reach their final capacities, they are closing. Newer landfills in some cases are being built, but in a lot of cases they're a little further away from the urban areas, as you would understand and appreciate. So it does introduce some additional transportation costs, but that's just the way of how the progression is working. So we'll continue to operate the landfill for its remaining life, continue to do the very best job we can, continue to be an open book to anyone who chooses to visit and share information as requested. >> Yeah. I did want to -- I'm Andrew Dobbs, with Texas campaign for the environment. I wanted to note a couple things on this, and I'm grateful that Melanie came out today. She's been a long-time friend of ours, and she does a great service at bar management. First things first, I think it is really important that we not conflict with environmental -- on environmental quality, not for environmental quality, is captivating, it is captive to polluting interests. The people that get appointed to that commission have backgrounds in polluting industries. And then they typically go -- and top staff in the agency typically don't on to

[2:31:15 PM]

be polluting industry lobbyists. I've had top former staff from that agency lobbying on behalf of polluters in this room. And so the regulations that are in place today serve a couple of different purposes. Most notably, to, you know, do the bare minimum to comply with federal regulations so that there is no, you know, -- so that the devolution of the regulatory authority remains in place, so that these same polluting interests get to continue regulating, as opposed to what might be strict regulations from the federal level, at least in the past. That is -- that needs to be taken into consideration. It is very -- so that just needs to be stated flatly. You know, I was very grateful to Ms. Aven and to Zach for the work that they did presenting the information about landfills in the area. The one thing that we know is that the thing that is better than a well-run landfill is no landfill. Right? And a closed landfill still has significant environmental impacts, but it is less than an active landfill, for sure, especially the quality of life impacts, like Melanie was just talking about, are significantly reduced. So our goal is not -- the solution that we should be looking at is how can we close these, how can we close landfills or prevent their opening. And so the city participant participating with a landfill puts us in a difficult position for fighting. I just heard waste management staff say in eight years this thing will close, which means they're not planning on an expansion. I would like to see that, you know, clarified and penned down here today, in a way that, you know, they can be held accountable to in the future. >> Let me interject something that I might not interject if it weren't my

[2:33:15 PM]

last day, quite honestly. [Laughter] >> But that is, when Mr. Dobbs used the word "Polluters" in this room, I had sort of an internal reaction to that, because I thought to myself, what if another stakeholder referred to Mr. Dobbs's organizations with some sort of identifier like that. So I'm not -- I'm not sure it's appropriate to say don't say the word polluter, that seems kind of silly, but I guess I want everybody to be mindful of how seriously everyone in the room takes their work and try to speak of that work in such a fashion. That said, I wonder if council wants to ask anything of either Ms. McAfee or waste management before we continue. Councilmember pool? >> Pool: Well, I'll go ahead and just give waste management and opportunity to talk

to us about what their plans are for the facility and to look at an expansion, and what closing in eight years might look like. >> Yeah. Let me preface by saying eight years is the estimate, and the reason there's an estimate is, every year there's a slightly different amount of waste that comes in or doesn't come in. The weather affects it. So every year we update, like any landfill operator does, you update the air space, that's what we call it, that's been consumed, therefore, it updates how much you have left. There's a lot of variables that are involved, but that's -- it's an engineer's estimate. So based on the current volumes, we're estimating eight years. You could maybe stretch it to ten years if the volumes were to drop. That's when we will reach the design capacity of the landfill. As a practical matter, I guess I'll qualify what I said about closing this, as a practical matter, there is no -- we're landlocked. There's no room to expand in that way. So as a practical matter, I don't see an expansion as a

[2:35:15 PM]

viable option. But am I going to say today that under no circumstances would we ever do that? I don't know that today is a referendum on the future of our landfill in that way, and so I think that would be unfair to ask that of me today. But we have no plans. >> Pool: Okay. >> Can I make one comment to that? >> Sure. >> So what we hear on the street, which I realize is not a real reliable source, is that when it comes close to capacity, that there will be a merger with bfi where the landfill can go as high as the base allows it. So there is the possibility that if they were to merge together and make a really big base and continue to go up. 1. >> That's not been discussed, as far as I'm aware. And I'm pretty aware. So I'm not using that as -- [laughter] >> I think you could look at the two landfills and extrapolate, well, wow, that would make a lot of sense, but there's a lot of technical reasons and there's a lot of cost reasons why that wouldn't happen, be viable, even if the two parties were willing, and we are competitors, republic and waste management, so that would be difficult. >> Mr. -- Well, councilmember alter's light is on and councilmember pool's light on. Pool's light on. councilmember alter. >> Alter: I just want to make sure I'm understanding the pros and cons. I understand we have an option we don't want to go to a particular landfill, and the only landfill I've heard that is at this point a specific landfill we might be interested in avoiding is the waste management one. There's also an opportunity to say these are the criteria we want any landfill we're using to fulfill, which would give all of the landfills an opportunity to meet that criteria, or we can say we're just going to go to any landfill we met. Is that first part correct in terms of the three --

