

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO

Minutes of the Town Council Meeting of January 14, 1992

7:20 p.m.

Closed session regarding personnel matters, and regarding pending litigation pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(c).

8:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER.

Mayor Zaharoff convened the regular meeting, with Councilmembers Chignell, Colteaux, Kanis and Walsh present.

2. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC EXPRESSION.

Diane King, 1055 San Anselmo Avenue, said youths were blocking her access over the sidewalk. Town Administrator Bonander will contact her.

Sarah Nome, 77 Alder Avenue, objected to actions by Administration staff regarding revelation of persons receiving tax rebates and interaction with her at the counter. She expressed disbelief in the recent census figures that shows San Anselmo's population dropping to below 12,000, and said that it was the Council's responsibility to refute those figures.

Carter Coleman, 22 Agatha Court, congratulated Councilmember Chignell on his engagement, and announced that 700 Christmas trees were brought to Drake High School Saturday for chipping in the joint recycling effort between the school, the Town, and San Anselmo Garbage.

Zaharoff expressed congratulations to Captain Rich Schmidt for arranging for the Salvation Army bucket outside Town Hall during the holiday season; it was the second highest revenue generating bucket in Marin County this year.

3. CONSENT AGENDA.

- (a) Approve minutes: December 10, November 12, September 10, and July 23, 1991.
- (b) Acknowledge and file warrants: Nos. 8015 through 8258, in the amount of \$1,552,551.85.
- (c) Approve Bay Area hazardous waste siting proposal.
- (d) Announce vacancies in the Volunteer Program Advisory Board (2 seats), and the Historical Commission (1 seat).
- (e) Approve appropriation of \$250 from Contingency budget for membership in League of California Cities' Public Employees Retirement System coalition.
- (f) Approve Resolution endorsing the California Housing Bond Act of 1992.
- (g) Resolution calling for election, and consolidation of election services with County.
- (h) Nominate applicants to the Board of Review, and schedule interviews.
- (i) Request assistance from Assemblyman Filante and Senator Marks in securing state acquisition funding for Bald Hill.

Item (i) was pulled from the consent agenda.

M/S, Chignell/Walsh, to approve the consent agenda, with the exception of item (i). Motion passed unanimously.

- (i) Request assistance from Assemblyman Filante and Senator Marks in securing state acquisition funding for Bald Hill.

Walsh expressed concern that the state legislation being advocated ran contrary to the rejection last year of a local tax measure for acquisition of Bald Hill.

Elizabeth Byers, Open Space Committee, said the proposed legislation was broad, and it was advocated that Bald Hill be one of the sites targeted for acquisition funding.

M/S, Colteaux/Kanis, to request assistance from Assemblyman Filante and Senator Marks, as proposed. Motion passed unanimously.

4. PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A GARBAGE RATE INCREASE OF 15 PERCENT EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 1, 1992.

Town Administrator Bonander presented the staff report and described the circumstances leading to the proposed rate increase. In 1990, in consideration of the costs of operating the business, and that there were no rate increases in the three years prior to 1990, the Town Council approved garbage rate increases that included a 7 percent increase effective January 1, 1992. County, state, and federal legislation on protection of water tables and other regulatory burdens on landfills, surcharges hazardous waste, and costs resulting from efforts to conform to AB 939 which requires a reduction in garbage generation resulted in an additional 6 percent pass through fee approved by the Town Council in 1991. In 1992, the County has seen an average rate increase per ton tipped at the Redwood Sanitary Landfill is 69 percent in one year, which calculates to \$2.85 per ratepayer. The proposed 15% rate increase is directly related to the increased tipping fees and the 20.9% increase in surcharges.

Regarding the tipping fees, Bonander noted that the landfill had originally enacted a \$58.48 per ton tipping fee, but reduced it to \$49.56 per ton following completion of an audit managed through the County. Once Town staff had analyzed these costs, there was further discussion with the Solid Waste and Recycling Advisory Committee and San Anselmo Garbage Disposal regarding offering a 20 gallon can as an alternative to the 32 gallon standard can. The Council had asked the committee to look at a small can rate last fall. The Committee recommended a small can rate of \$13 and a mandatory recycling program. The Committee met last Thursday to review the rate structures, and the Committee asked that the small can rate be reduced to less than \$13 and increase the two and three can rates to compensate. The majority of the Committee recommended continuing with mandatory garbage.

