



**CITY OF BURLINGTON, VERMONT**  
**CITY COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION, ENERGY & UTILITIES COMMITTEE**

c/o Department of Public Works  
645 Pine Street, Suite A  
Post Office Box 849  
Burlington, VT 05402-0849

802.863.9094 VOX  
802.863.0466 FAX  
802.863.0450 TTY  
[www.burlingtonvt.gov](http://www.burlingtonvt.gov)

**Councilor Franklin Paulino, Chair** *North District*  
**Councilor Jack Hanson,** *East District*  
**Councilor Jane Stromberg,** *East District*

**Inquiries:**  
**Peter Egolf**  
802.734.5172  
pegolf@burlingtonvt.gov

**Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee of the City Council**

**Draft Minutes – Tuesday, July 28, 2020 5:30 PM**

1. **Meeting Started at 5:32 PM**
2. **Minutes of 6/23/2020. On motion of Councilor Paulino the minutes were approved as written (seconded by Councilor Stromberg).**
3. **Public Forum**
  - Gene Bergman – Disappointed regarding the options for consolidated collection. There was not a fair public review, and staff has many questions to be answered. Privatization is not the right way to go.
  - Jean Waltz – Cedar and Rose Street, location of completed traffic-calming project, needs attention (toxic paint, flooding due to raised area). Traffic in the area drives too fast as evidenced by fatal motorcycle accident. Desires a recommendation on how to make this area better, will email Rob Goulding for direction.
  - William Calfee – Supports efforts around consolidated collection. Wants the City to be proactive to use electric trash trucks.
4. **Consolidated Collection**
  - Lee Perry (DPW); Jennifer Porter, Sam Lybrand (GBB)
  - Gershman, Brickner and Bratton, Inc. (GBB), consultant, conducted a study for the City of Burlington to explain the feasibility of residential solid waste collection contracts. Assessed the viability of consolidating residential trash, recycling and food scraps in both the City of Burlington and the City of South Burlington.
  - Presented an evaluation of consolidated collection scenarios to include (8) options. One example shared by GBB showed that by the City moving towards bi-weekly consolidation, the City could show a potential annual savings of \$700K - \$2.8M. A second example using weekly consolidation could show a potential annual savings of \$1.6M - \$3.6M.
  - Presented data on the greenhouse gas savings. Estimated that a consolidated collection system will save up to 2/3 of current miles traveled. Using weekly waste collection scenario, City would save an estimated 182,043 pounds of carbon dioxide per year.
  - GBB has made (8) recommendations in order to efficiently move the City in the direction of consolidating our collections.
  - Should the City move forward with the next steps, the proposed timeline is 9-12 months to complete the selection process for haulers.
  - Director Spencer – Data on resident survey analysis is also available but was omitted tonight to leave the most time for Councilor questions. Staff seeks the following input from the Committee tonight: Do you want to vet a public municipal system? Are there other outstanding issues to discuss? Is there additional public engagement that you want? When do you want to move to make a recommendation? Overall, staff is pleased with the report though there are still outstanding items identified in our memo that need to be incorporated. Suggested that if the Council wants to explore a municipally-operated consolidated collection approach, the most expedited way would be to have the City put in a bid for the consolidated collection service.
  - Councilor Discussion
    - Councilor Hanson – Expressed support for consolidated collections regarding both sustainability and cost savings. Worth looking into a municipal option as well. Would like more understanding of merging the three components versus separating them into different collections from GBB.
    - Councilor Stromberg – In agreement with Councilor Hanson regarding sustainability and cost savings. Would like to look at options for Burlingtonians to separate food scrap composting. Likes the idea of having the collections being public, however, would favor what is most efficient for the City. Would like more time to study the options.
    - Councilor Paulino – Likes the idea of having collections being public, but does not see this as a feasible option. Feels that the City must complete the billing in order to have control over payments.
  - Public Discussion
    - William Calfee – Supports consolidated pick up and believes it would be great to encourage Burlingtonians to recycle and compost. Desires to see the collection vehicles produce fewer emissions and noted brake pad dust is mitigated by use of electric vehicles with regenerative braking. Concerned about putting off a decision.

