



MINUTES

President and Board of Trustees
Village of Arlington Heights
Committee-of-the-Whole
Board Room
Arlington Heights Village Hall
33 S. Arlington Heights Road
Arlington Heights, IL 60005
August 31, 2015
7:00 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. ROLL CALL

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: President Hayes; Trustees: Blackwood, Farwell, Glasgow, LaBedz, Rosenberg, Scaletta, Sidor and Tinaglia

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Randy Recklaus, Village Manager; Diana Mikula, Assistant Village Manager; James McCalister, Director of Building & Health Services; Sean Freres, Environmental Health Officer; Tom Kuehne, Director of Finance; Eileen Hellstrom, Recording Secretary

IV. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Status Report - Expiration of Single-Family Solid Waste Contract on March 31, 2016

Mayor Hayes stated that the collection of refuse has been provided by Groot for many years and we are looking to see if there are ways this can be done differently.

Randy Recklaus, Village Manager, said the Village's contract with Groot Industries for Residential Solid Waste Removal Services expires on March 31, 2016. It is time to determine whether, and under what conditions, the Village would consider renewing our contract with Groot vs. going out for a Request for Proposals (RFP) with multiple vendors.

A renewal agreement with Groot was used as a basis to make that decision. We used data that we had from working with the Solid Waste Agency of

Northern Cook County (SWANCC) to simulate the bidding process by comparing what is in the market place and see how competitive Groot can be.

Mr. Recklaus talked about the advantages of retaining the current provider since the Village has a strong history with Groot and it can be challenging to change vendors.

Mr. Recklaus said whenever you are renewing your contract and contemplating entering into a new contract it is logical to review your current service model and determine if any changes would be desirable. During this meeting we will go over the current service model and talk about the proposals that staff has been able to negotiate with Groot for new alternatives.

Currently the Village has twice a week pick-up throughout the community. Residents are billed \$17.52 per month, billed bi-monthly. There is also a \$2.50 per month charge for a refuse container. All residents receive a cart for recycling. There is an additional fee that every home pays \$7.69 per month that supports our waste transfer station that is currently owned with 23 other municipalities. The Village has a 25% discount for Senior Citizens and a 50% Circuit Breaker discount for those residents who cannot afford the regular rate.

There are a couple of things about the Village's contract that are unique in our region. There are only two other communities within the SWANCC area that has non-optional twice a week pick-up. All the other communities have gone to once a week pick-up. There are only three other communities that have a senior discount and the Village of Arlington Heights' senior discount is deeper than most communities. The Village has bi-monthly billing where most Villages have gone towards quarterly billing for refuse service.

Mr. Recklaus talked about something else that should be factored into the equation and wanted to make sure the Board is armed with the best information. He wanted to mention the impact garbage trucks have on the roads. Refuse trucks are the heaviest trucks that go up and down residential streets regularly. A heavier vehicle going on roads more frequently vs. less frequently will do more damage to the roads. (See Attachment A) The starting and stopping of the refuse trucks is problematic due to a push every time the truck starts and stops. The Engineering Department did a technical explanation of a formula of the load equivalency saying that an empty garbage truck is about the equivalent of 1000 passenger vehicles.

Photos were shown of damage to residential roads that have garbage pick-up on one side of the road and not on the other due to a park or a school on the other side of the street.

Mr. Recklaus mentioned another unique feature of the Village's waste program is being a member of SWANCC which is a co-op of municipalities

that jointly own a waste transfer station. The garbage truck that picks up the trash is not suitable for highway travel. This truck dumps the garbage in a local building, then a bulldozer pushes the garbage onto a vehicle that can travel on the highway to the landfill. The Village owns this facility and the bonds are paid off which reduced the cost. The recommendation is to reduce the current SWANCC fee of \$7.69 per month per customer to \$6.00 per month per customer. The reduction in this fee will result in savings for the residents but will also allow the Village to reallocate some of this money for infrastructure support. (See Attachment B)

Mr. Recklaus said there are a couple of different alternatives for the Board to consider. They looked at a five year renewal with three different service alternatives. All three alternatives result in additional services to residents, additional services to the Village, and cost savings to the residents. Mr. Recklaus said the Board doesn't have to narrow in on one of these alternatives tonight, the one thing that needs to be done as soon as possible is to make a determination whether the Board wants to continue discussing these three alternatives or go to an RFP process.

