



Subject: Universal Recycling Ordinance Phase 2 – Administrative Rules Development
#4 Stakeholder Group Meeting – Retail Businesses: Owners, Managers, and Operators

Date: August 28, 2013 2 p.m. – 4 p.m.

Location: City Hall; Room 1029; 301 W. 2nd St.; Austin, TX 78701

Introduction

Austin Resource Recovery held a stakeholder meeting intended for retail businesses: owners, managers, and operators to discuss the Universal Recycling Ordinance. The purpose of this meeting was to educate stakeholders about the ordinance, develop ways that to collaborate with associations and organizations on outreach, and ultimately work together to amend the Universal Recycling Ordinance Administrative Rules

Stakeholders were provided with information on Austin Resource Recovery's Strategic Initiatives' division. Stakeholders then introduced themselves. Staff walked meeting participants through the meeting agenda and transitioned to the education component of the discussion.

Part One – Staff presentation on URO and Administrative Rules

Staff made a presentation to stakeholders on the City's Zero Waste goals, the Universal Recycling Ordinance, the relationship between the URO and ARR's Administrative Rules and the process to amend the Administrative Rules.

(STAKEHOLDER) What about when the property is divided by different property types? Restaurant on the top floor, other businesses on other floors, etc.? How is the square footage counted? Is it the whole building, just the restaurant?

(STAFF) It would just be the restaurant's square footage that is counted.

(STAKEHOLDER) I have a client as well. 120,000sq, many different uses in the same building...not sure what they are responsible for and how they are affected. So if it is in a strip mall setting then restaurants aren't affected?

(STAFF) No, they are included. It would be the area that is designated for that specific business type that would be counted.

Part Two – URO Phase 2 Information Exchange and Facilitated Discussion

Staff introduced Part Two of the meeting by stating the purpose and the goal of the discussion. Staff explained the first half of Part Two would focus on stakeholders providing input related to their issues or concerns with specific sections of the URO section of the Administrative Rules.

(STAFF) We are going to be looking at the handout, "Emerging Themes". We are going to spend about 30 minutes reading through this document and we would like for you to write down your issues/concerns and your solutions on the post-it notes. We are going to problem solve once everyone has completed reading through the document. Please write the section of the rules that you want to discuss on your post-it note.

(STAFF) We will begin with Sections 8.1-8.5.





Subject: Universal Recycling Ordinance Phase 2 – Administrative Rules Development
#4 Stakeholder Group Meeting – Retail Businesses: Owners, Managers, and Operators

Date: August 28, 2013 2 p.m. – 4 p.m.

Location: City Hall; Room 1029; 301 W. 2nd St.; Austin, TX 78701

(STAFF) We have been hearing concerns about the responsible party so we will start there. The way the Ordinance is written currently it states that the responsible party is the property owner or designee. We have been hearing from stakeholders that there are some issues with that. This is definitely a recurring theme so what are some solutions to this?

(STAKEHOLDER) Solution: It should not be the property owner it should be the contracting party, owner, tenant or the manager. Whoever is currently contracting through the service is going to know best.

(STAFF) So should that be a change to the Ordinance?

(STAKEHOLDER) Yes.

(STAKEHOLDER) What happens if they ignore the Ordinance? What if they don't have a contracting party?

(STAKEHOLDER) What if they are a self-hauler? They wouldn't have a contracting party. What if they get their own license to haul?

(STAKEHOLDER) Are you talking about who is responsible for just filling out the form or who is responsible for providing recycling?

(STAKEHOLDER) (Reading section of the rules) Section states that property owners are in charge of providing recycling not necessarily making their tenants or employees recycle. I am not sure if a lot of these folks even know what the Ordinance holds them responsible for and what is considered a violation of the Ordinance.

(STAKEHOLDER) They are not requiring you to recycling anything; they are requiring you to contract and provide services. You cannot fine people for not using it. You have to provide the service and the education.

(STAKEHOLDER) Well then why do we have all these \$2,000 fines? Under enforcement there are a lot of fines.

