



City Council Work Session

Monday, October 30, 2017, 6:00 p.m.

Council Chambers, 317 S. Washington

Mayor Shelley Hansel

Council Member Kip Etter

Council Member Bill Butts

Council Member Kelly Hawley

Council Member Jim Valentine

Council Member Jan Korte

Council Member Vince Wetta

Agenda

- ❖ Pledge of Allegiance

- ❖ Agenda Items
 1. Elkhorn Valley Packing odor issues ~ History of odor issues and operations included
 2. Auditorium Management Contract ~ Memo from Director Jones, & current Management Agreement
 3. Audit Services ~ Memo from City Manager Shields
 4. Automated Curbside Recycling Program ~ Report from Director Jones, Proposed Budget, Options A, B, & C Amortization tables
 5. Compost Site Hours of Operation ~ Remarks & survey from Director Jones
 6. Cowley College, Sumner Campus- Letter of Support, Drone Program
 7. City Manager Evaluation ~ Mayor Hansel

- ❖ Miscellaneous

October 30, 2017
Work Session

In order to provide some history of the odor issue and operations at the location of 1509 E. 16th Street, following are excerpts from City Council meetings minutes relating to Wellington Quality Meats, Inc. and Elkhorn Valley Meat Packing Plant from April 18, 1989 to March 4, 2003.

April 18, 1989 Regular session

Steven Hamlin, Owner of Wellington Quality Meats, Inc., appeared before the Council regarding a billing received from the Utility Office in the amount of \$19,345.40 for a month's surcharge for what its plant is doing to the municipal sewage treatment plant, and asked Council to do something about foregoing the surcharge

Hamlin stated his Company had taken steps to rectify the problem and had contacted a consulting company to make recommendations for correcting the problem. City Manager Preston reviewed the letters sent to the Company dating back to March, 1988 advising them that a surcharge would be assessed until the situation was corrected. Preston said the Plant was designed to handle domestic sewage and was not capable of handling the large volume of a slaughter operation. The increase in operations has resulted in a serious sludge disposal problem. The ordinance controlling Biological Oxygen Demand and suspended solid concentrations (Sec. 15-438 of the City Code) was required to be included in the City Code by the Department of Environmental Regulation and the Kansas Department of Health and it is the City's responsibility to enforce it. Under the terms of the City Water Pollution Control Permit, the City could be fined up to \$10,000.00, per day for each day the plant is not in compliance. City Attorney Russell suggested that the Environmental Protection Agency Grant that was entered into when the facility was built be reviewed before a decision is reached. Councilmember Starkey suggested the City investigate the possibility of grants or loans that may assist the Wellington Quality Meats, Inc. with costs involved in attaining compliance. Councilmember Boyd moved a decision be tabled for two weeks to give the City Attorney an opportunity to review the EPA Agreement and allow Mr. Hamlin to further his plans. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Young and carried unanimously.

March 6, 1990 Regular session

Randy Weins, representing Wellington Quality Meats, addressed the Council on zoning regulations. Wellington Quality Meats is currently zoned "C-S" Highway Service. The use regulations for this type of zoning allow for a Slaughter House with several conditions. One of these conditions that a Slaughter House must meet, is that a tract of land 100 feet wide must be located between a slaughter house and adjacent residential zoning. The zoning regulations do not separate the slaughter house or cattle pens from other accessory buildings, such as garages. Wellington Quality Meats would like to build a maintenance building 40' by 80', which will be less than the 100 foot requirement, and would like the Council to make this accessory building an exception to the rules. The Board of Zoning Appeals does not have the authority to grant a variance in these use regulations. The Zoning Ordinance would have to be changed and this would take a

public hearing and be presented to the Planning Commission for their recommendations. President of the Council Starkey suggested a change in the ordinance with the stipulation that would require anything connected with the keeping of/or slaughter of animals be kept 100 feet away from a residential zone and directed Staff to look into the situation more closely to develop something, or perhaps amend the ordinance to be presented at the next meeting.

June 5, 1990 Regular session

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE ZONING AND SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS OF~THE: ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WELLINGTON, KANSAS was introduced and read. Councilmember Young moved the foregoing Ordinance be passed. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Thompson. Upon roll call vote those voting "AYE" were Crum, McGovern, Gilliland, Starkey, Thompson, Anderson, McKowen and Young. Those voting "NAY" were none. No. 3586 was assigned to this Ordinance.

August 7, 1990 Regular session

Soules reported that Quality Meats has their pre-treatment system installed and operating. Several complaints have been received concerning odor. The pre-treatment system has encountered air flow problems that caused the system to malfunction and an odor to occur. The company is working on the problem in an effort to correct the cause of the odor.

June 4, 1991 Regular session

Councilmember Anderson reported having several complaints in regard to the odor from Wellington Quality Meats. Staff was directed to check into the situation to see if the problem can be corrected.

August 6, 1991 Regular session

Anderson inquired about the odor reported coming from Wellington Quality Meats. Soules reported a sample had been taken that was unsatisfactory, reportedly due to a malfunction of equipment. City Planner Zeltkals reported he and City Inspector Bennett had visited the plant and there was definitely a problem, but the "Management" said they would comply. The situation will be further reviewed.

November 16, 1999 Regular session

Mayor Chisham reported he has received several complaint calls the last few days about the bad odor from the Meat Packing Plant. City Manager Myers reported he will have staff will check on this.

February 19, 2002 Regular session

Council Member Gilliland reported he has been contacted by several people who live near Elkhorn Valley Packing Plant; regarding the bad odor coming from the plant. He

contacted Jeff Bennett, Elkhorn Valley Representative, who reported they are working on clearing up the odor problem in the area.

April 2, 2002 Regular session

Mr. John Brand, resident at 1422 Huron Court, addressed the Council regarding the bad odor in his neighborhood that was being caused by the Elkhorn Valley Meat Packing Plant. He expressed concern that the problem has persisted over the last six weeks. Mr. Brand reported he has contacted the City and Elkhorn Valley regarding the odor and understands they are working on the problem. He stated he supports their efforts and wished to express his opinion so that the problem can be corrected.

Mr. Jay Robinson, 1505 North Keyes, addressed the Council regarding the bad odor in the same neighborhood. Mr. Robinson asked the Council if they were aware of the problem being caused by the packing house. He stated he had received numerous calls from residents in the neighborhood complaining about the odor and asked if steps were being taken to alleviate the problem.

Council Member Bustraan, who is maintenance supervisor for Elkhorn Valley, reported the problem originated from the power outage caused by the January ice storm. The outage caused their system to become inoperable and waste accumulated and became septic. He stated his company has called in several consultants to help with the problem. City Staff has also been monitoring the problem and called in a consultant from Salina Vo Tech. The consultant gave recommendations to Elkhorn to correct the problem. He reported they are hopeful the problem will be improved within the next week. City Manager Mvers stated staff will continue to monitor the problem.

December 17, 2002 Regular session

Council Member Holmes reported he had received a complaint from a citizen about the odor around the Steak House. Staff will check on this.

February 18, 2003 Regular session

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ARTICLE XV "C-S" HIGHWAY SERVICE DISTRICT AND ARTICLE XX "I-2" HEAVY INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT OF THE CITY OF WELLINGTON ZONING ORDINANCE AS ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 3826 was introduced and considered. City Engineer Mangan reported the Planning Commission held a public hearing at their November 2002 meeting regarding deleting Slaughter Houses, and all of their attendant activities, from the C-S Zoning district and only permitting them in I-2 with a special use permit. This proposed zoning ordinance was recommended to the Council by a 4-1 vote from the Planning Commission. It was not immediately forwarded to the Council because of concerns expressed by Elkhorn Valley Packing Company on the impact this amendment would have on their current and future operations. Engineer Mangan included a zoning definition of a slaughter operation, which is comprised of five different operations, in the agenda packet.

City Staff has met with Elkhorn Valley Packing owners and also held a neighborhood meeting to present information and discuss the proposed amendment to the zoning ordinance. Engineer Mangan stated the Council now had three options to consider on the proposed ordinance. Option 1 would be to not pass the ordinance and take no action to change the existing zoning ordinance. This would allow slaughter house operations in a C-S zone. Option 2 would be to pass the ordinance, which would then restrict all five slaughter house operations to an I-2 zone by Special Use Permit. Option 3, proposed by staff is to take action to separate slaughter operations 1, 2 and 3 from operations 4 and 5 by definition; prohibit operations 1, 2 and 3 from all commercial zones; allow operations 1, 2 and 3 in I-2 zone by Special Use Permit; allow operations 4 and 5 in C-S zones. City Manager Myers explained staff's reasons for recommending Option 3. He stated Elkhorn is considering moving their boning, packaging and cold storage operation from their current location in Nebraska to Wellington. This would add 60 new jobs to the City's economy, and is a "clean part" of the operation, which would not add to any offensive environmental problems. He reported staff has been in contact with the owners of Elkhorn Valley and has had several discussions with them in regard to moving the boning operation to an identified industrial site rather than their current site. The owners are interested in this and have agreed to discuss this option with City Staff.