The alternatives before the Council included (1) The rate structure as originally proposed that is based on pass through costs, with 7 percent increase effective January 1, 1992 as previously approved and 15 percent increase effective February 1, 1992, with no small-can rate; (2) A \$13 small can rate, determined on the basis of weight of material in a 20 gallon can compared with a 32 gallon can, with some adjustments in the two and three can rates to offset; and (3) A \$11.50 small can rate, with two and three cans per week charges increased to two and three times the one-can rate.

Colteaux inquired about the percent increases in each of the three options and different number of cans.

Chignell asked Al Bianchi, attorney representing San Anselmo Garbage Disposal, asked if the company would agree

to the rate schedules that included the small-can rates irrespective of any further cost analyses, to which Bianchi said yes.

Chignell asked Bonander questions regarding an independent analysis of the tonnage, whether Redwood Sanitary had reported back on revenues, expenditures and tonnage, having the garbage company absorb the costs, whether all the rate increases were unanticipated, how the small can rate was calculated, whether complaints have been recorded and forwarded to the Town, and when the documents required by the franchise agreement were submitted. Bonander said Redwood Landfill did not respond with any information, that the passage of the state legislation was done with the intent that ratepayers would be held accountable for the pass-through costs, that it was known there would be increases in rates but not the amount of the increases, and that it was estimated that approximately 200 to 300 households would use the small can and some two and three can users may reduce their volume over time. The documents required by the franchise agreement were received by November 12, 1991. Regarding complaints, Bonander said that to her knowledge there were no unresolved pending complaints filed with the garbage company.

Town Attorney Roth advised that according to the franchise agreement, the garbage company may apply for this rate increase, and the Council may deny the request; if the request is denied, he advised the Council to state its reasons for the denial.

Walsh requested clarity on the purpose of the 7 percent increase. Bonander explained that it was to compensate the franchise holder for expected increases in operating costs, assuming some reasonable level of increase in fees.

The public hearing was opened.

Diane King, 1055 San Anselmo Avenue, said she would like not to see the rates increase, and spoke highly of the garbagemen who go above and beyond in providing service.

Peter Cole, 6 Allyn Drive, said the garbage rates have already increased 22.5 percent over three years without the 15 percent increase, whereas inflation has not been near that rate. The franchise holder must have made money before 1990 or else he would not have extended the contract and the business. He felt there was room for San Anselmo Garbage to absorb some of the increased costs since inflation has not been 22.5 percent over the past three years, even accounting for some consideration of no rate increases just prior to 1990.

Nancy Morita, 6 Cypress Drive, urged the Council to vote for alternative three, for environmental reasons, to give incentives to people to act more consciously in the waste they generate, and recycle. She inquired about the value of the goods that are recycled and how those profits could offset additional costs. When she worked for the Post Office a number of years ago, San Anselmo Garbage Disposal would not pick up newsprint.

Roberta Floden, 1107 San Anselmo Avenue, said she was pleased to see a small can rate. She said West Marin has no mandated garbage collection, and that Mill Valley, West Marin and Corte Madera have a small-can rate. She felt that mandatory collection was a subsidy of a private business and monopoly, and said there was a precedent in Corte Madera of someone not being required to have mandatory garbage collection. For persons who recycle and compost and only have a bit of plastic every month, she

said, the law says they can dispose of dry waste by hauling it to a legal disposal facility. However, residents have no choice, they must pay for garbage collection whether they use it or not. Having to pay for garbage service does not make people clean. Even with mandatory garbage collection, trash accumulates. Residents should only have to pay for what they need and want, in the sense of being responsible citizens. Although that kind of responsibility cannot be legislated, persons who are responsible and compost and recycle resent the fact that in spite of that, they are made to pay for something they do not want. If the Town is concerned with tipping fees, instead of having a law that everyone must have garbage collection, there should be a law that everyone must recycle and compost.

Letha Marchetti, 29 Sais Avenue, said that the garbage collection was a monopoly, and that the Town would be better off with free competition. She said she did not see any reason to give a 22 percent raise, and it was up to the Town Council to decline the request.

Robert Alvarado, Austin Avenue, cited rates from neighboring agencies printed in the Independent Journal. Bonander was asked to read aloud the information she had on garbage and recycling rates in other Marin agencies.