(STAFF) The compliance piece is just for the property owners to make sure the service is provided. On the other hand if the tenants aren't recycling you would not be held responsible for that.

(STAKEHOLDER) There is a minimum capacity rate?

(STAKEHOLDER) Don't property owners have to show that there is a 25% diversion rate after the first year? And then the second year that changes? They have to show the diversion rate.

(STAKEHOLDER) My understanding is that you simply just need to report what has been accomplished. You are not held liable if those goals are not met.





Subject: Universal Recycling Ordinance Phase 2 – Administrative Rules Development
#4 Stakeholder Group Meeting – Retail Businesses: Owners, Managers, and Operators

Date: August 28, 2013 2 p.m. – 4 p.m.

Location: City Hall; Room 1029; 301 W. 2nd St.; Austin, TX 78701

(STAKEHOLDER) Well there is a minimum capacity requirement.

(STAFF) The capacity requirement is the ratio of your recycling to your total service. Whether those continue to grow or not is not part of the equation.

(STAKEHOLDER) I don't understand. If it is saying you have to recycle 1:1 ratio...

(STAKEHOLDER) Service capacity is your cubic yards...the containers multiplied by the frequency of pick-up. So if you have an 8 yard for trash and an 8 yard for recycling they both have to be picked up once a week. If you have an 8 yard for trash and a 4 yard for recycling the recycling would need to be picked up twice a week to have equal capacity.

(STAKEHOLDER) Okay, got it.

(STAKEHOLDER) How does a compacter play into that?

(STAKEHOLDER) That is something different.

(STAKEHOLDER) So they are not weighing the trash?

(STAKEHOLDER) 8.15.6.1: Written notices. \$2,000 fine etc. Why is that even in here?

(STAKEHOLDER) Could you explain compliance requirements?

(STAFF) As a property owner you have specific requirements you have to meet as per the ordinance. Let's point back to the slide that lists those. You have to do the groundwork to provide the access or infrastructure. You have to do your part, but you are not responsible if tenants or employees do not participate.

(STAKEHOLDER) Well you aren't going to pay for pick-up if there isn't anything in there.

(STAFF) You could be fined for not having the bins, but not if your tenants aren't recycling.

(STAKEHOLDER) 8.9.2: must collect at least the following materials. It says you must collect those. You can't just put a dumpster out there and leave it empty and be in compliance. It says you must. It's voluntary for them, but mandatory for the property owner. We are getting back to the whole issue of the property owner. What exactly is it that we are trying to do? I don't think you are trying to get the commercial world to pay to have empty bins picked up.

(STAFF) If there is education, signage, appropriate sized bins and you are making a good faith effort then you are fine.





Subject: Universal Recycling Ordinance Phase 2 – Administrative Rules Development
#4 Stakeholder Group Meeting – Retail Businesses: Owners, Managers, and Operators

Date: August 28, 2013 2 p.m. – 4 p.m.

Location: City Hall; Room 1029; 301 W. 2nd St.; Austin, TX 78701

(STAKEHOLDER) 8.4.8 Nails down the answer to that question.

(STAKEHOLDER) And, I would agree that is true, but there are other things through this whole Ordinance that contradict that. Maybe we need to re-word the Rules so that it all reads the same. That may be the whole issue. When I saw [8.4.8] I said, "ok", but then I read further and I must have five different types, I must have 75%, and I must do this, and they contradict each other. So, maybe we just need to re-write it so it's clearer.

(STAKEHOLDER) What happens if you are a property owner and you make it available and they [tenants or employees] don't do it [recycle]?

(STAFF) So, if I hear you correctly, there is a contradiction between what, as a property owner, I am responsible for providing and to what extent, is that correct?

(STAKEHOLDER) I just need clearer understanding and I think others down the road will too as well as to what your responsibilities are and what you are going to get fined for.

(STAFF) And that's part of the reason we are here if you can tell us where it's unclear and then we can help clarify things.

(STAFF) And if I hear you correctly, what's unclear is the way it's written in the sections, it's difficult to understand what you are responsible for.