[2:37:16 PM]

>> Yes. Just to remind the viewing audience, we're only talking about the refuse that comes from city facilities, nothing from the private sector, we can't control. So the trash that we pick up in city hall, that's the policy question, where do you want us to take that? Do we put an rfp out that allows it to be taken to any landfill? Do we do performance criteria that a landfill must meet? I would hesitate to do that if the ultimate goal as to not take it to a landfill, just tell us that, and we can move on. >> Alter: Well, it's also the residential waste, correct? Not just the city -- >> We have a contract for our residential waste that goes through tds, and that's another 20 years, so that's not in play. >> Alter: Okay. So it's just for the city -- >> City facilities. >> Alter: City facility waste, and we also have a goal of getting that to zero -- >> That's right. >> Alter: -- In the first place. Okay. And in terms of the pros and cons of the waste management site relative to the other ones, what would you say -- how would you summarize those? >> Ignoring environmental concerns, which you all have to take into account, strictly from a business perspective, when start eliminating options, that's going to probably cost the city more money to dispose of our trash. That's the

only business perspective, is it could -- and that's a valuable question for you all, how much is that worth? Because when you start eliminating some competition, we expect that prices would go up. >> Alter: Okay. And how would you summarize the environmental? >> Oh, I think you have people in the room that can summarize that better than I could. >> I don't know if that's an invitation for those folks to do so or not. I just want to be very cognizant, not just to the councilmember, but several peaks

[2:39:16 PM]

who have been waiting to speak. If somebody wants to briefly address that part of councilmember alter's question, they may. >> On this history fact sheet, the city, most of the 30 years, has opposed sending waste to waste management, so they have been an ally of ours, because of all the atrocities that have happened out there. So I would find it very unfortunate if all of the years where they stood by us, and now that those atrocities a kind of forgotten, that we walk away from all those troubles. And, last, that if, for some reason, they do decide to expand, that if you're doing business, it's going to be much harder to take an opposition stand. >> I just want to ask a question, as a practical matter, because it sounds like even if we divest in fayette, even if all facilities as a poll matter decide we're not going to send any waste to waste management, you still have other -- you're not closing -- you're not closing because the city is going to stop sending waste to you. >> That's right. The city has been and the city currently is, be it small, a customer of our landfill. We have contracts now where the city's waste is a portion of it, a small portion of it, uses our facility, and we've had contracts in past years. But the vast -- the vast majority of the waste we handle every day comes from customers that we collect in and outside of Austin, business customers, which is an open market situation. Most of the competitors in this room that have hauling services, they also have individual contracts with commercial and in some cases residential customers outside of the city, and they utilize our site. So, certainly, the city's business is important to us.

[2:41:18 PM]

But, to your question, it won't affect the life, the projected remaining capacity of the landfill if the city's waste uses this site or not. >> Garza: Okay. That's an important point to make for people listening, that even if the city supported a policy, it would -- it doesn't affect the operation of the -- of the -- of the waste management, necessarily. >> That's right. >> Real quick, but it does affect your -- it could affect your ability to oppose an expansion if that comes up and if the expansion goes through, then it could extend the life of this, decades. >> All right. So what I'm trying to figure out is who wants to speak to 5a any further, which is to say, should materials be directed to or away from certain landfills in future solicitations, before I move on. So if anyone has comments on that, specifically, we'd like to hear them now. Looks like -- Mr. Gosh, did you want to say something? >> I just had a question. So whoever gets the organic processing, and there's a certain amount of that product that you have to take the contamination out, so just -- so the question would be, so then you're saying that material could not go to waste management; is -- it would be -- whoever does process that, that would be an important logistic question for them society. That .so that means all that product would need to go down south, I'm assuming. >> I don't know in arr wants to clarify that. I had a slightly different understanding. >> That is the question, before the work group and council, for all contracts where there's any refuse, we were talking about our facilities, but Mr. Gosh is correct, there's contaminants in the organics, that would be a question as well then. Would that be restricted to a certain landfill, or not? >> Okay.

