Roll Call
Board Members Present:
Jake Anderson
Sarah Campbell
Greg Dix
Bob Kappel
Aimee House Ladonski
Dave McElroy
Heath VonEye
Merle Wollman
John Overby
Deb Reinicke
April Schave

Board Members Absent:
Craig Ellerbroek
Dale Long
Roger Hageman
Nancy Korkow

Guests Present:
Jesse Dewitt
Randy Dewitt
Tom Wilford
Laurie Cressman
Bobbi Nelson
Bob Novak
Butch Hanssen
Perry Schempp
Approval of Minutes

- Motion made by Kappel to amend meeting minutes from September 28, 2010 on following points:
  - Page 3: Point 5, first bullet, should read: “Transfer fee should be dropped in the event that an existing hauler purchases another haulers account, they are already licensed and have an account, therefore should not be subject to the fee. If a new business purchases a haulers account, they will be treated as a new hauler and will be subject to the transfer fee.”
  - Page 4: Bullet 8, Kappel: Comment should be reflected as being made by Bobbi Nelson, not Bob Kappel. “The fee will get passed along to haulers” should read “The fee will get passed along to citizens”.
  - Page 5: first bullet, should read “Intent of amendment is to meet need of both parties”
  - Page 5: Motion to take up Chapter 23 in next ARO Committee meeting as first agenda item made by Anderson.
  - Page 9: Bullet 8; should read “…we will have to make sure that the South Dakota Codified Law allows for City authority.”
  - Page 11: Major bullet 5: Not made by Kappel, made by Bobbi Nelson.

- Aimee: working on drafting SOP for Solid Waste Planning Board to include meeting minute layout.
- Motion made by VonEye to approve amendments as addressed by Kappel; McElroy seconded.
- Voted; all in favor, none opposed

Agenda

   - Construction projects are starting to wrap up
     - Cap on East cell is approximately 95% complete
     - Well installation is approximately half complete, behind schedule due to drill rig issues
     - C & D has shown increase from last year

2. Sustainability Coordinator- Ladonski
• Green Living Expo will be taking place at the Sioux Falls Arena and Convention Center, where we will be hosting a booth, on Saturday October 23 and Sunday October 24.
• We are continuing with the Recycla-BALE project.
• Ladonski- recommends that board members log into SiouxFalls.org occasionally to view the Planning Board page where agenda and minutes are posted. Encourages the board to also review the purpose of the Planning Board as set forth by the Mayor.

3. Review of Ch 18 Proposed Changes
• Ladonski- handout has been provided of all changes that were proposed throughout both 2009 and 2010 in order to refresh memory
• McElroy- following the ARO Committee meeting on the 19th, Bobbi Nelson brought up potential issue with wording of 18-59, as proposed at last meeting. Several haulers use three levels of service for residential customers; we discussed working to strengthen pay as you throw. One popular container size falls between other three levels, the way it was written could be misinterpreted. Reworded section 18-59 (1).
  o **Kappel made a motion to approve proposed language as outlined by Landfill Superintendent.**
  o **2nd by Anderson**

Discussion
  • Kappel- glad to see the proposed language change so that we are not compounding prices. Are these actual container sizes as seen in our community? (Dave- what we see majority of in community).
  • Anderson- what about the haulers who do not provide containers? (Dave- it would still be based on level of service by bag numbers)
  • Dix- does not support language, on edge of dictating what can charge and will charge.
  • Dave- not dictating what you must charge, simply strengthening pay-as-you-throw system and volume based pricing.
  • Kappel- believes that the revised language is better than what it was at.
  • Dix- each ordinance that you pass puts further restrictions on the hauler.
- Dix- as MSW goes down and recycling goes up, the cost for the hauler continues to go up.
- Dave- disagrees. The less MSW you bring to the landfill, the less you pay. Recycling material is either free, or you are paid for it.
- Dix- does pay to get rid of some recycling.
- Dave- even if you pay, you could not be paying $30 a ton as you do with municipal solid waste.
- Wollman- all businesses have costs, things that have no differentiation from one hauler to another. The purpose is getting citizens to recycle more. Does it do that or does it not? That should be our focus.
  - Move forward with original motion made by Kappel, seconded by Anderson.
  - Voted; 8 yes; 2 no; motion passes.

- Kappel- makes motion that as a board, send forward all Chapter 18 proposed changes to City Administration and then on to City Council for review and approval.
  - 2nd by Anderson.

Discussion
- Kappel- there is obviously dissention on some of the Chapter 18 proposals; would like to say however, that I am glad to see that we are not continually voting unanimously and there is healthy debate. Some of these changes are critical in meeting the goals and objectives of the boards. Any time that new or revised Ordinances are adopted, we will likely not know if they need to be tweaked until they are implemented, we may very well making needed changes in two or three years. I do support these changes, and some of them are ones we have been working on for a long time.
- McElroy- I would like to add to that too. I went into more detail in the last meeting when we were proposing pay-as-you-throw. It is very common nationwide, I do not have the details in front of me, however, there was a municipality that increased their recycling by 47% by using the pay-as-you-throw program. I could give example after example of the successes across the nation, so the pay-as-you-throw program does work.
• Anderson- the proposed changes that Dix made to 18-81, for altering board composition. We tabled the issue at the ARO Committee meeting until after the next Haulers meeting, so are we a little premature in voting comprehensively for Chapter 18 changes?
• Kappel- I understand your concern. However, we continually make proposed changes, if we continually wait until it is perfect, we would not make proposed changes. If it stands on its own to where the board supports it, we can send it forward once it has been acted on as another change.
• Dix- if we do pass this today, when would it go to the City Council for its first reading?
• McElroy- I would assume at least three weeks out for the first reading or maybe longer.
• Dix- if it goes to the Administration for review and they find issues with it, will it then come back to this board for final approval before it is sent on for City Council review?
• Kappel- not necessarily. The Administration is reviewing it for legality of proposal. If it is not a legal proposal, it will be scratched and then sent forward to City Council.
• Anderson- we will be doing this in conjunction with the Administrative Rules?
• Kappel- technically we cannot until the ordinance is in place allowing that, but Council would not want to vote on that section without knowing what the Board is recommending for rules. Further explanation of process by Kappel and McElroy.
• Wollman- so we are looking at all of the proposed changes that have been made over the past year and now voting on and sending forward as a package? (yes)
• Wollman- will it be standard for us to go up to a year or year and a half for recommendations or is it the pace we are on?
  ◦ McElroy – it is the pace that we are on as a board and then where the Administration and City Council are at.
  ◦ Kappel- I would hope that we get to where we are more proactive at making revisions and sending them forward more timely. That way we are not watering it down with 20
or 30 changes in a package to where maybe something that needed further discussion gets overlooked. If we send up only one or two issues to City Council at a time, they may get the true gravity of consideration by the public and the Council.

- Ladonski- I agree with that comment. This board was in a bit of pause mode for most of 2008 and the early part of 2009. Right now we are making up for lost time. Once we move forward with currently proposed Chapter 18 changes, then this board can focus on advancing additional proposed changes 2 – 3 at a time. We have been holding regular monthly meetings and giving due process to each of these issues that we are looking at.

- Shave- there does not seem to be much for 18-17 & 18-21, are these the two sections that we discussed will need to mirror one another?

  - Ladonski- these are the most recent changes.

- Public Comment:

  - When would Greg Dix’s proposed changes to 18-81 be coming back for consideration and begin this whole process?
    - Anderson- it was tabled until the next haulers meeting it would then go back through the ARO Committee before being presented here.

  - Speaking to 18-59, not in opposition of it, however, feel it is important to point out that the board is making rules for haulers and customers in five counties. A large part of the cost is getting to the customer in rural settings, getting to them and then to the landfill. It is a possible concern for individuals in rural areas due to the size of containers. If this idea works, the rate that we have today may increase in the future to handle the recycling that the customer is now putting on us.

    - Dix- So, what you are saying is that if the board passes this proposal, the container you have at $12.00 currently would escalate each year?
    - Costs do tend to go up. Costs will be shifting.
• Anderson- can you adjust your rates accordingly? If you are against the proposal, what is your recommendation?
• Yes. But right now we do not pay to get rid of our recycling; in the future we may have to pay to get rid of it at market cost. Recommendation is to let the market dictate, just set base rate. Leave it as it is. We just need to work towards getting the customer to care about the recycling portion somehow.
• Dix- there is always fixed costs, no matter what we are picking up there are always costs for operations.
• Anderson- Dave, with your drop in MSW, did your operations cost drop at all?
  o McElroy- Yes, there were decreases, but yes, there are always operations cost associated with landfilling.
  o Anderson- There’s adjustments in benefits in the long run though?
  o McElroy- yes.
• VonEye- the intention of the board is to increase the lifetime of the landfill through green initiatives. It may seem like doom and gloom now, but it will balance out in the long run.

- Bob-reminder of original motion, for acceptance of proposed changes to be sent forward to Administration and City Council for review and adoption.
- Bob- towards public comment: respect ideas and the way that they are presented. Appreciate continued support of the board. Have learned a lot from your ideas, I appreciate that because I don’t know a lot about your industry. Some of the concerns you have presented are short term and hauler specific. As board members, it is our job to look beyond those things based on the purpose of the board. (Read Mayor’s intent of the board). These things are what we are talking about. I would be excited as a board member to deal with potential future problems; I look at them as opportunities to reduce the cost of running the landfill. I guarantee that if we
achieve 70%, Dave will not have the same number of employees as he has now, he will not have the same equipment he has, we will not be out purchasing land for future landfills for a very long time. So, yes, you have short term concerns as a hauler but still for the long term we are doing the right thing by what is being proposed. There are so many intangibles that we as a board and citizens do not necessarily see yet; but if we as a board and other boards across the nation are successful in recycling efforts there will be tremendous cost benefit across the entire country due to sustainability efforts. It may not reduce your hauler costs, the cost to dispose of waste at the landfill, it may not reduce your recycling costs, but there will still be tremendous cost savings across the country and the world because of the efforts to run a more sustainable society than what we have been used to over the past fifty years. I do appreciate your comments, I understand them but from my perspective, I believe they are short term and hauler specific. I will continue to take them into consideration, but we have to look at long term and the purpose of this board.

- Public Comment- I want to thank you for those comments as well. However, I understand the last public comment also. If you have a hauler that only hauls outside of Sioux Falls, let’s say company A is charging $20 just to get to your house, and then he figures the cost per can, if the hauler gets there and there is only one can at $2 a piece, now you are at $22.00. By this system, you are going to force them to go way higher than is necessary. You end up taxing your customer for fuel and time instead of just garbage because it will take much more in fuel and time to get to the landfill. So, recycling is not going to be that big of a deal to them. That is all I have for outside of the City portion. My main question for the board is, who has to follow the regulations that you are establishing here?
  - McElroy- that would be in reference to our solid waste agreements with each individual city or county, right now, they are not specific enough...(recording unclear here).
  - Public Comment- I am neither for nor against the proposal. However, if I am located in the City where I have to follow
the regulations and I am competing against someone in a county that does not have to follow the regulations, that makes it more difficult for me. For companies that never come to the landfill because they are dropping at a transfer station, how do you know that they are recycling and who is responsible for enforcement of recycling percentages or anything that involves these companies?