(STAKEHOLDER) Or, it may make me think I am not responsible for something when in the end, I am.

(STAKEHOLDER) What about if you are a property owner, but the tenant is the one who contracts for trash or recycling, are you responsible for monitoring to make sure they've done those contracts correctly?

(STAKEHOLDER) Currently, these rules require a certain minimum capacity from a property owner. And, I understand that staff will ratchet up the minimum capacity requirements on an annual basis. So, what you are looking at here will change annually, I believe every October. You are requiring a certain level of capacity whether you use it or not.

(STAFF) Yes, according to the rules.

(STAKEHOLDER) So, who's the responsible party if you have some property that's owned by an out of state person and they've contracted for someone to have a business and they contract for the [waste] service. Who's responsible?

(STAFF) Currently the property owner, or their designee.





Subject: Universal Recycling Ordinance Phase 2 – Administrative Rules Development
#4 Stakeholder Group Meeting – Retail Businesses: Owners, Managers, and Operators

Date: August 28, 2013 2 p.m. – 4 p.m.

Location: City Hall; Room 1029; 301 W. 2nd St.; Austin, TX 78701

(STAKEHOLDER) That's problematic, that just gives the out of state property the power to designate whoever they want. There are legal issues with giving that person the ability to designate. It would need to be tighter than owner or designee.

(STAFF) Do you think the contracting party having responsibility would be better?

(STAKEHOLDER) It would solve everything except the instance of self-hauler, but we could come up with exceptions. They're already exemptions in the rules.

(STAKEHOLDER) If you go back to the analysis of property owner versus designee, there are properties that have 99 year leases. Do you think they are going to re-do these leases or contracts? If you do the operator or contractor it would solve those issues. I think you are going to have to tweak the contracting party [language], but you are going to have to do something more local, on a site specific basis to make it work.

(STAKEHOLDER) Take the path of least resistance. Someone has to sign a contract for solid waste or recycling at a commercial operation. At that point, catch it right then. Contractors ought to be the ones to prove compliance, to fill out the plan.

(STAKEHOLDER) If they are self-hauling they ought to be able to get an alternative equivalent compliance under the rules, if they can't document it.

(STAKEHOLDER) I think that would be whoever signed the contract; that person would be a representative of that entity, that commercial business.

(STAKEHOLDER) Can the ordinance fine a business or does it have to be an individual?

(STAFF) That would be a question for code compliance.

(STAKEHOLDER) That may be how we ended up with the property owner.

(STAFF) Does everybody agree that something around the concept of contracting party would be acceptable?

(STAKEHOLDER) I think it would be difficult to enforce. Staff cannot enforce it.

(STAFF) A comment about more zoning categories, 8.2.2, your specific question?

(STAKEHOLDER) I am just saying that there are multiple commercial zoning designations and I just wanted to bring that up.





Subject: Universal Recycling Ordinance Phase 2 – Administrative Rules Development
#4 Stakeholder Group Meeting – Retail Businesses: Owners, Managers, and Operators

Date: August 28, 2013 2 p.m. – 4 p.m.

Location: City Hall; Room 1029; 301 W. 2nd St.; Austin, TX 78701

(STAFF) For the purposes of this ordinance and the rules, as I mentioned earlier, commercial, it's a more liberal usage of the term. There are more zoning categories affected by URO than just commercially zoned properties. Are we all clear on that?

(STAFF) 8.4.6, self-recycle.

(STAKEHOLDER) 8.4.6 says they shall contract, if they self-haul or do their own recycling on site, you don't have a contract.

(STAFF) So the question is those who are not under contract or for those that don't have a contract, are they getting credit if they are diverting, and are they in compliance? Is that what you are asking? Does anyone else have any thoughts around that, or concerns, issues?

(STAKEHOLDER) Yes, kind of that same question, through the years, we've had people who want our compost and so we've given it to them, and so now we still have to have a compost deal over here as if we don't give it to them?