Several members of the neighborhood near Elkhorn Valley were in attendance at the meeting. Mr. Carl Garnand expressed concern that if the amendment to the ordinance allows Elkhorn to locate their boning operation at their current site, it would then give them no incentive to locate at the proposed industrial site. Mr. and Mrs. Ken Miller expressed concern that the offensive odor from the slaughter house operation would hinder commercial development in the area, which was hoped to increase with the new high school being built. Mr. John Zoglmann also expressed concern about the offensive odor in the neighborhood and asked if Elkhorn had been given a time limit by the City to correct the odor problem. City Engineer Mangan stated there was a problem with the odor last year after the ice storm when Elkhorn was without electricity. Elkhorn was given a notice at that time. Mr. John Brand stated that Elkhorn Valley had agreed to install a backup generator after the bad odor problem last year and to date this has not been done. He also questioned if the zoning amendment in option 3 was passed, what incentive this would give Elkhorn to move their boning operation to a different site. Mr. Zoglmann asked if the City could do anything legally about the odor. City Manager Myers stated City ordinance does allow the City to have entry to the property if there is an offensive odor. The City can then work with Elkhorn on the problem or attempt to mitigate the problem on its own. He reported Elk Horn has made attempts to improve the odor problem and is continuing to work on this. He stated the City will continue to monitor the problem. After further discussion, Council Member McGovern moved to return the ordinance to the Planning Commission and give consideration to staff's recommendation of option 3. Council Member Rains seconded. Upon roll call vote, those voting "AYE" on the motion were Council Members McComb, Holmes, McGovern, Kelley, Rains, Craig and Gilliland. Council Member Bustraan abstained from voting. The motion carried.

March 4, 2003 Regular session

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ARTICLE XV "C-S" HIGHWAY SERVICE DISTRICT AND ARTICLE XX 1-2" HEAVY INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT OF THE CITY OF WELLINGTON ZONING ORDINANCE AS ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 3826 AND REPEALING EXISTING SECTIONS was introduced and considered. Mayor Chisham reported this matter has been previously discussed at two Planning Commission meetings and at the February 18, 2003 Council meeting. He asked that City Staff make opening comments first and then if any members of the audience wished to address the issue, they direct their comments to the Council. Engineer Mangan explained the change in the ordinance, which would take slaughter houses out of C-S Zones and puts them in I-2 zones with a Special Use Permit. It would allow boning and fabrication operations in a C-S Zone.

Mr. John Brand, 1422 Huron, asked to address the Council. Mr. Brand presented a petition to the Council. He reported the petition was circulated by several members of the neighborhood behind Elkhorn Valley and contained over 180 signatures. Mr. Brand read the petition which requested the Council consider taking action "to restrict all five slaughter operations to an I-2 zone by Special Use permit, which would prohibit any of the five defined slaughter operations from other commercial zones. This would also prevent Elkhorn Valley from expanding any of the operations on its current site." Mr. Brand stated by taking this action, neighborhood residents felt it would induce Elkhorn Valley to relocate to an industrial site within Wellington. He expressed concern with the odor problems that have occurred in the neighborhood. He also expressed concern with the new high school being built in this area the odor problem would make a bad impression on visitors or potential residents.

Council Member McComb asked if the City had found any reasons for the odor problem. City Manager Myers stated in the past there have been sources found, but some of these were sources besides the slaughter house. Mr. Mike Grant, owner of Elkhorn Valley, reported they have rebuilt the aeration system in the plant to help alleviate the odor problem. He reported they also purchased a back-up system this week that would provide air to the sewer system in the event of a power failure. Mr. Grant stated Elkhorn Valley is sensitive to the issues presented by the residents of the neighborhood and will work very hard to become a better neighbor. Mayor Chisham encouraged the neighborhood residents to notify Elkhorn Valley and the City whenever they smelled an odor in the neighborhood. He also recommended the City do spot checks to find the source of the odor problem.

Council Member Kelley moved to pass the ordinance as presented. Council Member Gilliland seconded. Upon roll call vote, those members of the Governing Body voting "AYE" were Council Members Holmes, McGovern, Kelley, Craig, Gilliland and Mayor Chisham. Council Member McComb voted "NAY". Council Member Bustraan abstained from voting. Number 3868 was assigned to this ordinance.



MEMO

To: **Honorable Mayor and Council
Shane J. Shields, City Manager**

From: **Jeremy M. Jones, Director of Public Works**

Date: **October 26, 2017**

Re: **Auditorium Management Agreement**

The City entered into an agreement with the Wellington Area Chamber of Commerce & CVB (Chamber) and Wellington Recreation Commission (WRC) in 2015 for management and maintenance services. Under that agreement, the City pays WRC \$10,000 per year to clean and maintain the facility, including Heritage Park. This includes vacuuming, changing light bulbs and HVAC filters, maintaining the flag on the building and numerous other duties. The Chamber's responsibilities are to coordinate rentals of the building, receiving \$5000 annually from the City and 75% of the rental revenue. Staff has given both entities written notice that we wish for the current contract to expire at the end of 2017 and will be looking at options for 2018 and beyond. We feel this is a good opportunity to assess the goals of the facility and if there are more beneficial ways to manage it in the coming year. We have made progress in several areas with respect to improvements to the Veteran's Room, added interest in the facility and getting our name out as a viable venue to numerous events. Both the Chamber and WRC have been partners and essential to this progress.

I have spoken with the Memorial Auditorium Board to establish some overall goals they would like to pursue. That goal is simply to continue to take steps in the improvement of the facility to accommodate a wider array of entertainment and activities and begin competing with others in south central Kansas for those events. In order for this to occur, I believe a concerted effort must be placed on recruiting talent to the Auditorium, possibly someone with little to no other duties with the City or other organization, i.e., dedicated to the task.

Options that have been discussed include continuing our current obligations into 2018, allowing a single entity (Chamber, WRC, or other) to have full responsibility of the facility or having a single individual, either by employment or contract, take those responsibilities.

At this time, we are looking for any input the Governing Body may have on this matter.

CITY OF WELLINGTON, KANSAS
MEMORIAL AUDITORIUM MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT, made and entered into this 21st day of January 2015 by and between the City of Wellington (City), the Wellington Recreation Commission (WRC) and the Wellington Area Chamber of Commerce and CVB (Chamber):

WITNESSETH: The parties hereto for the consideration hereinafter specified, agree as follows with respect to a proposal that the WRC and Chamber will manage the daily operations of the Memorial Auditorium (including Heritage Park) and Armory for the City.

THE CITY agrees to:

1. Pay to the WRC \$10,000 annually, in four (4) payments, beginning March 1 of each year, and following on April 1, July 1 and October 1. The payment for the first year of this Agreement shall be paid on a pro-rated basis of \$27.40 per day, beginning on the effective date of this Agreement until December 31, 2015, paid quarterly.
2. Pay to the Chamber \$10,000 in 2015, in three (3) payments, beginning on the effective date of this Agreement and following on July 1 and October 1. Pay to the Chamber \$5000 in 2016, in four (4) payments, beginning March 1 and following on April 1, July 1 and October 1. Any payments in future years shall be negotiated not less than ninety (90) days prior to the expiration date or renewal date of the Agreement.
3. Pay all utilities for the Memorial Auditorium and Armory, including heat.
4. Provide property insurance coverage for both facilities.
5. Be responsible for major repairs and major maintenance of both facilities and infrastructure, including plumbing, electrical, mechanical structures and their ancillary equipment.
6. Pay for annual fire alarm and fire suppression testing and elevator maintenance.
7. Provide ice and snow removal on the public sidewalk.
8. Provide a current fee schedule applicable to these facilities.

THE WRC agrees to:

1. Be responsible for the daily custodial and minor maintenance and repairs of the Memorial Auditorium and the Armory.
2. Be responsible for the daily operation of the Armory and receive any revenues produced from events and activities in the facility.
3. Provide at its expense, and file with the City Clerk, contents insurance and sufficient liability insurance covering the WRC, it's officers, agents and employees and holding the City harmless from any and all liability for damage caused by injuries, accidents or claims arising from or made in connection with the WRC's management and maintenance of these facilities, including Heritage Park; or the City may, at the WRC's expense, be added to the WRC's liability insurance policy as a named insured in the following amounts:

Personal injury including:

Products and Contractual Limit	\$500,000
Each Occurrence Limit	\$500,000
Medical Expense Limit	\$ 5,000



Memorandum

To: Honorable Mayor and Council
From: Shane J. Shields, Carol S. Mericle
Date: October 27, 2017
Re: Audit Services discussion – Work Session October 30, 2017

The existing contract between the City and Kenneth L. Cooper Jr., CPA, Chtd Certified Public Accountants expired with the completion of the audit for year ending December 31, 2016. The discussion of audit services is to gain a consensus of how the council wishes to proceed in contracting for audit services for the next period. Typically, the audit services contract has been for a three-year period. Contracts were entered into in 2011 and in 2014. Per the City's Procurement Policy, financial, accounting and auditing services are not required to be competitively bid, the Request for Proposals process may be followed. The process followed in 2011 and 2014 were the following:

2011 – Council direction was to distribute Request for Proposals for auditing services. Request for Proposals were created and distributed to eight auditing firms, local and outside the city. Four proposals were returned with Mr. Cooper being the only local firm to submit a proposal. The Council selected Mr. Cooper's firm since it was the only local firm submitting a proposal. Mr. Cooper's proposal was not the proposal with the lowest cost.

2014 – The Proposal process was considered. There is time and work involved for the Proposal process for both the City and firms submitting. Firms request and the City provides background information and details that the firms base their proposal on. Council direction was to contact all local CPA firms and confirm if each had any interest in submitting Proposals for the City's audit services. If no other firms had interest in submitting, direction was to negotiate a contract with Mr. Cooper. Notice was made to the other local firms and there was no interest in submitting a proposal for services. A contract was finalized with Mr. Cooper and approved by Council.