[2:43:18 PM]

Any other comments then on this particular question? Then that would take us to biosolids and a preferred policy for biosolids management and discussion there? Because you shouldn't be nice to me just because it's my last day and not have comments. So Mr. Dobbs. >> Yeah. Thank you. One thing I just wanted to note is that while we do have the recommendations from the working group, the zero waste advisory commission, as I understand it, and I think the commissioners that are here can probably speak to this better than I could, did submit other, you know, recommendations, in part, because of the majority of commissioners weren't part of the working group. And ultimately those commissioners aren't -- they don't have any obligation to the working group. They have an obligation to the people of Austin. And so they thought that while this was a good starting place, additional protections and guidelines were necessary to protect the people of Austin. And so I -- you know, I hate that we only have half the picture here and not the -- not the recommendations that were put out by zwac, because, you know, it is our understanding -- and I need to review it again to be completely frank, that that's a very good starting place for policy on these contracts, for being able to direct staff to -- direct staff to design their solicitation with those ideas in mind, and if we can follow that, then I think that we can -- that it would solve a lot of the challenges that we -- that we have, you know, perceived in this process. So, you know, that policy is something that I believe needs to be taken into consideration as well. >> Pool: Well, I think we can go ahead and request a copy of the zwac responses to -- >> Councilmember, I think that was passed out already. If not, we can have it passed out to you. We gave you the one from the joint working group, and we -- was that passed out? We can get it to you right now.

[2:45:19 PM]

>> Pool: We do have that, but it sounded like there were changes that were made at some other level. The two -- there were two reports -- >> No. What you should have is zwac 2 -- >> Pool: What we have is wastewater recommendation and then we have the joint working group, but not zwac -- >> This one is separate. Is this one it? >> I think Ashley can pass those out. >> Pool: Oh, great. Thank you. >> We do prefer the joint working group one that reflected both commissions. And I must say if we're going to go just with the zwac, that the water/wastewater commission should have another opportunity to weigh in on that because that is our -- that is the commission we normally go to. And that was one of our reservations about the one, just from the zwac, the two commissions together, we'd have to go to them after all the items, in the future, we'd have to go to two commissions. >> Just for clarification, on the process that Darrell laid out, we have opportunities for both commissions to weigh in again on the process. So we have that built in. So I think what Darrell is saying, we would take the joint working group process to both and get comments on that. Zwac has already responded, water/wastewater responded too. >> Pool: I think it would be helpful if we had a red line. They do look superficially similar but I can tell the zwac one has an additional -- >> I know [indiscernible] Would like to speak to this before. I don't know if he'd like to offer an explanation now. >> It's not exactly an answer to your question, but I can do that. I'm looking through it right now with that exactly in mind. >> Pool: Okay. >> They're somewhat subtle suggestions but I think -- the reason I think it's important to

[2:47:20 PM]

Dobbs's point, even though it is normally a wastewater commission issue, y'all even just said today that this isn't really your business, y'all treat wastewater. So I do think the reason zwac was an important partner in this, this is stuff that we tend to as commissioners, know more about and be more passionate about when it comes to a zero waste policy. So I don't see it as an issue that we came back with a few additional sort of stipulations. But I think it comes down to, on number 6, for example, we ask that -- that the commissions, you know, be consulted, that we kind of built in some language that would bring it back to the commissions, and I have to look at this more closely to redline it further. But I think the changes aren't huge, as Mr. Dobbs said, this was a good start and we just made a couple tweaks that made us feel better as a commission. But what I was going to bring up on this topic, but slightly different going back to our earlier conversation, about the sale of the compost, that was kind of red-flagged by us because there was the sense that the compost was being sold for very, very small amount, and there was a potential revenue generation for the city, so it's kind of like, well, are we undercutting our constituents and our taxpayers by selling off this product that we could get more for? So I really support the idea of an auction, and I think it's also an example where, even if it's revenue-generating, it probably should still be -- come under sort of the direction of policy, because that was an example where it wasn't generating a lot of revenue, and that was the problem, that was the policy issue. So I just wanted to make that comment specifically on the sale of the compost. >> I think what Ms. Must grove is referring to, saying it's not our business, she's talking about marketing is not our business. And also the biosolids are not considered part of the zero waste program or considered zero waste. >> Fair enough. But, you know, I think we're talking about as a commission,