(STAFF) Currently there are no rules or requirements in the rules because it was a new amendment to the Ordinance; it's worth fleshing this out. Correct me if I am not hearing you correctly; it sounds like there may be some standard ways people get contracts and have their hauler come pick up their compostables, or there may be alternative ways they are still in fact diverting the materials, but going about it in a different method? Does that capture what you are getting at?

(STAKEHOLDER) Well, except for also, it has to be licensed hauler, so you can't give it [compost] to people anymore? That's what I am asking.

(STAKEHOLDER) You can, if it's not for a fee.

(STAKEHOLDER) But then how do you keep track of how much you've given? Do you just have your empty compost there so you can comply?

(STAKEHOLDER) If you can give it all away, you don't need a licensed hauler, you could somehow figure out how to calculate your diversion to get performance based compliance, but you aren't going to get it weighed.

(STAKEHOLDER) If you are the property owner you have to have a plan, part of that would say for compost you are going to collect and donate all of that material. You estimate how much was composted and donated. There's a function in terms of the plan for the City and the reporting function.

(STAFF) Currently the recycle plan form doesn't have any reporting mechanism there for composting because those requirements are new. So, if we need to compost and we need to report, what does that look like in the plan form? Are





Subject: Universal Recycling Ordinance Phase 2 – Administrative Rules Development
#4 Stakeholder Group Meeting – Retail Businesses: Owners, Managers, and Operators

Date: August 28, 2013 2 p.m. – 4 p.m.

Location: City Hall; Room 1029; 301 W. 2nd St.; Austin, TX 78701

there any other ideas or ways we can remain flexible so people can reach the goals of diverting and still be able to report if there are unique ways that it's happening?

(STAKEHOLDER) What about diversion to non-profit groups or community kitchens? That could be another alternative.

(STAKEHOLDER) I just think we need to establish that wherever that material is going, it's being diverted in an appropriate fashion and it's not being dumped illegally or something else.

(STAKEHOLDER) You are going to have to be real flexible on the food waste because it's the newest thing and there are so many different things you can do with it. There are and there already are niche services. People are going to need to be able to document and get credit for on the plan form. You don't want people who are being creative about donating as much as possible and giving to a community garden to be sitting there having more trouble than those that are contracting to haul the food waste. We have to figure out a way for people to get credit.

(STAFF) Did I hear something in the front of the room regarding how compostables are weighed?

(STAKEHOLDER) Oh, no we were talking about for compactor ratios.

(STAFF) She was talking about documentation of that. The plan form doesn't require submitting anything, but you should have something in your records that would show how you made those calculations.

(STAKEHOLDER) This also applies to shredding, I believe. So, whether it's compacting or shredding somehow that needs to be calculated into your plan or reporting function because it's not going to the landfill.

(STAFF) I am hearing a lot of reasons why 8.4.6 needs to be addressed. I am not sure if folks who shred on site are regarded as licensed haulers. And also as retailers they may be back hauling and I am not sure they are covered.

(STAKEHOLDER) The shredding companies are in fact covered by the Hauler's Ordinance.

(STAKEHOLDER) Can pallets be substituted for one of the five required materials? We have to do something with that as well. I don't think they are licensed private haulers.

(STAFF) Are there any examples you can give of how people are documenting alternative compliance?

(STAFF) So far we are dealing with multi-family and large office buildings.

(STAKEHOLDER) I would think on composting, as staff, develop a list of alternative compliance, I don't know if it would be in the rules, but if people are doing alternative things, like feeding the animals at the zoo, if you want to do that, who would





Subject: Universal Recycling Ordinance Phase 2 – Administrative Rules Development
#4 Stakeholder Group Meeting – Retail Businesses: Owners, Managers, and Operators

Date: August 28, 2013 2 p.m. – 4 p.m.

Location: City Hall; Room 1029; 301 W. 2nd St.; Austin, TX 78701

you contact?, etc. I know with H.E.B some of their products actually go to some of the people who need food. A list of contacts for people who are looking for ways to divert organics would be helpful.