Mr. Cooper has advised that he does have interest in continuing audit services for the City.

Staff is pleased with the services provided by Mr. Cooper and his firm and would have no concern with continuing the firm's audit services. Mr. Cooper and staff are always readily available for questions and/or issues. They are also willing to meet with staff upon request and on short notice.

Respectfully,

Shane J. Shields
City Manager

Carol S. Mericle
City Clerk & Finance Director



2017 Sanitation Collection and Recycling Proposal

Section 1: Operations Summary

The current Sanitation Collection operation utilizes seven full-time staff members and three 20-yard rear load collection trucks. There are just under 3000 residential customers and 300 commercial accounts. Commercial service is provided six days a week with residential collection three days, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday. Each residential collection day averages 1000 stops divided between three routes. Staffing levels required for commercial service is two to three on a truck. The residential days utilize all three trucks with three staff on one, two staff each on the other two trucks. Approximately 200 commercial customers own at least one dumpster with the remaining 100 customers using a variety of smaller containers. Residential customers provide their own containers of various size and design. The majority of the residential collection is conducted via alley collection with curbside provided to approximately 1100 homes in 6 housing additions and various locations lacking alleys, including North A/US 81 from 11th to 18th and West US 160. Current residential pricing is \$14.25 per month with a maximum weekly volume equivalent of 180 gallons. Staff will pick up trash in excess of this amount, at no charge, providing the customer does not regularly exceed the maximum. Occasionally we charge for a one-time pickup of furniture or large quantity of trash. Commercial pricing is based on the size and number of containers and the number of pickups each week.

The recycling operation also falls under the responsibility of this department. The recycling program is predominantly conducted at the drop-off facility at the old fire station where customers bring unsorted materials Wednesday afternoon and Saturday morning. Materials are collected in a 40-yard compactor box and hauled to the Waste Connections transfer station in Wichita to be shipped to their sorting facility in Hutchinson. There is also a small commercial collection route on Fridays that currently has 20 customers. One of the rear load collection trucks is utilized. The truck is taken to the recycling center on Saturday to complete filling it and then driven to the same transfer station as the compactor box. The City receives a "rebate" for the materials taken to Wichita that helps reduce the rental cost of the compactor. 2016 total recyclables collected was 452,000 pounds that saved \$5000 in disposal fees.

The City of Wellington is also one of the few municipalities in Kansas that owns a transfer station/landfill. Acquired from Sumner County in 2006, the facility houses a 3600 sq. ft. transfer floor, construction and demolition landfill, tire monofill, household hazardous waste building, metal recycling area and brush pile. The transfer floor is utilized for household trash to be loaded in semi-trailers for disposal at Plumb Thicket Landfill in Harper County through a contract with Waste Connections. Staffing includes three full time employees - a scale attendant and two equipment operators, plus houses the office for the Sanitation Supervisor.

Finally, the Compost Site on East Lincoln operates within this same fund. Open four days each week, nine months out of the year and Saturdays in December, the facility is used for the disposal of yard waste, trees and brush to divert them from the landfill. The yard waste (grass and leaves) is composted and available to the

public for free. All other debris is burned. The facility is staffed with one part time employee to ensure the requirements of our KDHE permit are adhered to and to assist the public as needed.

Equipment

- 2006 Freightliner 20-yard rear load collection truck
- 2007 Freightliner 20-yard rear load collection truck
- 2011 International 20-yard rear load collection truck
- 1997 New Holland Skid Loader
- 40 yard compactor (rental)
- Vertical baler
- 2012 JCB backhoe
- 2015 Caterpillar dozer

Trash Service

Residential trash service can be operated in a more cost-effective manner by using a fully automated packer truck with a robotic arm which can mechanically lift trash carts at curbside. Such a service can be operated by a single driver with no need for additional staff on the truck. An analysis of the hours needed to collect the number of pickups required in Wellington is shown in Table 7.

While equipment costs are higher, the reduced labor costs would result in savings to the City. By utilizing a fully automated trash truck, pickup times can be reduced and labor costs are cut by 43%. Total number of pickups has been estimated, standard collection rates applied, and it is apparent that one 40-hour employee could collect this trash given the right equipment.

Single Stream Recycling

Single stream is the most effective recycling method to encourage maximum diversion of the waste stream. Nationwide, 34% of waste is diverted to recycling. The Kansas community average is 31%, while Wellington diverts 8%. So there is potential to recycle much more than is currently accomplished.

If the City were to implement an independent recycling collection program, it would require funding the purchase of a collection truck, disposal facilities and equipment. Since the trash collection truck will be in use each day, a recycling truck must be purchased. Once collected, recycling would have to be stored in a local transfer station where it would be held until ultimate hauling to a material recovery facility (MRF). The current recycling building has no docks, loading bays, or loading equipment, so those elements would have to be constructed or acquired. A loader would have to be purchased to move recyclable material in the transfer station. The nearest MRF is in Hutchinson, so the City would have to arrange for hauling from the local transfer station to that location. Our current hauling contract with Waste Connections could be expanded to include recyclables.

Consequently, there are three alternative directions for trash and recycling collection: 1. Abandon the concept of curbside collection and continue operations as they are, 2. Implement a semi-automated system and modify

our current trucks and purchase additional trucks for the service, 3. Implement a fully automated system, acquire necessary equipment, construct appropriate facilities.

Comparative Rates

Since citizens will compare Wellington rates with neighboring communities, a survey of monthly residential base rates for trash service was conducted for area cities. Table 1 presents the findings of that survey. Wellington is currently on the bottom end of the fee schedule. When comparing in this manner, we would be able to increase monthly customer rates to fund operation modifications and still be competitive with others in the area.

Table 1 Comparative Monthly Residential Base Trash Rates in Neighboring Cities			
Community	Trash Hauler	Base Monthly Residential Trash Rate	Services
Ark City	City of Ark City	\$18.44	Rear load MSW, drop off recycling facility
Belle Plaine	Waste Connections	\$19.75	Automated MSW/Recycling
El Dorado	City of El Dorado	\$14.25	Automated MSW/Recycling
Salina	City of Salina	\$15.30 \$ 5.40	Rear load MSW Manual curbside recycling
Wellington	City of Wellington	\$14.25	Rear load MSW, drop off recycling facility
Winfield	City of Winfield	\$15.31	Rear load MSW Manual curbside recycling
Privatization Quote	Private Company	\$20.75	Automated MSW/Recycling

Privatization

In 2016 the City of Wellington negotiated with a private company for a quote to contract for the collection of MSW and recycling. Both services would be automated curbside. This would essentially dissolve the City's Sanitation Collection department, sell off its assets and eliminate seven FTE. The private company would supply all labor, equipment and carts for the service and the City would retain billing responsibilities to the customer. This would require two salaries and General Fund reimbursement to be moved to the Transfer Station budget, creating a loss of \$125,000 annually, along with a loss of \$68,940 transfer to General Fund. Ultimately, the Governing Body chose not to proceed.

Comparison to City Goals

Staff has compiled a goal and objectives for solid waste and recycling collection within this proposal. An analysis of these proposals is shown in Table 2. An improved collection operation would meet City goals, reduce operating expenditures and provide a more sustainable rate structure. However, modifications will require a substantial upfront investment, to be outlined later in this proposal.

Table 2: Satisfaction of City Goals			
Goal			
	Objective	City Operated Trash	City Operated Recycling
Standardized, equitable and affordable customer service and rates	Equitable rate schedule	1. Trash collection can be performed at lower cost with a fully automated system.	1. Curbside recycling increases recycling volumes and decreases MSW disposal costs.
	Economies of Scale	2. Current accounts able to be serviced within 40 hour work week with less staff.	2. Current accounts able to be serviced within 40 hour work week.
	Incentives to recycle	3. Reduced operating costs allow for sustained rate structure.	3. Service provided at the home is customer friendly and easy to use.

Options for Continuing City Operated Collection Services

As outlined above, we have three main options for our collection operations, 1. Continue operations as they are, 2. Implement a semi-automated system, 3. Implement a fully automated system, and to some extent, hybrid combinations of these options, although that becomes very complex and should be considered only after careful consideration and discussion about each specific combination.

Table 3: Proposed Options for Continuing City Operated Collection Services

	Trash	Recycling
Collection Service	Weekly pickup for residential customers.	Select one of three options:
	Continue service as is.	Continue operating drop-off facility.
	Implement semi-automated system.	Implement semi-automated system.
	Implement fully automated system.	Implement fully automated system.
	Offer bulky waste pickups on scheduled basis.	Weekly or bi-weekly collection.
	Continue walkup service for elderly and handicapped.	Voluntary or mandatory participation if curbside collection
	Continue existing options for commercial customers.	
Equipment	Determine adequate type and number of trucks needed for selected method, including consideration of backup.	Determine adequate type and number of trucks needed for selected method.
	Provide standardized 60 or 90 gallon trash cart for residential customers. Carts specifications must be coordinated with new truck.	Provide standardized 60 or 90 gallon trash cart for residential customers. Carts specifications must be coordinated with new truck.
	Determine need for additional loading equipment if 2nd transfer building constructed.	Determine need for additional loading equipment if 2nd transfer building constructed
Human Resources	Current staffing is 7 FTE. Manual collection requires more staff.	Staffing level determined by method of trash service operated. Manual collection requires more staff.
	Semi-automated will require same FTE as manual collection.	Curbside collection will require additional staff if MSW is manual or semi-automated.
	Full automation provides the option of reducing FTE by 2-3.	Curbside collection can operate with reduced staffing if MSW is fully automated.
Disposal	MSW in current operation hauled to Harper County, contract with WC.	Compactor box or direct haul to WC transfer facility in Wichita, on-site pickup by International

		Paper.
	Current transfer building running at capacity.	Curbside collection would require it's own dedicated transfer building.
	New or modify existing transfer building.	New or modify existing transfer building.
Rates	Current collection rates require increase at this time.	No recycling fee except for 20 commercial accounts that have scheduled pickups.
	Rate increase TBD based on method selected.	Rate increase TBD based on method selected.
	Determine increase of tipping fees.	Fee or no charge for use of recycling transfer building.