Richard Gade, 222 Floribel, said that since the ratepayers were subsidizing the garbage collection business, they were entitled to have a financial statement or budget presented by San Anselmo Garbage.

Mark Brougham, 77 Oak Knoll Avenue, said the garbage problem was bigger than a rate increase. What the County needs is some land on which to dump. He said that if garbage collection is private, it should be competitive; if it is provided by government, it should be as cheap as possible.

Bill Brewster, 40 Tamalpais Avenue, displayed a bag of garbage that he said was the amount of his weakly garbage: 7 lbs. He said it would take 71 people to make a ton of garbage, and wanted to know where the other money goes, that it was a profit to the garbage company.

Jean Jung, owner of "Gold Dreams", 864 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, said she has not had garbage in three years; she does not need or want garbage collection. She wanted a "no charge, no can" rate. The third proposal was a good start. The garbage company should not get any increase. If they were recycling properly, they would be making money. What does the Town Council seem so anxious for the garbage company to get the increase? For someone to pay for non-existent garbage is extortion. She said she is already paying a percentage of the rates charged for collection of garbage in the common areas at Red Hill Shopping Center. She said Ray Forrest insists in an aggressive and arrogant manner that she pay for a non-existent garbage pick-up.

Norman Gover, 87 Butterfield Road, said he echoed the last two to three speakers. He did not have garbage pickup. Everything they do not need is taken out of the waste stream. What is needed is to put the garbage company out of business in the sense that people cannot afford to continue to have garbage collection and landfills. How much encouragement comes in finding better ways to recycle. Are we looking at perpetuating the organization they cannot afford. There have to be answers on how much money is collected on recycling. He is the warden of a recycling center in San Francisco. Where is the citizenship. They need to put the rate increase on hold until they can find a better way.

Stephanie Kramer, 211 San Anselmo Avenue, member of the Solid Waste and Recycling Advisory Committee, said she echoes a number of the sentiments expressed this evening. The Committee has thought about most aspects of recycling. These rate increases are going to increase. The rate increase is a direct charge passed on by the landfill. The landfill is being hit by the State that it be safe, and no toxics are escaping. Landfills are a bad habit, and it would be continuing a bad habit to dig holes. She would like to see the public not generating any waste. The Town has made garbage collection mandatory. Garbage pickup is going to be necessary in the short run, until we rethink a lot of what we manufacture. The public can start by being smart about what we buy. In the meantime, it is up to the Town Administrator to determine whether any fees can be absorbed by the garbage company. Expecting San Anselmo Garbage to absorb some or all would be a big crunch financially. The bottom line is consumer habits have to change.

Carter Coleman, 22 Agatha Court, Chair of the Solid Waste and Recycling Advisory Committee, welcomed the public to come to the Committee meetings on the first and third Thursday evenings of the month.

Sarah Nome, 77 Alder Avenue, said she did not generate garbage for many years on end, but was charged for garbage service, and a lien was placed on her property. She said she separates aluminum, glass and paper, and saw the garbage men through newspapers into the garbage can. She questioned mandating garbage service when it was a for-profit business. San Anselmo is unique in that garbage collection is guaranteed by the taxpayers. She asked if there had been a loss of garbage because of the drop in San Anselmo's population over the past ten years according to the census.

Connie Rogers, Administrator for the San Anselmo Chamber of Commerce, said businesses who have garbage dumpsters have expressed concern that if the Town does not have mandatory garbage collection, people without collection will dump garbage in the businesses' dumpsters. She said the Town Administrator has come up with three viable options, and that current garbage issues are bigger than an additional \$2 or \$3 cost per month in garbage bills.

Barbara Thornton, Scenic Avenue, member of the Solid Waste and Recycling Advisory Committee, asked for clarification on the way the rate increase was calculated and whether commercial properties were included in the number of customers, whether the 7 percent increase approved for January 1 included some expected cost increases, how many two and three can customers were projected with the small-can rate, whether the recycling report was public information, and the amount of the revenues from recycling and whether that revenue was taken into consideration as part of the rate increase. Everything should be looked at in the rate request.