- McElroy- This is an unlicensed company?
- Public Comment- No, they are very licensed. Their trucks never come into the city though, so how are they...
- McElroy-if they have a license with us, they have to prove and verify recycling.
- Public Comment- Even the ones that are dropped at the transfer stations?
- McElroy- yes.
- Public Comment- how are those verified?
- McElroy- they are weighed at an elevator.
- Public Comment- the report that I have says reporting issues. So who does that, who keeps things fair in the counties outside of Minnehaha or outside of Sioux Falls? To pass this mandatory rate increase with no basis for or enforcement of those people outside of the city makes it difficult for me to be for or against it.
- McElroy- if they have a license with us, they are required to follow the regulations.
- Public Comment- but not everyone who brings trash there has a license with you.
- McElroy- If they do not bring garbage to our facility or haul within the City of Sioux Falls, they would not be required to have a license with us.
- Unknown- is there haulers within the five county region that do that?
- McElroy- not that I am aware of.
• Public Comment- whose license can you revoke, can you revoke City of Harrisburg’s license? Just as an example. Since they do not haul in the City of Sioux Falls.
• McElroy- they are licensed with the City of Sioux Falls landfill.
• VonEye- Just as a point of clarification – the City of Madison is a licensed hauler to the City of Sioux Falls landfill, so they can revoke our license or penalize us the same as a hauler within Sioux Falls, such as Novak Sanitation.
• Public Comment- they can? (yes) So, then, using Madison as an example, who would be responsible for enforcing the regulation with ... say...Bud’s?
• VonEye- the City of Sioux Falls landfill, through the license that he has with them. In our application process these regulations would be addressed, on the application it will show what the rate structure is that he has to follow. We use the City Commission minutes or resolutions to verify this if he is in need of clarification or proof throughout the application process.
• Public Comment- so then, say that Company A fills out the application according to what you have asked for, gets the license but then does not follow it. Say I fill out the application showing the rates that are mandated, say at $24 but then I choose not to follow it; choose to offer $20. I want to know who I should be looking to come after me. If I know someone who has filled out the application completely correct and then does this and I have a problem with them doing that....who enforces that?
• McElroy- Aimee and I. So you are alleging that there are people who could be falsifying their application?
• Public Comment- I am saying that could absolutely be happening.
• McElroy- Excellent. Let us know who.
• Ladonski- I would like to comment on the report that was sent out by Dave McElroy that shows reporting issues. Those issues are not necessarily on the recycling percentages; those reporting issues could simply mean that they are reporting in pounds instead of tons, or that they neglected to sign their form, that could mean that they are behind on their reporting form. There are a variety of reasons as to why there are reporting issues annotated next to their company name. It does not automatically mean that they are completely out of compliance. We are in the process of trying to get Chapter 18 approved, of trying to get Administrative rules approved and once we have gotten to that point, you will see that many of your concerns, issues and questions that you have raised here today will be answered. I just wanted to let you know that and let you know that you are spot on, so thank you for your comments.
  ▪ Kappel- Reminder again of motion that was made to approve changes for submittal to Administration and City Council.
    ▪ Ladonski- roll call vote on motion.
    ▪ Voted; 9 yes; 1 no; motion passes.

4. Review of proposed Administrative Rules
• McElroy- In your packet, you will see a copy of the Administrative Rules that were previously voted on as well as the Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for the adoption and modification for the Administrative Rules, which in detail follows the process that we would take to adopt and implement those rules. Of course, before we could follow this process, Chapter 18 would first need to be approved.
  o Public Comment- Chapter 66 a. 01, that was discussed at the last SWPB meeting, will that be discussed again prior to voting or sending forward to the Administration and City Council?
  o McElroy- that has already been voted on and approved at the last meeting, however, there is a 30-day public comment period that it will go through.
Anderson- we actually did not vote on this because we lost our quorum.

Public Comment- I want to comment on this issue then, because it appears that if a hauler was to not meet the recycling goal, they would be subject to losing their haulers license. When this came up to City Council four years ago, in a report that I have from KELO, it was the intent of the City Council then that haulers would not lose their license in response to this. The Public Works Director at the time stated that it was not the intent for haulers to lose their license. So, they had in the back of their mind that a hauler would not be put out of business for not meeting the recycling goal.

McElroy- that is not the way that the ordinance is wrote, I would love to get a copy of that report that you have.

Kappel- the ordinance states the opposite

McElroy- yes, it does.

Kappel- we have to look at what the context was of the question as well as the answer. The director at the time, said that it was not the INTENTION to take haulers license away, however, where was the rest of the story… that it may be necessary, that we may have to. It clearly states that the license may be revoked for not meeting the goal. The current rules do not address or clarify when the license can be revoked or action be taken.

McElroy- right, as clarification, these proposed changes to the Administrative rules further clarifies when we may enforce that.

Anderson- chair, will you be making an amendment to the motion for the Administrative rules before we go on?

Ladonski- there has not been an official motion made on the Administrative Rules at this time.

Kappel- I would make the recommendation that we not take official action on the Administrative Rules until Council is closer to taking action on Chapter 18. I think there may be additional comments and issues that have been raised in the Administrative Rules committee that may need further discussion and need to be looked at. I would not like to see us approving partial sets of rules.

McElroy- so if anyone has any recommendations or suggestions on the Administrative Rules, feel free to contact me and I can make those changes or bring them up for discussion.
5. ARO Committee Report

- Ladonski- the Chair of the ARO Committee, Heath VonEye, had other obligations the night of the meeting, so I will share some information that came of that meeting.
  - There was fabulous discussion that came from issues discussed at the meeting that led to the recommendation of a survey to be sent to the haulers, I want to point out that the topics on the survey are simply open for discussion, not for official action at this time. (List of survey discussion points were read). A draft of those discussion are included in your packet. If you wish to make comment on any of the draft questions or recommend further questions, please make comment by 1 November so that we may mail those surveys by mid-November.
  - Jake Anderson did reference a study in the ARO Committee meeting, he was kind enough to forward that study to Dave and I today, so a copy of that study is included in your packet. Dave is going to comment or summarize that report.
    - McElroy- the report that Anderson forwarded did outline various techniques used to encourage increased recycling. The report basically suggests that education only did not affect the recycling rate. However, container size, color, and frequency did appear to have an impact on increased recycling.
    - Kappel- of course we have to always remember that these studies can be very site specific.
    - Anderson- of course, it was simply being looked at due to the topics for discussion at the ARO committee meeting. This discussion was in reference to frequency of collection versus the container size, the report was in my head and I offered to share the information.

Adjournment- motion made by Kappel, seconded by Anderson, all in favor. Meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.
Chapter 18

GARBAGE AND RECYCLING*

Article I. In General

Sec. 18-1. Definitions.
Sec. 18-2. Littering prohibited Generally.
Sec. 18-3. Same Duty of business owners, occupants.
Sec. 18-4. Same Duty of person.
Sec. 18-5. Littering on premises of another.
Sec. 18-6. Removal of litter by city.
Sec. 18-7. Violation of rules, regulations.
Secs. 18-25, 18-14. Reserved.

Article II. Collection Regulations

Sec. 18-15. Litter on sidewalk.
Sec. 18-16. Preparation for deposit.
Sec. 18-17. Garbage containers.
Sec. 18-17.1. Rental units; garbage and recycling service.
Sec. 18-18. Maintenance of containers.
Sec. 18-19. Garbage service required.
Sec. 18-20. Yard waste collection.
Sec. 18-21. Residential recycling collection and containers.
Sec. 18-22. Non-residential recyclable collection.
Sec. 18-23. Apartment garbage and recycling service.
Sec. 18-24. Residential recyclables; required recyclables.
Sec. 18-25. Business reporting of recyclable materials.
Sec. 18-26. Solid waste containing recyclable materials.
Sec. 18-27. Waste disposal site.
Secs. 18-25, 18-26, 18-27. Reserved.

Article III. Sanitary Landfill

Sec. 18-28. Designation.
Sec. 18-29. Unlawful deposits.
Sec. 18-30. Rates for use.
Sec. 18-31. Drop-off site for large electronics and hand-held electronics; fees; etc.
Sec. 18-32. Certain materials excluded.
Sec. 18-33. Removal restricted.
Sec. 18-34. Private landfill unlawful.
Sec. 18-35. Refusal to admit certain vehicles.
Secs. 18-36, 18-43. Reserved.

Article IV. Commercial Haulers

Sec. 18-44. License required.
Sec. 18-45. Chapter 23 applicable.
Sec. 18-46. Identifying name
Sec. 18-47. Reserved.
Sec. 18-48. Transfer.
Sec. 18-49. Expiration.
Sec. 18-50. Hauling unit permits.
Sec. 18-51. Unit inspection required.
Sec. 18-52. Display of permit.

* Cross references: Administration, ch. 2; food and food handlers, ch. 17; disposal of garbage and waste food by food establishments, ' 17-8; health and sanitation, ch. 19; examples of nuisances, ' 19-50; garbage disposal in mobile home parks, ' 24-17; littering in parks, ' 27-8; plumbing, ch. 33; utilities, ch. 41.

State law references: Municipal garbage disposal systems, SDCL 9-32-11.
Sec. 18-53. Minimum design and capacity requirements for vehicles and containers.
Sec. 18-54. Loading of vehicles.
Sec. 18-55. Reserved.
Sec. 18-56. Collection conditions.
Sec. 18-57. Minimum vehicle requirements.
Sec. 18-58. Proof of insurance required for license.
Sec. 18-59. Solid waste collection rates.
Sec. 18-60. Garbage haulers licensed recyclable collectors.
Sec. 18-61. Licensed recyclable collectors.
Sec. 18-62. Reserved.
Sec. 18-63. Filing of reports.
Sec. 18-64. Recycling collection and/or processor; license required.
Sec. 18-65. Reserved.
Sec. 18-66. Filing of reports.
Sec. 18-67. Confidentiality of information.
Sec. 18-68. Customer information.
Sec. 18-69. Reserved.

Article V. Solid Waste, Regulated Medical Waste, Transfer in Recycling Facilities

Sec. 18-70. License required.
Sec. 18-71. Application for license.
Sec. 18-72. Transfer.
Sec. 18-73. Renewal.
Sec. 18-74. License fees.
Sec. 18-75. Denial or revocation.
Sec. 18-76. Operating requirements.
Sec. 18-77. Volume reduction permitted.
Sec. 18-78. Conduct prohibited.
Sec. 18-79. Requirements for disposal of solid waste generated from the treatment of regulated medical waste.

Article VI. Solid Waste Planning Board

Sec. 18-80. Creation.
Sec. 18-81. Composition of board.
Sec. 18-82. Purpose.
Sec. 18-83. Staff.
ARTICLE I. IN GENERAL

Sec. 18-1. Definitions.

The following words, terms and phrases, when used in this chapter, shall mean except where the context clearly indicates a different meaning:

Animal waste means any accumulation of manure or straw which has been used for the transportation, housing or penning of animals.

Apartment means any building with two or more rental dwelling units.

Chip Board means a type of paperboard generally made from reclaimed paper stock such as cereal boxes.

Catch basin means a formed holding area for sludges, sediments, screenings, or grit which may include the cleanout and settling tank areas.

Commercial garbage collector or commercial garbage hauler means any person who transports any garbage, rubbish, or livestock waste to the City of Sioux Falls Sanitary Landfill for a consideration or a fee.

Contaminated means impure, unclean, dirty, grimy, or infectious.

Construction and demolition debris means carpet, wood, construction plastic, shingles, glass, metals, wiring, insulation, tile, drywall, furniture, concrete, and mattresses.

Curbside means on the public right-of-way, generally between the sidewalk and the paved portion of the street.

Corrugated cardboard means heavy paper with alternating ridges and grooves.

Garbage or municipal solid waste means all refuse, containers or accumulation of animal or vegetable matter which attends the processing, preparation, transportation, cooking, eating, sale, or storage of meat, fish, vegetables, fruit and all other food or food products found within the city which has been condemned by the health department as a nuisance or is likely to cause or transmit disease, or which may be a hazard to health. This definition excludes all items defined in section 18-32.

Garbage collector or garbage hauler means any person who hauls or transports any garbage to the City of Sioux Falls Sanitary Landfill.

Hand-held electronics means cell phones, pagers, personal digital assistants, handheld video games, calculators, small MP3 players, small compact disc players, small cassette players, small radios, small walkie talkies and digital and electronic cameras.

Hauling unit means the container in which garbage or materials listed in section 18-32 is transported. It may be permanently affixed to a chassis or may be temporarily attached, such as a roll-off unit.

Hazardous material is any material that has a hazardous characteristic, such as being ignitable, corrosive, reactive, or toxic.

Hazardous waste is any waste that is on the Environmental Protection Agency's hazardous waste list in 40 CFR 261 or which is known to have a hazardous characteristic, such as being ignitable, corrosive, reactive, or toxic.