Implementation Plan

The plan for implementing the new trash service is shown in Table 4. The key element is the time schedule to design, bid and construct a new MSW transfer building.

Table 4: Implementation Plan for Automated Service		
	Trash	Recycling
Implementation Plan	Design and bid new transfer building.	Design and bid modifications to existing transfer building.
	Determine number of carts required to service existing accounts and estimated growth.	Same as Trash. Implementation could occur simultaneously or proceed trash.
	Develop bid specifications for truck and carts.	
	Undertake bid process for carts and truck.	
	Order carts and fully automated truck.	
	Truck order could take six months depending upon specific make/model desired.	
	Refine route structure as desired during this period.	
	Public education of new system and specific requirements.	
	Deliver carts one week in advance of implementation.	
	Implement new collection system as soon as equipment becomes available and carts are distributed.	

Rationale for Recommendations

The information below identifies state-of-the-art collection practices, recommends solutions for the City, and presents detailed costs and rate impacts of making those changes.

Municipal Trash Collection

Since the City of Wellington needs to replace two trucks, it is feasible to completely review the operation at this time. There are two primary best practice methods to collect municipal solid waste:

- Semi-automated System
- Fully Automated System

Each practice is analyzed below in order that the Governing Body and staff can demonstrate that it analyzed all its options for an internal City-owned operation.

Practice 1: Semi-automated trucks with mechanical lift attachments.

The semi-automated system requires a driver and a collector outside the truck wheeling cart containers to the truck, placing them onto mechanical “flippers”, which then lift the containers and empty the trash into the truck bay. Collectors then return the empty carts to the curb. Use of standardized carts has allowed some cities to be very productive, enabling a residential collection rate of 60-80 households per hour. Standardized containers are required in this option, so there is a cost component for carts; however, cart costs are the same for semi-automated or fully automated operations. Wellington does not have standardized carts, and would need to provide to the customer.

Workers must be outdoors in all weather: ice, rain, sleet, and high temperatures. Worker fatigue is a concern in this environment. When workers are fatigued, accidents are more likely. Consequently, working conditions can be an issue in semi-automated systems. In addition, there are traffic conflicts, because collectors cross the street to get the container, then re-cross to place the container back on the original curb. This places employees at further risk.

Semi-automated systems are a more flexible method of collection than a fully-automated system, since human collectors can more easily get into tight quarters than large trucks. Semi-automated systems often function better in cul-de-sacs or very narrow streets. Wellington currently has nine (9) cul-de-sacs. Overflow trash that would not fit into standard containers is more efficiently handled than with fully-automated systems.

Practice 2: Fully automated trucks with extension arms.

The least labor intensive method, the fully automated truck requires only a driver and no other collection personnel. The driver operates a remote control robotic arm to lift, empty and replace the trash cart. These trucks can accommodate 100-125 households per hour, substantially more than the semi-automated systems. Although by far the most efficient method, the fully automated system does come with significant start-up costs for more expensive trucks. Standardized containers are required for this process, so there is a start up cost to acquire carts. However, cart costs are the same in either the semi-automated or fully automated systems.

A fully automated system is substantially better for employee working conditions. Since there are no employees walking in the street, this operation is safer for city employees. Fatigue is limited and potential worker injury is minimized.

A summary of benefits and drawbacks comparing the two systems are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Benefits and Drawbacks of Collection Practices

Practice	Benefits	Drawbacks
SEMI-AUTOMATED	1. Works well in areas with constraints such as tight streets, on street parking, cul-de-sacs or one-way streets.	1. Moderate productivity levels, but less than fully automated systems.
	2. Dual side collection enables both sides of street collection on single pass.	2. Highly labor intensive. Requires same employees as current service and more than fully automated system.
	3. Use of collectors enables easy, but inefficient pick up of overflow materials outside of carts.	3. Mechanical lifters must be hand-loaded, slowing down the collection process.
	4. If standardized carts are used: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Manual lifting limited resulting in lower risk of employee injury. · Workers' Comp reduced. · Less operator fatigue. · Worker longevity may be increased. · Possibly less turnover in employees. 	4. Cost of standardized carts is about \$50 per cart with ten year warranty.
	5. Other advantages of carts (see Table 6).	
FULLY AUTOMATED	1. Substantially higher productivity enables trash collection in fewer hours.	1. Fully automated truck is more expensive.
	2. Fewer truck hours needed, diminishing wear on equipment.	2. Maintenance costs may be higher with more hydraulics.
	3. Need for only one employee, the driver, enables much lower labor costs.	3. Relies on customers to place carts properly, so good public education required.
	4. Worker safety improved by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Keeping employees out of the street. · Elimination of lifting. · Operator fatigue minimized. · Potential worker injury minimized. · Workers' Comp reduced. · Less turnover in employees 	4. Overflow trash requires driver to pass by or get out of truck, decreasing productivity.

	5. Advantages of carts (see Table 6) same as Semiautomated.	5. Challenges faced with one-way streets, low overhanging wires, dead-end streets.
	6. Labrie builds a split body automated truck that is capable of collecting both trash and recyclables at the same time. This truck would reduce the staff, trips and overall expense of automating both services.	6. Cost for carts same as semi-automated system.
		7. May require more skilled operator.
		8. Higher fuel costs with one side of street collection.

Use of Standardized Carts

Use of standardized carts is sometimes characterized as simply an aesthetic advantage. In reality, use of standardized carts is important on several levels as shown in Table 6. Not only do carts present a better physical appearance in neighborhoods, carts provide public health advantages. Dogs and other animals are kept out of the trash, thus eliminating “trashy” looking alleys and what might otherwise be an environment which could foster breeding of rodents. Carts also keep rain and ice out of the trash and recycling, protecting the trucks and reducing contamination of recycling loads.

In systems where standardized carts are not utilized, employees are continually at risk for lifting overly heavy loads and potential conflict with vehicular traffic. Cities may mandate a weight limit on customer supplied containers, but there is no way to predict in advance what the actual weight of container is, workers may occasionally find themselves lifting an oversize load. Carrying unorganized loads across city streets and lifting oversized loads places employees at risk of injury. Further, this puts the City in a disadvantageous risk management position and could cause problems with absenteeism, productivity and Worker’s Compensation claims.

Staff recommends using carts of the same color with different colored lids to identify the material inside. This reduces to overall expense of inventory and improves serviceability in the future.

Table 6: Reasons to Utilize Standardized Carts-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimizes manual lifting, thus reducing risk of injury.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convenient and easy way to dispose of household trash and recycling.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminates loose trash and unhealthy environment conducive to rodents.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rain, ice and other elements kept out of trash and recycling. ·
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Automated trucks require standardized carts.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maneuverability allows citizens and workers to move carts with ease.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhances visual appearance of neighborhoods.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better odor control than having unsecured loose trash on the ground.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimizes loose trash blowing in streets and yards.

The 90 gallon polycart is the equivalent of 3 to 4 typical trash cans. By providing standardized containers, residents do not have to purchase their own containers. The carts are easily maneuverable and save residents from heavy lifting hazards as well as City workers. Citizen convenience is maximized by providing a safe, easy to use method of disposing of waste. The 90 gallon cart will be sufficient size for trash or recyclables for virtually every pickup. There might be occasions during the Christmas holidays when there is extra trash, but those situations will be very rare and we will have to accommodate. By utilizing the same style of carts for both trash and recycling, there are advantages of familiarity with similar equipment and standardized training. There is also a 66 gallon option that would also suffice and be more maneuverable for some in the community.

Recycling Collection and Disposal

Recycling goals include maximizing the diversion of waste away from landfills and customer convenience. If recycling is simple and straightforward, citizens will be most likely to maximize participation in the program. Programs requiring extensive sorting or hauling one’s own materials to a drop off site will gain participation only by the most dedicated citizens. Offering a program that is easy to understand and comply with will maximize diversion and reduce trash disposal costs.

Recycling operations utilize the same collection practices as the collection of trash. The advantages and disadvantages of these practices would be essentially the same. Because the set-out rate for recycling may be less than trash, recycling routes might be run more quickly than trash. Also, recycling is often only collected every other week. Our hopes are that recycling becomes second nature and will require the same or more frequent collections compared to trash.

Single stream recycling is the method used to maximize recycling volumes and enable the most customer friendly system. By adding recycling, the City will be asking its residents to change their behavior within the household. Consequently, this service must be structured for ease of the customer.

