

**Cuyahoga Falls City Council**  
**Public Affairs Committee Meeting**  
**September 15, 2003**

Members: Mr. James, Chair  
Mr. Gorbach  
Mr. Flinn

Mr. James called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. All members of Committee were present.

**LEGISLATION CONSIDERED**

Temp. Res. No. B-130

**DISCUSSION**

Temp. Res. No. B-130

Mr. James read B-130 (second reading). Mr. Leonard stated this will increase the generation fee by \$2.25. \$1.20 goes to the Hardy Road land fill closure; \$.05 goes to the Authority, and \$1.00 goes to communities who are meeting the goals of the Solid Waste Plan. Yolanda Walker of the Summit/Akron Solid Waste Management Authority stated there are a number of changes in this plan. She stated they are required to write a plan for the districts they manage every ten years. Updates are required every three years. The Board adopted their plan in July. It is a requirement that 60% of the population in their communities ratify by the October 14 deadline. It then goes to the Ohio EPA for final approval. A part of the plan states that 90% of residents must have access to recycling. Communities with a population of 20,000 and over must provide curbside recycling or have a drop off program by 2006. Populations under 20,000 must be provided with a drop-off program. The current generation fee is \$2.75 and it will be raised to \$5.00. After the plan is approved in January, they have 90 days to notify the landfills. The increase will become effective after that, which would be around April, 2004. There is a rebate fee of \$1 per resident for recycling. Cuyahoga Falls could receive \$49,000 as a result of its recycle program. Mr. Gorbach asked when the City would receive the rebate. Ms. Walker stated fees will be collected in 2004 and then the money would be rebated in 2005. She pointed out that Cuyahoga Falls already qualifies for the rebate. Mr. Potts asked what the difference was in the terms "subscription" and "nonsubscription". Ms. Walker stated these were EPA terms. "Nonsubscription" is when a resident's payment for trash hauling includes the ability to recycle and has the choice of whether he/she will recycle or not. "Subscription" is when a resident is paying for trash hauling and must also pay an additional fee for recycling. Mr. Potts stated that under grant programs, the report refers to statistics from 2001 and wondered

why 2002 isn't used. Ms. Walker stated the EPA uses a reference year and is using 2001. In the next three-year update, it will use a different year. Mr. Potts asked if Akron ratified the plan. Ms. Walker stated the mayor has signed on and the plan will be going to Council. They really need Akron to ratify. Mr. Flinn asked if it costs \$3 per customer per year and the City gets the rebate, would it be a wash. Ms. Walker stated it would. Mr. Gorbach stated the City currently receives a recycle grant and asked if it would be affected by this program. Mr. Leonard stated they are separate programs as far as he knows. The grant is administered through ODNR so it should not be affected. Mrs. Hummel asked if the City was still using its composting facility. Mr. Leonard stated they were not and that they were using a private composter in Hudson. Mrs. Hummel asked what the status of the facility was if we were not using it. Mr. Leonard stated it has reverted back to the owner. He added no debris was left and that it was cleared in August, 2002. They also filed papers notifying the EPA that the City is not using it. Mrs. Hummel stated that part of this draft refers to the transfer station in Akron and asked if there was a timeline for relocation of the Akron transfer station at Fountain Street. Ms. Walker did not know. Mrs. Carr answered that they had two years from the date of the memorandum of understanding which was in December, 2002. Mrs. Hummel asked about the generation fee and the amount of money that Akron would be responsible for as was mentioned at a previous meeting. Mrs. Carr stated they are in a three-way negotiation to finalize the terms of the memorandum of understanding. We have signed off on where we want to see it go. It is now with Akron to get their response. Those fees will need to be discussed during the budget process as to where they will be paid out of. The fees could be passed on to the customers but they are looking at other options. She added that \$500,000 has been put into an escrow account and another \$300,000 will be paid when the agreement is in final form. Mrs. Hummel stated this agreement commits \$1.20 as a pass-through to Akron to the tune of \$7.2 million, and then the interest would get them to \$9 million. There was also an additional cost of long-term closure of \$6 million. She asked if there was a commitment from anyone. Mr. Leonard stated some of the money has already been paid when the Hardy Road Landfill was open. He pointed out that the whole thing falls apart if Akron does not do its piece. Mrs. Hummel asked if that was the end of our payment commitment. Mrs. Carr stated it is only the \$500,000 and the \$300,000 if we get the water agreement. Mrs. Hummel asked if there would be any other rate increase aside from the generation fee. Mrs. Carr did not believe so because of the potential grant but they need to analyze it further before committing to an answer. She added if the City is getting a credit for recycling, they want to get that back to the people in some form. Mrs. Hummel asked how long the generation fee has been \$2.75. Mr. Leonard answered since 1993.

Eilert Ofstead, 610 Brookpark Drive, asked, in regard to the 90% goal for recycling, whether the County had a plan to assess the effectiveness of the drop off option. Ms. Walker stated they plan to conduct a survey county-wide with waste haulers, residents and legislative bodies to determine effectiveness.

They do not have good numbers and are attempting to get better ones. Drop offs are a last resort. They are trying to get more innovative programs. Mrs. Hummel asked if there was any interest on the part of the Authority to investigate new technology regarding incineration. Ms. Walker stated not at the present time because it is expensive to do. They are not in the business of owning facilities but rather involved in programs and working with communities.

Denise Leipold, 3411 N. Hampton, stated she read the executive summary. Plans such as this are good because this is the extent of what the law allows. Even the EPA cannot recommend the best technology. This is good for what is allowable under the law.

Committee recommended bringing out B-130.

Meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.