Large electronics means desktop and laptop personal computers, monitors, mainframe computers, battery backup uninterruptible power supplies, printers, scanners, copy machines, fax machines, televisions, video cassette recorders, laser disc players, digital video disc players and stereo receivers.

Litter means garbage, rubbish, waste material or animal waste improperly disposed of by discarding, abandoning, allowing to accumulate, scattering or depositing the same outside an approved container.

Magazines means multi-page publications, whether published periodically or not, of coated paper.

Metal containers means any container made from aluminum, tin or steel which contained a product for consumption.

Newspaper means printed ground wood paper commonly referred to as newsprint, including glossy advertisements delivered with the newspaper.


Paper products means magazines, catalogs, advertising supplements, books and junk mail. It does not include chip board, items such as juice boxes, milk cartons, cereal boxes, mix boxes, tissue boxes, shoe boxes, soda and beer cartons, etc.

Plastic containers means any formed or molded container composed predominately of plastic resin.

Recyclable collector means any person who collects or receives recyclable materials from another person or persons for a consideration or a fee and/or for the purpose of resale.
Recycling collection facility means an established facility where recyclable materials are collected for shipment offsite with no processing. Fully enclosed automated self-serve aluminum collection machines are considered recycling collection facilities. Facilities which handle recyclable hazardous materials or waste petroleum products are considered recycling collection facilities. Scrap metal/junk yards are excluded from this definition.

Recycling container means a container which will securely hold recyclable materials for collection and will prevent recyclables from falling or being blown from the container.

Recyclable materials means materials or products that may be readily separated from the solid waste stream and may be used or reused as a substitute for raw materials or other items, including but not limited to aluminum, glass paper, plastic and steel.

Recycling processing facility means an established facility where recyclable materials are collected and/or processed by sorting, volume reduction, containment or other preparation for shipment offsite. Electronics recycling facilities are included.

Regulated medical waste means medical waste as defined by section 15.03.020(533).

Residential means a dwelling having accommodation for and occupied by one or more families.

Residential recyclables Required recyclables means:

(1) Office paper.

(2) Corrugated cardboard and chip board.

(3) Plastics #1 and #2 and metal containers.

(4) Newspapers.

(5) Electronics.

(6) Magazines.

(7) Bulk-rate mail.

Rubbish means all combustible refuse matter, such as contaminated or non-recyclable paper, sweepings, rags, contaminated cardboard, and similar materials.

Salvaging means the controlled removal of waste materials for reuse.

Sanitary landfill means the area provided by the city for the dumping or depositing of garbage, rubbish, animal waste, litter and waste materials not prohibited by city ordinance.

Scavenging means the uncontrolled and unauthorized removal of waste materials.

Sludges means any solid, semisolid, or liquid waste encountered, collected, and/or concentrated from a municipal, commercial, or industrial wastewater treatment plant, water supply treatment plant, catch basins, or air pollution control facility exclusive of the treated effluent from a wastewater treatment plant.

Solid waste means garbage, rubbish, waste materials, special wastes, and sludges as defined in this section.

Solid waste generated from the treatment of regulated medical waste means waste generated from the treatment of regulated medical waste in conformance with city, state, and federal rules and regulations so it no longer poses a threat to public health.

Solid waste transfer facility means a fixed facility where solid waste from collection vehicles is consolidated and temporarily stored for subsequent transport to a permanent disposal site.

Special waste means asbestos; gasoline, fuel oil or waste oil, contaminated soils, materials, sediments, etc.; co-mingled gasoline and fuel oil and/or waste oil contaminated soils, materials, sediments, etc.; and anti-freeze contaminated soils, materials, sediments, etc.

Waste material means all nonrecyclable and noncombustible inorganic matter such as ashes, glass, sand, earth, stones, concrete, mortar, metals, and similar material.

Wood waste means trees, any size diameter tree branches, brush, wood, wood shavings and wood pallets.

Yard waste means grass clippings, garden waste, and leaves.

Sec. 18-2. Littering prohibited - Generally.

It shall be unlawful for any person to throw, drop, cast or deposit upon any street, alley, sidewalk, lake, stream, river,
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Sec. 18-3. Same Duty of business owners, occupants.

(a) Generally. The owner or occupant of any store or other place of business situated within the city shall exercise reasonable diligence at all times to keep his premises clean of wastepaper, wrapping paper, paper napkins, cartons, package containers, and other used or waste materials thrown or left on such premises, and to take reasonable measures to prevent the materials from drifting or blowing to adjoining premises.

(b) Receptacles. Separate garbage and recycling receptacles of sufficient size and number shall be kept accessible to all persons on the premises where such articles may be placed.

(c) Signs. Every business establishment shall place upon its premises in a conspicuous place, in close proximity to the receptacles referred to in subsection (b) of this section, a sign which shall, in essence, convey to all persons a request that they use such receptacles for their separate disposal of garbage and recyclable materials.

Sec. 18-4. Same Duty of person.

It shall be unlawful for any person going upon the premises of another to in any manner dispose of wastepaper, wrapping paper, paper napkins, cartons, package containers, and other used or waste materials except in receptacles provided for such purposes. It shall be unlawful for any person going upon the premises of another to dispose of recyclables in a garbage receptacle or to dispose of garbage in a recycling receptacle which may cause or permit recyclables to become contaminated or otherwise unfit or more difficult to recycle.

Sec. 18-5. Littering on premises of another.

It shall be unlawful for any person going upon the premises of another to in any manner dispose of litter except in receptacles provided for such purposes and except with the permission of the person in possession of the premises.

Sec. 18-6. Removal of litter by city.

If the occupant, person in charge or owner of any real property within 14 days fails to remove litter from real property after notice from the city to do so, the city may cause such litter to be removed and for such purpose may enter upon any such real property. The cost of such removal may be assessed against the real property.

Sec. 18-7. Violation of rules, regulations.

It is unlawful to violate any promulgated rule or regulation of the Sioux Falls Regional Sanitary Landfill established by the city. The Director is authorized to adopt any rules or regulations as may be necessary to ensure its oversight. A copy of such rules or regulations shall be filed with the city clerk, with public notice thereof to be provided by the clerk by publishing the notice of rules change in a newspaper of general circulation within the city's jurisdiction. The proposed rules or regulations shall be posted on the city's website. This public notice and posting shall occur at least 30 days before the effective date of such rules or regulations.

ARTICLE II. COLLECTION REGULATIONS

Sec. 18-15. Litter on sidewalk.

The owner or occupant of any lot or private ground abutting upon any public sidewalk shall not allow rubbish, debris or obstruction of any kind to be or remain on such sidewalk along such abutting property.

Sec. 18-16. Preparation for deposit.

All household and commercially generated garbage, animal waste, rubbish, and other materials shall be placed in a securely tied bag. Recyclable materials shall be separated into their respective categories from the waste stream. Animal waste from commercial operations shall be transported and deposited in covered leakproof hauling units.

Sec. 18-17. Garbage and Recycling containers.

The occupant, owner, or manager of every dwelling, house, apartment, or construction site and of every place of business and building shall provide suitable, rigid watertight
containers, in which the occupants shall cause to be deposited all garbage, animal waste, and rubbish and recyclable materials, except yard waste, accumulating upon the premises. The garbage and recycling containers shall be kept in an inconspicuous place beside or behind the structure which is reasonably accessible to the licensed commercial garbage hauler. There shall be provided a tightly-fitted cover for each container which shall be removed only for the purpose of cleaning or depositing or removing recyclable materials, garbage, rubbish, and animal waste or cleaning. The vicinity of the garbage container shall be kept free from garbage, rubbish, animal waste, litter, yard waste or any putrescible matter that attracts flies and rats.

(Ord. No. 73-75, * 5, 11-17-75; Ord. No. 88-81, * 4, 11-2-81; Ord. No. 60-92, * 2, 6-22-92; Ord. No. 149-95, * 1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)
Sec. 18-17.1. Rental units: Garbage and recycling service.

The owner or manager of any dwelling who rents, leases, or lets dwelling unit(s) for human habitation shall provide in a location accessible to all dwelling units at least one 30-gallon receptacle for each dwelling unit, or receptacles with a capacity sufficient to prevent the overflow of garbage and rubbish from occurring, and receptacles for recycling, into which garbage, rubbish, and recyclable materials from the dwelling units may be emptied between days of collection. The owner or manager of the units shall subscribe to and pay for garbage removal and recycling service as required by ordinance. For single-family dwelling units and duplexes, such services may be provided by the tenant, if a written lease so provides.

(Ord. No. 71-99, '1, 7-6-99; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-18. Maintenance of containers.

Every container required by this article shall be maintained in as sanitary condition as possible in view of the use to which it is put, and shall be thoroughly cleansed as needed by washing, sanitizing or otherwise.

(Ord. No. 73-75, '6, 11-17-75; Ord. No. 88-81, '5, 11-2-81; Ord. No. 149-95, '1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-19. Garbage service required.

Every dwelling unit and every other occupied building within the city shall have commercial garbage service. The occupant, owner, or manager of such dwelling or other occupied building shall each be responsible for securing such service at least once each week for each occupied building within the city.

(Ord. No. 73-75, '7, 11-17-75; Ord. No. 43-93, '2, 5-17-93; Ord. No. 149-95, '1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 43-97, '2, 6-2-97; Ord. No. 74-04, '3, 7-12-04; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-20. Yard waste collection.

Yard waste shall be collected by licensed commercial garbage haulers. Yard waste shall be deposited in a proper container, a Kraft-type paper bag designated for yard waste, or a 32-gallon rigid watertight container with a tightly fitted cover, and placed at a location, other than curbside, designated for collection by the licensed commercial garbage hauler contracted to remove the same. All yard waste and containers therefore shall be kept in an inconspicuous place except when placed for collection. Yard waste shall be collected or removed at a minimum of once a week.

(Ord. No. 60-92, '3, 6-22-92; Ord. No. 72-92, '1, 8-3-92; Ord. No. 43-93, '4, 5-17-93; Ord. No. 70-93, '1, 9-20-93; Ord. No. 149-95, '1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-21. Residential recycling collection and containers.

Residential recyclables shall be collected at least one or twice each month by a licensed garbage hauler. Recyclables shall be separated from household garbage and rubbish and deposited in a proper recycling container and placed at a location, other than curbside, as directed by the licensed hauler contracted to remove the same. All recyclables and containers therefore shall be kept in an inconspicuous place except when placed for collection. Recyclables collected shall not be deposited at the sanitary landfill. The separation of glass shall be on a voluntary basis.

(Ord. No. 43-93, '5, 5-17-93; Ord. No. 70-93, '2, 9-20-93; Ord. No. 149-95, '1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 43-97, '3, 6-2-97; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-22. Non-residential recyclable collection.

Commercial and business establishments, governmental facilities, entertainment facilities, and schools, shall separate from the waste stream all items excluded from disposal at the Landfill as specified in section 18-32 generated by or accruing to such establishments, prior to removal from the subject premises. Such recyclable materials shall not be deposited at the sanitary landfill. Such recyclables shall be removed from the premises at a minimum of one or twice a month.

(Ord. No. 149-95, '1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 43-97, '4, 6-2-97)

Sec. 18-23. Apartment garbage and recycling service.

Every owner of an apartment shall do the following to facilitate recycling in each such building:

1. Provide adequate recycling containers for recyclable material. Containers shall be stored on the premises in a screened location that is convenient for the deposit and collection of recyclables.

2. Provide recycling service along with garbage service.

3. Distribute written information to the building tenants at the time of leasing and at least annually thereafter regarding the established recycling program. If the landlord changes the garbage/recycling service provider, the landlord shall promptly provide tenants with recycling information relative to the new provider.

4. Annually post a copy of the recycling information in a conspicuous place available to all residents, unless the physical structure of the premises does not allow for a common area which is available to all tenants. Any time the information is not easily legible, it shall be reposted.