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Once Per Week Refuse Collection

Under this model, waste would be collected only once a week, refuse carts would be provided to all households free of charge. The senior discount would be reduced from 25% to 15%. The low income/disability discount would remain unchanged at 50%. The \$5.00 per ton floor in recycling rebate would be eliminated, but the recycling rebate program would remain in place. The proposal also includes switching from bi-monthly billing cycle to a quarterly billing cycle. Cost would be reduced about 22% from what residents are paying now. It would be \$19.60 in total. Currently if you don't have a refuse cart, you are paying \$25.21 a month. If the resident does have a refuse cart they pay an additional \$2.50 a month.

- This would increase by the CPI every year with a floor of 1.5% and a ceiling of 3.5%.
- Annual landscape waste sticker increases of \$0.10 per year
- Free refuse cart provided every year
- Extension of landscape waste collection season to December 15th (currently December 1st)
- Addition of a subscription landscape waste/food scrap collection option
- Collection of 20 curbside recycling cans in the Downtown (currently 7)
- Addition of refuse and recycling collection at the Mane Event/Taste of Arlington (Savings of \$3,000-\$5,000 annually)
- Addition of collection for the Downtown train station (Savings of \$2,987 annually)
- Addition of street sweeping container collection at Public Works (Savings of \$3696 annually)
- Addition of fall leaf pile collection at Public Works (Savings of

\$18,270 annually)

2. Once a Week Refuse Collection with Twice Per Week Subscription Option

Under this model, waste would be collected only once a week but if the resident paid an extra monthly charge they can retain twice a week pick-up. The cost for once a week pickup would be the same, \$19.60 including the solid waste infrastructure fee. If you wanted twice a week pick-up it would be \$29.00. Currently if you have a cart you are paying \$27.71 a month, so the price paid per month would go up \$1.29. If you don't have a cart currently, you are paying \$25.21, so this would be increased by just under \$4.00. All other features of Alternative #1 would be in effect.

The only difference between Alternative #1 and Alternative #2 would be the option of an individual household to pay more to retain their twice a week pick-up. Alternative #2 would not have a significant reduction of refuse vehicles on the roads. This could be used as an interim step towards a long term transfer to a once a week pick-up or used as a pilot program and would reduce the traffic somewhat.

3. Twice Per Week Refuse Collection (Current Level of Service)

Under this model, the current level of service would be retained with each household receiving twice a week pick-up. Because the Solid Waste Infrastructure fee would be going down, residents would see a decrease in their bill from \$25.21 to \$23.52.

- Chicago MSA CPI, with limits of 1.5% - 3.5%
- Annual landscape waste sticker increases of \$0.10

The resident would have to continue to pay \$2.50 per month for a refuse cart. The senior discount and low income/disability discount would remain unchanged at 25% and 50% respectively.

Mr. Recklaus talked about in all three models there are additional services to the Village. We would be tripling the number of recycling cans downtown. They would handle refuse pick-up at the Mane Event and Taste of Arlington which saves the Village between \$3,000-\$5,000 annually. They would do refuse collection at the Downtown train station at a savings of \$2,987 annually. Also the street sweeping collection which is about a savings of \$3,696 annually and most notably they would collect the fall leaf pile at Public Works at a savings of \$18,270 annually. The Village's cost would be going down about \$30,000 as a result of these extra services.

Mr. Recklaus said that Alternative #1 would save the Village about \$1.2 million dollars a year. Residents would save about \$67.00 a year.

Alternative #2 would save the Village about \$742,000.

Alternative #3 would save the Village about \$351,000.