[2:49:22 PM]

doing our five-year review of the waste master plan, and that's probably going to be one of the top priorities that it probably should be part of the zero waste plan. So I understand that that's the current state, but it's probably a reason why it should be. >> Alter: Can we get clarification on the papers before we go forward? It looks to me we have two copies of the same zero waste commission recommendation, which is the ones that were amended by zwac, then is this other sheet the original one from the joint committee? >> One document is just water/wastewater, one is a joint working group. And a third is the zero waste advisory commission. So there are three bodies that overlap in membership that all weighed in. >> While we're working -- >> They're all the similar. >> Pool: While we're working through that, the second page is what's different, and it looks the same with the triangle on it. Would it be possible to ask water/wastewater, Mr. Trietta, and zwac, to work through, one more time, look at the changes made by zwac and see if we can get some agreement from water/wastewater? Just give it one last try to see if there are things in there that there's more consensus on? >> We'd be happy -- I mean happy to. It's not a big deal at all. And I think one of the bigger things that I noticed after I saw it come back out, after we approved it in our committee, was that they are, in some instances, handcuffing it -- handcuffing the contractor to just produce compost, when there is a lot of beneficial use in different things, like the pellets and other things. But it appears to me Austin utility is moving forward with that request, with the hundred percent compost. To me, it just doesn't make good

[2:51:22 PM]

business sense to handcuff a business when it can have a different commodity. But I'd be happy to pull that work group together again and let both commissions pull together, have a meeting and see if we can make sure everybody is on the same page. It's not a big deal. >> Counselor, we'd be fine with that, but what you



were saying is take it back to the entire commission, since we were close to the end, the entire commission -- the water/wastewater commission was fine with the joint working group. With we can take this back for another look at that, and we'd be happy to get their comments and forward that to y'all in some way. >> Pool: I think that would be fine, just because it sounded like water/wastewater didn't have an opportunity to comment on changes that zwac made to the joint group's findings. And so -- and we can take this offline and work through -- >> [Off mic] She's been waiting. >> Thanks. I just wanted to it rate from an industry perspective on our end, the staff has recommended adoption of the joint wastewater and zwac committee recommendations. We are supportive of that. We are certainly -- want to hear, you know, and understand the exact differences, but my recollection from being at that -- the zwac committee meeting where the changes were added, a lot of the things that were added go beyond the policy level and down into tactical administration of the contract, and just did not seem appropriate for a policy document. So, you know, as we go back and look at that, that's one of the things I would ask folks to consider, you know, are these things policy, or are they tactical contract administration. >> Mr. Dobbs. I think -- I was going to ask what the specific concerns were, but I think that answers it and we can talk offline about those details. >> Okay.

[2:53:25 PM]

>> I'm sorry. I'm just -- I'm highlighting, at least for the four councilmembers, the differences, and, I don't know, in my opinion, it was really just clarification of policy recommendations to add a little bit of specificity, but I'm highlighting so you can see it. >> Commissioner Acuna. >> Could I suggest something? In light of the fact it's probably a pretty timely issue, I like the idea of a working group coming together, and this is more of a clarification question. Is it possible that this working group can sit down, as Ms. Musgrove's timetable shows here? We have a gun to our head. Is it possible for the working group to sit down and basically draft the rfp, the rfp, which again, is consistent with city policy, set the matrix and evaluation method, and then at that point put it out on the street? >> No. I don't believe that's a working group or an advisory committee's role, to draft an rfp. I believe that's staff's role. We'll certainly bring the specs for the biosolids, the compost, bring the things that are important to you, but I don't believe that that -- that is not an advisory committee's role to draft an rfp. >> So semantics here. Probably not draft it, but craft it together, with a course -- >> I don't believe that's the advisory committee's role, to craft, draft, write, edit -- >> Okay. [Laughter] >> I don't know how else to say that. That's not the advisory committee's role. >> And this, quite frankly, folks, is ground we've tread before in these meetings. It's obvious that the commissions want to be involved in the process of determining what is asked of respondents, but there's also a recognition that staff also need to play a primary role there. And I've heard staff articulate concerns related to the potential for commission members