Jamie Gray, Cordone Drive, member of the Solid Waste and Recycling Advisory Committee, said she voted on the Committee for mandatory garbage collection, but did not vote for what number of times per month it should be mandatory. She said many people could do with fewer garbage pick-ups. The Committee talked about extending biweekly service to all residents, not just seniors and disabled persons. She felt that \$13 for a small-can pick-up was not a great incentive from \$15.80 for a single can, and she and the Committee supported a fee closer to \$11 to reward recycling. She said that garbage collection is a monopoly, and it seems like it always comes to the same thing; that we have to accept on blind faith that the

garbage company deserves to get what they are asking for. The small can rate came to the foreground with the 15 percent increase.

Sarah Nome, 77 Alder Avenue, said it has been more than a year since gas was taken by or sold to San Anselmo garbage on the honor system, without payment of federal and state taxes.

Greg Shepherd, 208 Oak Springs Drive, said it was time the Town provided incentives to minimize the waste stream; persons who recycle are subsidizing persons who do not recycle. The Town needs to get away from the landfill habit. Citizens should pay for the actual tonnage they generate. Recycling is a profitable program. He urged the public to work with the Solid Waste and Recycling Advisory Committee. If the city is unable to respond to the comments tonight, then maybe the citizens of the Town should stop paying their garbage bill and let the Town of San Anselmo administer that program.

Jane Margulis, Scenic Avenue, said if she is forced by city ordinance to pay money to a company that has a monopoly, she feels entitled to see some financial information from the company. No one has ever checked into the information provided by the garbage company, and wanted to know why an independent study has not been done. She said she was curious about San Anselmo garbage executives' raises, said the public has been lied to by San Anselmo Garbage and she did not believe them, and the small can rate was established to appease people.

Henry Mulberry, Lansdale Avenue, said that if the Town was subsidizing San Anselmo Garbage gasoline, the garbage company should pay taxes.

Al Bianchi, attorney representing San Anselmo Garbage Disposal, said this is not merely a garbage collection company, but a recycling company as well. Recycling is not a money making proposition. Some other cities are audited annually by the auditing firm of Deloitte-Touche, who have confirmed that recycling operates at a loss. If it did not operate at a loss, it would not be necessary for other garbage and recycling companies in Marin County to charge the \$1.75 they charge for recycling above and beyond the garbage fees. Recycling is a wonderful thing, but it is costly and not free. It would be nice to have lowered rates through competitive garbage service. However, when there was competitive garbage service more than 30 years ago, the rates were not lower in terms of absolute rates because it costs a fixed amount of money to service a territory. The wider the territory, the greater the cost. rates were not regulated, they were just set by competition. Every city has gone to a selected garbage company and given that company exclusive rights because nobody wanted half a dozen garbage trucks rumbling down the street several times a week serving different customers, because it increases collection costs, traffic, noise, and wear and tear on city streets, and does not make economic sense. The Town Council set the rates in 1990 and extended the contract, where it says the collector is to be permitted a reasonable profit. A reasonable profit is what you determined on the basis of the facts three years ago and the analysis of the Town Administrator. That established the 7 percent increase as being sufficient to allow a reasonable profit. The 7 percent exceeds the inflation rate, but it is geared to the actual costs of doing business, and the rates had not been increased for several years. The current pass-through increases are rates over which the garbage company has no control; they are due to increased dump fees and governmental charges. The garbage company owns no interest in the landfill, and

the landfill is not financially regulated by any government entity. Landfills ought to be eliminated, but that is a transitional process and there are costs associated with pre-closure and post-closure. There are fees that are mandated by federal, state and county governments that have been passed on to San Anselmo Garbage Disposal. The purpose of some of the charges is for study and implementation of the transition that diverts solid waste from the garbage landfill into recycling. Some of these purposes are worthwhile purposes. The garbage company has only the ratepayers from which to collect money. Regarding the mandatory charge for collection, he noted there are other people in town who are not present this evening, and could the persons present guarantee that those folks will do the recycling necessary to reduce or avoid the need for garbage collection? If so, why haven't they. The Town Council is going to have to make recycling happen in more households, according to state legislation AB939; the people in this room will make that happen in their households, but the Council is responsible for seeing that the goals overall are met. San Anselmo Garbage wishes to cooperate with the people of San Anselmo towards that end.