5. Provide notification to the City Recycling Coordinator by April 30 of each year of the following:
a. Written information given to tenants about established recycling programs;
b. That recycling information has been posted in a conspicuous place on the premises;
c. The identity of the garbage hauler hired to provide the service to each apartment building, by address; and
d. The information being provided to his or her tenants, i.e., City of Sioux Falls recycling brochure, garbage hauler’s letter, or landlord-drafted letter.

Information not received by the Recycling Sustainability Coordinator by May 1 shall be considered delinquent. Failure to provide information shall be punished as any other violation of ordinance.

Sec. 18-24. Residential recyclables.

Residential recyclables shall be stored separately from garbage while awaiting collection.

Sec. 18-25. Business reporting of recyclable materials.

Businesses are required to report the weight of any recyclable materials hauled, transferred or recycled by self or others to their garbage hauler for use by the garbage hauler to account for recyclable materials.

Sec. 18-26. Solid waste containing recyclable materials.

Garbage haulers shall not collect solid waste containing visible required recyclables for disposal. Garbage haulers must leave a note explaining why solid waste was not collected. Residents and businesses must remove those required recyclable materials before the garbage hauler can collect solid waste that has been rejected for this reason.

Sec. 18-27. Waste disposal site.

All garbage generated within the City of Sioux Falls must be disposed at the Sioux Falls Regional Sanitary Landfill.

ARTICLE III. SANITARY LANDFILL

Sec. 18-28. Designation.

The city council shall designate an area to be known as the sanitary landfill which shall be for the deposit of municipal solid waste, construction and demolition debris, asbestos, and other waste materials.

Sec. 18-29. Unlawful deposits.

It shall be unlawful for any person to deposit or cause to be deposited any garbage, rubbish, animal waste or
other waste material in or upon any park, street, alley, gutter or in or upon any other private or public property within this city or upon any other property on the route between this city and the sanitary landfill area.

(1957 Rev. Ords., * 7.908; Ord. No. 2308, 12-14-64; Ord. No. 88-81, * 7, 11-2-81; Ord. No. 149-95, * 1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

**Sec. 18-30. Rates for use.**

(a) Municipal solid waste, sludges, or solid waste generated from the treatment of regulated medical waste, and other solid waste material not defined within this section generated in Minnehaha, McCook, Lincoln, Turner, and Lake Counties, South Dakota, deposited at Sioux Falls landfill:

1. Passenger car: $8.00 to include surcharge.
2. Pickup trucks, panel trucks, and two-wheel trailers not to exceed three cubic yards: $16.00 to include surcharge.
3. Four-wheel trailers and trucks: $32.00 per ton, plus surcharge, with a minimum charge of $16.00 per load.
4. Municipal solid waste, sludges, or solid waste generated from the treatment of regulated medical waste, and other solid waste material not defined within this section generated outside of Minnehaha, McCook, Lincoln, Turner, and Lake Counties, South Dakota: $96.50 per ton, with a minimum charge of $16.00 per load.

(b) Construction and demolition debris waste, wood waste, and appliances generated in Minnehaha, McCook, Lincoln, Turner, and Lake Counties, South Dakota, deposited at Sioux Falls landfill:

1. Passenger car: $8.00 to include surcharge.
2. Pickup trucks, panel trucks, and two-wheel trailers not to exceed three cubic yards: $16.00 to include surcharge.
3. Four-wheel trailers and trucks: $30.00 per ton, plus surcharge, with a minimum charge of $16.00 per load.
4. Trailer houses shall be charged at $7.00 per cubic yard, utilizing 3 feet times length times width, and converting to cubic yards.
5. Construction and demolition debris waste, wood waste, and appliances generated outside of Minnehaha, McCook, Lincoln, Turner,
and Lake Counties, South Dakota: $96.50 per ton, with a minimum charge of $16.00 per load.

(c) Yard waste:
   (1) Passenger car: $2.00 to include surcharge.
   (2) Pickup trucks, panel trucks, and two-wheel trailers not to exceed three cubic yards: $5.00 to include surcharge.
   (3) Commercial haulers, four-wheel trailers, and trucks: $10.00 per ton, with a minimum charge of $2.00 per load.

(4) Yard waste generated outside Minnehaha, McCook, Lincoln, Turner, and Lake Counties, South Dakota: $22.00 per ton or $3.00 per bag.

(5) Leaves generated in the City of Sioux Falls and unloaded at city-designated leaf drop-off sites by individuals (no commercial vehicles): $2.00 per passenger car, pickup truck, or two-wheel trailer.

(d) Tires:
   (1) All tires 17 inches in diameter or smaller: $2.00 each or $135.00 per ton.
   (2) All tires larger than 17 inches in diameter: $7.00 each or $135.00 per ton.

(e) Special waste generated in Minnehaha, McCook, Lincoln, Turner, and Lake Counties, South Dakota:
   (1) Asbestos: $15.00 per cubic yard based on the manufacturer's box rating or on box capacity as determined through measurement by the city.
   (2) Contaminated soils, materials, sediments containing petroleum constituents or antifreeze: $15.00 per cubic yard.
   (3) The minimum charge under this section is a three cubic yard or three ton charge.

(f) Special waste generated outside Minnehaha, McCook, Lincoln, Turner, and Lake Counties, South Dakota:
   (1) Asbestos: $70.00 per cubic yard based on the manufacturer's box rating or on box capacity as determined through measurement by the city.
   (2) Contaminated soils, materials, sediments containing petroleum constituents or antifreeze: $70.00 per ton.
   (3) The minimum charge under this section is a three cubic yard or three ton charge.

(g) Large electronics: $10.00 per unit up to three units, $1.00 per pound for over three units.

(h) Hand-held electronics: No charge for up to ten units, $1.00 per pound for over ten units.

(i) In addition to the above rates for solid waste, there will be added thereto a solid waste management fee of $1.00 per ton pursuant to SDCL 34A-6-81.

(j) Loads that are not properly tarped or secured: $25.00.

Exceptions: asphalt, concrete, contaminated soil, steel, white goods, and tires if loaded in a manner such that the items are not likely to fall or be blown from the vehicle.

(k) The city may charge patrons of the sanitary landfill, compost site, or the rubble site any and all costs associated with the patrons' failure to follow sanitary landfill, compost site, or rubble site rules and procedures for any class of waste.

(l) Deer or elk carcasses generated within the state: private individuals, no charge up to ten carcasses; businesses, $50.00 per ton.

(m) Deer or elk carcasses generated outside the state: $500.00 per ton.

(n) Licensed garbage haulers that exceed the recycling goal, as set forth in section 18-75 by 50% shall receive a $1.00 per municipal solid waste ton rebate that will be credited by March 31st of the following year. The first rebates will be awarded by March 31st of 2011, based on garbage hauler recycling rates in 2010. Garbage haulers that receive this rebate are strongly encouraged to use this rebate to enhance their recycling efforts and/or reward their customers.
Sec. 18-31. Drop-off site for large electronics and hand-held electronics; fees; etc.

The city shall provide a drop-off site for large electronics and hand-held electronics at least twice each year upon dates and at locations that are approved by the city council. Any fees authorized by section 18-30 of this code of ordinances shall be waived for any citizen of the counties served by the City of Sioux Falls Sanitary Landfill bringing large electronics or hand-held electronics to the designated drop-off site for disposal. (Ord. No. 38-04, 4-4-04; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-32. Certain materials excluded.

The following materials shall be excluded from the solid wastes deposited at the landfill site:

1. Office paper.
2. Corrugated cardboard and chip board.
3. Plastic containers #1 and #2.
4. Metal containers.
5. Automobile bodies or other bulky articles.
6. Wood waste, unless hauled by a licensed commercial garbage hauler as municipal solid waste.
7. Oils, gasoline and other petroleum products.
(10) Yard waste.

(11) Lead acid batteries.

(12) Waste tires.

(13) White good appliances.

(14) Regulated medical waste.

(15) Radioactive materials.

(16) Large and hand-held electronics.

(17) Magazines.

(18) Newspaper.

(19) Bulk-rate mail.

Any person bringing material for deposit at the landfill, upon entry onto the landfill premises, authorizes the city to inspect the material before deposit. If excluded materials are discovered during the inspection, the city may refuse the entire load and charge the person attempting to deposit the materials the cost of the inspection.

(4) The city reserves the right to recover materials for use at city facilities.

Sec. 18-34. Private landfill unlawful.

No person shall operate or permit the operation of a disposal site in the city for the disposal of garbage, litter, rubbish or animal waste.

Sec. 18-35. Refusal to admit certain vehicles.

The city may refuse the admittance or the unloading at the sanitary landfill of the following vehicles:

(1) Those so loaded or uncovered so that material may fall or be blown off the vehicle while in transit.

(2) Those not having a permit displayed as required by section 18-52.

(3) Those containing special wastes not having received prior approval of the director or his designee or not having provided the landfill a minimum of 24 hours notice of intent to deliver said special wastes.

(4) Those containing materials in a form which when unloaded at the landfill will blow or is prone to blow from the face of the landfill.

(5) Those containing solid waste from the treatment of regulated medical waste not having documentation of waste sources and third party testing.

(6) Those belonging to or operated by an entity having an unpaid balance on account with the City of Sioux Falls Sanitary Landfill that is 60 days or more past due.

Secs. 18-36C-18-43. Reserved.
ARTICLE IV. COMMERCIAL HAULERS

Sec. 18-44. License required.

No commercial garbage hauler shall use the streets or the City of Sioux Falls Sanitary Landfill for the collection, removal or disposal of any garbage, animal waste, rubbish, or recyclable materials without first having obtained a garbage hauler's license from the city.

(Sec. 18-44)(Ord. No. 111-89, '1, 10-16-89; Ord. No. 149-95, '1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 98-02, '1, 11-18-02; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-45. Chapter applicable.

The provisions of chapter 23, insofar as the chapter may be applicable and not in conflict, shall apply to and govern the issuance of any license under the provisions of this article.

(Sec. 18-45)(Ord. No. 111-89, '1, 10-16-89; Ord. No. 149-95, '1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-46. Identifying name.

Each vehicle having a permit under this article shall permanently display the licensed commercial garbage hauler's name in easily-legible letters at least three inches high or identifying logo. Any container belonging to a licensed commercial garbage hauler shall bear the hauler's name or identifying logo. Recyclables containers shall also be labeled for specific materials to be placed therein.

(Sec. 18-46)(Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-47. Reserved.

Sec. 18-48. Transfer.

A license issued under the provisions of this article may be transferred after paying the city a transfer fee as set out in section 23-30(10). The transfer will be approved only to a person meeting the minimum startup requirements for garbage hauling. Any person having a controlling interest in an existing garbage hauling operation cannot have a monetary interest in other licensed garbage hauling operations in the city. Licenses transferred upon sale of a business to a new owner may be reissued in the name of the previous owner upon payment of a reissuance fee, compliance with the provisions of this article and proof that the business has been returned.

(Sec. 18-48)(Ord. No. 111-89, '1, 10-16-89; Ord. No. 149-95, '1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-49. Expiration.

Every license issued under the provisions of this article, unless renewed, shall expire on December 31 following its date of issuance. Sale of a licensed garbage hauling business to an existing licensed garbage hauling business will cause the seller's license to expire upon transfer of responsibility for conducting or managing operations.

(Sec. 18-49)(Ord. No. 111-89, '1, 10-16-89; Ord. No. 149-95, '1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 15-03, '7, 2-10-03; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-50. Hauling unit permits.

A permit fee as set out in section 23-30(10) shall be charged for each hauling unit used by the licensee to transport garbage.

(Sec. 18-50)(Ord. No. 111-89, '1, 10-16-89; Ord. No. 149-95, '1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-51. Unit inspection required.

All hauling units permitted under this article shall be subject to random inspections by the city. Random inspections include inspections of vehicles, equipment, and contents delivered to the landfill for deposit.

(Sec. 18-51)(Ord. No. 111-89, '1, 10-16-89; Ord. No. 149-95, '1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 15-03, '8, 2-10-03; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-52. Display of permit.

The permits issued for the hauling units under this article shall be permanently displayed on each unit permitted to carry garbage.

(Sec. 18-52)(Ord. No. 111-89, '1, 10-16-89; Ord. No. 149-95, '1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-53. Minimum design and capacity requirements for vehicles and containers.