[2:55:26 PM]

involved in some sort of drafting to then be posing on the thing with which they were involved with drafting. So I'm not sure we could continue the discussion here. It's obvious that the commissions want influence, I think the staff wants to give them some room, to be determined. Is there anything more on biosolids? Because we are very close to the top of the hour. Councilmember alter. >> Alter: Yeah, I believe, if I understood correctly, staff made a statement that they had direction to do 100% compost, and I'm just not sure -- and I wasn't here when this came up before. I just wasn't sure when that direction -- >> We said we were willing to do 100% compost, and that is consistent with the zero waste advisory commission recommendation and the joint working group. We were willing to accept that part of it and move forward

and do 100% compost, where we can agree to everything that's in there. And I don't believe our water/wastewater commission would, either. >> Alter: But the question was the wastewater commission, if you say it's 100% compost, then you're not taking into consideration certain markets that you might have for the material that the other forms than compost, which may or may not be acceptable, but that there might somehow be a market for something other than compost? >> If it's a higher use of this developed by technology in the future, we would do -- we would be -- we would want to be able to do that. And that's reflected in the triangle. I realize it's sort of confusing, but the triangle at the top of the -- >> Alter: Okay. >> -- Of both documents say composting, other higher use. So it's just something that comes out in technology, that is a higher and better use, that we would want to be open to that and not confined just to doing compost, if there's something we thought was a better -- we're willing to move beyond the class B and -- land application and not do that anymore. >> Alter: Okay. But you're not saying you're

[2:57:27 PM]

limiting yourself to the compost, but you're willing to be up higher on -- >> Exactly. >> Alter: Okay. That was what I was confused on. And is there a problem with the biosolids right now where there's a piece of it, as we just have too much right now, we've got to get rid of that surplus, and then we also have to take care of what's moving forward, so there's kind of two parts to the problem? So there might be a solution that hasn't been addressed for just getting rid of the surplus, that's not the same thing as what do we do moving forward? Is it possible? >> Right. We have the current curing piles and we haven't yet decided how to best dispose of those, but we were thinking of putting that in the contract or the rfp as part of the proposal response, as to how the person responding or the company responding would suggest we beneficially reuse those piles. They are taking up a large amount of the land area that the contractor will need to do the 100% compost. So that we do need to deal with the inventory. We also are looking at different ways internally to deal with it between now and next April when we have another contract in place. We just -- we're still flushing some of that out. But you're right, that is a definite concern, is to free up that entire old pad portion, which is covered right now with curing piles. >> Alter: I will take it offline, but I'm still -- I'm intrigued by the give-away option, if part of the problem is just to clear the >> We'd be open to discussion. Councilmembers, let me say we welcome you out for a tour -- to see how the operations work. We also have 50 years of bird watching that's been going on out there so maybe come late in the day too. >> Alter: True. >> Council, we need to make

[2:59:29 PM]

some decisions here. I know that councilmembers have other obligations as does everybody in the room. So I also know that the staff very much wanted to get some direction or some feedback on the remaining question related to servicing special events. So shall we pivot to that for another five or ten minutes? Should we postpone that? Should we continue this piece for another five or ten minutes? What's the pleasure. >> Pool: I would like to go ahead and move quickly over to the last item and take input from all our stakeholders here just to get their thoughts because those of us on the dais can talk about it elsewhere. >> All right. We're shift to go 6a and I see Mr. Gregory's hand. >> Yes, I can do either one. Speaking on special events, I want to clarify from the conversation that happened earlier on that, it seemed to be being conflated with litter abatement and street sweeping. As a service provider, we don't have any problem with the arr department providing that -- those services and the council waiving fees for them. The problem with this issue and why this is a question is because when they issued their rfp for the city-wide dumpster

contract, it was a drastic expansion of the city's event service capabilities and expanding the dumpster collection capabilities of not only recyclables, which is the only thing council ever directed them to provide, but with solid waste, organics, portable restrooms, and we've found many records of a great deal of that being provided for free and not only to events that are specifically deemed cosponsored by the city council, it's been confirmed by the staff that departments on their own can unilaterally declare any event city cosponsored at the department level, which would make them eligible for these services.

