
City of Grand Island



Tuesday, February 19, 2002
Study Session Packet

City Council:

Joyce Haase
Margaret Hornady
Gale Larson
Glen Murray
Jackie Pielstick
Larry Seifert
Robert Sorensen
Scott Walker
Tom Ward
Fred Whitesides

Mayor:

Ken Gnadt

City Administrator:

Marlan Ferguson

City Clerk:

RaNae Edwards

7:00 PM
Council Chambers - City Hall
100 East First Street

Call to Order

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call

A - SUBMITTAL OF REQUESTS FOR FUTURE ITEMS

Individuals who have appropriate items for City Council consideration should complete the Request for Future Agenda Items form located at the Information Booth. If the issue can be handled administratively without Council action, notification will be provided. If the item is scheduled for a meeting or study session, notification of the date will be given.

B - RESERVE TIME TO SPEAK ON AGENDA ITEMS

This is an opportunity for individuals wishing to provide input on any of tonight's agenda items to reserve time to speak. Please come forward, state your name and address, and the Agenda topic on which you will be speaking.



City of Grand Island

Tuesday, February 19, 2002

Study Session

Item H1

Discussion of Possible Park Land Acquisition

The Parks and Recreation Department will present a possible park land acquisition proposal in the eastern part of Grand Island.

Staff Contact: Steve Paustian





City of Grand Island

Tuesday, February 19, 2002

Study Session

Item H2

Update Concerning Solid Waste Fee Schedule

The Solid Waste Fee Schedule is approved by council. A Solid Waste Fee Schedule based on weight was implemented on October 1, 2001. The switch from volume measurement (Cubic Yards) to weight based measurement (Tons) increases the disposal fee for packed loads (ie: residential packer trucks) and decreases the disposal fee for loose loads (ie: roll off containers). A dual fee structure with a lower tipping fee for packer trucks was approved by the city council in an effort to reduce the financial impact on the residential property owner. Data available at the time indicated that the hauler's disposal fee for a packer truck could increase 7.0%, resulting in a potential increase to each household of \$3.86 per year.

Solid Waste Superintendent, Kevin McKennon reviewed the revenue for the time period of October 1st through December 31st, 2001. We would like to update council on the effect the conversion has had on the financial status of the division. We would recommend continuing the dual fee structure to reduce the financial impact on the residential property owner. The hauler's disposal fee for a packer truck could increase an additional 12.0%, resulting in a potential increase to each household of \$6.60 per year.

We would recommend an April 1st, 2002 implementation date.

Please see attached document for a summary of the alternatives that were considered by staff.

Staff Contact: Steven P. Riehle, P.E., Public Works Director / Ci

Revenue Study
Solid Waste Division
Grand Island Public Works Department

February 11, 2002

A revenue study was conducted from October 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001 to compare the revenue gained or lost from the conversion from Cubic Yards to Tons for fee calculation. The rates which went into effect October 1, 2001 are:

<u>Type of Truck</u>	<u>Landfill</u>	<u>Transfer Station</u>
Residential Packer Truck	\$ 22.85 per ton	\$ 28.50 per ton
Loose material and Roll-off Containers	\$ 29.85 per ton	\$ 35.50 per ton

The new tonnage rate resulted in a revenue shortfall of over \$62,000 for the first quarter of the 2001-2002 fiscal year when compared to the cubic yard rate. The shortfall at the Landfill was \$39,000, and the Transfer Station was \$23,000. This would result in an 11.67% (\$248,000) shortfall in revenue for the fiscal year. This change in revenue is quite extreme, with the greatest shortfall in revenue from the roll off containers at the Landfill, and the loose material at the Transfer Station (primarily small vehicles).

We considered five alternatives to compensate for the shortfall in revenue:

1. Maintain the current structure.

Make no change in rate structure.

Impacts:

- Shortfall in revenue of \$248,000 for the fiscal year when compared to cubic yard revenue.
- Loss of revenue would be unhealthy for the Division.

2. A 12% across the board increase in rates.

Maintain a dual rate system: one rate for packer trucks and one rate for loose material and roll off containers with a differential between the Landfill rates and the Transfer Station rates.

<u>Type of Truck</u>	<u>Landfill</u>	<u>Transfer Station</u>
Residential Packer Truck	\$ 25.60 per ton	\$ 31.90 per ton
Loose material and Roll-off Containers	\$ 33.45 per ton	\$ 40.00 per ton

Impacts:

- Shortfall in revenue of \$32,000 for the fiscal year when compared to the cubic yard revenue.
- Loose material and roll off container rates at the Landfill and Transfer Station would be considerably higher than the regional average Landfill rate of \$31.65 per ton.
- Rates will drive away loose material and roll off container customers.
- Loss of loose material and roll off container customers will force an increase in packer rates. Residential customer rates could increase by almost \$12.00 per year.