Staff believes that all three of these alternatives are competitive. Direction

from the Board is needed to see if these proposals are enough to continue to renew our contract with Groot or if the Board would rather issue a RFP. Also direction is needed on which service alternative to pursue. Finally, direction is also needed as noted in Tom Kuehne's memo (Attachment B), the allocation of the Solid Waste Fund to the Capitol Fund.

Mayor Hayes said before he hears from the Board he wants to thank all those involved in the process up to this point. He also wanted to thank Groot for their participation which has resulted in some very worthwhile options for the residents.

Mayor Hayes asked if the Village were to pursue a contract extension with Groot and considered these three alternatives, how could we gather input from the public. There have been thoughts and concerns from our residents about going from twice a week to once a week pick-up. Mayor Hayes would like an opportunity for the residents to provide input. He would like a plan in place going forward by publicizing these alternatives and the preferred alternative as the Board sees it tonight, and gather public comments.

Mr. Recklaus replied there would be a couple of ways to handle that. If the Board was gravitating towards one alternative or another, Staff could get that out to the public by having a televised meeting, press release, or information on the Village's website. We can ask for feedback and comments by a particular date.

Trustee Sidor said this was a great analysis and the pictures showed how one side of the street was more torn up by residential homes than the other side alongside a park. He spoke during the election about once a week pick-up and this is what he would lean towards. He feels both Alternatives #1 and #2 are considerable. He likes the fact that savings are involved. Trustee Sidor mentioned that if there was once a week pick-up and not as much road deterioration, then the Village would not have to resurface as many roads which would be substantial savings. He also had a question for the representative from Groot. In Glenview, he believes they had twice a week pick up and went to one day a week with the option for twice a week, and eventually phased out the twice a week option. He wanted to know if this was correct.

Frank Hillegonds, Municipal Manager for Groot, replied that Glenview had a menu of options with four different alternatives all with different pricing. When they renegotiated their contract six years ago they wanted to streamline all the costs. They eliminated all the twice a week pickups and went to a once a week curb service. They wanted the lowest price possible, and everything is billed separately. They have a different model than all the other 48 communities that Groot services in the Chicagoland area.

Trustee Sidor asked how the transition was received from the residents of Glenview from all the options to once a week curbside garbage pick-up.

Mr. Hillegonds replied whenever there is change it brings angst from a lot of people. The main concern was from residents who received back door service who physically needed this service. A hardship rate was established which required Village staff to approve residents who have physical hardships and cannot bring their garbage material to the curb.

Trustee Sidor asked how the Village of Glenview is doing today after the transition. Mr. Hillegonds replied they are doing fine.

Mayor Hayes wanted to remind the Board what they are looking for is a decision as to whether or not the Board should pursue a contract extension with Groot or go out for a RFP and their thoughts on the three alternatives at this point.

Trustee Tinaglia talked about the amount of garbage getting smaller due to recycling. It's not as smelly or large as it used to be when twice a week garbage pick-up was important. He would be leaning more towards a single pickup per week with the option for those residents who would like twice a week pick-up. He doesn't want to take away any service from a resident who feels it's their right to have and, at the same time, he doesn't want to impose an extra cost on someone who doesn't want the extra pick-up.

He has talked to a lot of residents through emails who have dealt with Groot in the Village and most residents are really happy with Groot. Trustee Tinaglia would be in favor of working this out with Groot who has been a good neighbor and a good provider without going for a RFP.

Trustee Glasgow asked Mr. Recklaus if we chose Alternative #1, #2, or #3 would we save money on all options. Mr. Recklaus replied yes that was correct.

Trustee Glasgow asked if the only real change is the number of garbage pick-ups. Mr. Recklaus replied essentially yes, but there is somewhat of a difference in the Senior Discount from Alternative #3 vs. Alternative #1 and #2.

Trustee Glasgow talked about three different trucks driving through the neighborhood, recycling, yard waste, and garbage. There would be four different trucks if garbage pick-up was twice a week, and three different trucks if garbage pick-up was once a week. Once a week pick-up would be reducing the road wear by one quarter. Trustee Glasgow asked Mike Pagones, Deputy Director of Engineering if he could put a number value on how much it would save the Village to go from twice a week pick-up to once a week pick-up due to road wear.