(STAKEHOLDER) On page 8, a list of substitute materials, if there were entities here that utilize the materials to facilitate or coordinate moving those materials, that's a great suggestion.

(STAFF) Do you all think that would help address what's coming up, what we've been hearing regarding reduction or reuse, so it's diversion, but not recycling or composting, how do we capture this?

(STAKEHOLDER) We have to keep in mind EPA hierarchy. So this will help establish and drive that hierarchy.

(STAKEHOLDER) There are three options to get your diversion rate: reduce, reuse, recycle. That is being missed here. We are talking zero waste, things not going in the landfill.

(STAFF) It sounds like there needs to be a function in the recycle plan form, but I am also hearing that there needs to be guidance or direction on this in the rules.

(STAKEHOLDER) I think it's a paradigm thing, saying you have to recycle these materials and have this many cans, the goal of the zero waste is to reduce waste. So if you just open the doors and say, have a plan and make it performance based it solves the whole thing. You are diverting x amount of what you used to have.

(STAKEHOLDER) That makes sense except for when you have buildings that have 52,000sqare feet; I have 10 tenants, 10 trash haulers, 3 service providers. I have no way of measuring what that whole building is responsible for right now. So that's another thing we need to figure out. As a property owner I can put recycle cans out there, I am happy to do that, I can give all these guys their signage, educational material, but I have no way of measuring.

(STAKEHOLDER) We have to come up with a way for multi-tenant situations in large industrial buildings and retail and that's where we are having issues

(STAFF) Let's talk about that, we've heard issues with multi-tenant situations, so what might that look like in terms of a solution for the rules? What would be helpful to see or what's missing that would make you feel better about what you are required to do?

(STAKEHOLDER) I think establishing a baseline. What's your current level of waste? What's the size of your container and how frequently is it being serviced will give you a sense of that. The objective is to say, with these things in place, how has that shifted over time?

(STAFF) Woody, is the recycle plan form designed to show trends over time?





Subject: Universal Recycling Ordinance Phase 2 – Administrative Rules Development
#4 Stakeholder Group Meeting – Retail Businesses: Owners, Managers, and Operators

Date: August 28, 2013 2 p.m. – 4 p.m.

Location: City Hall; Room 1029; 301 W. 2nd St.; Austin, TX 78701

(STAFF) It's a snapshot in time, shows what your level of service is at the moment.

(STAKEHOLDER) That can only be done successfully if the contracting entity is the one to do it. The property manager cannot tell you that.

(STAKEHOLDER) Property owner or manager doesn't get involved in that.

(STAKEHOLDER) That's why she [property manager] shouldn't be involved in the plan form.

(STAKEHOLDER) So, would I have twenty bins behind my building? How can I do that?

(STAKEHOLDER) Your service provider will work with you to optimize the mix and you will lower your cubic yardage of trash, there are ways to do it.

(STAKEHOLDER) This is one of the issues we need to figure out.

(STAFF) Are you asking if the plan form handles a shared system? We can make that work.

(STAKEHOLDER) They'd have to have the same street address and the same materials. One might be disposing pallets one way.

(STAKEHOLDER) The list of materials and the five materials, we kind of get bogged down in that. That's kind of outdated language. You are going to contract for single stream. That's going to be more items than the five required. You aren't going to see multiple cans. All the haulers in here are providing commercial collection.

(STAKEHOLDER) Yes, but that doesn't necessarily apply in all situations. I don't want to give the impression everything commercial is going to go single stream.

(STAKEHOLDER) I think you need to back-up a little bit and use the plan form in a more educational way. On the plan form, you can ask for what their total diversion has been. You can tell them how to get the benchmark that from the hauler. And then you can give them the [options] reduce, reuse or the recycle and the fact that that can be performance based. I think you need to rethink the plan form in light of all the conversations that are going on. It may be how you solve the property owner or designee is if you define the designee as the operator on site, then maybe that, if you tweak the form and make it more sophisticated. Have a workshop for the haulers once you get the plan form done. They are the other side of the contract. So, get the hauler and the customer in sync about what the plan is for that particular site.