3. Adjust the rates for loose and roll off containers.

The fees for the packer trucks at the Landfill and the Transfer Station would remain as they are now. The rate for loose material and roll off containers would be raised to \$42.25 per ton at the Landfill. The rate for loose material and roll off containers would be raised to \$46.50 per ton at the Transfer Station.

<u>Type of Truck</u>	<u>Landfill</u>	<u>Transfer Station</u>
Residential Packer Truck	\$ 22.85 per ton	\$ 28.50 per ton
Loose material and Roll-off Containers	\$ 42.25 per ton	\$ 46.50 per ton

Impacts:

- Shortfall in revenue of \$14,000 for the fiscal year when compared to cubic yard revenue.
- Rates of \$42.25 and \$46.50 are much higher than the regional market Landfill rate of \$31.65.
- Rates will definitely drive away loose material and roll off container customers.
- Loss of loose material and roll off container customers will force and increase in packer rates. Residential customer rates could increase by over \$17.00 per year.

4. A single rate per ton with a Transfer Station differential.

The single rate for packers and roll off containers would be raised to \$29.50 per ton with a Transfer Station differential of \$4.25 per ton.

<u>Type of Truck</u>	<u>Landfill</u>	<u>Transfer Station</u>
Residential Packer Truck	\$ 29.50 per ton	\$ 33.25 per ton
Loose material and Roll-off Containers	\$ 29.50 per ton	\$ 33.25 per ton

Impacts:

- Shortfall in revenue of \$14,000 for the fiscal year when compared to the cubic yard rate.
- The Transfer Station rate of \$33.75 would be far above the regional Landfill average of \$31.65.
- This rate would place a greater burden on the residential customer. Residential customer rates could increase by \$10.00 per year.

5. Continued dual rate structure at the Landfill and Transfer Station.

Maintain a dual rate structure at the Landfill and Transfer Station: one rate for packer trucks and one rate for loose material and roll off containers.

<u>Type of Truck</u>	<u>Landfill</u>	<u>Transfer Station</u>
Residential Packer Truck	\$ 28.75 per ton	\$ 31.75 per ton
Loose material and Roll-off Containers	\$ 30.75 per ton	\$ 35.75 per ton

Impacts:

- Shortfall in revenue of \$58,000 for the fiscal year when compared to the cubic yard rate.
- Least impact to residential customers of the options considered. Increase should be near \$6.60 per year.

Summary

The Solid Waste Division can not afford Option 1. Options 2, 3 and 4 will either drive away the roll off customers or place an undue burden on the packer trucks and residential customers.

Option 5 is a compromise. It increases rates to loose material and roll off container customers and still provides competitive rates for packer truck customers. The rates at the Landfill would still be below the regional Landfill average of \$31.65 per ton.

Note: All shortfalls in revenue are measured by comparing revenue received at tonnage rates versus FY 2000-2001 cubic yard rates. The study does not measure increased flow to the Landfill over the 3 month period, in order to compare only the variable of rate structure.



City of Grand Island

Tuesday, February 19, 2002

Study Session

Item H3

Update Concerning Comprehensive Plan

The Hall County Regional Planning Commission has signed a contract with JEO Consulting Group of Wahoo.

JEO has offices in Nebraska, Iowa and Wisconsin, including an office in Hastings. JEO has a wide range of experience in planning in Nebraska and surrounding states. They will be teaming with CBB of St. Louis to update the transportation network for Grand Island that was created for the 1992 comprehensive plan. Keith Marvin, AICP, Planning Manager for JEO Consulting Group, was at the meeting on Wednesday for the contract signing.

The cost of the proposed scope of services is \$218,065. The Planning Commission raise \$225,000 for this project in funds from member communities and grant sources.

Staff Contact: Chad Nabitv

Regional Planning Commission Guides Communities into the Future

Change is one of the inevitable facts of life. Physical changes take place in every community every day. Sometimes it is only the slow changes that are the result of daily wear and tear. Other times it is the catastrophic changes that happen because of floods, tornadoes and other natural events. It may also be those changes that appear suddenly, but in all likelihood were inevitable:

- the owner of the empty lot next to your house decides to build there;
- a wide street that moves traffic between and around several neighborhoods is striped for three or four lanes of traffic instead of two;
- the city extends sanitary sewer and water to your neighborhood and refuses to let you simply replace your septic system or well.