Mr. Pagones said one of the things that might help with understanding the cost savings is the difference between the cost of reconstructing a road vs. resurfacing the road. If the Village was able to keep the number of trucks to a minimum and we can resurface a road rather than reconstruct the road,

reconstruction is roughly five times the cost of resurfacing for the same amount of road. This would be a five times difference in cost for the road. Right now the Village has so many streets to catch up on with regards to resurfacing that they fall into a reconstruction project before we take care of them. If the load factor can be lessened and the time frame expanded, maybe we can resurface the roads rather than reconstruct them.

Trustee Glasgow talked about his neighborhood having cul-de-sacs and the only traffic is from residents who live on the street and garbage trucks. He does not have the wear and tear even with twice a week pick-ups. When he is driving on a main street he can see where there is wear and tear due to the amount of traffic. He asked why the roads were not designed to accommodate these trucks?

Mr. Pagones replied that the bad areas where patching was done on one side of the street was because of a particular type of base that was more susceptible to load impact. Many communities that were built in the 70's and 80's had a pozzolanic base. That particular base over time deteriorates and becomes horrendous. Later it was switched to asphalt which the Village uses now.

Trustee Glasgow asked Mr. Recklaus how the reduction in senior discount would affect their bill.

Mr. Recklaus replied that the difference is between \$25.00 and \$19.00, and the difference between this new alternative would be \$19.00 vs. \$16.00. They are still seeing a discount and will be paying less.

Trustee Glasgow asked Mr. Hillegonds if the Village goes from garbage pick-up twice a week to once a week how does that change the day of the week garbage is picked-up?

Mr. Hillegonds responded that currently the schedule is Monday, Thursday and Tuesday, Friday. The community would be re-routed and half of the residents would have their garbage day changed.

Trustee Glasgow asked Tom Kuehne, Director of Finance, about decreasing the SWANCC funding. Could that money be banked for storm water issues in the future?

Mr. Kuehne responded that usually when you have charges you look for a nexus of charges. The nexus would not exist for storm water and he would argue that we would need to find an alternative source of revenue rather than using the funds for storm water issues.

Trustee Glasgow asked Mr. Dave Van Vooren, Executive Director for Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County (SWANCC), how many communities he represents. Mr. Van Vooren replied there are 23 members in the SWANCC organization.

Trustee Glasgow asked Mr. Van Vooren how does this bid rate with what he sees elsewhere.

Mr. Van Vooren replied that the scope of services and pricing that Arlington Heights receives is extremely competitive in the marketplace if not a market leader for twice a week pick-up.

Trustee Glasgow asked Mr. Recklaus if this is the best price for our residents and why not do a RFP.

Mr. Recklaus replied the reason they are not recommending a RFP at this point is Staff does not feel confident they would get a substantially lower price going to a RFP, but the Village would be taking on risks getting a service provider that would not provide the same level of service that Groot does. Secondly there is a disruption cost to changing providers. Even if you get the very best provider, there are going to be problems. Given that we have a strong relationship with Groot and the service level being very high, we can feel good about the price and service. If we went to a RFP, we may be sacrificing service at the expense of pricing.

Trustee Glasgow said the only Alternatives he sees as realistic are Alternative #1 and #2. Alternative #2 with the option for twice a week pick-up does not serve the purpose of what Staff has indicated regarding the wear and tear on the roads. By only reducing the garbage truck traffic by one quarter, he can't say that there is a direct nexus between the trucks and the wear on the roads. He would be leaning towards retaining the twice a week service.

Trustee Scaletta said that Groot does provide great quality service to the entire Village. He feels wear and tear on the roads is a much bigger issue than twice a week pick-up. The future is not great when it comes to the streets. The continued increase in cost of oil and labor have reduced the amount of roads repaired every year. He is concerned that if something isn't done now the roads will continue to deteriorate. The Village might not have a surplus every year and the opportunity to repair the roads. Trustee Scaletta feels the garbage trucks put significant weight on the roads. The Board needs to be proactive and his decision is to support a once a week pick-up. He said he would not be ready to sign with Groot today unless he had more specific details on how the pick-ups are going to work so there is no disruption.