The common method for single stream recycling systems is to collect recycling, transport the collected materials to a transfer station for temporary storage, load materials into a long haul trailer, and then haul materials to a nearby municipal recycling facility.

The nearest municipal recycling facility that accepts single stream recycling is in Hutchison, approximately 90 miles away. In addition, there is no transfer facility in the county that would accept the single stream to hold it for future transport to the Hutchinson facility. Waste Connections operates a transfer building in Wichita that could be used, but the City would have to haul each load to them. This adds hours to each daily route and wear and tear on the equipment. Therefore, it is recommended that a new transfer facility be developed if a single stream City-operated service is desired. Then the recyclables can be hauled to Hutchinson, either by a city truck/trailer or by private hauler. These disposal costs must be considered in addition to the collection costs.

BEST PRACTICES FOR WELLINGTON

Best practices may be different in Wellington than in larger or smaller communities in other areas. The best options will depend not only on characteristics of the type of trash truck, but also on the relative costs of each option. Therefore, an analysis of the costs of each option is required to make a meaningful decision. The following tables compare our current manual service to a fully automated curbside trash service and a manual curbside recycling collection to a fully automated curbside recycling collection.

Table 7: Productivity Analysis and Resource Requirements		
Productivity Analysis	Manual	Automated
Customer Count	3300	3300
Residential	3000	3000
Commercial	300	300
Total	3300	3300
Unit Collections Per Hour Standards (1 truck)		
Residential	48	125
Commercial	10	10
Truck Collection Weekly Hours Required (All)		
Residential	63	24
Commercial	23	23

Total Weekly Truck Hours	86	47
TOTAL TRUCKS REQUIRED		
Residential Collection	3	1
Commercial Collection	1	1
COLLECTION EMPLOYEES REQUIRED	7	4
Driver	3	2
Collector	4	2
Personnel cost (avg. \$58,500 each)	\$409,500	\$234,000
CAPITAL COST ANALYSIS: TRASH		
Trash Truck Cost Estimate	\$125,000-\$175,000	\$300,000
Annualized Cost (10 years)	\$12,500-\$17,500	\$30,000
Trash Carts	\$ 0	\$139,500
Annualized Cost	\$ 0	\$13,950

CAPITAL COST ANALYSIS: RECYCLING	Manual Curbside	Automated
Transfer Station	\$875,000	\$875,000
Annualized Cost	\$43,750	\$43,750
Loader/Trailer	\$100,000	\$100,000
Annualized Cost	\$10,000	\$10,000
Recycling Carts	\$0	\$139,500
Annualized Cost	\$0	\$13,950
Recycling Collection Truck	\$135,000	\$250,000 or already provided above with automated trash service
Annualized Cost	\$16,875	\$31,250/\$0
Staffing Required	(6)	(1)
Annualized Cost	\$350,000	\$58,500
Total Annualized Cost	\$420,625	\$157,450/\$126,200

Analysis of the above tables shows a substantial savings in hours per week needed to service 3000 residential trash customers with a fully automated truck vs. the current rear-load manual service. This equates to

providing the same service with three less laborers for a savings of \$100,000-\$175,000 each year. **Please note** - Staff is recommending the reduction in staff to be accomplished through attrition rather than layoffs. The Collection Department historically has a high turnover rate, either by employees transferring to other departments, finding employment with another employer or termination. In addition, there would be no cart charges for residential customers. The cart would be provided by the City and costs would be covered in the residential rate. Commercial containers would continue in the same manner used currently. Therefore, a move to fully automated service is recommended as the best practice for trash.

The primary savings is that the operation can be accomplished with one driver alone. This enables substantial savings which offset the additional cost of the fully automated truck, additional fuel expense, and carts.

If recyclable collection is added to the service, staff recommends a fully automated system. This would require purchasing a second automated truck or ultimately a split-body truck that collects trash and recyclables at the same time. The City of El Dorado has been utilizing this truck for about a year and has seen substantial savings in labor, purchase, and repair costs.

Projected Rates

Staff believes this analysis confirms that the fully automated system would be a more cost-effective method of collection. Several factors need to be considered in order to set a rate structure that is affordable, provides the needed funding for the operation, pay off the bond indebtedness and still have enough left to begin building our cash and equipment reserves back to a comfortable level. Staff will present a copy of an approved 2017 budget and a draft budget to represent the same depicted with automated service, as an attachment. Below we will outline the needed expenditures and equipment to establish the amount that will need to be bonded and how that affects the rate structure.

Automated MSW and recycling collection can be accomplished with one automated truck with a split body packer. Although more costly at purchase, this eliminates the need for a second truck and operator. This also reduces the number of trips for collection and provides fuel savings. Carts would all be the same color with two different colors of lids to indicate the material inside. This reduces the number needed at initial purchase and kept in stock. We recommend utilizing the Armory as the new truck barn rather than building new. This reduces the cost significantly and is the only building available that doors could be modified to accommodate the taller automated truck. This would require the Wellington Recreation Commission to move indoor practice facilities to another location.

1 Automated split body collection truck	\$300,000
6200 carts @ \$45 each	\$279,000
New MSW transfer building	\$875,000
Modification of Armory	\$100,000
2nd loading equipment for transfer building	<u>\$120,000</u>
TOTAL	\$1,674,000

We recommend funding this transition through a bond of issuance. John Haas provided some estimates in September 2016 on a \$2,000,000 issuance running 10-year, 15-year and 20-year amortizations. The term of these bonds will largely dictate the required rate increase to cover those annual payments and provide funds for reserves.

<u>Life of Bond</u>	<u>Annual Payment</u>	<u>Total Interest</u>
10-year	\$231,121	\$246,211
15-year	\$168,862	\$462,934
20-year	\$139,902	\$723,059

As you can see, there is a significant difference in annual payments and about \$477,000 more/less in interest. The 20-year bond provides for a smaller rate increase to our customers but extends well past the useful life of the equipment being purchased. This could be funded with a minimum \$2.00 residential increase and 7% commercial increase. The 10-year bond would require an increase of at least \$5.00 per month and 10%+ commercial increase, but pays out much sooner with the revenue already being collected freed up for equipment replacement and sustained rates.

Closing

I think we have all heard both sides of the curbside collection argument from the public, some are for the convenience and some are against any rate increase to fund it. I am not sure I can adequately provide any more information that might sway opponents to the side of support. From an operational standpoint, it just makes sense to begin moving to an automated system. I have never heard from a manager/director of an automated service that regrets making the transition. They cite the benefits of lower operational costs, faster route completion, less worker compensation injuries, extended careers for their quality employees and customer satisfaction as proof that the system works well. Their main complaint has been that they didn't transition sooner.

It is getting more difficult each year to hire quality employees and even harder to keep them. We struggle to get eight applications for a collection position and about half of those have a criminal history that disqualifies them or a poor job history. Several of our recent hires have struggled to obtain the commercial driver's license and we are investing many hours in that training with them, only to have to move to another position. A transition to automated service would help us retain those employees and avoid the difficulties rehiring in the future.

	BUDGET	PROPOSED	
REVENUES			
Sanitation			
Refuse Collection-Residential	\$505,000.00	\$575,872.00	\$646,744.00
Refuse Collection-Commercial	\$178,000.00	\$190,740.00	\$195,800.00
Refuse Collection-City Gov./NP	\$6,397.00	\$6,397.00	\$6,397.00
Recycle-Commercial	\$7,000.00	\$7,000.00	\$7,000.00
Trash Bags	\$1,700.00	\$1,700.00	\$1,700.00
Compost Bag Tags	\$175.00	\$175.00	\$175.00
Transfer Fees - Landfill	\$580,000.00	\$550,000.00	\$550,000.00 \$1 MSW
Construction & Demolition Fees	\$50,000.00	\$55,000.00	\$55,000.00 \$2 C&D
Misc. Fees - Landfill	\$4,500.00	\$4,500.00	\$4,500.00
Total Sanitation	\$1,332,772.00	\$1,391,384.00	\$1,467,316.00
General Gov. Services			
Fines/Forfeits/Penalties			
Refuse Penalties	\$13,000.00	\$13,000.00	\$13,000.00
Total Fines/Forfeits/Penalties	\$13,000.00	\$13,000.00	\$13,000.00
Interest Earned			
Interest from Investments	\$770.00	\$770.00	\$770.00
Interest from Savings/Checking	\$592.00	\$592.00	\$592.00
Total Interest Earned	\$1,362.00	\$1,362.00	\$1,362.00
Property Sales/Rentals			
Property Rental	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
Farm Rental	\$1,102.00	\$1,102.00	\$1,102.00
Total Property Sales/Rentals	\$2,102.00	\$2,102.00	\$2,102.00
Miscellaneous			
Cash-Over and Short-Landfill	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Use of Equipment	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00
Sale of Materials	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00
Insurance Recoveries	\$892.00	\$892.00	\$892.00
Recovery of Bad Checks	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Refund of Expenditures	\$80.00	\$80.00	\$80.00
Total Miscellaneous	\$5,472.00	\$5,472.00	\$5,472.00
Refunds			
Other Non-Rev. Receipts			
Purchases Made for Resale	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00
Total Other Non-Rev. Receipts	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00
TOTAL REVENUES	\$1,358,208.00	\$1,416,820.00	\$1,492,752.00