A responsible and responsive government is one that is prepared to meet the challenges (minimize the negative impacts and maximize the positive impacts) of all of these types of change.

A group of citizens appointed by the County Board, City Councils and Village Boards in Hall County, known as the Regional Planning Commission, provides insight and guidance from the perspective of ordinary citizens into planning for and reacting to these changes. They work with the professional planning, engineering and legal staff of the County, Cities and Villages to plan for changes to those communities. Since 1968, it has been the mission of the Regional Planning Commission to give their informed opinion and recommendation regarding changes to these communities to the elected officials. The opinions and recommendations of the Regional Planning Commission are formed based on:

- their knowledge of the communities,
- the recommendations of staff or consultants,
- the comments, questions, fears, hopes, and dreams of the people (citizens, landowners, neighbors, school children, etc...).

The Regional Planning Commission recommends a course of action (based on technical information balanced against the common sense of the citizens) to the local governing bodies. This information is essential to elected officials that must make decisions that will change their communities. These recommendations and decisions do produce winners and losers:

- some people end up with a four-lane street in front of their house,
- others have city services extended to their suburban development,
- businesses have places to locate,
- developers sell lots for those business and houses.

Virtually every project, regulation or change brought before the Regional Planning Commission will have positive impacts for some people and negative impacts for others. The Regional Planning Commission tries to be fair in the way it gathers information about and makes decisions regarding each project, regulation or change.

In the end the people of Hall County, it's Cities and Villages, have places to work, live, sleep, shop, play and learn. They can be sure that the consequences of changes to the community have been considered and weighed. They can also be sure that as other changes occur the consequences of those changes will be taken into account.

Planning is fundamental

Everybody plans. Everybody changes their plans to fit new situations.

A young couple just getting married has their life together all planned.

Year	Plan
1	Live in an apartment and save for a house. Both work full time.
3	Buy a house, have a baby. Both work full time
4	Both work full time
5	Have another baby. One parent works full time other stays home and takes care of the kids.
8	Kids in school or preschool. Both work full time
10	Buy a bigger house.
24	Kids are in college
28	Kids are out of college
31	Build dream house
40	Retire and Travel

Wouldn't it be nice if life could work like that. We all know it doesn't. That young couple will have to deal with issues that they can't plan for. What if one of them loses their job. What if they have a house fire? What if they can't get have children or if they have twins, triplets or more? What if the kids don't get in college? What if interest rates are at 18% when they want to buy a house?

Not knowing the answers to those questions isn't a reason to not plan. They should still make plans. They just need to realize that those plans may need to be changed, updated or redone to fit the conditions when they do know the answers to some of those questions.

Comprehensive plans for communities are like the couples first plan. In an ideal world if everything works out, you don't need to change the plan. You don't need to update it. In the real world plans change.

Comprehensive Plan Timeline

- March 2002 Kickoff Meetings for Hall County and Grand Island Comp. Plans
Meetings with Staff and Steering Committees
- May 2002 Kickoff Meetings for Wood River, Doniphan, Cairo and Alda Plans
Meetings with Staff and Steering Committees
- April 2003 Approve Comprehensive Plans for Hall County and Grand Island
Begin revising regulations based on new plans
Meetings with Staff and Steering Committees
- June 2003 Approve Comprehensive Plans for Wood River, Doniphan, Cairo and
Alda
Begin revising regulations based on new plans
Meetings with Staff and Steering Committees
- January 2004 Adopt new subdivision and zoning regulations for all Communities.

The Steering Committee

Each community will have its own steering committee. Membership on the steering committee should include Planning Commission representatives from that community, city council, county board or village board members from that community, local business people, landowners within the community, persons from the extraterritorial jurisdiction of the city or village, real estate professionals, chamber of commerce and economic development officials, representative from the local service clubs, school board members, utility company representatives, any individual interested in the future of their community.

The steering committees may recruit additional people to serve on subcommittees to deal with specific portions of the plan such as housing or transportation.

The steering committee will be responsible for working with the consultant to develop a comprehensive plan and regulations that are in the best interests of the community. The consultant will develop the plan and regulations using good planning practices, techniques and principles based upon the guidance of steering committee. The steering committee should be available to take the plan and regulations as presented by the consultants to the Hall County Regional Planning Commission and the elected officials for approval.