Trustee Scaletta asked Mr. Kuehne about the increase of the garbage pick-up every year based on the CPI, and if it was always on the high side of 3.5%, in the next five years, what percentage would the price increase.

Mr. Kuehne replied 17.5% to possibly 20%.

Trustee Scaletta asked when the Village had its last contract for five years, what was the increase from the beginning until the end?

James McCalister, Director of Building & Health Services, replied the annual increase was 2% after the first year. Trustee Scaletta is concerned that it could hit the high end of 3.5%.

Trustee Scaletta likes the way all three alternatives have bundled the Village's needs. Overall he is pleased with the proposal received from Groot, but he would like to hear from some residents. He is trying to decide if the Village should stay with Groot at this time or go out for a RFP. He likes the RFP process which gives the most information and best pricing. On the other hand he has a concern that Groot has now given their proposal to every provider who is going to bid on this. We could possibly get another hauler who gives a low price but won't provide the quality service that we currently receive from Groot.

Trustee LaBedz agrees with Trustee Scaletta about going out to bid at this point and having all the information available from Groot. Someone can come in with a lower bid and next year the cost increases dramatically or the service is not what was expected. One thing she has not heard while talking to the residents was any concerns about Groot being the garbage provider. She would be comfortable moving forward with a contract extension.

As far as the once a week pick-up vs. twice a week pick-up, she thought about 25% of the residents she spoke with were adamant wanting to continue twice a week pick-up. The rest were willing to go to once a week pick-up. Trustee LaBedz talked about her concern regarding the extra weight of an empty garbage truck equivalent to the weight of 1000 cars on the roads multiplied by the pick-ups twice a week.

Trustee LaBedz asked about the landscape waste/food scrap cart and asked if this would be a separate garbage truck going through the neighborhoods? Mr. Hillegonds replied that the food scrap would be combined with the yard waste truck. They did not want to have another truck pick this up.

Trustee LaBedz said the biggest concern she heard was if the Village went to once a week pick-up, residents wanted to see a reduction in their cost, and based on the information tonight, this would be the case. The other concern was where residents would put the additional cart. Should we go this route, we would have to work with residents on ideas of where to place an extra cart since there isn't a lot of room for two carts for some homes.

Trustee LaBedz asked if back door service would continue for those residents who need it? Mr. McCalister replied yes, that is correct.

Trustee Rosenberg asked about the logistics and what days the garbage would be collected.

Mr. Hillegonds responded that there will be an adjustment period. They will also be delivering carts three weeks prior to the service change.

Trustee Rosenberg asked if there will be options for sizes of carts.

Mr. Hillegonds said it would default to a 95 gallon size, the largest cart, and they will allow residents to pick a different size of 35 gallon or 65 gallon. They will also allow residents to upgrade from a smaller cart to a larger cart or downgrade to a smaller cart if they decide the cart they have is too small or too big at no extra charge.

Trustee Rosenberg asked if the food scrap waste would be tossed in with the yard waste?

Mr. Hillegonds replied for the food scrap program, since it is generally liquid waste, the residents are asked to put it in the cart with the yard waste.

Trustee Rosenberg asked if Mr. Hillegonds agrees that the second garbage pick-up is much lighter than the first garbage pick-up.

Mr. Hillegonds responded that he agrees that there is less volume of garbage picked up on the second pick-up day.

Trustee Rosenberg asked in the communities where the option of twice a week pick-up is offered, if they have situations where residents put their garbage at other neighbors homes that have twice a week pick-up.

Mr. Hillegonds said it's never something they have ever had a problem with.

Trustee Rosenberg said he noticed that Glenview had the lowest price per month compared to Arlington Heights. He asked if it's the other services that are bundled that are causing the \$6.00 difference?