[3:01:31 PM]

Also, it's certainly not just a south by southwest thing. When the rfp came out they listed 17 events. Only two of those events were city-sponsored events. The remaining 15 were customers of ours. We have a very large special event services and specialized business unit devoted to those services. So it's not simply a matter of fee waivers for street sweeping and litter abatement. It was a full-scale expansion into providing dumpsters for commercial entities, these special events for solid waste recycling, organics, even portable restrooms and waiving those fees in competition with private service providers. We can't -- and I don't feel that we should have to -- compete with free services, especially for services that the council never directed the city staff to provide no these events. So that is the problem that we have with it. >> Ms. King from arr is at the able with her mic on and I did notice some reactions. I don't know if you wanted to share any clarifying information. >> In such a short time you've read my face well. [ Laughter ] So I would like to clarify a couple of things. First and foremost, the city departments' portion and their partnerships or cosponsorship of events, there are various city departments. A good example would be the kite festival. And the kite festival situation, the parks department has made that a partnership between the parks department and the organization that puts on the kite festival. And so part of that partnership is that they are willing to take on certain responsibilities, and that's what we see oftentimes where departments are cosponsoring their specific events or are willing to partner up with an organization.

[3:03:32 PM]

So that's normally where the department takes that responsibility. Austin resource recovery has not done that. A department has decided to share a sponsorship responsibility with that event organizer. So to the degree -- and I do want to remind council, and I'm glad that Mr. Barclay stated that. The reason this was brought up was because in the contract that was brought before council about city facilities, special events was identified as a key concern that the haulers were concerned about but we have for quite sometime provided these services to these city cosponsored events as a part of what we have just done. So we've utilized the city facility contract to provide those services. What we did, though, in this particular case, when we released that rfp, was we -- as events have broken in this community, we had higher needs beyond the needs providing service to the actual brick and mortar buildings. Most events occurred on evenings and weekends. We articulated the need for a single point of contact so we could actually meet with a person if the dumpster was located in an incorrect place. We are articulated a need for invoicing to be turned over more quickly instead of what is normally provided as part of a building facility, for example. Mainly because event organizers wanted their invoices faster. We also articulated a need for the diversion rates because we needed to know and be able to report that out more quickly. So part of the reason this came to light is because we were more specific about the needs to provide services to those events that were not just in line with what the event organizers were asking for but also in line with what was expected

of us to respond and clarify what it took in order to provide green event services to these event organizers and explain in our carbon

[3:05:34 PM]

footprint, track our waste measures, things like that. That's why it became an issue, is because those things kind of came up a little more and that's why we brought the issue back because the service providers were concerned we were going above and beyond what was asked of us originally. >> Pool: So you're not emptying any of the dump dumpsters. >> Through our contract relationship. We utilize the city facility contracts. Right now the city facility contract, although that has not been granted, when we go back out for the request for proposal, that will need some clear direction. If we are going to be providing services to special events that needs to be articulated as to whether or not we are also going to provide dumpster services to the special expedients that's why we're here in the special events. We don't have dumpster capability, we do not have resources -- >> Pool: Specifically you're not sending in anybody to empty a dumpster that belongs to a different company. >> That's correct, yes. So we only use the dumpster contract that we have contracted with a service provider for. >> Pool: Right. And the cleaning of the streets and the picking up of the you to litter -- up of the litter on the street and everything that is strictly the city's responsibility or is that something that we have in the past contracted out? >> So I can't speak to the past and how far back you want to go. What I do know is that in the central business district in particular, in the public improvement district in the downtown area, there's a specific carved out area and general agreement I think in partnership with the downtown Austin alliance. The city of Austin provides street sweeping services, litter collection, litter control services, and what that means is we are emptying the -- the arr staff is actually emptying staff and recycling containers in the downtown area. You see that concentration because those downtown businesses that are part of that district pay an additional fee on top of their regular taxes. So we as arr are providing that service. When the event starts to expand beyond that boundary,

[3:07:36 PM]

then -- and there is a clear delineation of the boundary for a particular event, then there maybe situations where the best example I can use is the Austin marathon, for example. The Austin marathon takes over the streets, clear boundaries defined, they add additional containers, they actually try to avoid using the city-provided containers in the downtown area. They'll cover them so they can get a clear understanding of their waste management level or the wastes that they're generating and their diversion rate. But if there are containers then they calculate -- we work with them to provide service to those containers. So the event organizer will contract with the service provider. I think they've done that with Texas disposal system and other event staff to actually pull the material and take care of that material themselves and empty. They've done street sweeping on their own. But you have see in the marathon situation we have corded off blocks. It's very clear. And we helped work with them for years to build them up to the point where arr was not providing that service. >> Pool: Any other questions? >> Councilmember alter. >> Alter: Can you walk me first through south by southwest. If that contract had gone into effect what would be different potentially? >> I'm sorry, which? Oh, for the city facility contract? >> Alter: Yeah. >> Nothing. Because the dumpster contract in the downtown area is utilized -- we utilize the downtown dumpster contract. So what that means is there is, again, that carved out area I think we've talked about before that was defined by ordinance. We call it the T bar district, the reason is because it's shaped like a T and it's got a lot of bars in