All licensed commercial garbage haulers are required to have watertight vehicles or containers which shall be permanently covered with no openings on top that would allow the contents to escape. All metal boxes are required and shall be equipped with metal doors which shall be in a closed position when the truck is in motion. Containers must be attached to the frame when in transport. Vehicles and containers must be manufactured or designed for garbage hauling. Pickup trucks containing dumpsters, open-framed boxes and wood-framed trucks are prohibited. Such vehicles or containers shall be thoroughly washed at such times as may be directed by the city or as may be necessary to keep the vehicles or containers in proper sanitary condition. Such vehicles or containers transporting garbage and rubbish or animal waste shall be so loaded that all the material shall be carried within the metal containers.

(Sec. 18-53)(Ord. No. 111-89, '1, 10-16-89; Ord. No. 149-95, '1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 15-03, '9, 2-10-03; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Cross references: Motor vehicles, ch. 25.
Sec. 18-54. Loading of vehicles.

Vehicles used for transporting rubbish, animal waste and waste materials shall be so loaded that no materials shall fall off or be blown off the vehicle while in transit. Loosely loaded vehicles with open boxes must be tarped.

(Ord. No. 111-89, ' 1, 10-16-89; Ord. No. 149-95, ' 1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-55. Reserved.

Sec. 18-56. Collection conditions.

Every licensed garbage collector or hauler shall collect the garbage, rubbish, and animal waste from residential customers at least once each week and from business customers at least once in each week. The collections in the business district shall be made as early in the day as convenient. Garbage, rubbish, and animal waste loaded in a hauling unit must be in transport to a proper disposal site within 48 hours after pickup, unless the City of Sioux Falls Sanitary Landfill has been closed for more than 24 consecutive hours.

(Ord. No. 111-89, ' 1, 10-16-89; Ord. No. 43-93, ' 3, 5-17-93; Ord. No. 149-95, ' 1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-57. Minimum vehicle requirements.

Persons seeking a garbage hauler's business license shall provide proof of ownership of a minimum of one packer truck in good working condition. This requirement shall not apply to persons using roll-off containers exclusively.

(Ord. No. 111-89, ' 1, 10-16-89; Ord. No. 149-95, ' 1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-58. Proof of insurance required for license.

No license shall be issued to any garbage hauler until proof of insurance is furnished to the city, showing the following insurance to be in full force and effect during the entire term of the license. The licensee shall furnish proof of liability insurance for public liability and property damage and for bodily injury/death growing out of any one accident or any other cause in the minimum sum of $250,000.00 for one person, with an annual aggregate limit of $500,000.00 for two or more persons; and in addition shall provide damage liability insurance in the minimum of $100,000.00 for property damage growing out of any one accident or other cause, or as an alternative, provide combined limit for bodily injury/death or property damage in the sum of $500,000.00. Such public liability and property damage insurance shall protect against loss from liability imposed by law for damages on account of bodily injury, including death resulting therefrom, suffered or alleged to have been suffered by any person resulting directly or indirectly from any act or activity of the licensee or any person acting for the licensee or under the licensee or under the licensee's control or direction and also to protect against loss from liability imposed by law for damages to property of any person caused directly or indirectly by acts or activities of the licensee or any person acting for the licensee or under the licensee's control or direction.

(Ord. No. 111-89, ' 1, 10-16-89; Ord. No. 149-95, ' 1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-59. Solid waste collection rates.

All licensed garbage haulers shall file, as a part of their application for a license, a general statement of their use of rate structures and billing systems consistent with the city's comprehensive plan of solid waste reduction and recycling program which shall include the following elements:

1. A Pay As You Throw (PAYT) rate to reward people who reduce their level of solid waste collection service based either upon volume or weight. Haulers must provide at least two levels of service based on volume or weight and each higher level of service must be at least 1.25 times the next lower level of service.

2. A rate to provide customers with adequate options and incentives to reduce their weekly level of solid waste collection service and the amount of solid waste collected as a result of their participation in waste reduction and recycling programs.

3. A rate that includes the combined cost of solid waste, using the above elements, and recycling collection services.

(Ord. No. 43-93, ' 6, 5-17-93; Ord. No. 149-95, ' 1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-60. Garbage haulers licensed recyclable collectors.

A license under section 18-44 permits and requires the holder to collect recyclables, as well as the items listed in that section.

(Ord. No. 43-93, ' 7, 5-17-93; Ord. No. 149-95, ' 1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-61. Licensed recyclable collectors.

It shall be unlawful to purchase recyclables in the city or use the streets for the collection of recyclables without first having obtained a recyclable collectors' license from the city. Only persons with a license under section 18-44 may collect residential recyclable/recyclables.

(Ord. No. 149-95, ' 1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)
Sec. 18-62.  Reserved.
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Sec. 18-63. Filing of reports.
Every licensed recyclable collector shall file with the Recycling Coordinator/Sustainability Coordinator a monthly report of their recycling tonnages on forms provided by the city showing the total weight by type of recyclables collected and those delivered to a recycling collection and/or processing facility not licensed by the city. Records relating to recycling activities shall be kept confidential, upon request, to the extent necessary to protect proprietary information.

(Ord. No. 149-95, * 1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 15-03, * 11, 2-10-03; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-64. Recycling collection and/or processor; license required.

It shall be unlawful to purchase recycled materials or operate a recycling collection facility or a recycling processing facility without first obtaining a recycling collection and/or processing facility license from the city. 

(Ord. No. 149-95, * 1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-65. Reserved.

Sec. 18-66. Filing of reports.

Every licensed recycling collection and/or processing facility shall file a monthly report before the 15th of the following month on forms provided by the city, showing the total weight by type of recyclables purchased and/or processed during the previous month’s reporting period. The report shall also include the total tonnage of waste or recycling materials accepted by the facility and the tonnage of that portion of the collected materials that were returned to the waste stream. Every licensed recycling hauler shall file a monthly report before the end of the following month, showing the total weight by type of recyclables collected and deposited at a processing facility during the previous month’s reporting period. Records relating to recycling activities shall be kept confidential, upon request, to the extent necessary, to protect proprietary information.

(Ord. No. 149-95, * 1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-67. Confidentiality of information.

The information disclosed under sections 18-59 and 18-63 may be disclosed only to the following:

(1) The licensee who is required to submit the information to the department, or his designee appointed in writing;

(2) Officers, employees, or legal representatives of the department for the purposes of, and only to the extent necessary in, the administration of this section;

(3) Any agency, body, commission, or legal representative of the United States or the State of South Dakota charged with the administration of solid waste management, and only to the extent necessary in, the administration of such laws and regulations; and

(4) To the extent required by a proper judicial or administrative order.

(Ord. No. 28-96, * 1, 3-4-96; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-68. Customer information.

All licensed garbage collectors/haulers shall at least annually provide customers with written information regarding volume of base-rate structure and garbage, recycling, and yard waste service.

(Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-69. Reserved.

ARTICLE V. SOLID WASTE, REGULATED MEDICAL WASTE, TRANSFER IN RECYCLING FACILITIES

Sec. 18-70. License required.

No person shall operate a solid waste or regulated medical waste, transfer or treatment facility without first having obtained a license to perform such service from the city.

(Ord. No. 93-88, * 2, 10-24-88; Ord. No. 149-95, * 1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 75-01, * 6, 8-6-01; Ord. No. 15-03, * 14, 2-10-03; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-71. Application for license.

A written application for a license required by this chapter, if not provided for otherwise, shall be filed with the city and shall set forth the following information:

(1) The true name and address of the owner or operator of the facility or site.

(2) Legal description of the place where the facility or site will be located.

(3) A schematic drawing of buildings and other structures, showing layout and general dimensions for unloading, storage, compacting, processing, parking and loading areas.

(4) The description of equipment including type, capacity and number of units.

(5) A description of the fire-control equipment and additional emergency firefighting equipment that will be located at the facility or site.
(6) An estimate of the design capacity and current daily capacity of the facility in tons.

(7) Anticipated amount and planned method for final disposal of authorized collections.

(8) Insurance requirements:

a. Workers' compensation insurance providing the statutory limits required by South Dakota law. In addition, it shall provide coverage B, employer's liability coverage, of not less than $1,000,000.00 each accident, $1,000,000.00 disease-Policy limits. The required limit may be met by excess liability (umbrella) coverage.

b. Commercial general liability insurance providing occurrence form contractual, personal injury, bodily injury, and a property damage and liability coverage with limits of at least $1,000,000.00 per occurrence, $2,000,000.00 general aggregate, and $2,000,000.00 aggregate products and completed operations. The required limit may include excess liability (umbrella) coverage. If "occurrence form" insurance is not available, "claims made" insurance will be acceptable.

c. Automobile liability insurance covering all owned, nonowned, and hired automobiles, trucks, and trailers. The coverage shall be as broad as that found in the standard comprehensive automobile liability policy with limits of not less than $1,000,000.00 combined single limit each occurrence. The required limit may include excess liability (umbrella) coverage.

The city's approval or acceptance of certificates of insurance does not constitute city assumption of responsibility for the validity of any insurance policies nor does the city represent that the above coverages and limits are adequate to protect any individual/group or business, and assumes no liability therefor.

(9) A bond shall be filed with the city finance office in an amount of at least $25,000.00, indemnifying the public against damages sustained because of any spill, dump or discharge occurring at the transfer, collection or processing facility or during transport from the facility to a permanent disposal site.

(10) A written emergency operational plan to provide for an alternative waste-handling system during periods of in operation, if applicable.

(11) A statement of the proposed days and hours of operation.

Sec. 18-72. Transfer.

Licenses issued pursuant to this chapter are not transferable.

Sec. 18-73. Renewal.

The city may, upon reapplication, renew a license issued under this article.

Sec. 18-74. License fees.

On filing an original application or a renewal application for a license to operate a solid waste or regulated medical waste transfer or treatment facility, or a solid waste transfer site, the applicant shall pay a fee as provided for in Chapter 23.

Sec. 18-75. Denial or revocation.

A license required by this chapter may be denied or revoked by the city if one or more of the following facts or circumstances are found to exist:

1. The applicant is not able to obtain the necessary bonding and insurance.

2. The facility is permitted to operate in such a manner as to create air, land or water pollution, public health hazards or nuisances.

3. The facility or site is not maintained in a clean and sanitary condition.

4. Violation by the licensee of applicable noise and fire ordinances.
(5) Violation by the licensee of any applicable provision of this Code, state law, rule or regulation.

(6) Failure to pay or keep current any account with the Sanitary Landfill as required by section 18-35(6).

(7) Failure to meet the recycling goal for the previous year. The recycling goal for 2006 is eight percent by weight. The recycling goal for each subsequent year shall be the "mean" ratio recycled by all licensed commercial garbage haulers during the immediately prior year. Licensed commercial garbage haulers will be informed of the recycling goal for the current year by March 31.  

(Ord. No. 93-88, '2, 10-24-88; Ord. No. 149-95, '1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 15-03, '17, 2-10-03; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-76. Operating requirements.

General requirements and operation procedures for solid waste transfer facilities are listed as follows:

(1) Storage of salvage. Salvaging and volume reduction operations shall be restricted to a specified, clearly identified area of the transfer facility. Salvage materials generated onsite or imported shall be stored away from other activity areas and be limited to a volume as approved by the Sioux Falls Sanitary Landfill. Stored materials salvaged from solid wastes shall be ancillary to the operation of the facility, unless such storage is planned as an integral part of the operation.

(2) Drainage control. Surface drainage shall be handled as specified in the facility design. Storm water drainage leaving the facility shall not contain pollutants, solids, washwater or leachate emanating from solid wastes or any other process wastewater.

(3) Housekeeping. A high standard of housekeeping is required in the maintenance of station equipment. Accumulation of fuel drums, parts, inoperable equipment, tires, scrap, and similar items must be minimized unless reasonably screened from outside the station boundary.

(4) Odor control. The facility shall not be a source of odor nuisances.

