

Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
4/10/2019 4:09 PM	Bruce Clark	Against	<p>So....you want to shuffle accounts to transfer \$2.8 million to backfill administrative costs regarding trash bill collection? What happened to all those savings that were supposed to accrue from your well thought out trash policy? We are watching each and EVERY Council action regarding the hideous trash policy that you foisted upon us. We're also watching the Council's behind the scenes attempts to punish civil disobedience to arbitrary city ordinances through your attempts to amend the City Charter (Ord 19-18). Do you think you can skate by with your face saving actions to continue the existing trash policy without us making the voters aware of them?? That's magical thinking on your part! Admit you were wrong. Either s**** the existing trash policy, or drop your opposition to a referendum allowing the voters to decide its merits. Drop your attempts to apply an iron fist to those opposing your ill-conceived ordinances.</p> <p>Simply put, this resolution is to move money around from various places in the budget since the City has to pay the haulers for so many unpaid/delinquent invoices. Unfortunately, there is only so much money to move around and so more will be needed very soon if we keep going down this path, it's not sustainable. I have a solution! A HUGE number of the unpaid invoices are from multifamily properties who are unfairly being mandated to pay for air (trash carts not needed and never tipped). Another are the zerowasters as they compost, recycle, and "shop smart" when at the store to not add into the waste stream. A huge portion of your trash paying resisters would pay their trash invoice if sharing was allowed in multifamily (ie. 1 cart vs 3 in a triplex) and zerowasters were allowed to opt out. Then, the City budget wouldn't be so far in the red to balance. Reward zerowasters. Allow sharing. The environment wins. The haulers are paid. The City budget is much better off.</p>	+2
4/9/2019 10:12 PM	Alisa Lein	Against	<p>Simply put, this resolution is to move money around from various places in the budget since the City has to pay the haulers for so many unpaid/delinquent invoices. Unfortunately, there is only so much money to move around and so more will be needed very soon if we keep going down this path, it's not sustainable. I have a solution! A HUGE number of the unpaid invoices are from multifamily properties who are unfairly being mandated to pay for air (trash carts not needed and never tipped). Another are the zerowasters as they compost, recycle, and "shop smart" when at the store to not add into the waste stream. A huge portion of your trash paying resisters would pay their trash invoice if sharing was allowed in multifamily (ie. 1 cart vs 3 in a triplex) and zerowasters were allowed to opt out. Then, the City budget wouldn't be so far in the red to balance. Reward zerowasters. Allow sharing. The environment wins. The haulers are paid. The City budget is much better off.</p>	+2

Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
4/6/2019 3:47 AM	JRodriguez	Against	This program was pushed thru with no consideration to the city taxpayers. It is not our problem to clean up city councils mistakes or pay for them.	-2  +3
4/5/2019 4:07 PM	Luke Stultz	Against	The residents are not and can not be the City's ATM. Instead of being fiscally responsible, Amy Brendmoen and her cronies on the City Council continue to work against their constituents interests. This resolution is an attempt to pay for a program that people overwhelmingly do not want, are not willing to pay for, and in fact are suing the City over. Stop wasting taxpayer funds and start doing your job responsibly. If any regular person did their job this ineptly and expected additional money from their employers to cover their mistakes, they'd be laughed out of the building.	+2
4/5/2019 3:48 AM	Eric Lein	Against	THOUSANDS OF GARBAGE CUSTOMERS RECOMMEND: 1) Admit failure; 2) Stop throwing good (taxpayer) money after bad; 3) Admit to Judge Castro that this garbage collection program should have been suspended as of November 14, 2018, and that voters' referendum on ORD 18-39 should proceed in November 2019; 4) let some heads roll; and 5) Apologize for way too many mistakes made in what began as an effort to do good work.	+4