Colteaux asked Bianchi his client's position on when there are pass-through costs, whether there may be a look at the overall operation and costs, rather than just looking at the finances of the pass-through costs. Bianchi responded that the 7 percent increase approved in 1990 should be taken as a given because the Town Council should not revisit the same issue over again. The contract states that the contractor may come to the Council for only the aspect of the additional costs involve in interim rate increase requests, and only that aspect should be reviewed at this time, independently of other other aspects that are considered upon general rate increase requests.

Zaharoff asked whether a portion of the 7 percent rate increase was to reflect increases in tipping fees. Bianchi said that the increase in the tipping fee was far beyond what anyone could have or did anticipate.

Walsh asked about the purpose of the 6 percent rate increase approved last year. Bonander said it was for similar governmental mandates and pass-through fees, but of a lesser scale. Walsh asked why the hazardous waste, State waste management, and AB 939 fees are not included in the 7 percent increase. If it is a private business, it is expected there will be costs over which they have no control.

Bianchi said he agreed to the extent that those increases were included in the amount of the rate increases. In response to a question on why San Anselmo Garbage does not get out of the recycling business if it is not profitable, Bianchi said that the more successful recycling is, the recycling materials are available, and the lower the cost per unit because it causes a glut in the market, and San Anselmo Garbage getting out of the recycling business would not solve the problem of costs. If the garbage company is to remain in business, they have to pass on the mandatory costs, and the only place they have to turn to for those costs is the ratepayer.

Council members asked questions regarding the revenue earned from recyclables, the cost to provide recycling service, the tonnage of garbage taken to the landfill, whether second units are charged for garbage collection, whether businesses operating out of the home are charged twice, the adequacy of the analysis on the contractor's financial statement, and hiring an independent auditor. Bonander said that information on actual tonnage delivered to the landfill for 1991 will be reviewed in the fall but

that the estimated tonnage for that period was based on the estimate from the prior year, explained how the monthly increase was calculated from the increased tipping fees and surcharges, how the small can cost was set, that the two and three can rates would be subsidizing the small can rate under "Option 3", and that a second unit is charged as a separate household unit. Bonander said that several other communities in Marin County use independent auditors. Some of the financial information that is provided by San Anselmo Garbage Disposal is not available for public disclosure, but would be made available to an independent auditor for that review if the Council chose to hire an auditor with expertise in review of garbage companies.

Colteaux said he supported "Option 3", with the reservation that the public, notably the two and three can users whose rates will increase above what was previously noticed in order to accommodate the small can rate, be notified and encouraged to reduce the number of garbage cans they use. He said he did not think that the Town had the choices we would like to have on these pass-through fees. The Town will have an opportunity in the fall to look at the rates as a whole picture beyond the pass-through fees. He said that the limited analysis of the rate increase proposal was done adequately by Town staff, and expected to see the garbage rates continuously reviewed by the Council as costs increase.

Chignell said that he thought the views of the people present represent the community, that the community does not support the rates as proposed, he did not believe that certain increases are a matter of fact of life nor did the business community believe that, he voted against the rates and 10-year contract extension in 1990, the garbage company has not abided by the contract in providing required information in a timely manner, and the Town allows the garbage company to have a monopoly, but the garbage company does not live up to their end of the agreement. He said he did not believe the calculation could be made independently of actual tonnage figures, that rates have increased 75 percent since September 1989 for a one-can weekly pickup, operating expenses and inflation were being taken into account when the rates were set in 1990, he did not believe that the garbage company did not foresee some of these increases, he did not believe they must be passed on to the taxpayers in total, that the garbage company should also absorb some of the bad economic times, that the Town should leave the lifeline rate as is, institute the small can rate immediately, and eliminate mandatory service on a case-by-case basis. He said the Solid Waste and Recycling Advisory Committee was doing a good job, and that San Anselmo Garbage Company had performed altruistic work such as the tree recycling program, inserts with garbage bills, and work with the Chamber of Commerce.

Kanis said he supported "Option 3" as an interim increase, that it was time for the Town to revisit the whole matter of solid waste management, the contractual relationship with San Anselmo Garbage on what is expected, incentives and disincentives that the present Municipal Code does not address, so that the Town gets up to date on garbage issues and recycling and takes a fresh look at it, to move forward to a new era in which people who have small amounts of garbage and recycle are rewarded.