SANITATION COLLECTION**Personnel Services**

Regular Wages	\$254,263.00	\$190,150.00	\$190,150.00
Overtime Wages	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
FICA	\$19,834.00	\$15,158.00	\$15,158.00
Retirement	\$22,126.00	\$17,503.00	\$17,503.00
Health Insurance	\$69,792.00	\$46,420.00	\$46,420.00
Workman's Compensation	\$13,456.00	\$5,922.00	\$5,922.00
Unemployment	\$259.00	\$297.00	\$297.00
Total Personnel Services	\$384,730.00	\$280,450.00	\$280,450.00

Contractual Services

Mulching Mower Blade Program	\$600.00	\$600.00	\$600.00
Telephone & Communications	\$1,300.00	\$1,300.00	\$1,300.00
Heat	\$2,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
Advertising & Publications	\$300.00	\$500.00	\$500.00
Freight & Postage	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00
Association Dues	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250.00
Equipment Repair & Maintenance	\$2,500.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
Vehicle Repair & Maintenance	\$6,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
Radio Repair & Maintenance	\$200.00	\$200.00	\$200.00
Licenses-Titles-Permits	\$200.00	\$200.00	\$200.00
Contracted Personal Service	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
Equipment Rental	\$2,000.00	\$2,750.00	\$2,750.00
Landfill Fees	\$145,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00
Testing/Inspection	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00
Uniform Service/Rental	\$1,100.00	\$900.00	\$900.00
Building & Grounds Maintenance	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00
Employee Physical/Drug Screen	\$600.00	\$300.00	\$300.00
Training, Lodging & Meals	\$300.00	\$300.00	\$300.00
Total Contractual Services	\$166,700.00	\$121,650.00	\$121,650.00

Commodities

Office Supplies	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00
Janitorial Supplies	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00
Departmental Supplies	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00
Vehicle Parts & Supplies	\$15,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00
Motor Fuel & Lubricants	\$27,000.00	\$27,000.00	\$27,000.00
Bldg. & Grounds Maint. Supplies	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
Machinery Parts & Supplies	\$0.00	\$100.00	\$100.00
Equipment Parts & Supplies	\$600.00	\$600.00	\$600.00
Small Tools	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00
Uniform & Clothing	\$800.00	\$400.00	\$400.00
Street Materials	\$400.00	\$400.00	\$400.00
Safety Training & Supplies	\$300.00	\$300.00	\$300.00
Total Commodities	\$50,300.00	\$45,000.00	\$45,000.00

Capital Outlay**Transfers**

Transfers to General Fund	\$68,940.00	\$78,184.00	\$85,782.00
Transfers to Equipment Reserve	\$20,000.00	\$30,000.00	\$30,000.00
Total Transfers	\$88,940.00	\$108,184.00	\$115,782.00

Non-Exp. Disbursements

Purchases Made for Resale	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00
Misc. Expenses to be Reimbursed	\$300.00	\$300.00	\$300.00
Reimbursement to General Fund	\$83,765.00	\$86,961.00	\$93,297.00
Reimb. to Special Liability	\$16,127.00	\$16,127.00	\$16,127.00
Total Non-Exp. Disbursements	\$103,692.00	\$106,888.00	\$113,224.00

TOTAL SANITATION COLLECTION

\$794,362.00	\$662,172.00	\$676,106.00
---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

TRANSFER STATION**Personnel Services**

Regular Wages	\$87,049.00	\$85,446.00	\$85,446.00
Overtime Wages	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00
FICA	\$6,774.00	\$6,651.00	\$6,651.00
Retirement	\$7,927.00	\$8,210.00	\$8,210.00
Health & Insurance	\$17,448.00	\$27,972.00	\$27,972.00
Workman's Compensation	\$1,518.00	\$2,434.00	\$2,434.00
Unemployment	\$89.00	\$130.00	\$130.00
Total Personnel Services	\$122,305.00	\$132,343.00	\$132,343.00

Contractual Services

Transfer & Disposal Costs	\$372,000.00	\$342,572.00	\$342,572.00
Hazardous Waste Disposal	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
Telephone & Communications	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00
Heat	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
Electricity & Water	\$3,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00
Advertising & Publications	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00
Printing	\$1,300.00	\$1,300.00	\$1,300.00
Association Dues	\$4,000.00	\$3,700.00	\$3,700.00
Equipment Repair & Maintenance	\$6,000.00	\$6,000.00	\$6,000.00
Vehicle Repair & Maintenance	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
Licenses-Titles-Permits	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00
Property Tax	\$205.00	\$205.00	\$205.00
Professional & Consulting Services	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00
Bad Check Account	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00
Contracted Personal Service	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
Equipment Rental	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00
Payments to State	\$3,200.00	\$3,200.00	\$3,200.00
Testing/Inspection	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00
Uniform Service/Rental	\$700.00	\$700.00	\$700.00
Disposal of Tires	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
Building & Grounds Maintenance	\$2,500.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
Employee Physical/Drug Screen	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00
Training, Lodging & Meals	\$750.00	\$750.00	\$750.00
Total Contractual Services	\$410,515.00	\$382,287.00	\$382,287.00

Commodities

Office Supplies	\$300.00	\$300.00	\$300.00
Janitorial Supplies	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250.00
Departmental Supplies	\$1,100.00	\$1,100.00	\$1,100.00
Vehicle Parts & Supplies	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00
Motor Fuel & Lubricants	\$8,500.00	\$8,000.00	\$8,000.00
Bldg. & Grounds Maint. Supplies	\$1,500.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
Machinery Parts & Supplies	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00
Equipment Parts & Supplies	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
Small Tools	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00
Uniform & Clothing	\$400.00	\$400.00	\$400.00
Signs & Materials	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00
Street Materials	\$3,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00
Computer Supplies/Software	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
Radio Parts & Supplies	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00
Total Commodities	\$22,650.00	\$23,650.00	\$23,650.00

Capital Outlay**Transfers**

Transfers to General Fund	\$63,000.00	\$60,950.00	\$60,950.00
Transfer to Equipment Reserve	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
Total Transfers	\$68,000.00	\$65,950.00	\$65,950.00

Non-Exp. Disbursements

Refund of Permits/Fees	\$0.00	0	\$0.00
Total Non-Exp. Disbursements	\$0.00	0	\$0.00

TOTAL TRANSFER STATION	\$623,470.00	\$604,230.00	\$604,230.00
-------------------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

Total Revenue	\$1,358,208.00	\$1,416,820.00	\$1,492,752.00
Total Expenditures	\$1,417,832.00	\$1,266,402.00	\$1,280,336.00
Profit/(Loss)	(59,624.00)	\$150,418.00	\$212,416.00

Table 1
City of Wellington, KS

General Obligation Bonds
Series 2016

Option A: 20 Year Amortization

Estimated Debt Service to Maturity

Statistics		Dates and Interest	
Issue Size:	\$2,075,000.00	Dated Date:	1-Sep-16
NIC:	3.1765%	Settlement Date:	1-Sep-16
Bond Years:	23,742,916.67	End of First Period:	31-Dec-17
Average Life (Years):	11.4424	Gross Interest:	\$723,059.58
Average Debt Servi	\$139,902.98	Accrued Interest:	\$0.00

Payment Date	Principal	Interest Rate	Interest	Semi-Annual Debt Service	Annual Debt Service	Coverage Requirement @ 100.00%
1-Apr-17			31,952.08	31,952.08		
1-Oct-17	80,000.00	1.00	27,387.50	107,387.50	139,339.58	139,339.58
1-Apr-18			26,987.50	26,987.50		
1-Oct-18	85,000.00	1.20	26,987.50	111,987.50	138,975.00	138,975.00
1-Apr-19			26,477.50	26,477.50		
1-Oct-19	85,000.00	1.40	26,477.50	111,477.50	137,955.00	137,955.00
1-Apr-20			25,882.50	25,882.50		
1-Oct-20	90,000.00	1.55	25,882.50	115,882.50	141,765.00	141,765.00
1-Apr-21			25,185.00	25,185.00		
1-Oct-21	90,000.00	1.70	25,185.00	115,185.00	140,370.00	140,370.00
1-Apr-22			24,420.00	24,420.00		
1-Oct-22	90,000.00	1.85	24,420.00	114,420.00	138,840.00	138,840.00
1-Apr-23			23,587.50	23,587.50		
1-Oct-23	95,000.00	2.00	23,587.50	118,587.50	142,175.00	142,175.00
1-Apr-24			22,637.50	22,637.50		
1-Oct-24	95,000.00	2.20	22,637.50	117,637.50	140,275.00	140,275.00
1-Apr-25			21,592.50	21,592.50		
1-Oct-25	95,000.00	2.40	21,592.50	116,592.50	138,185.00	138,185.00
1-Apr-26			20,452.50	20,452.50		
1-Oct-26	100,000.00	2.70	20,452.50	120,452.50	140,905.00	140,905.00
1-Apr-27			19,102.50	19,102.50		
1-Oct-27	100,000.00	2.70	19,102.50	119,102.50	138,205.00	138,205.00
1-Apr-28			17,752.50	17,752.50		
1-Oct-28	105,000.00	3.00	17,752.50	122,752.50	140,505.00	140,505.00
1-Apr-29			16,177.50	16,177.50		
1-Oct-29	110,000.00	3.00	16,177.50	126,177.50	142,355.00	142,355.00
1-Apr-30			14,527.50	14,527.50		
1-Oct-30	110,000.00	3.00	14,527.50	124,527.50	139,055.00	139,055.00
1-Apr-31			12,877.50	12,877.50		
1-Oct-31	115,000.00	3.30	12,877.50	127,877.50	140,755.00	140,755.00
1-Apr-32			10,980.00	10,980.00		
1-Oct-32	120,000.00	3.30	10,980.00	130,980.00	141,960.00	141,960.00
1-Apr-33			9,000.00	9,000.00		
1-Oct-33	120,000.00	3.30	9,000.00	129,000.00	138,000.00	138,000.00
1-Apr-34			7,020.00	7,020.00		
1-Oct-34	125,000.00	3.60	7,020.00	132,020.00	139,040.00	139,040.00
1-Apr-35			4,770.00	4,770.00		
1-Oct-35	130,000.00	3.60	4,770.00	134,770.00	139,540.00	139,540.00
1-Apr-36			2,430.00	2,430.00		
1-Oct-36	135,000.00	3.60	2,430.00	137,430.00	139,860.00	139,860.00
Totals	2,075,000.00		723,059.58	2,798,059.58	2,798,059.58	2,798,059.58

