Enjoy this self-guided tour of Golden’s world of residential recycling and solid waste.

See how the City does it now and explore possibilities of how we could do it in the future.

Please start to your left, and let’s talk Trash!
How did we get here?

City Council embarked on an effort in early 2007 to look at the current global warming threat to our environment and how the City of Golden could take part in helping to make a difference.

City Council also recognized that the City's actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and increase energy efficiency could have multiple benefits – creating jobs, decreasing air pollution and energy costs, and save money for government and residents.

In February 2007, City Council held the first Sustainability Open House event, where over 200 residents attended and over 60 people volunteered for one of the 7 Community Working Groups.

The Community Working Groups included topics such as green building, economic health, education, energy efficiency and renewable energy, transportation, water, and solid waste and recycling.

The Solid Waste & Recycling (SW&R) community group was comprised of 13 residents who met over several months to look at how the City could be more efficient in recycling and reducing waste. The SW&R group conducted a survey of 117 Golden residents to measure residents’ current efforts to recycle and to gauge their support or opposition for new waste and recycling programs.

The final recommendations of the SW&R group to City Council included the following goals:

1. **Single Stream Recycling** - implement a single stream recycling system so all recyclable materials can be placed in the same container.
2. **Pay-As-You-Throw** - Implement a system to tie the volume of trash generated to the cost of trash service. The more you throw away, the more you pay.
3. **Organic Composting** - Provide a publicly located and supported facility where yard waste and kitchen waste may be dropped off for composting at no charge.
4. **Single Vendor for Solid Waste Services** - select a single solid waste hauler who will provide exclusive service to Golden’s residential communities.
5. **Downtown Recycling Bins** - Provide recycling bins in downtown areas such as along Washington Ave., Clear Creek Trail, Parfet Park and Lions Park
6. **Organic Composting, Curbside Pick-up** - provide residential curbside pick-up of organic materials for an additional fee or as part of total solid waste and recycling fee.

Golden’s Goal: To Reduce the City’s solid waste stream by 25% in ten years.
7. **Plastic Shopping Bag Ban** – require local businesses to stop offering plastic shopping bags to their customers.

8. **Event Recycling** – develop an event recycling program that applies to all events held in the city.

By mid-2007, the seven community groups presented their recommendations to City Council in a report: the Golden Sustainability Initiative. Based on the report, several public meetings and large amount of public input, City Council adopted our Sustainability Goals for the City in August, 2007. Resolution No. 1793 outlines the City’s goals over the next ten years and includes an aggressive program to address energy efficiency, education, economic health, renewable energy, green building, solid waste and recycling, alternative transportation and water.

Please take a copy of Resolution 1793 for more detail on Council’s sustainability goals.

In early 2008, City Council appointed 7 residents to the newly created Community Sustainability Advisory Board. The CSAB is charged with:

- Assisting the city achieve the sustainability goals established by Council Resolution 1793
- Securing public support of various sustainable initiatives
- Develop and monitor a community outreach and communication plan.
- Recommend Municipal Code changes to City Council related to Council’s sustainability goals.
- Keep Council advised of the Board’s progress
- Advise the City Manager on programs to improve the City’s internal sustainability efforts.

In mid-2008, the City also hired a full-time sustainability coordinator to help implement the Sustainability Goals and assist the CSAB in their efforts.
How could a new Waste Collection System improve our Sustainability?

- **Reduce Golden’s Carbon Emissions**
  - Optimize and enhance collection of recyclables and solid waste.
  - Improve Golden’s air quality
  - Conserves energy through optimization and efficiency

- **Improve Waste Diversion**
  - Make curbside recycling easier and more efficient
  - Accept more materials curbside
  - Extends life of local landfills

- **Improve Air Quality and Save Energy**
  - Curbside recycling drastically reduces trips to drop-off center.
  - Fewer large commercial trucks on residential streets
  - Many times recycling uses less energy than manufacturing new

- **Conserve Landfill Space**
  - Recycling helps extend the useful life of local landfills
  - Reserves landfills for things that cannot be used anymore

- **Economics**
  - Potential to reduce costs for everyone
  - Reduces energy expenses
What is the current status of Recycling in Golden?

The City’s current Recycling Drop-Off Site is located off of Golden Gate Canyon Road near State Highway 93 (see map). The Drop-Off Site was created with the following:

- The Site is a partnership between City of Golden, MillerCoors and Ball Corporation. The City of Golden maintains facility and monitors service of the bins. MillerCoors and Ball Corporation pay all bills for the daily service of bins. Bins are emptied every day except Sundays.
- The Site was originally provided as a resource for multi-family housing only (condos, apartments, etc.)
- The Site opened December 6th, 2003 at the Splash Aquatic Park and was later relocated May 15, 2007 to its current larger facility. Tree limb recycling was also relocated to the new location.
- Material collected increased 1330% since opening
  - The site allows Single Stream Recycling – All types of recyclables can be placed in the same container.
  - Larger bins have been added to increase capacity.
  - More frequent pick-ups have been scheduled to keep up with the demand.

Single Stream Recycling means you can put everything in one container. Larger bins have increased capacity at the site.
What is Single Stream Recycling?

- All acceptable recyclable materials are placed in the same container for collection
  - Paper, cardboard, glass, aluminum, plastic and tin all go in the same bin.
- Collected materials are taken to a Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) for sorting
  - Materials are sorted mechanically and by hand.
  - Sorted materials are bailed and shipped around the state, country and world for recycling.