- Jenn Greene (BED) shared historic context that the City in the past has recommended consolidated collections.
- Gene Bergman – Encourages the City to study the collections options in more detail.
- Councilors expressed interest in having more time to study a public consolidated collection option including additional data requirements.
- Director Spencer – Staff and TEUC comments will be incorporated into GBB report. Staff will bring a concept and scope, or at least a framework, for a municipally-operated consolidated collection system to the next TEUC meeting.

## 5. Integrated Planning for Water Resources

- Jenna Olson (DPW); Juli Beth Hinds (Birchline Planning LLC)
- Introduced process and provided context for how the many active projects fit into the integrated process plan, and discussed public engagement.
- 2017 agreed to model wastewater, combined sewer and stormwater systems, ID specific phosphorus reductions, and to develop project portfolios.
- Clean water resiliency plan and phosphorus challenge: CWRP \$30M investment in wastewater treatment plants, pump stations, stormwater outfalls and stormwater infrastructure. In return the City must reduce phosphorus by 63% by 2036.
- Achieving regulatory compliance: data collection of separate vs. integrated permits.
- Meeting the challenge: what combination of projects will get the City to where it needs to be in order to meet the reduction requirement? Some projects will have an impact on neighborhoods and privately owned land. Each project portfolio has different impacts, costs and benefits.
- Developing project portfolios: (5) highlights to include opportunities, analysis, options, scoring and selection.
- Community involvement and next steps: community involvement needed! Overall investment approach, private property rebates and incentives vs. additional regulations, and City operations. Next steps: public outreach and portfolio evaluation, meetings with US EPA and VT Department of Environmental Conservation to select the preferred portfolio, presentation to City Council, and finalizing the integrated plan.
- Councilor Discussion
  - Councilor Stromberg – Happy with this. How do to engage the public and get more public input? Does plan have to be set by end of year?
    - Jenna Olson – Yes.
  - Councilor Paulino – The City should be a leader. What have been your difficulties as a staff person to make this happen? Does this plan bind the City moving forward?
    - Jenna Olson – Yes, but can be amended and adjusted. The purpose of the plan is to utilize an adaptive management approach.
    - Julie Beth Hines - Binding on the approach and commitment to a level of investments.
  - Councilor Hanson – What is the scale of upgrade to treatment plants? High cost requires evaluation. Support this work.

## 6. FY21 Fleet Recommendations

- Martha Keenan, Lee Perry (DPW)
- Answered questions from last year to alleviate concerns about City vehicles and process including Net Zero goals.
- Proposed lease of (30) vehicles and pieces of equipment, (10) of which are electric or hybrid.
- Cost of carbon included for each option, except equipment with run-time hours. Working with BED to create calculation for that equipment.
- Funding approved in FY21 budget and presumes there will be a master lease for these vehicles.
- Explained process for selecting vehicles including selection of electric vehicles where feasible. Any vehicles or equipment powered by fossil fuel is the result of the alternatives not being feasible for the work outlined, or cost prohibitive.
- Councilor Discussion
  - Councilor Hanson – Clarification regarding carbon pricing in calculations and choice of vehicles. Desire to see options for moving more vehicles into (5) year leases instead of (10) year for sooner divestment of fossil fuel vehicles. Lease choices to be shown in memo to Council as well as carbon pricing where applicable.
  - Councilor Stromberg – Can a lease be broken if something a more sustainable option becomes available? Is there the option not to purchase at end of lease?
  - Council Hanson – Amendment to Motion: All 10 year fossil fuel leases will be changed to 5 year leases, where financially feasible.

### On Motion by Councilor Paulino (seconded by Councilor Stromberg)

- **Recommend that the Council approve and authorize the Director of Public Works to purchase 30 pieces of equipment—subject to review and approval by the City Attorney—for a total value of \$2,300,334 with financing determined by the Clerk Treasurer's Office at a rate not to exceed 4% and a term of 5 years for some equipment and 10 years for the longer-term equipment, with the further direction to put as much of the fleet that is expected to have viable electric options in the coming years into the shorter 5 year lease as is financially feasible. Passes Unanimously.**

## 7. Director's Report

- Tabled to next meeting.

## 8. Councilors' Update.

- No update.

**9. Next TEUC Meeting**

- August 25, 2020 at 5:30 PM.

**10. Adjourn**

- On Motion by Councilor Paulino (seconded by Councilors Hanson and Stromberg), meeting adjourned at 8:35 PM.