Project Cost		2,000,000.00
Bond Reserve	0.00%	0.00
Costs of Issuance		42,079.63
Underwriter's Discount	1.50%	31,125.00
Miscellaneous		1,795.37
Total Proceeds Required		2,075,000.00

Table 2
City of Wellington, KS

General Obligation Bonds
Series 2016

Option B: 15 Year Amortization

Estimated Debt Service to Maturity

Statistics		Dates and Interest	
Issue Size:	\$2,070,000.00	Dated Date:	1-Sep-16
NIC:	2.7746%	Settlement Date:	1-Sep-16
Bond Years:	17,617,500.00	End of First Period:	31-Dec-17
Average Life (Years):	8.5109	Gross Interest:	\$462,934.38
Average Debt Servi	\$168,862.29	Accrued Interest:	\$0.00

Payment Date	Principal	Interest Rate	Interest	Semi-Annual Debt Service	Annual Debt Service	Coverage Requirement @ 100.00%
1-Apr-17			27,400.63	27,400.63		
1-Oct-17	115,000.00	1.00	23,486.25	138,486.25	165,886.88	165,886.88
1-Apr-18			22,911.25	22,911.25		
1-Oct-18	125,000.00	1.20	22,911.25	147,911.25	170,822.50	170,822.50
1-Apr-19			22,161.25	22,161.25		
1-Oct-19	125,000.00	1.40	22,161.25	147,161.25	169,322.50	169,322.50
1-Apr-20			21,286.25	21,286.25		
1-Oct-20	125,000.00	1.55	21,286.25	146,286.25	167,572.50	167,572.50
1-Apr-21			20,317.50	20,317.50		
1-Oct-21	130,000.00	1.70	20,317.50	150,317.50	170,635.00	170,635.00
1-Apr-22			19,212.50	19,212.50		
1-Oct-22	130,000.00	1.85	19,212.50	149,212.50	168,425.00	168,425.00
1-Apr-23			18,010.00	18,010.00		
1-Oct-23	130,000.00	2.00	18,010.00	148,010.00	166,020.00	166,020.00
1-Apr-24			16,710.00	16,710.00		
1-Oct-24	135,000.00	2.20	16,710.00	151,710.00	168,420.00	168,420.00
1-Apr-25			15,225.00	15,225.00		
1-Oct-25	140,000.00	2.40	15,225.00	155,225.00	170,450.00	170,450.00
1-Apr-26			13,545.00	13,545.00		
1-Oct-26	140,000.00	2.70	13,545.00	153,545.00	167,090.00	167,090.00
1-Apr-27			11,655.00	11,655.00		
1-Oct-27	145,000.00	2.70	11,655.00	156,655.00	168,310.00	168,310.00
1-Apr-28			9,697.50	9,697.50		
1-Oct-28	150,000.00	3.00	9,697.50	159,697.50	169,395.00	169,395.00
1-Apr-29			7,447.50	7,447.50		
1-Oct-29	155,000.00	3.00	7,447.50	162,447.50	169,895.00	169,895.00
1-Apr-30			5,122.50	5,122.50		
1-Oct-30	160,000.00	3.00	5,122.50	165,122.50	170,245.00	170,245.00
1-Apr-31			2,722.50	2,722.50		
1-Oct-31	165,000.00	3.30	2,722.50	167,722.50	170,445.00	170,445.00
Totals	2,070,000.00		462,934.38	2,532,934.38	2,532,934.38	2,532,934.38

Project Cost	2,000,000.00
Bond Reserve	0.00%
Costs of Issuance	42,027.60
Underwriter's Discount	1.25%
Miscellaneous	2,097.40
Total Proceeds Required	2,070,000.00

Table 3
City of Wellington, KS

General Obligation Bonds
Series 2016

Option C: 10 Year Amortization

Estimated Debt Service to Maturity

Statistics		Dates and Interest	
Issue Size:	\$2,065,000.00	Dated Date:	1-Sep-16
NIC:	2.2564%	Settlement Date:	1-Sep-16
Bond Years:	11,827,083.33	End of First Period:	31-Dec-17
Average Life (Years):	5.7274	Gross Interest:	\$246,211.88
Average Debt Servi	\$231,121.19	Accrued Interest:	\$0.00

Payment Date	Principal	Interest Rate	Interest	Semi-Annual Debt Service	Annual Debt Service	Coverage Requirement @ 100.00%
1-Apr-17			21,993.13	21,993.13		
1-Oct-17	190,000.00	1.00	18,851.25	208,851.25	230,844.38	230,844.38
1-Apr-18			17,901.25	17,901.25		
1-Oct-18	195,000.00	1.20	17,901.25	212,901.25	230,802.50	230,802.50
1-Apr-19			16,731.25	16,731.25		
1-Oct-19	200,000.00	1.40	16,731.25	216,731.25	233,462.50	233,462.50
1-Apr-20			15,331.25	15,331.25		
1-Oct-20	200,000.00	1.55	15,331.25	215,331.25	230,662.50	230,662.50
1-Apr-21			13,781.25	13,781.25		
1-Oct-21	205,000.00	1.70	13,781.25	218,781.25	232,562.50	232,562.50
1-Apr-22			12,038.75	12,038.75		
1-Oct-22	205,000.00	1.85	12,038.75	217,038.75	229,077.50	229,077.50
1-Apr-23			10,142.50	10,142.50		
1-Oct-23	210,000.00	2.00	10,142.50	220,142.50	230,285.00	230,285.00
1-Apr-24			8,042.50	8,042.50		
1-Oct-24	215,000.00	2.20	8,042.50	223,042.50	231,085.00	231,085.00
1-Apr-25			5,677.50	5,677.50		
1-Oct-25	220,000.00	2.40	5,677.50	225,677.50	231,355.00	231,355.00
1-Apr-26			3,037.50	3,037.50		
1-Oct-26	225,000.00	2.70	3,037.50	228,037.50	231,075.00	231,075.00
Totals	2,065,000.00		246,211.88	2,311,211.88	2,311,211.88	2,311,211.88

Project Cost		2,000,000.00
Bond Reserve	0.00%	0.00
Costs of Issuance		41,975.58
Underwriter's Discount	1.00%	20,650.00
Miscellaneous		2,374.42
Total Proceeds Required		2,065,000.00

Originally presented
February 22, 2017

Issue: Numerous requests to have hours of operation for 6 days/week, longer hours on days open, more days open in December, January, February. Approximately equal requests from citizens versus tree trimmers/landscape businesses.

Staff fully supports providing more hours and days but the following should be considered when deciding how that is accomplished.

Current hours - Open 1st Saturday in January		8:00 AM - 4:00 PM
March to November	Monday	12:00 PM - 6:00 PM
	Wednesday	8:00 AM - 12:00 PM
	Thursday	12:00 PM - 6:00 PM
	Saturday	8:00 AM - 4:00 PM
December	Saturday	8:00 AM - 4:00 PM

25 Hours per week, average up to 999 hours per year

2017 Budget - 999 hours @ \$12.05 = \$12,038, plus misc. = \$12,971

Funded in Sanitation Fund, creates no revenue

Adding hours could put status to full time

50 hours per week split between 2 part-time

More hours in winter creates more chances of staffing the facility with little to no traffic. Increases number of times facility will have to be closed for inclement weather. Public notices do not reach everyone and we always have people sitting at the gate wondering why we are closed. Limits the time staff has to maintain the facility - clean drainage ditches, level out brush pile pad, often burn during winter, repairs to golf cart or building, etc. Typical winter weather is not such that regular traffic is likely.

Issuing keys to contractors - Would all tree trimmers/landscapers get keys? Even out of town contractors? No way to keep totals for material brought in - information is required for our annual report to KDHE. No way of knowing who brought in unauthorized waste, effects permit status, creates more hours of maintenance to cleanup. Are contractors responsible if a citizen follows them in to dump yard debris? What if contractor forgets to lock gate on their way out. This property has access to City owned storage property to the north and to other properties surrounding us.

Open gate upon call as needed - How many contractors will need this service? This could happen multiple times each day, pulls staff off other projects and tasks. Can not guarantee we will always have staff available. Does not accommodate Saturdays in January, February unless stand-by personnel are used, creates 1 hour OT each call and not funded by Sanitation budget. Will they also want this service for Sundays?

Unstaffed hours - I receive calls every year from communities, often times sent to us by KDHE, wanting to know how we operate and keep the site clean, no violations. These calls are always from unstaffed facilities. Their biggest issue is unauthorized waste and a messy facility.