Mr. Hillegonds replied that Glenview bought their own carts. They own and maintain them. This is why they are just under \$11.00. Whereas the price of the cart is included in the cost of \$12.97 for Arlington Heights.

Trustee Rosenberg asked what is the price of a cart. Mr. Hillegonds replied the cost of a 95 gallon cart delivered is about \$58.00.

Trustee Rosenberg said he echoes all the other Trustees with Groot's excellent level of service. He agrees that the garbage trucks put wear and tear on the road ways. He asked if a garbage truck has more weight impact than a yard waste or recycling truck.

Mr. Hillegonds replied that it depends on the time of day and how loaded it is. He said the newer trucks have wider front and back tires that can better distribute the weight. Garbage trucks do put wear and tear on the streets. A yard waste truck can weigh just as much as a garbage truck, and recycling trucks can be a little lighter. Garbage trucks can weigh 52,000 pounds loaded.

Trustee Blackwood said her number one concern is essential services and that roads are taken care of. When she read the weight of the trucks, she felt the Village should probably go to once a week service. She talked about living on a busy street which has edge grinding and currently there are ruts on both sides of the street. Besides the garbage trucks that go by, there are probably about 50 times as many cars. She looked at the streets behind hers that are very quiet, and every street that she went down with residential homes on both sides, the streets were in great condition and no edge grinding needed what so ever. This made her realize it is not the garbage trucks and she feels it is probably the pozzolanic material.

Trustee Blackwood talked about the savings indicted by going to once a week pick-up. As Mr. Kuehne indicated in his memo that the additional funds of \$500,000 would attribute to about 20% of the overall recommended \$2.7 million expansion of the street program. While it's important and she would like to see money go towards street improvements, she doesn't know if that supersedes the \$3.92 cent savings per month that is recommended from twice a week pick up to once a week pick-up.

Trustee Blackwood wanted to ask Groot, with the additional cart and once a week pick-up, if the garbage overflows from the cart and you have additional bags of garbage or pieces of furniture on the side, is there an additional charge for that?

Mr. Hillegonds replied there is no extra charge.

Trustee Blackwood said in her opinion, she feels Groot should be very happy to participate in a RFP because of their high service standards and reputation. She feels their pricing would be very competitive and strong with any of the other haulers. She was concerned about the amount of weight the garbage trucks have on the streets and the impact until she drove around the different streets in her neighborhood. She talked about one of the examples used in the presentation by Raven Park. It seems that edge grinding is required on roads that have heavy traffic as opposed to more quiet streets. She is taking the weight of the garbage trucks out of the equation.

Trustee Blackwood said the cost savings going from twice a week pick-up to once a week pick-up is roughly \$4.00 and she wasn't sure this would make enough of a difference. She would be in favor of Groot but just to reinforce that with everyone else, a RFP is always a good idea.

Trustee Farwell thanked Mr. Recklaus, Mr. Kuehne and James McCalister for the presentation and negotiation with Groot for a great package of options, with this being one of best he has seen. He can't speak highly enough about Groot. He has not heard a single complaint about them but many compliments about their level of service. He said a vote in favor for a RFP is not a vote against Groot. For him, these are two independent thoughts. Trustee Farwell said it's our responsibility to do whatever we can to continue to raise the bar of transparency. When you have a long time vendor and never being subject to a RFP through the years, it does bring a certain

amount of question even in the best of contracts. When he says he would be in favor for a RFP over signing another five year contract with Groot, it's because of his responsibility as a civil servant to assure that we are getting the best possible deal we can for the Village.

Trustee Farwell said he doesn't negotiate garbage contracts so he cannot say that we got the best deal from Groot. He knows it's a good one, but doesn't know it's the best one. He would like to know what other refuse companies would put together. The last RFP was in 2001 and since that was a long time ago, he would be in favor of a RFP.

Comparing once a week vs. twice a week garbage pick-up, Trustee Farwell feels it's time for once a week pick-up. The amount of rubbish we create has diminished through the years, with the expansion of recycling.