it. It's basically sixth street, some of congress, some of fourth street. They've also carved out certain -- it's been a long time coming but for the most part we call it the T bar district. In that district you see the high cons administration -- sorry, of south by southwest venues and it started there, right? So it grew from beyond that point. But in that particular carved out area, there is a

[3:09:39 PM]

service provider by ordinance council directed arr previously solid waste services to manage the contract for dumpster in that area. Over the years we've had a managed contract, currently Texas disposal systems is the service provider, previously it was I believe waste management so we've amending that contract for quite sometime provide service for that dumpster. During south by we utilize that contract. So during south by events that occur outside of that district, that contract district, the private service -- the private vendor that services the event venue, so the best example to be to look along Rainey street. When south by flows out into the Rainey street area, all those vendors and all of those businesses, they have to coordinate with their own service provider, their private hauler to ensure that trash is managed. We don't have a role in that. We've clarified to south by we do not have a role in that. We will report if there's a problem, but for the most part with regards to dumpster if you are outside that service district it is your responsibility to handle the overflow of trash and recycling in your dumpsters so we don't get involved. >> Alter: So if nothing changes then what is -- >> So the question becomes what has been possessed is should Austin resource recovery provide special event services to all these special events? There's the dumpster component and there's the litter abatement component. So the litter abatement component does become a challenge because the litter abatement is really where the rubber meets the road. That's where litter occurs, trash is all over the streets, where street sweeping occurs. If that is also posed as a concern -- at first we were focusing solely on the dumpster portion but the question evolved to a larger level of service we were providing so we posed a larger question.

[3:11:39 PM]

If you want to break it down, should arr provide service or allow -- provide service for special events dumpster provided and then you break out the second part, litter abatement? >> Alter: May I ask tds if they have a different interpretation of that? >> Our concern -- well, somewhat, but our concern is with the provision of dumpster services. That has always been reserved by ordinance to private -- licensed private haulers. We compete with lots of other licensed private haulers. When it comes to -- when it changes into the city providing dumpster service for recyclable solid waste and organics and doing so for free, that can have a drastic effect on the competitive market that we rely on. So as far as demarch indicating dumpster services and litter abatement, I think that's an excellent idea because litter abatement and street sweeping are the things that are easily quantifiable by the department because that's what they do on a regular basis. The dumpster services we feel are currently reserved by ordinance to competition. However, the staff has taken it upon themselves to begin providing that service in many cases for free. I would suggest that they -- my request would be that they continue to do their core competence of litter abatement and street sweeping while the private market competes for the dumpster services for recyclables, solid waste, and organics. >> I need to make one clarification. Staff never provides service for free unless council directs us to. We don't provide a free service. We aren't allowed to. Waivers of all of our fees are done by the city council. >> Alter: But then who pays the dumpster part? You have a contract with them but that's under you

[3:13:40 PM]

and those costs go up for your contract. Is the city waiving the fees that we're then paying to tds currently? >> In the past it has, yes. >> Alter: Okay. >> Yes, city staff does not waive any of the fees. There are situations where you are -- if other departments who have become a sponsor but they will eat the cost of that. So, for example, if a department becomes a sponsor of an event and says I'll cover your cost of trash, then under their contract part, then they will cover the costs in their department rates. >> Alter: Right. But if we are -- I mean, like, if we wanted to make that distinction, it seems to me we should say that we're not going to be waiving fees for the dumpsters at all. >> Sure, yes. >> Alter: We may be providing that through the contract, but that fee should go on to somebody else. >> I think that's the question. I think that's the question you're being asked, is whether or not city cosponsored events can or should utilize city -- city contracts in support of their events. And so Austin resource recovery relies upon the city facility dumpster contract in order to facilitate the provision of waste services, and if the decision is that city council -- that city cosponsored events must use private services, then that has to be a clear delineation. If they are not eligible for city facility contracts, I think that's what -- from -- I'm sorry. The haulers are looking to require all city events, any event that occurs in the city limits, that they would have to go with a private service provider and not utilize city facilities contract. If I'm misunderstanding that, then that would help further clarification. >> If I may I've got