OPTION #1

Increase hours of operation for 12 months to 6 days, 8 hours each, 2496 hours/year, \$27,518
1 FTE and 1 part-time OR

Likely creates 2 FTE with full benefits (\$18,648 insurance, KPERs, leave time)

Total cost - \$35,000 - \$50,000

Hours	January to December	Monday	10:00 AM - 6:00 PM
		Tuesday	10:00 AM - 6:00 PM
		Wednesday	8:00 AM - 4:00 PM
		Thursday	10:00 AM - 6:00 PM
		Friday	8:00 AM - 4:00 PM
		Saturday	8:00 AM - 4:00 PM

OPTION #2

Increase hours of January/February only, 56 hours, \$675 increase until benefits kick in with existing schedule remainder of year

Split position with 2 part-time OR

Create FTE with full benefits \$9324 insurance

Total cost - \$13,500 or \$23,000

Hours	January, February	Saturday	8 AM - 4 PM
	March to November	Monday	12:00 PM - 6:00 PM
		Wednesday	8:00 AM - 12:00 PM
		Thursday	12:00 PM - 6:00 PM
		Saturday	8:00 AM - 4:00 PM
		December	Saturday

OPTION #3

Increase hours of operation to 2 days in January/February/December, 6 days, 8 hours each remainder of year, 2080 hours/year, \$22,932 + benefits

Creates at least 1 FTE, maybe 2

Total costs - between \$32,000 - \$41,500

Hours	January, February	Wednesday	8 AM - 4 PM
		Saturday	8 AM - 4 PM
	March to November	Monday	12:00 PM - 6:00 PM
		Wednesday	8:00 AM - 12:00 PM
		Thursday	12:00 PM - 6:00 PM
		Saturday	8:00 AM - 4:00 PM
		December	Wednesday
		Saturday	8:00 AM - 4:00 PM

OPTION #4

Increase hours, Saturday Jan/Feb, 6 days, 8 hours each remainder of year, 1928 hours/year, \$21,252, possibly done with 2 part-time positions

Likely would create 1 FTE and 1 part-time

Total cost - approx. \$30,000

Hours	January, February	Saturday	8 AM - 4 PM
	March to December	Monday	10:00 AM - 6:00 PM
		Tuesday	10:00 AM - 6:00 PM
		Wednesday	8:00 AM - 4:00 PM
		Thursday	10:00 AM - 6:00 PM
		Friday	8:00 AM - 4:00 PM
		Saturday	8:00 AM - 4:00 PM

October 26, 2017

Staff recently conducted a survey of 16 compost facilities within south central Kansas, survey report attached. Within this many facilities, there are nearly as many different ways to operate with respect to staffing, hours, location, monitoring and compliance issues. 9 of the 16 do not staff their facility, however, 7 of those are located on or next to other City operations for close monitoring. 3 cities monitor with cameras with only one reporting success in prosecuting illegal dumping. Several of the 9 unstaffed facility expressed concern about the time required to check daily and clean up illegal dumping. Conway Springs stated they have closed the gates several times after dumping becomes a regular occurrence and El Dorado was shut down by KDHE until a trash problem was cleaned up. This only took a day to clean up but staff were taken away of other duties to accomplish.

Wellington staff maintains the opinion and recommendation that our facility should remain staffed at any time we are allowing the public or contractors in. As stated above, there are several concerns of allowing free access to this property. Not stated above is the concern of protection of the public while burning the brush pile.

Our facility is often commended by KDHE for how it is operated and maintained. They have used us as an example for other facilities as we have received zero violation notices in over a decade. Modifying the operation in any way to create use of the facility without on-site monitoring would be a step backwards and has the probability of being cited by KDHE. Fines for violations could easily meet or exceed the cost of staffing additional hours over the course of a few months.

Staff fully supports accommodating the public and contractors to better suit their needs, but expresses concern if this should compromise our permit or staffing of other operations.

Compost Site Survey

Prepared 10/18/2017

City	Contact	Staffed	Permit	Public	Gated	24/7 or Hours	Located at Landfill	Issues W/Material	How frequent	Burn on Site
Andover	316 733 2621	N/A;	N/A	N/A	N/A	M-F 7a-3:30p Sat-Sun 7a-11a	Site Closed	N/A	N/A	N/A
Anthony	620 842 5434	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Locked - must sign out a key from Clerk's Office Can purchase key \$100 or rent a key Offer \$90 if return keys	No	Yes but can have them pick it up thru info on sign out sheet	Occasionally	2 to 3 times per year
Ark City	620 441 4460	Yes PT thru temp service	Yes	City residents only	Yes	Mon-Thurs 8-Noon Sat 8-5	No 2 sites E & W	Commercial contractors pay fee	Rarely	Weekly
Augusta	316 775 4540	Sanitation Employees Monitor	Yes	Yes	Yes	Wedn-Sun After Nov 1st-Sat & Sun	Beside Sanitation Barn	Yes Lawn Care Co need permits	Frequently	Yes twice/year
Conway Springs	620 456 2345	Cameras City employees check daily	Yes	City residents only	Not Locked	24/7 Council requested gates remain open at all times 90% of dumping is after hours	RR Property given to City	Yes, plastic bags & loads from outside City & dump wrong areas	Frequently Have been able to prosecute w/cameras	Burn Pile As Needed Compost Wind Rowed
Derby	316 788 0301	Employees Monitor	No	City residents only	Yes	Mon-Fri 7:15-3:45 Year Round Sat 8a-Noon (April 1-Nov 1)	High Park - with parks & soccer fields	Yes & after hours dumping	Cameras help	Limbs & brush only, "woody waste" budget ev 2 yrs to grind & haul- burn yearly
El Dorado	316 321 9100	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Mon-Fri 7a-6p, Sat-Sun 8a-6p	No	Yes - checked daily	Cleaned up 2x/week	Yes
El Dorado Butler Co	316 321 9278	Landfill Employees Monitor	Yes	Yes	Yes	Mon-Fri 8:30-5:30 Sat 8:30-2:30	Yes	Goes across scales- attendant checks & weighs	Rarely	Tree Pad separate, twice/year

City	Contact	Staffed	Permit	Public	Gated	24/7 or Hours	Located at Landfill	Issues W/Material	How frequent	Burn on Site
Emporia	620 340 6332	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Mon-Sat 8a-5p, Sun 1-5	Same property but separate facility	Yes - if they catch them, they pay for trash at gate	Occasionally	Just purchased Air Curtain Destructor - open burn permit, 30 hrs month
Goddard	316 239 8770	PW employees monitor	No Only 1/2 acre site	Yes	Yes	8-4 Every other Sat - 9a-Noon	Back half of Public Works 80 acre property	Yes, but chain gate when becomes an issue and inspect loads	Occasionally	Separate burn pile - 4 times per year
Harper Mike Feist, Landfill Mgr	620 842 5240 580-554-0022	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	They do not get enough moisture for grass/leaves.	Site Not Active	N/A	N/A	Burn tree limbs as needed
Haysville	316 529 5940	No	Yes	City residents only	Yes	Office hours of PW - weekly, can arrange for weekend w/on-call employees	Next to Public Works Facility	Give license plate info at gate, cameras help	Frequently	Have not burned in 2 years, but need to , just keep pushing up pile
Hutchinson/ Reno County	620 694 2587	FT Landfill Employee assigned to maintain/monitor compost, brush, tires, metal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Mon-Sat 8a-5p Also offers single stream, e-waste, HHW, mattresses, re-usables, C & D, concrete & metal Offered Tour Anytime	Yes	Yes - goes across scales	Frequently	Brush Pile every day, weather permitting
Hutchinson	620 694 1912	PW employees monitor	No	Yes for taking out compost/wood chips Dumping is only for City forestry operation/ Westar	Yes	24/7 Close when wind/snow storms hit to prevent illegal dumping	No Inside Cary Park/PW & Zoo	Yes - no dumping allowed from residents - for taking compost & wood chips only	Frequently	Brush is hauled to Co. Landfill-no charge for residents Landfill burns pile

City	Contact	Staffed	Permit	Public	Gated	24/7 or Hours	Located at Landfill	Issues W/Material	How frequent	Burn on Site
Wichita	316 268 8318	Landfill Employees Monitor	Yes	Yes	Thru Landfill	Mon-Fri 7a-5p Sat 8a-2p Reduced hours in Winter	Yes	Yes Check at gates	Constant battle	No Tree debris taken at C & D, company grinds quarterly
Winfield	620 221 5520	Yes PT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Tues & Thurs 12p-6p Sat 9a-3p Also allows individuals to bring up to 4 tires at a time - company slices & hauls off	Old Landfill Site	No - attendant catches	Rarely	Yes, as needed
Winfield/ Cowley Co	620 221 5425	Landfill Employees Monitor	Yes	Yes	Yes	Mon-Fri 8a-5p Sat 8a-Noon	Yes	No - monitored close	Rarely	Rarely - usually just push up pile

Full Questions:

- 1) Is the facility staffed?
- 2) Does the facility have KDHE Permit?
- 3) Open to public?
- 4) Gated? Open 24/7 / Hours?
- 5) Located @ permitted Landfill or other site?
- 6) Issues w/prohibited materials being dumped?
How frequent?
Create KDHE violations?
Able to prosecute violators?
- 7) Burn on site?