Trustee Farwell talked about the 2010 Survey done on-line and by mail which indicated that the residents were in favor of once a week pick-up over twice a week. The number one concern from the survey was value and cost. If the residents can save money by once a week pick-up, then we are satisfying that criteria. He would be in favor of once a week garbage pick-up.

Mayor Hayes does agree that there is a justification going to once a week garbage pick-up but with the option for those who would like to stay with twice a week pick-up. He would support Alternative #2. He is not in favor of going out for a RFP. Mayor Hayes said the change to once a week would be a big enough change that we would not want to subject our residents to a potential change for a provider as well. He thinks there is something very much gained by staying with our current provider who has demonstrated they can do the job in a very efficient and professional manner. He would prefer to negotiate with Groot.

Ron Vargas, Village resident, asked if they have considered removing some of the contaminants from the garbage such as CFL lightbulbs, batteries, and electronics. He can find recycling centers to take these to, but he has to travel to other communities to do so, which makes it very tempting to just throw it in the garbage.

Mr. Recklaus said these are two separate issues. The Village doesn't have ability to enforce that these are not put into the garbage, but we can provide opportunities for a drop off spot. This has been discussed in the past with Public Works. This is something that is not dealt with in this contract, but it's something that Staff can do more research on.

Mr. McCalister said the Health Services Department does accept the following through the SWANCC program, CFL lightbulbs, batteries, mercury thermometers, and medications.

Mr. Recklaus said the big thing that we don't have in town is the electronic recycling.

Paul Culhane, Village resident, wanted to complement the Staff on the alternatives presented and he supports Alternative #1, once a week pick-up. He thinks getting the bin will hold a week's worth of garbage and this would be a much more efficient system and would save money.

Ron Cmoie, Village resident, said regarding this issue for him it's obvious with a 25% reduction in road usage. He raised a family of six and has lots of gatherings on a regular basis, and he has very little garbage but lots of recycling. He thinks it's time for a change to switch to once a week pick-up. He thinks Groot is great and he does not advocate a RFP.

Kate McVay, Village resident, said she is in full favor of going to a RFP since it has been a long time. We have 18,400 homes and we are a large Village. There are many competitors out there and a RFP doesn't mean you have to go to the lowest bidder.

Michael Brink with Waste Management, wanted to come on behalf of Waste Management and express their interest in responding to a RFP for the Village. Arlington Heights is a large community and they would be happy to provide service for the Village.

Mayor Hayes said the issue seems to be whether or not to go out to a RFP.

Mr. Recklaus responded that if the Board does vote to go out to a RFP, any direction you can give Staff would be welcome in terms of what options need to be explored.

Trustee LaBedz moved, seconded by Trustee Tinaglia, that the Committee-of-the-Whole recommend to the Village Board to pursue a 5-year contract extension with Groot.

Trustee Glasgow agrees with Trustee Farwell that it is not an indictment of Groot to go to a RFP, but his concern is to make sure the Village has the lowest price for the residents. His question to Staff was how quickly could a RFP be completed. He doesn't want to lose out on any potential savings that can be passed on to the residents.

Mr. Recklaus asked Mr. Van Vooren if 30 days would be conceivable. Mr. Van Vooren replied that SWANCC has some model RFP documents that can be sent to Staff at the Village. Otherwise it could take 30 days to develop a RFP, 30-45 days to give vendors an opportunity to route and think about pricing, 30-45 days to acquire the necessary recycling carts and the garbage carts if it was a new vendor, and complete all of this before the existing contract expires. This could be a tight time frame. There is no guarantee that the RFP process will generate an outcome less than the proposal today.

Trustee Tinaglia wanted to follow-up and say it's not all about the lowest price but to have the best quality service for the most reasonable price. The

reason he seconded this motion is because he is aware of getting bids for services that are not always the best service.

Trustee Rosenberg asked Mr. Van Vooren how many qualified haulers are out there that can handle a contract for Arlington Heights.

Mr. Van Vooren responded that in the Chicago metro area, there are a half a dozen haulers that could bid on this. He mentioned, Groot, Waste Management, Republic Services, Advanced Disposal, Lake Shore Recycling, and Flood Brothers.

