

STAFF REPORT

DATE: February 21, 2018

TO: Utility Rate Advisory Commission

FROM: Richard Tsai, Environmental Resources Manager
Jennifer Gilbert, Conservation Coordinator

SUBJECT: Yard Material Collection Service Alternatives Review and Survey Development

Recommendation

1. Review ranking feedback provided by commissioners on the Loose In the Street (LITS) program alternatives and affirm the ranking of options to be included in the consultant review of cost impacts within the study and community-wide outreach.

Fiscal Impact

There are no fiscal impact results for this report; necessary staff time is already budgeted.

Council Goal(s)

- **Pursue Environmental Sustainability:** Specifically within Objective 3, to Conserve Resources in an Environmentally Responsible Manner; Task F: Explore, quantify and prioritize ways to improve the long-term environmental impacts and costs of our waste system and align them with the City's conservation goals.

Background and Analysis

The City has retained R3 Consulting (R3) to conduct a solid waste rate study to review the current rate structure of the City's solid waste services, provide an updated rate structure to recover service costs, and to review alternative service delivery options to assist the city in meeting financial and environmental goals. The URAC has been in the process of reviewing sections of the study, prior to the review of the full study, to provide input and feedback throughout each step. Initial focus has been on the Loose In the Streets (LITS) program, based on the extensive public comment received by the city on the issue.

Building on the review conducted of the LITS alternatives in December of 2017, and the need for community feedback on the use and understanding of the LITS program, at their January 2018 meeting, the commission reviewed a draft survey intended to collect feedback, with twelve options of possible alternatives to the program for consideration. Upon reviewing the survey with all twelve LITS options, the URAC expressed concern that the survey might be too cumbersome and that a slimmed down list of the top preferred LITS options should be used for the survey instead. As such, they requested that staff survey the commission members first, as they are representatives of the public, to see if their own personal options could be used as a litmus test on the top preferences to survey from.

On January 13, staff emailed commission members the list of the twelve different LITS service options and asked them to rank them according to their preference (see Attachment 1). The results of the survey are summarized below. Staff grouped the LITS options together, by similarities in the type of alternatives, in order to see the patterns that emerged.

A.	Keep LITS Service as-is
B.	Eliminate the LITS Collection Program Entirely
C-F.	Eliminate the LITS Collection During Non-Leaf Season, with modification to Leaf Season Collection
G-I.	Keep Year-round LITS Collection, with modifications to pick up schedule
J-L.	On-demand, Opt-in, Neighborhood pickups only

Table 1: Ranking by Each Commissioner

Ranking	J Troost	O Bystrom	J Franco	E Roberts-Musser	R McCann	L Kristov
1	F	E	B	B	J	D
2	E	C	L	F	E	J
3	D	A	J	E	D	E
4	C	D	D	C	C	G
5	J	B	F	D	F	C
6	L	K	E	I	I	A
7	K	F	K	A	H	F
8	G	G	G	G	G	B
9	I	J	H	H	K	I
10	H	I	C	L	B	H
11	B	H	I	J	A	K
12	A	L	A	K	L	L

Table 2: Highest Priority Service Options by Ranking

LITS Service Option	J Troost	O Bystrom	J Franco	E Roberts Musser	R McCann	L Kristov	Total Ranking Score
E	2	1	6	3	2	3	17
D	3	4	4	5	3	1	20
F	1	7	5	2	5	7	27
C	4	2	10	4	4	5	29
J	5	9	3	11	1	2	31
B	11	5	1	1	10	8	36
G	8	8	8	8	8	4	44
A	12	3	12	7	11	6	51
I	9	10	11	6	6	9	51
K	7	6	7	12	9	11	52
L	6	12	2	10	12	12	54
H	10	11	9	9	7	10	56

Based on the rankings provided by each URAC member, the top five preferred LITS service options are E, D, F, C, and J, respectively; commission members preferred options that eliminated the LITS collection during non-leaf-drop season.

Given the data received from DWR regarding the low percentage of customer use of the service, and the extensive feedback on the program received by staff from the public, staff recommends surveying the public on the top **six** LITS options as determined by the URAC, which would include option B, (eliminating LITS collection). Staff also recommends including option G in the survey, which would keep the current non-leaf season collection and extend the leaf-season weekly collection to four weeks. Although option G was not ranked highly by the URAC (it falls in the middle of the list), it is an option that has been consistently requested by the public, and therefore believe that URAC should consider the option for inclusion in the public survey. Depending on feedback received from URAC members, staff hopes to send out the modified LITS survey to the public on February 23 (see Attachment 2).

Staff plans to bring a staff report regarding the final solid waste rate study and LITS to the URAC and Natural Resources Commissions (NRC) in March and to City Council in early April. Following Council decisions on service levels, staff will return to URAC with a draft proposition 218 notice at a subsequent meeting.

Timeline

Solid Waste Rate Study to URAC	March 21, 2018
Solid Waste Rate Study to NRC	March 26, 2018
Solid Waste Rate Study to City Council	April 2018

Attachments

1. January 2018 URAC LITS Alternatives Study Responses
2. Draft City-wide LITS Survey