(STAKEHOLDER) I promise that is happening and will happen without being codified in the rules.





Subject: Universal Recycling Ordinance Phase 2 – Administrative Rules Development
#4 Stakeholder Group Meeting – Retail Businesses: Owners, Managers, and Operators

Date: August 28, 2013 2 p.m. – 4 p.m.

Location: City Hall; Room 1029; 301 W. 2nd St.; Austin, TX 78701

(STAKEHOLDER) The key is for the hauler and the customer to communicate and make sure they've got the right service and the right bins.

(STAKEHOLDER) There's really no way to know what the weight is going to be.

(STAKEHOLDER) You aren't going to have weights.

(STAFF) Is that the comment to not provide additional units of measurement on the form?

(STAKEHOLDER) Yes, the customer has no means to determine the weight of materials they've generated.

(STAKEHOLDER) They don't get that on their statement?

(STAKEHOLDER) No, it all goes into one truck.

(STAKEHOLDER) As haulers we provide semi-annual estimates by weight and volume of what we've collected. You've got two data sets you can compare. You'll be able to do a lot of enforcement by comparing those.

(STAFF) This is a comment on 8.4.4, proprietary information.

(STAKEHOLDER) This is the section that gives the city the right to review all invoices and contracts and basically any document, so there should be language that makes it very clear that the city may not take possession or take record of any of these things. They can review; they can only look for verification purposes. They cannot take possession of it and then have it be open for public record.

(STAFF) So can everyone agree on adding some additional language?

(STAKEHOLDER) So, if they need to use the info to make sure of compliance, wouldn't it be public record?

(STAFF) Any non-compliance case goes through a process. The private information wouldn't be public record, if one of our staff is on site and documents what they see, that becomes public record.

(STAFF): Another comment, 8.3.3 seems to contradict 8.15.4, enforcement or voluntary compliance, (staff reads 8.3.3 and 8.15.4)

(STAKEHOLDER) We clarified that earlier, but I do have a question about signage. In our building janitorial will take all the trash and recycling and put them in the basement in the proper receptacle. Does that mean we have to have signage at the receptacles that the tenants don't see? Right now it just says recycling on the haul off container.





Subject: Universal Recycling Ordinance Phase 2 – Administrative Rules Development
#4 Stakeholder Group Meeting – Retail Businesses: Owners, Managers, and Operators

Date: August 28, 2013 2 p.m. – 4 p.m.

Location: City Hall; Room 1029; 301 W. 2nd St.; Austin, TX 78701

(STAKEHOLDER) The haulers are responsible for the signage; the haulers signage will satisfy your requirements. There may be additional requirements for containers available for tenants or customers, I'm not positive about that, but the signage for your janitorial staff at the containers, haulers take care of that.

(STAKEHOLDER) That brings up a really good point about the indoor signage. 8.9.1 says that owners shall establish an indoor common collection storage area, but retail and industrial have no common areas. We just don't have common areas.

(STAKEHOLDER) Common areas really haven't been defined well.

(STAFF) Would that be a possible solution then, to put a definition around common collection areas? Is that the right terminology? How do y'all refer to those areas?

(STAKEHOLDER) You could say established collection areas. Then it could be the back of the house.

(STAKEHOLDER) What is it trying to refer to? The place where the individual puts their recyclables? I am not sure what you mean.

(STAKEHOLDER) 8.9.1 talks about common area collection and that's like the lobby of your office building. We had a long discussion about this in the last meeting.

(STAKEHOLDER) Yes, but we don't have those areas.

(STAFF) There's another reading of this and it may not be obvious. It's if you do have a common area recycling station it should abide by building codes and fire and safety. I wasn't in the writing of this, but it says that if you do have one you should abide.

(STAKEHOLDER) I think the intention is to make recycling convenient so people will actually do it. So I think property owners can identify on their own site plan where those common areas could be or should be, and I think there should be a broader definition for that.