Mr. Recklaus wanted to mention that Staff did not accept Groot's first proposal. This has been in discussion for several months. There were a lot of options that were explored over many meetings. Staff did not take this lightly. There is a value to go to a RFP and knowing for sure that you have the lowest price and Staff respects that.

Trustee Sidor said if this were a commodity he would agree to go to a RFP, but as a service provider, there are ancillary benefits and services the provider gives a community. In his opinion, Groot has earned the Village's business. He concurs with Trustee LaBedz, Trustee Tinaglia and Mayor Hayes that we don't have to do a RFP.

Trustee Farwell wanted to separate these two issues. A RFP is not an indictment of Groot by any means. A RFP is not saying that we are going to get a better deal, price or service. He feels it's an exercise as a governmental body and we owe it to the constituents. Fourteen years is a long time to have a contract. He is in favor of a RFP. If the Board decides to change haulers, it will be done in such a way that we have faith in the new vendor. This is why he will be voting no on this motion.

Mayor Hayes thinks our obligation as elected officials is bigger than trying to find the lowest cost and to ensure that we provide the highest quality. We have a known entity here in Groot that the community is comfortable with and they have demonstrated their expertise and professionalism. He would like to continue to stay with Groot. He is in favor of the motion and called for the vote.

Ayes: Trustees LaBedz, Tinaglia, Sidor and Mayor Hayes

Nayes: Trustees Blackwood, Farwell, Glasgow, Rosenberg and Scaletta

The motion failed.

Trustee Glasgow moved, Seconded by Trustee Farwell, that the Committee-of-the-Whole recommend to the Village Board to begin the process of issuing a Request for Proposals for refuse collection.

Ayes: Trustees Blackwood, Farwell, Glasgow, Rosenberg and

Scaletta

Nayes: Trustees LaBedz, Sidor, Tinaglia and Mayor Hayes

The motion passed.

Mr. Recklaus asked in terms of drafting a RFP quickly, any further guidance on options that should be contained in the RFP, or not contained, would be appreciated.

Mayor Hayes would prefer not to go with Alternative #1 which does not provide an option for twice a week pick-up.

Trustee Scaletta said that we need to start with the Groot proposal as the starting point to be able to put together the RFP. He wants to be able to take another company's numbers and put them right next to Groot's numbers to understand the comparison.

Trustee Rosenberg would like to continue the yard waste as revenue neutral, as a pay as you go, and the proposal should continue that thought.

Mr. Recklaus wanted to confirm that for the proposals, providers would give us Alternative #1, Alternative #2 and Alternative #3 that is substantially similar to what Groot has done, so we can compare all three Alternatives from the responding vendors.

Trustee Scaletta replied yes since he doesn't believe there was any clarity from the Board tonight on a decision as far as Alternative #1, #2 or #3.

Trustee Tinaglia disagrees and it would be cumbersome to ask for all that information from every provider. What he heard was a unanimous understanding that twice a week is probably not necessary but should be available, Alternative #2. In his opinion, the RFP should be similar to Alternative #2.

Trustee Glasgow agrees with Trustee Scaletta. There is no consensus from the Board with regard to the alternatives. Presenting this all three ways in a RFT should be provided since we are their customer. Having that information would be helpful for comparison.

Mr. Recklaus said what he is hearing is that the RFP would mirror what Groot has provided for us, the three alternatives.

Trustee Scaletta moved, seconded by Trustee Glasgow, that the Committee-of-the-Whole recommend to the Village Board to reduce the current monthly Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County (SWANCC) fee charged to single-family homeowners from \$7.69/month to \$6.00/month and use available SWANCC funds for street purposes through the following annual transfers: \$200,000 transfer to the General Fund to cover the annual cost of the street

patching program; and \$300,000 transfer to the Capitol Projects Fund for additional street resurfacing work.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Trustee Glasgow moved, seconded by Trustee Scaletta to adjourn the meeting at 9:30 p.m. Upon a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.