(5) Equipment construction. All equipment used for the collection and transportation of solid wastes shall be durable, easily cleanable and designed for safe handling and constructed to prevent loss of waste from the equipment during collection or transportation. All equipment shall be maintained in a good condition and cleaned in a frequency and in a manner to prevent the propagation or attraction of flies, mosquitoes, rodents, birds and other vectors.

(6) Frequency of removal. Waste can be stored at the transfer facility or site for no longer than 48 hours. A weekly removal of salvaged waste material is required. Other frequencies may be acceptable, so long as they do not result in health or safety problems and are authorized by the Sioux Falls Sanitary Landfill.

(Ord. No. 93-88, '2, 10-24-88; Ord. No. 149-95, '1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 15-03, '18, 2-10-03; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-77. Volume reduction permitted.

Volume reduction operations, such as baling, shredding, compacting, or salvaging, are permitted at a solid waste transfer facility, provided they are conducted in a controlled manner as an integral part of the operation and in conformance with conditions established by the Sioux Falls Sanitary Landfill. Volume reduction activities shall not interfere with other aspects of facility operation and shall be controlled to minimize health, safety, or nuisance problems.

(Ord. No. 93-88, '2, 10-24-88; Ord. No. 149-95, '1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-78. Conduct prohibited.

The following conduct is prohibited, unless the applicable permit to allow such activity has been obtained and the operation is in accordance with the appropriate federal, state, and local laws, rules and regulations:

(1) Scavenging.

(2) Acceptance of hazardous substances.

(3) Acceptance of regulated medical wastes.

(4) Acceptance of liquid wastes.

(Ord. No. 93-88, '2, 10-24-88; Ord. No. 149-95, '1, 11-20-95; Ord. No. 75-01, '8, 8-6-01; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)
Sec. 18-79. Requirements for disposal of solid waste generated from the treatment of regulated medical waste.

Any person that brings solid waste generated from the treatment of regulated medical waste to the landfill shall meet the following requirements:

(1) Provide documentation that the waste has been properly treated. Sampling and testing of the solid waste generated from the treatment of regulated medical waste shall be performed by a method and frequency approved by the city.

(2) Maintain waste manifests containing information regarding the waste generators and quantities of materials treated from each source.

(3) Allow the city to inspect the treatment facility and required records.

(4) The facility shall maintain all records for a minimum of three years.

(Ord. No. 75-01, * 10, 8-6-01; Ord. No. 15-03, * 19, 2-10-03; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

ARTICLE VI. SOLID WASTE PLANNING BOARD

Sec. 18-80. Creation.

There is hereby created a solid waste planning board.

(Ord. No. 61-98, * 1, 6-15-98; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-81. Composition of board.

The solid waste planning board shall be appointed by the mayor with the advice and consent of the council:

(1) Fifteen members shall be selected as follows:

a. Three members shall be city employees, the Landfill Manager, the Recycling/Sustainability Coordinator, and the Environmental Manager, each of whom shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor.

b. Two members shall be representatives of the garbage hauling/recycling industry.

c. One member shall be from the Minnehaha County Planning Office.

d. Three members shall be citizens of the City of Sioux Falls who have no financial interest in the garbage/recycling industry.

e. One member shall be selected by each of the governing bodies of Lake County, Lincoln County, McCook County, Turner County, and the City of Madison.

f. A member of the South Dakota Multi-housing Association.

(2) The terms of members, except the city employees, Minnehaha County Planning Office representative and the five members of the governing bodies of Lake County, Lincoln County, McCook County, Turner County and the City of Madison shall be for a period of three years, and members may serve an unlimited number of terms.

f. A member of the South Dakota Multi-housing Association.

(3) Members of the solid waste planning board are not required to be citizens of the City of Sioux Falls, with the exception of those indicated in (1) d. of this section.

(Ord. No. 61-98, * 1, 6-15-98; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)

Sec. 18-82. Purpose.

(a) Review the current waste stream of the users of the Sioux Falls landfill and investigate how the waste stream may vary in the future and analyze how current and future recycling efforts may impact on the waste stream.

(b) Assess the availability of markets and potential markets for recyclable materials on the local, regional, and national scale, including collection sites, actual recycling operations, prices, and any related matters.

(c) Develop plans for public education programs for waste reduction and recycling.

(d) Develop plans and pilot projects to achieve waste reduction and recycling goals and provide economic, environmental, and social cost-benefit analysis for each project.

(e) Assess current ordinances and statutes and recommend appropriate changes.

(f) Review and analyze alternative methods (other than landfilling) for disposal of "special wastes," i.e., hazardous wastes generated by households and small quantity generators, waste oil, tires, batteries, pesticides, and any other problem wastes.

(g) Make ongoing reports to the mayor of its findings and recommendations.
Sec. 18-83. Staff.

The city Recycling Sustainability Coordinator shall serve as chairman for the board. The city attorney shall appoint a staff member of the attorney's office to advise the board.

(Ord. No. 61-98, \* 1, 6-15-98; Ord. No. 63-06, 5-15-06)
CITY OF SIOUX FALLS
ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Chapter 66
Public Works / Landfill

Article 66:01
GARBAGE & RECYCLING

ADOPTED: TBD

REVISED: TBD
66:01:A01 - Exemption to Denial or Revocation of Chapter 18 License

The Director of Public Works may grant a temporary exemption to the requirements of Sioux Falls Ordinance Section 18-75 (7) for up to 12 months. This exemption is intended to allow a Licensee that is in good faith performing necessary requirements established in Section 66:01:B01 of these administrative rules to be allowed to operate as long as all other requirements are being met. A signed letter will be issued to the licensee allowing the temporary exemption. The licensee must continue to meet the requirements of Section 66:01:B01 for the exemption to remain in effect.

66:01:B01 - Licensee Requirements Necessary for Exemption from Denial or Revocation of License

The licensee must comply with the following requirements to continue to operate and to prevent their license from being denied or revoked.

a. Hire a qualified independent third party approved by the Sustainability Coordinator to evaluate its recycling procedures. Third party must submit a written report to the Sustainability Coordinator on whether it feels licensee can meet Section 18-75 requirements for the current year.
b. Continue to make good faith efforts to improve recycling.
c. Hauler must submit a corrective action plan to the Sustainability Coordinator indicating how they will improve their recycling percentage.
d. Ensure that the Recycling Goal for the remainder of the current year will be met.

If the above conditions are met the Director of Public Works may issue an exemption letter as established in Section 66:01:A01 of these rules. The exemption will be temporary in nature and is intended to allow time for the licensee to implement its proposed corrective actions.
SUBJECT: ADOPTION AND MODIFICATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

The following procedures are followed when adopting and modifying administrative rules to more clearly define the implementation, administration and execution of Chapter 18 of Revised Ordinances of Sioux Falls South Dakota.

Administrative Rules Process:

1. Rules are recommended for implementation by the Solid Waste Planning Board or the Office of Public Works;
2. Rules are drafted by the Office of Public Works;
3. Draft rules are reviewed by Public Works (PW) and City Attorney Office (CAO) management staff;
4. Draft rules are submitted to the Mayor to determine the necessity to adopt such rules through the executive and administrative authority vested in the mayor.
5. Draft rules are reviewed by the Solid Waste Planning Board and voted on whether to recommend adoption of rules;
6. Draft rules shall be submitted to the City Attorney, City Clerk, and the Public Service Committee of the City Council for review. Rules may be referred back to Mayor and Director of Public Works (DPW) for reconsideration if it is determined that:
   a. Council has not granted administrative rule-making authority in accordance with Section 2.12 of Article I. of City Charter. or
   b. Draft rules exceed authority of Chapter 18 of City ordinance. or
   c. Draft rules are in conflict with existing city ordinance. or
   d. Determine that draft rules or a specific component of rules is legislative in nature and would be more suited to be adopted as a City ordinance.
7. Mayor and DPW shall address any comment or concern made by the City Attorney, City Clerk, or the Public Service Committee of the City Council and finalize proposed draft rules.
8. Proposed draft rules filed with the City Clerk and are Public Noticed in the Argus Leader;
9. Formal public comment must be returned to the DPW during 30 day Public Notice period;
10. Administrative Rules are adopted by mayoral executive order at the end of the public comment period if no comment or appeal is formally received by the DPW;
11. Processing any formal public comment or appeal:
   a. Any public comment received during 30 day Public Notice period is evaluated by the Landfill Division;
   b. Recommended rule revision or response to comment is generated by Landfill Division and submitted to and reviewed by DPW;
   c. The DPW acts as an arbitrator between the Landfill Division and the aggrieved party who made public comment or appeal;
   d. If public comment cannot be resolved by a revision to the rule or response to the comment within 30 days of comment or appeal, only the specific section addressed by comment is stayed. Other portions of the Administrative Rules not contested may be adopted and implemented;
   e. The DPW shall request participation and assistance of the CAO for any unresolved conflicts with the rule;
   f. CAO will have final review and decision to resolve comment or appeal of rule on behalf of the Mayor;
g. Aggrieved party making public comment who has been harmed by final rule may appeal decision in accordance with Section 2-60 of Article VI. (Administrative Appeals) of City ordinance;

h. Contested rule shall be finalized and adopted by mayoral executive order based upon the findings of this appeal process;

i. Aggrieved party may pursue judicial review on any properly appealed rule;

12. Copy of final rule is maintained and administered by the Landfill Division and the CAO;

13. Copy of Administrative Rule is distributed to regulated community. (i.e. Rule is submitted to Garbage Haulers and Recycling Facilities at next scheduled training session or at time when license or permit is issued or reissued);

14. Final rule shall be implemented with the same general provisions and administration as a standard City ordinance.

_________________________  ____________  ____________
Dave McElroy          Adopted          Revised
Landfill Superintendent
Figure 18-8. Outcome Measure: Citizen Ratings of Residential Refuse Collection Services (page 2 of 2)

| Percentage | Piano TX | Phoenix AZ | Sarasota County FL | Gilbert AZ | Worthington OH | Fairfax County VA | Hill County GA | Dublin OH | Davenport IA | Elk Grove CA | Tacoma WA | Urbana IA | Long Beach CA | Skokie IL | Clayton MO | Williamsburg VA | Los Alamos County NM | Oklahoma City OK | Tracy CA | *Laguna Beach CA | Bedford MA | Arlington TX | Harrisonville MO | Austin TX | Scottsdale AZ | Highland Park IL | Coral Springs FL | Smyrna GA | Decatur GA | Crystal Lake IL | *Park Ridge IL | *Moline Park CA | *Livermore CA | Peoria AZ | McAllen TX | Duncanville TX | *Sugar Grove IL | *Port St Lucie FL | Mesa AZ | Dallas TX | Cartersville GA | Hampton VA | Sioux Falls SD | Savannah GA | Peoria County IL | *Bozeman MT | Rock Hill SC | Delaware OH | *Gainesville FL | *East Providence RI | White House TN | *Hanover County VA |
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Complete data sets, comments, and chapter PDFs are available only to CPM participants at http://icma.org/cpm.
For information about CPM, please visit http://icma.org/CPM.
Figure 18-9. Outcome Measure: Citizen Ratings of Residential Recycling Collection Services (page 2 of 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hampton VA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington OH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery OH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall County GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax County VA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota County FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin OH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbandale IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skokie IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin TX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisonville MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plano TX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Livermore CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsburg VA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Park Ridge IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral Springs FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Laguna Beach CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamos County NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sugar Grove IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsdale AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Lake IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mesic Park CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield County VA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington TX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyrna GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mc Allen TX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Port St Lucie FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Hill SC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncanville TX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*East Providence RI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas TX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Gainesville FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware OH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Novi MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Meridian Charter Township MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinnell Valley MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hanover County VA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria County IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bozeman MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White House TN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Complete data sets, comments, and chapter PDFs are available only to CPM participants at http://icma.org/cpm. For information about CPM, please visit http://icma.org/performance.
October 7, 2010

Dear <Hauler Contact>

This letter is meant to update haulers on issues that we are working to address. We will be renewing our efforts to work together with haulers, recyclers, citizens and businesses to continue to improve solid waste practices and recycling in our region. The City will be holding more frequent hauler and Solid Waste Planning Board meetings as we strive to reach another level in our efforts to build a more sustainable community. It is the City’s hope that all licensed garbage haulers are successful. To be successful, it is your responsibility to read and understand the contents of Chapter 18, Garbage and Recycling Ordinance of the City of Sioux Falls. RECYCLING IS VERY IMPORTANT FOR OUR CITY AS IT STRIVES TO BECOME MORE SUSTAINABLE. Haulers that meet and strive to exceed the required recycling goal (2010 goal is 13%) and conduct business in an environmentally friendly manner will be rewarded by increased demand from the public for solid waste services from a top performing recycling collection services company.