(STAFF) That's what I am hearing that there needs to be clarification around that language.

(STAFF) And indoor common area collection areas shall be established in accordance with the rules, not that they should be established.

(STAKEHOLDER) If the language gets changed around property owner as the designee versus contractor for service then that will be changed throughout?





Subject: Universal Recycling Ordinance Phase 2 – Administrative Rules Development
#4 Stakeholder Group Meeting – Retail Businesses: Owners, Managers, and Operators

Date: August 28, 2013 2 p.m. – 4 p.m.

Location: City Hall; Room 1029; 301 W. 2nd St.; Austin, TX 78701

(STAKEHOLDER) The conversation last meeting centered around the lobbies and hallways and that these had to be established.

(STAKEHOLDER) I think there's another part of the ordinance that requires you to put recycling and trash cans for customers. I think if we delete 8.9.1 we could have addition by subtraction.

(STAFF) So, is everyone okay with the suggestion of deleting 8.9.1?

(STAKEHOLDER) It just depends, are there some critical requirements out there where you do have a common area collection? If there are critical requirements that aren't easily found, then it may be a good thing to have them in there.

(STAKEHOLDER) I think there's clarification needed: are collection points to be established in all common areas or those common areas must be identified as collection points? I think there's difference there. The later seems more reasonable.

(STAKEHOLDER) That collection issue gets to new buildings that need to have chutes. I think it would make sense to address that.

(STAKEHOLDER) A general comment, a lot of these rules are ordinance language, they are general and broad and we are debating interpretation. The rules are supposed to be very specific, meat on the bones of the ordinance. As an overarching comment we are piling generalities on top of generalities. We have not yet gotten to the specific rule type language that's going to tell people how to comply.

(STAKEHOLDER) The rules can't apply to everybody across the system. We are all really different.

(STAFF) 8.4.3 the comment is retention requirement or expectation.

(STAKEHOLDER) The plan form is submitted on an annual basis.

(STAKEHOLDER) Give people some freedom, don't dictate everything.

(STAKEHOLDER) General requirements, they all start differently. They are not consistent, look at all these sections and decide who is on the hook. It changes every sentence.

(STAFF) We have 10 more minutes, so let's open the floor.

(STAKEHOLDER) I just recall the last meeting we asked staff to go back and see about responsible party, if other ordinances had addressed that issue and how that came about.





Subject: Universal Recycling Ordinance Phase 2 – Administrative Rules Development
#4 Stakeholder Group Meeting – Retail Businesses: Owners, Managers, and Operators

Date: August 28, 2013 2 p.m. – 4 p.m.

Location: City Hall; Room 1029; 301 W. 2nd St.; Austin, TX 78701

(STAKEHOLDER) There was mention of the Smoking Ordinance and how that's written.

(STAFF) We have had some initial conversations with legal, but nothing to report back at this time.

(STAKEHOLDER) Are we looking at a class C misdemeanor? If you don't comply, they are going to give a class C misdemeanor? I bring about the irrigation problem and property owners in California were given class C misdemeanors and clogging up the courts.

(STAKEHOLDER) I have a client that wants to address the illegal dumping issue. Who's responsible through the URO for that? I know it's on their property, but they are adamant that they are not responsible for other's actions.

(STAKEHOLDER) Part of the question in my mind is what action should a property owner take in the instance of that happening? Should it trigger a 311 call to code compliance? How do you respond in the event of this action, what is the property owner's responsibility in this case? To mitigate the issue?

(STAFF) We need to check with code compliance on that.

(STAKEHOLDER) A related point is my question on 8.8.3 and this is lock bars and things on containers. This section needs to be deleted from the rules. The provision of lock bars is a service we provide and people we need. We should not be placing the Director of ARR as the mediator between disputes. This is something I will go to Council about.

(STAKEHOLDER) And this deters people from purchasing that service from you.

(STAFF) Is there anybody who disagrees with the suggestion of removing 8.8.3?

(STAKEHOLDER) Is there an interim step before you start into the legal proceeding? Businesses are not going to want to see their names in the paper as being bad environmental citizens.