[3:15:41 PM]

Mr. [Indiscernible] And Mr. White. I'll try and get around but I'm well over time. >> Thank you. I'll try to make this quick. First I want to say I'm definitely supportive of arr continuing to provide the event services. A couple things that I haven't heard today that I remember there being discussion about is that it was optional for these events whether or not they utilized the city contract. And maybe that's a different classification of event so I apologize if that was on a different issue. And that the fees could be waived even if the city contract wasn't utilized. So maybe some clarification on that if that's a different class of events, then I apologize. I just wanted to -- before time runs out just throw my opinion out there on a couple of these other issues. First of all, with the organics contract, I think it's absolutely critical that we get moving on that unless there is -- I have not heard any real concern about why that contract should not be authorized, and in my view it's really important to our zero waste goals that we -- you know, that we get that contract so that we can actually start providing that service to our residents. You know, we have a whole rollout scheduled. There are other contracts that have been coming through zwac and presumably getting authorized by council to do education and buy carts and all this other stuff. So I'm just, whatever, throwing my opinion out there that I hope we move forward quickly with authorizing that contract. I also just wanted to say on the contract for removing the biosolids product, whatever we want to call it, whether it's dillo dirt or the unscreened product, it seems like waiving the fee or allowing a reduction in the fee would have been a logical step to make and I understand maybe council needs to approve that. One of the issues we didn't discuss here but did discuss sensitively at zwac was the unscreened product has a significant amount of plastic in it. So not allowing for a fee

[3:17:42 PM]

waiver made the only option to put that unscreened product out there. The farmer in question didn't care, but, you know, that may end up in other people's property as well. So I just wanted to state those positions. Thank you. >> Thanks, commissioner. >> Kerry Geter, balcones recycling. We also provide special event services to the city, primarily on the recycling side. We provide all the services and accoutrements to a special event, with the exception of portable toilets. And to my knowledge, in the four or five years we've been doing this, we've not had any issues with anything that the city of Austin has done. So I wanted to go on record having said that. >> Thanks. Council, both [indiscernible] Have their mics on and I know time is of the essence so let me know whether we should stop or honor a couple more comments. >> Pool: Let's hear from Mr. Aconuye. He likes to have the last comment anyway. [ Laughter ] >> Thanks. This contract has been in effect for 20 plus years and we've never included the event portion in the dumpster contract. This was a new addition to this commission the reason that I was concerned about this is because it perhaps would take an opportunity away from a smaller, private individual recycler event provider at that point. And you're right. The city has suggested in the past, whenever an event was in play, they would suggest the various haulers available to provide that service, and the city was always good about giving the

[3:19:43 PM]

parameters required of that event hauler and what was expected, diversion reports, you name it, et cetera. All that was done. This was something, again, that was brought to this commission. It was something that wasn't broke, but yet it was brought or included in this new dumpster contract. And that's where I had concerns. It's, again, something that really doesn't need to be a part of this. The dumpster contract is absolutely vital and that has always been there and the city has done a great job of monitoring that and managing that. Thank you. >> Council, before I hand it back I just wanted to thank you all for giving me this opportunity and the opportunities over the last eight years to work with y'all. >> Pool: Thank you, Larry, for walking us through all of this. It's been a really full month, and I appreciate everybody's efforts around this table and gotten to recognize some faces and put names and business names to faces, too, which is really helpful. So I wanted to thank the stakeholders. I want to thank our staff. They've done really strong work primarily behind the scenes so that we can get to these meetings and have these handouts for you and be somewhat organized so we can move forward on the many topics we've been talking about. I wanted to end by giving you a little of an update. The report, we will be working from here on into about the middle of June in order to write the report and draft it up. It won't be ready June 1. I'm hoping by the third week of June we'll have a draft out and we'll be sure to circulate it so that everybody can see it and have a chance to comment on it, and then we'll have our recommendations included in that as well. Any last comments from anyone? Thank you, all. We are adjourned, and this being the last meeting of the waste management policy

[3:21:44 PM]

task force. Thank you, all. [ Adjourned ]