We continue to look for ways to incentivize recycling, especially ways to get incentives back to households that are doing a good job recycling. We welcome ideas and suggestions you have to accomplish this mission.

Earlier this year we implemented new monthly reporting forms to improve the required monthly reports from each hauler. The report format is intended to make the information more verifiable and accountable. Please give us your feedback if there are further improvements that can be made to this reporting process.

We will be performing increased hauler load inspections to check for prohibited materials and recyclable materials. Please continue to work with your customers to ensure that recyclable materials are being properly separated from solid waste. We will be increasing enforcement efforts on recyclable materials found in solid waste loads brought to the landfill.

The Solid Waste Planning Board is evaluating Administrative Rules that can be used to better define procedures to comply with ordinance requirements as it relates to the garbage and recycling industry. The current ordinance revisions developed in 2009 have not been acted on by the City Council. Based on the discussions we have had with the City Council, we want to provide them a copy of the draft Administrative Rules the board has developed. These rules...
are in draft form and we welcome your input. A draft copy of these Administrative Rules is enclosed.

We encourage your attendance at meetings regarding these matters and welcome your input and suggestions as we strive to meet the needs of our community. Please visit www.siouxfalls.org to stay up to date with related meeting information. Please contact us if you would like to be included on an email distribution list.

Last but not least, we want to assist in the education of your customers on recycling. We plan to develop and distribute large sticky notes that haulers can quickly write on and leave on a customer’s container to inform them of unacceptable disposal or recycling methods. For example, if the customer places recyclable materials in the garbage container, haulers should leave a note that is specific to what you observed to help educate the customer on proper disposal and recycling methods. Some haulers are already proactive with similar methods and we think a large sticky note with City logo will help to streamline this effort and provide an opportunity to further educate the customer.

Attachments referencing items we have discussed and plan to discuss are enclosed. Please review these and let us know your feedback. Recycling percentages by company are included. If you are at or below 13% please implement procedures immediately to improve your recycling practices before you submit your license renewal application.

We look forward to working with you and your company on these matters. If you have questions or suggestions, please feel free to contact me at (605) 367-8163.

Sincerely,

Dave McElroy
Landfill Superintendent, City of Sioux Falls

Cc Mike Huether, Mayor
Mark Cotter, Director of Public Works
Aimee Ladonski, Sustainability Coordinator
SWPB Members
Garbage Hauler File
Attachment 1

Recycling Percentages by hauler through June 2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hauler</th>
<th>Recycling Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ace Garbage Service</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addy Disposal</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al's Sanitary</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-OK Sanitary Service</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolte's Sunrise Sanitary Service</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bud's Cleanup Service</td>
<td>Reporting Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison</td>
<td>Reporting Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig's Sanitary</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D &amp; C Solid Waste Services</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota Disposal</td>
<td>Reporting Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan's Garbage Service</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ's Sanitary Service</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Garbage Service</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage N More</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haan Garbage Hauling</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg Sanitary Service Inc</td>
<td>Reporting Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland Disposal Services</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herm's Sanitation</td>
<td>Reporting Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman Sanitation</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J &amp; T Sanitation</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marv's of Brandon</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marv's Sanitary Of Sioux Falls</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novak Sanitary Service</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pik-N-Pak Disposal</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plucker's Sanitation</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R &amp; S Sanitation</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBS</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandman's Sanitary Service</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Bolte Sanitation Inc</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls Sanitation</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Dyke Sanitation Inc.</td>
<td>Reporting Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management of Sioux Falls</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recycling Percentages are through June 2010. We are attempting to resolve reporting issues. Please contact the Sustainability Program at 367-8165 for any issues.
Attachment 2

2009 Citizen’s Survey Results for Residential and Recycling Collection Services
Figure 18-8. Outcome Measure: Citizen Ratings of Residential Refuse Collection Services (page 2 of 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plano TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota County FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax County VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall County GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport IA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbana IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton MO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsburg VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamos County NM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City OK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Laguna Beach CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisonville MO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsdale AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral Springs FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyrna GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Lake IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Park Ridge IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Menlo Park CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Livermore CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecora AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mc Allen TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncannon TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sugar Grove IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Port St Lucie FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartersville GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk County FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bozeman MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Hill SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Gainesville FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*East Providence RI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White House TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hanover County VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complete data sets, comments, and chapter PDFs are available only to CPM participants at https://icma.org/cpm. For information about CPM, please visit http://icma.org/performance.
Figure 18-9. Outcome Measure: Citizen Ratings of Residential Recycling Collection Services (page 2 of 2)

Complete data sets, comments, and chapter PDFs are available only to CPM participants at http://icma.org/cpm.
For information about CPM, please visit http://icma.org/performace.
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Citizen Complaint Examples
Example 1:
Would it make sense to have the garbage haulers bid on sections of Sioux Falls to cut down on all of the overweight trucks going through the neighborhoods? I have counted as many as 6 different garbage trucks in one day drive by my house - this does not seem very efficient. Why send 6 heavy trucks down my street when one could accomplish the same task? Waste of fuel, increase in pollution, damage to the residential streets are all items that could be minimized.

Example 2:
I saw 4 garbage trucks on my way to work today. Makes no sense to me at all.

Example 3:
There are at least 8 haulers who service our neighborhood. This seems ridiculous and very inefficient.

Example 4:
I have a winter home in Arizona where the City does the collection of garbage and recycling and it makes a lot more sense than Sioux Falls system. There are too many trucks running up and down street and with the conditions of the roads this can’t be a good thing.

Example 5:
Why isn’t the City divided up into districts so we don’t have garbage trucks operating every day of the week. It would be nice if collection was only done 1 or 2 days of the week by area of town.

Example 6:
Why can’t the City collect all garbage on the same day?
Attachment 4

Draft Administrative Rules
CITY OF SIOUX FALLS
ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Chapter 66
Public Works / Landfill

Article 66:01
GARBAGE & RECYCLING

ADOPTED: TBD

REVISED: TBD
66:01:A01 - Exemption to Denial or Revocation of Chapter 18 License

The Director of Public Works may grant a temporary exemption to the requirements of Sioux Falls Ordinance Section 18-75 (7) for up to 12 months. This exemption is intended to allow a Licensee that is in good faith performing necessary requirements established in Section 66:01:B01 of these administrative rules to be allowed to operate as long as all other requirements are being met. A signed letter will be issued to the licensee allowing the temporary exemption. The licensee must continue to meet the requirements of Section 66:01:B01 for the exemption to remain in effect.

66:01:B01 - Licensee Requirements Necessary for Exemption from Denial or Revocation of License

The licensee must comply with the following requirements to continue to operate and to prevent their license from being denied or revoked.

   a. Hire a qualified independent third party approved by the Sustainability Coordinator to evaluate its recycling procedures. Third party must submit a written report to the Sustainability Coordinator on whether it feels licensee can meet Section 18-75 requirements for the current year.
   b. Continue to make good faith efforts to improve recycling.
   c. Hauler must submit a corrective action plan to the Sustainability Coordinator indicating how they will improve their recycling percentage.
   d. Ensure that the Recycling Goal for the remainder of the current year will be met.

If the above conditions are met the Director of Public Works may issue an exemption letter as established in Section 66:01:A01 of these rules. The exemption will be temporary in nature and is intended to allow time for the licensee to implement its proposed corrective actions.
October 14, 2010

To whom it may concern,

The City of Sioux Falls Sioux Falls Regional Sanitary Landfill (SFRSL) staff asks that commercial customers of waste haulers provide recycling information to waste haulers upon request. The numbers provided should be accurate and verifiable. Therefore, we ask that the commercial customer submit a weight ticket OR weight data on company letterhead that lists the tons of recyclables recycled. If commercial customers would prefer to provide this information directly to City of Sioux Falls staff, that is also acceptable.

There are currently 35 waste haulers operating in Lake, Lincoln, McCook, Minnehaha and Turner Counties. In an effort to increase recycling in our communities, administration requires accurate monthly recycling reports from all haulers that haul waste to the SFRS Landfill. The monthly reporting requirement asked of haulers is outlined in section 18-66 of the Revised Ordinances of the City of Sioux Falls.

The information presented on these reports is verified and used to calculate an annual recycling percentage for each hauler. Haulers that have customers that divert recyclables by means other than the hauler are often unable to capture that recycling data. This has the potential to impact haulers individual recycling rates. By taking just a few moments to provide this information to your hauler and/or the City of Sioux Falls Regional Sanitary Landfill Staff each month, you are contributing to the environmental sustainability of the communities in our region. For that, we thank you. If you have any questions about this process, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards,

Aimee House Ladonski
Sustainability Coordinator
City of Sioux Falls
605-367-8299
www.siouxfalls.org/green
Report

City of Roseville
Recycling Pilot Program
Summary

Ramsey County, Minnesota

December 2005
December 29, 2005

Norm Schiferl
Saint Paul - Ramsey County Department of Public Health
Environmental Health Section
1670 Beam Avenue, Suite A
Maplewood, MN 55109

Subject: Roseville's Final Report

Dear Norm:

The project team of R. W. Beck, Inc. and Dan Krivit and Associates (Project Team) is pleased to submit this final report entitled, City of Roseville Recycling Pilot Program Summary. This summary report includes analyses and documentation from previously published reports by the City of Roseville (City), Ramsey County (County), and the Project Team.

In addition to the results contained within this report, there are some additional observations that we will summarize within this cover letter for your consideration.

Post-Pilot and the Competitive Marketplace

After the City's pilot project concluded, the City issued its Specifications and Request for Proposal for Comprehensive Recycling Service on August 26, 2005. The Project Team, together with County staff, monitored the City's overall recycling services procurement process and related policy decisions.

The City's request for proposal (RFP) included key variables tested in the Roseville pilot program and allowed potential vendors to propose on a variety of collection methods including:

- Dual-stream and/or single-stream collection;
- Bi-weekly and/or weekly collection frequency; and
- Current, 18-gallon curbside recycling bins and/or alternative larger recycling bins or carts.

The City utilized the competitive environment of the Twin Cities marketplace for recycling services to encourage best value proposals in response to the City's RFP. Multiple proposal scenarios were allowed. For example, companies could submit a proposal for single-stream collection as well as a dual-stream proposal alternative. This system of "alternative proposals" followed a similar practice used successfully by the City of Maplewood in June 2005.

On September 21, 2005, the City of Roseville received proposals from four companies. One proposal was selected by the City Council in October 2005 and a final contract was negotiated by City staff based on this selection. The Project Team has not yet received copies of the proposals submitted, as these are being retained by City staff as confidential until the final contract is fully executed and such documents are made publicly available. As you know, the Project Team did not participate in the City's proposal review.
It is our understanding that the City received recycling proposals with multiple scenarios for collection methods (single-stream and dual-stream). Although the Project Team has not analyzed the details of the proposals, it is evident the City should benefit from the competitive marketplace to offer recycling services. Ramsey County municipalities should be in good position to continue to leverage this competitive environment to their advantage in order to improve cost-effectiveness of their recycling programs well into the future.