(STAKEHOLDER) The city has done that with the irrigation, I am sure they would do it with the trash.

(STAKEHOLDER) There's really not an incentive program mentioned. That's how we are going to get businesses on board. And then give them recognition on a public level. That they are going above and beyond. The incentive programs need to be tacked on to something like this.

(STAKEHOLDER) I agree. Spotlight the businesses that are going above and beyond.

(STAKEHOLDER) We have the Green Business Leaders, but we need something that's really focusing on waste reduction and that impact.





Subject: Universal Recycling Ordinance Phase 2 – Administrative Rules Development
#4 Stakeholder Group Meeting – Retail Businesses: Owners, Managers, and Operators

Date: August 28, 2013 2 p.m. – 4 p.m.

Location: City Hall; Room 1029; 301 W. 2nd St.; Austin, TX 78701

(STAKEHOLDER) That's something that has been talked about since the beginning of this process.

(STAKEHOLDER) I think businesses will respond if we take it up a notch and say hey we are recycling because it's the right thing to do and not hit them with 17 pages of rules.

(STAKEHOLDER) As I move this up the chain, if I can that there are incentives, that there are rebates, if we do this at five properties, this is what it will do for us. If there are incentives in place, it's more likely all of this will happen.

(STAKEHOLDER) Austin City Limits, does that include limited purpose areas?

(STAFF) It's just the City Limits.

(STAKEHOLDER) I'd like to hear from the group, I have been a part of most of these meetings and the same questions are coming up time and again, but I'd like to hear how they feel they need to get more information, how this process can work better to keep it as simple as possible and occupy as little of their time and effort as possible, and I think people are generally agreeable to making it work. How can Downtown Austin Alliance facilitate, what else can be done to move this along, get more people on board?

(STAKEHOLDER) I think there needs to be a stronger public campaign around it. You are still part of this as a city resident. A larger public campaign that really champions business and restaurant recycling.

(STAKEHOLDER) I need to reduce the paperwork. I cannot keep up with the paperwork.

(STAKEHOLDER) We all want this to be effective, that's my point.

(STAKEHOLDER) I think it should go back to the haulers. If they are educating their clients, executing good contracts and the word is spread that you need to recycle, they are going to contract with the haulers. I think you don't have to have all these rules. This is a bureaucratic nightmare. You guys have done a really good job running an inclusive and transparent process, but you don't have a lot of the restaurant owners at these meetings.

(STAKEHOLDER) Well we are here to talk about Phase 2 and we've done nothing but talk about Phase 1 rules. That concerns me that we are going to approach some of these later meetings and accelerate the pace to cram down a very important rules process for Phase 2 to bring in some of the restaurant owners to be involved.

(STAKEHOLDER) I would suggest we extend the schedule.

(STAKEHOLDER) Well the things we are talking about now are essentially going towards a re-write of the ordinance and this is because there weren't enough people involved in the beginning as stakeholders.





Subject: Universal Recycling Ordinance Phase 2 – Administrative Rules Development
#4 Stakeholder Group Meeting – Retail Businesses: Owners, Managers, and Operators

Date: August 28, 2013 2 p.m. – 4 p.m.

Location: City Hall; Room 1029; 301 W. 2nd St.; Austin, TX 78701

(STAKEHOLDER) You have to have the rules so that we can verify that what we want to happen is happening, but what you can do is at the beginning have a good faith method, one of the first things is a site inspector can approve your plan on any subjective matter he sees. If he sees you have less than the number of cans, but they are full and you have no trash, then it's approved. If the first thing in the ordinance is a good faith measure then it takes out all the complications.

(STAFF) Let's go ahead and wrap up, I do want to respect your time. We have listened and heard your concerns and it does sound like the process is not meeting your expectations. If you have ideas, recommendations or solutions we welcome those. Please call or email us and let us know. If you did not get to say what you wanted to say today, please call or reach out to us. Your handout shows our schedule. Thank you very much for your time today.

