

Date	Name	District	Opinion
11/13/2019 10:27	Eric Lein		Against
11/13/2019 10:49	Eric Lein		Against
11/6/2019 15:24	Michael Kuchta		Against
11/6/2019 15:24	Michael Kuchta		Against
11/6/2019 15:25	Michael Kuchta		Against
11/6/2019 15:26	Michael Kuchta		Against
11/6/2019 15:27	Michael Kuchta		Against
11/6/2019 15:28	Michael Kuchta		Against
11/10/2019 1:32	Ron Quido		

### Comment

I am AGAINST the price structure proposed in ORD 19-67 as of 11/06/2019. Although not perfect, PLEASE GIVE SERIOUS CONSIDERATION to the ideas submitted on this web page by MICHAEL KUCHTA (Parts 1,2,3,4,5,6). >>> "This proposal relies on the same principle we use in the everyday world when we ask for separate checks at a restaurant: Everyone pays for what they individually consume. With trash, low-use households generate only one-fifth as much as high-use households, so they should pay one-fifth the cost. Simple. Further, the fair share proposal encourages households to reduce waste

Forcing unwilling customers to pay private trash haulers for unnecessary empty trash carts does NOT align with the rate-setting requirements set forth in MN Stat Chapter 443. Michael Kuchta's method (Steps 1,2,3,4,5,6) will come closer to complying with (1) MN Statute 443.29: "The rates for rubbish disposal shall be a charge against the premises from which rubbish is collected..." AND (2) MN Stat 443.28: "...Such rates shall be as nearly as possible just and reasonable, taking into

Part 2: This presents a great opportunity for the Council to overhaul pricing, to be responsive to city residents, to cut trash fees for more than 70 percent of households, to allow households to pay their fair share based on how much trash they actually generate, and still produce the revenue needed to support coordinated collection. Unfortunately, Ordinance 19-67, as written, does not do that. The current draft is a lost opportunity. It makes only incremental changes, reducing rates across the board by about \$1 a month. That approach perpetuates the perverse incentives and inequities that now exist. I

Part 1: I will be working the evening of Nov. 6 and unable to attend the public hearing in person to testify on the 2020 trash rates proposed in Ordinance 19-67. But I'd encourage you to modify the ordinance, relying on the approach described below. During the public debate leading to the Nov. 5 referendum, there was one thing people on the "yes" and "no" sides both seemed to agree on: The contract could be better. One of the most common criticisms? Pricing. Current pricing

Part 3: The fair share proposal outlined below makes real change. Based on real-world data (as required by the contract), this proposal cuts rates by 60 percent for the lowest users, while raising rates by about \$9 a month for the highest users. This proposal relies on the same principle we use in the everyday world when we ask for separate checks at a restaurant: Everyone pays for what they individually consume. With trash, low-use households generate only one-fifth as much as high-use households, so they should pay one-fifth the cost. Simple. Further, the fair share proposal encourages households to

Part 4: Step Two: The city also knows how many households subscribe to which level of service: • 35-gallon cart emptied every other week: 5,074 • 35-gallon cart emptied weekly: 17,606 • 65-gallon cart emptied weekly: 28,912 • 95-gallon cart emptied weekly: 20,150 With this information, we can get a rough idea of how much total trash households generate at each level. For example, at the 95-gallon level, we multiply 20,150 households by an annual capacity of 4,940 gallons (52 weeks, 95 gallons each week). The math shows these households have the capacity to generate 99,541,000 gallons of trash

Part 5: Step Four: Because we know how many households are in each service level, and the rates that Ordinance 19-67 sets for each level, we can calculate how much revenue coordinated collection needs to generate from monthly fees. The total: \$24,588,636. Step Five: Combining all this information, we now know enough to overhaul rates so each level of service pays its fair share. As we saw in Step Three, the highest-use households -- those with a 95-gallon cart -- generate 42.5% of the total annual trash. So, they should contribute 42.5% of the cost. (Under Ordinance 19-67, high-use

Part 6: This approach meets the contractual requirement that costs be "based on ... the actual average tonnages collected per gallon per household in the prior 12 months." If you divide those results by the total households in each service level, you get more equitable individual pricing, yet the rates still generate \$24,588,636 in revenue. Here's what every level would pay under this fair share proposal: • 35-gallon cart, every other week: \$7.97 per month / \$95.65 per year • 35-gallon cart, weekly: \$15.94 / \$191.31 • 65-gallon cart, weekly: \$29.61 / \$355.28 • 95-gallon cart, weekly: \$43.27 / \$519.26 If you

Accept the haulers' offer to continue with the current rates for six months. The haulers' lawyer was obviously signalling that the consortium will legally challenge the City's adoption of this ordinance's proposed rates. Most voters approve of