**Pilot Design, Recyclable Materials Composition and Residuals Analyses**

The Roseville pilot project demonstrated how a recyclable materials composition study can be used to evaluate the impacts on the quantities and types of materials collected when changing recyclable materials collection methods. In addition to the detailed statistical results, the following research objectives were achieved through the Roseville pilot project:

1. Formulated improvements in various pilot research planning and field design strategies (e.g., planning timeframes, number and priority of research variables, labor requirements, costs, etc.).
2. Developed recommendations for a set of definitions/nomenclature that will help further the discussion about the various sources of contamination.
3. Developed and recommended a set of standard methods for recyclable materials composition sorting and analysis.
4. Trained select County staff and local municipal recycling coordinators on composition sorting methods. (These recommended methods were used by the City of Plymouth in their own pilot program.)
5. Received and reviewed previous research by Waste Management, Inc. on processing residuals from their materials recovery facility (MRF) in Minneapolis. *(Summary - Single-Sort Constituent Test; October 18, 2003)*.
6. Reviewed other relevant research on processing residuals and compiled a bibliography.
7. Participated in substantive, detailed discussions with City staff and Waste Management staff about procedures to reduce the amount of non-targeted materials set out at the curb by residents.

Subsequent to the Roseville pilot study, an issue arose related to mixed broken glass. The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency wrote a letter to Waste Management on September 2, 2005 in response to correspondence about Waste Management's handling of mixed broken glass from the City of Roseville's recycling program. The letter stated that although the MPCA has accepted specific materials for use as alternative daily landfill cover, it is not considered recycling. This letter is indicative of the need for local recycling officials to continue such policy discussions with the MPCA as per our recommendation #3 in the attached summary report.
Thank you and the City of Roseville for the opportunity to provide these services. We are hopeful that this work will benefit other Ramsey County municipalities in the future.

Sincerely,

Robert Craggs
R. W. Beck, Inc.

Cc: Mary Chamberlain, R. W. Beck, Inc.
    Dan Krivit, Dan Krivit and Associates
Overview

The City of Roseville, Minnesota (City) conducted a pilot study in 2004 to help refine its curbside recycling program to capture more recyclable material. The pilot analyzed the impacts that various collection methods have on the quantity and quality of residential recyclable materials collected curbside, as well as impacts on customer participation.

The project team of R. W. Beck, Inc. and Dan Krivit and Associates (Project Team) was retained by Ramsey County (County) to assist the City with this pilot project to:

- Assist with the design of the pilot;
- Conduct a recyclable materials composition assessment;
- Analyze the results of the field evaluation; and
- Produce a final recycling pilot project summary based on all available data and project reports produced by City staff, County staff, and the Project Team.

Directed by City staff, the pilot study included field tests of different strategies for providing curbside recycling collection services, analysis of data gathered from recyclable material composition sorts, a survey of residents before and after the pilot, gathering of set-out and participation data, and an examination of contamination issues. Waste Management, Inc., the existing City recycling contractor, conducted the collection operations of the pilot project.

Pilot Study Methodology

It was determined that key program parameters could be tested in a pilot collection project by comparing different collection approaches in different neighborhoods within the City.

The collection approaches that were tested are summarized below in Table ES-1.
Roseville Recycling Pilot Program Summary

Table ES-1
Pilot Study Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>Additional</td>
<td>Larger Bin</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Single-Stream</td>
<td>Frequency (Weekly)</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>(Current System)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every other week</td>
<td>64-gallon cart</td>
<td>Every other week</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Every other week</td>
<td>Every other week</td>
<td>Every other week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bins/Carts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18-gallon bin</td>
<td>18-gallon bin</td>
<td>Two 22-gallon bins with wheels</td>
<td>18-gallon bin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added Education</td>
<td>Only pertaining to new sorting system</td>
<td>Only pertaining to new sorting system</td>
<td>Only pertaining to new frequency of collection</td>
<td>Extra educational materials</td>
<td>Only pertaining to new bin capacity</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Newer homes &amp; more affluent than other pilot areas</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Slightly higher average income than other pilot areas except Contrast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Pilot Program

The pilot study was evaluated using several performance measures. The measures included:

- **Material Composition** – The composition of recyclable materials and non-targeted materials collected per route, based on actual field sorts.
- **Tonnages of Material Collected** – Gross weights and mean weights (gross less non-targeted materials based on material composition) collected per route and per household through field data and calculations.
- **Set-out and Participation Rates** – Actual rates based on field audits conducted by City of Roseville staff.
- **Customer Attitudes** – Customer survey responses based on a written survey administered by City of Roseville staff.

Each analysis is summarized below. Additional details can be found in the report.

Material Composition Assessment

To compare the types and quantities of recyclable and non-targeted materials collected in each of the various pilot study areas, the pilot program included detailed material composition sorts and analysis.
Executive Summary

For each pilot route (including the Control route), one field sort was conducted in the two-month "Before" period (June-July 2004) and two field sorts were conducted in the four-month "During" period (August-November 2004).

The statistical analysis measured if there was a statistically significant change in the percentages of the various recyclable materials, and/or the actual weight of certain materials in the pilot areas.

The overall results from the analysis reflect that the composition of materials collected for recycling changed significantly with single-stream but did not change significantly with any of the dual-stream variations (Increased Frequency (Weekly), Additional Education, and Larger Bin Capacity).

The percentages of non-targeted materials (at the curb) in the single-stream routes (Monday) during the pilot were higher than the percentages of non-targeted materials found on the same Monday routes collected dual-stream in the "Before" period. The percentages of non-targeted materials in the single-stream routes were higher than the percentages of non-targeted materials found in the combined (Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday) "During" dual-stream routes.

Tonnages of Material Collected

Average gross weights (all tonnages, including non-targeted materials) collected per route for each week of the study for which data was collected (three weeks in the "Before" period, and five weeks in the "During" period for the dual-stream routes; nine weeks for the Weekly route) were calculated. These gross weights were then converted to an average gross weight collected per household per route.

Weights of non-targeted materials included by residents with their recyclables were calculated for each pilot area. Overall, non-targeted materials in the "During" single-stream areas were found to be statistically significantly higher than the dual-stream "Before" areas.

Using the non-targeted materials data from the composition study, the mean gross weights per household were then adjusted by subtracting the non-targeted materials to determine the net pounds of targeted recyclable materials per household collected per route in the "Before" and "During" periods for each pilot area. The lower and upper ranges of pounds collected per household (net average non-targeted materials) were also determined for each route "Before" and "During" the pilot, as shown below in Table ES-2. Please refer to Tables 3 through 5 in the body of the report for more details.
## Roseville Recycling Pilot Program Summary

### Table ES-2
Comparison of Net\(^1\) Pounds per HH Collected Per Route Before and During the Pilot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Routes “Before” Pilot - All Dual-Stream Net Average Non-Targeted Materials(^2)</th>
<th>Routes “During” Pilot Net Average Non-Targeted Materials(^2)</th>
<th>Statistically Significant Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean (Avg. Lbs Collected per HH per Route)</td>
<td>Mean (Avg. Lbs Collected per HH per Route)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon. – Primary SS</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>28.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon. – Contrast SS</td>
<td>26.87</td>
<td>34.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed. – Add'l Educ</td>
<td>21.73</td>
<td>25.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs. – Larger Rins</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>26.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri. – Control</td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td>26.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) Average total pounds after non-targeted materials were subtracted.

\(^2\) The range was calculated by subtracting the difference in pounds collected with and without non-targeted materials from the gross pounds collected per household.
Comparing the tonnages collected before and during the pilot:

- The single-stream routes resulted in statistically significant increases in total tonnages recovered, even when their relatively high portions of non-targeted materials were subtracted out, as compared to the same areas collected as dual-stream routes in the “Before” period.

- The Larger Bin Capacity route resulted in a statistically significant increase in total tonnage recovered, net of non-targeted materials, as compared to the same area collected in the “Before” period.

Table ES-2 compared the pilot routes in which the recyclable materials were collected every other week. Because the Tuesday pilot route was collected weekly, the pounds collected per household were not comparable to those collected every other week, so a comparison of the weekly routes was conducted separately.

Before the pilot, the average net pounds of recyclable material collected per household on the Tuesday route, was 23.53 pounds. During the pilot, the average net pounds of recyclable material collected per household on the Tuesday (Weekly) route was 14.40 pounds. The average pounds of non-targeted materials per Tuesday household was .53 pounds when collected every other week and .55 pounds per weekly collection.

The effects of weekly collection of recyclable materials can be compared to every other week collection on an annual basis. Table ES-3 below shows the projected annual pounds per household for each route, based on the average pounds collected per collection event before and during the pilot, net non-targeted materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table ES-3</th>
<th>Comparison of Projected Pounds Per HH Per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Pounds Collected Per Collection Event During Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon. – Primary SS</td>
<td>28.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon. - Contrast SS</td>
<td>34.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues. – Weekly</td>
<td>14.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed. – Addtl Educ</td>
<td>25.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs. – Larger Bins</td>
<td>26.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri. – Control</td>
<td>26.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As reflected above, Weekly collection resulted in projected annual quantities collected that are comparable to the Primary Single-Stream route.
Set-out and Participation Rates

City staff conducted field audits of each pilot route, each collection week in order to collect accurate set-out data by identifying households that had curbside recycling bins or carts set out for collection. The results of the set-out data analysis showed that the routes with the largest increase in the number of set-outs were the Primary Single-Stream route and the Larger Bin Capacity route.

Participation for the every other week routes was defined as a household that set out recyclable materials at least once during the pilot study. Participation for the weekly routes was defined as a household that set out recyclable materials at least once during the first half of the weekly collection events and once during the second half of the weekly collection events. The pilot route with the largest increase in participation was the Larger Bin Capacity route.

Customer Attitudes

The City conducted two mail surveys, before and after the pilot study. About one-half of pilot program participants responded to each of the mail surveys. In the pre-survey, 39 percent of respondents stated that a financial rebate would motivate them to recycle more. In the post-survey, when asked if they would be willing to pay more for the cart system, 49 percent in the Primary Single-Stream area stated yes, and 64 percent in the Contrast Single-Stream area stated yes. Of the Weekly route respondents, 45 percent stated they would be willing to pay more for increased collection frequency. The survey results are summarized in detail in Table 11 of the report.

Conclusions

The Project Team has summarized the results of the City’s recycling pilot program as follows:

- The largest increase in the number of set-outs occurred in the Primary Single-Stream and Larger Bin Capacity routes.
- The largest increase in participation occurred in the Larger Bin Capacity route.
- The largest increase in quantities of material collected per household occurred in the Primary Single-Stream and Larger Bin Capacity routes.
- Based on the tonnages collected during the pilot routes, it is estimated that on an annual basis, the amount of recyclable materials collected weekly would be comparable to the quantities collected on the Primary Single-Stream route.
- The composition of the combined (Primary and Contrast) single-stream routes showed increased percentages of paper collected, decreased percentages of metals, glass and plastic, and an increase in the percentages of non-targeted materials. However, the net quantities collected in the combined single-stream routes were greater than those in the combined dual-stream routes.
The Additional Education route did not result in a statistically significant increase in the quantity of materials set out at the curb.

Opportunities for improving curbside recycling in any given municipality are truly program-specific. The City of Roseville has a very mature recycling program, and may have different demographics when compared to other communities (see the Background information on page one of the report for details on demographics); thus, its pilot program results may differ if compared to other programs. Cities need to decide the optimal curbside recyclable materials collection program based on a range of issues including cost, materials recovery levels, participation, and customer preference. The information from this study should be helpful to many communities in Ramsey County and the Twin Cities metropolitan area.

Recommendations

The Roseville pilot project can provide lessons for other recycling program managers looking for opportunities to improve program performance.

1. Ramsey County municipalities should closely examine the available results from this Roseville pilot and other research projects referenced when evaluating alternative collection options such as single-stream. This study shows that more than one program option (single-stream, increased frequency, or larger bin capacity) may foster an increase in quantities collected.

2. Ramsey County staff should continue policy discussions with the MPCA and other counties about the definition of “recycling” as it relates to glass, and the marketing of glass collected curbside. The County should strongly encourage a resolution to issues around glass recycling. Glass is presently not considered recycling when used as landfill cover.

3. Municipalities should consider including RFP/bid and contract provisions for contractors to measure the various types of contamination. If a municipality elects to include such requirements, the municipality should also consider how to monitor and enforce such provisions for measurement of contamination.