Walsh said they have spent the last 12 months looking at options, and there seems to be a lack of figures and inconsistencies in the information. She said she has to plan 12 months ahead in her business, and cannot ask her clients to pay for unforeseen cost increases. She supported the small can rate of \$11, effective immediately, wanted people to know it was available, and did not want



any increase in the Lifeline charge. She wanted to see a "no garbage, no fee", and a biweekly availability, would entertain a 17 to 19 percent rate increase including the 7 percent, but did not feel that the rate payer should be held accountable for the full 22 percent.

Zaharoff said it was a difficult issue for her because on the one hand she lives here and pays the same garbage rates, and when she got her notice that a 22 percent rate increase was proposed, it did not appeal to her very much. But she has a responsibility to represent and protect the Town in its obligations. She was unsure of the complete 15% pass-through proposal. The Town Administrator has reviewed the records and assured Council it was a legitimate cost that is passed through, but could not help but think that some percentage of the 7 percent prior increase takes into account these pass-through fees and surcharges. She was interested in getting a quote on an independent audit to make sure there is not any excess profit out of the pass through charges. She said she has to look not only on what is happening in San Anselmo, but other cities in Marin where this issue has arisen and where the pass-through costs have been approved. When you look at the prices, most of the time San Anselmo charges are lower than those in other agencies. She said she understood the viewpoints about mandatory garbage collection, and of persons who generated very little garbage, because they are being penalized for having to pay at least the single can rate. The way the rate system has been set up, it is operated as more like a community system. Some people are going to subsidize others. She favored "Option 3" which has a subsidy, because the people who are serious about recycling should be rewarded. In order to have the \$11.50 small can rate, the two and three can rates will have to increase. Those people who generate little garbage are in it with the rest of the community. She was interested in exploring in the next couple of months a program where the Town either goes to biweekly rates or make some kind of adjustment to that situation. In "Option 3" she supported instituting a small can immediately at \$13, and lowered to \$11.50 in July as an interim rate, subject to the findings of the independent audit.

Bonander said part of the reason for the July 1 start-up date for the small can rate is that there is currently no system in place for the application and notification process for the small-can rate and the associated mandatory recycling requirement.

Ray Forrest, San Anselmo Garbage, said his company would do everything possible to make the small can program effective March 1, 1992.

Councilmembers spoke of increasing efforts to notify people about recycling and encouraging recycling, notably among the two and three can users.

M/S, Colteaux/Kanis, to approve "Option 3", which sets the one-can weekly rate at \$15.80, the two-can weekly rate at \$28.40, and the three can weekly rate at \$40.30, with the amendment that the small can alternative with a rate of \$13 be implemented March 1, 1992, and that the small can rate be set at \$11.50 effective July 1, 1992, with the rates for two and three cans increased to \$31.60 and \$47.40 respectively effective July 1, 1992.

Zaharoff asked that the Solid Waste and Recycling Committee's notice on how to recycle be included in the notice of the rate increase.

M/S, Chignell/Walsh, to amend the motion to maintain the lifeline service rate at its present level. Motion passed unanimously.

The question on original motion was called. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Colteaux, Kanis, Zaharoff

NOES: Chignell, Walsh

Staff was asked to report back in two weeks with information on the cost of an outside expert analysis of garbage rates.

5. CONTINUED CONSIDERATION OF APPEAL OF APPLICATION FOR AN OVERNIGHT PARKING PERMIT, 138 WOODSIDE DRIVE, BY RICHARD ECKERSDORFF.

The appellant was not present. It was the consensus of the Council was to continue the item to the next regular meeting.

6. PUBLIC HEARING ON ADOPTION OF AN ORDINANCE REGULATING TOWING OF VEHICLES.

Due to the lateness of the hour, the item was continued to the next regular meeting.

7. CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES PERTAINING TO A POTENTIAL TRANSPORTATION JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY BETWEEN MARIN AND SONOMA.

Colteaux apprised the Council of the meeting the following evening on this issue.

8. REPORT ON LETTER FROM AUDITOR ON INTERNAL CONTROLS.

Due to the lateness of the hour, the item was continued to the next regular meeting.

9. COUNCIL REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS, COMMENTS AND DIRECTIONS TO STAFF; STAFF MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.

Recycling element - Bonander reported that there will be public hearings scheduled throughout the County on the Countywide Waste Management Committee Recycling Element.

10. ADJOURNMENT IN MEMORY OF JAMES R. "DICK" CROOKE.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:25 p.m.

Beth Pollard