Where do my recyclables go?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain Bottling Company (Wheat Ridge) for new bottles and to other local companies for use in recycled pavement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardboard</td>
<td>Portland, OR; Albuquerque, NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>Alabama to make new aluminum beverage containers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin</td>
<td>Pueblo, CO to make rebar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastics</td>
<td>#1 PET (polyethylene terephthalate) used to make new beverage containers. #2 HDPE (high density polyethylene) goes to Wyoming to create plastic fencing. #3, #4, #5, #6, and #7 plastics are bundled together and shipped to China for further sorting and reuse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **The current Recycling Drop-off Site has reached its maximum capacity.**
   - Illegal Dumping of trash
   - Heavy use by residents outside the City (unincorporated Jefferson County, Arvada, etc.) which means Golden taxpayers subsidize recycling for others.
   - Residents are canceling curbside service at home to use free drop-off site instead.
   - Capacity Demands
     - Approximately 600 visits per week and growing.
     - Volume recycled has increased 1330% from 94 cubic yards to 1344 cubic yards per month since the site was opened in 2003.
   - Location is not convenient for residents in southern portions of the City.

2. **Solid Waste Collection Concerns**
   - Residents must contract with Waste Haulers individually
     - 2008 – Seven haulers licensed to provide service (EDS, Waste Management, Allied, Camelback, etc.)
     - Each Hauler can have multiple trucks driving throughout the City.
     - Recycling is an optional service added to your bill.
   - We cannot accurately estimate how much trash and recyclables are produced. How can we as a City strive to achieve 25% reduction over the next 10 years if we cannot measure our current output?
   - Charges for trash and recycling services vary between haulers. What can you expect for typical waste hauler rates? See the table below. It may be possible to reduce your monthly rate with one of the options described later in the tour.
## Provider Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Trash Service per Month</th>
<th>Recycling Service per Month</th>
<th>Additional Charges</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Month</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hauler #1</td>
<td>$15.50</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
<td>$3.85</td>
<td>$23.10</td>
<td>$69.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauler #2</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$4.29</td>
<td>$21.29</td>
<td>$63.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauler #3</td>
<td>$24.25</td>
<td>Service not available</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$28.25</td>
<td>$84.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauler #4</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauler #5</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>Service not available</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Concerns with Quality of Life

- Many garbage trucks are loud and cause noise pollution
- Multiple haulers add to traffic congestion
- Large commercial vehicles contribute to air pollution and emit unsightly black clouds of exhaust.

### 4. Costs of Street Maintenance and Replacement

- Large solid waste and recycling trucks cause as much damage to asphalt with each trip as 1,200 passenger vehicles traveling over the same asphalt.
- Excessive heavy truck traffic in residential areas shortens useful life of residential roads.
- The city must budget additional funds to maintain and replace roads damaged by heavy truck traffic.
- Taxpayers are ultimately burdened with the cost of earlier road replacement.

![Significant road damage caused by heavy truck traffic shortens road life.](image-url)
Residential cul-de-sac with 10 homes is serviced by three different trash haulers once each week. Traffic volume between Monday and Friday is approximately 500 passenger cars and 3 trash trucks.

3 trash trucks per week have \textbf{7.4 times} the impact on pavement as 500 cars per week.

Although less than 1\% of all traffic on the cul-de-sac, 3 trash trucks account for \textbf{almost 88\%} of pavement impacts.
Option #1 - Keep The Status Quo

With Community support for this option, City Council may decide to maintain the current recycling and waste removal collection system as is.

- Open Competition System - Any hauler that obtains a license may haul trash and recyclables in the City of Golden.
- Resident must choose which hauler to use.
- Residents must request curbside recycling service from their hauler.
- Price differences between haulers for service.

Potential Impacts of Option #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Residents retain right to choose their own hauler</td>
<td>• Nothing changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allows for continued economic competition between waste haulers</td>
<td>• Recycling rate remains stagnant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents keep ability to choose which hauler provides service to their residence</td>
<td>• Difficult to estimate how much trash and recycling the city is producing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No additional expenses</td>
<td>• No improvement to environmental quality; Difficult to reduce air, stormwater or noise pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Heavy use of drop-off center continues; Center continues to act as regional recycling facility subsidized by Golden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does not facilitate implementation of curbside yard waste pick-up program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vehicle Miles Traveled not reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Location remains inconvenient to many south Golden residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of trash and recycling trucks on residential roads remains the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Road impact continues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Street repair is a significant portion of the City’s annual street maintenance budget.
Option #1 Comments

- Status quo is not acceptable. Wasteful: traffic, fuel, noise etc. No oversight of haulers.
- Status quo does not sustain the health and welfare of Golden and its citizens!
- Status quo is not acceptable
- Status quo is a failure
- Limits garbage from being picked up in a timely manner and creates pollution from high winds on street.
- The status quo maintains free market which is important to keep costs down for customers.
- Did you consider environment, health, and public infrastructure costs in your comment? (arrow pointing to previous bullet point)
- Please figure out a way not to mix yard waste & garbage in a plan.
- “Free enterprise” simply means to externalize the hidden (but real!) costs. Seek better solutions.
Option #2 - City Modifies the Existing Trash Ordinance

The Current City Ordinance regarding trash and recycling within the city limits requires that all waste haulers be licensed by the City and provide recycling services if a homeowner so requests. There are several opportunities to modify the existing ordinance to meet the City's needs. Possible ordinance changes could include:

- Require Trash Haulers to provide curbside Recycling service and include it with price of trash service.
- Limit the number of Companies licensed to do business in the city. A limit on the number of waste haulers could reduce impact to the City's streets.
- Limit the number of days that services can be provided. (i.e. once per week)
- Require documentation of quantity of materials disposed and recycled by the service providers.
- Create or Implement an Incentive Program
  - Coupons or rebates to each household.
  - Incentives based on amount of material recycled.

Potential Impacts of Option #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Service automatically provided to all residential customers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trips to the recycling center may be reduced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced number of trucks in neighborhoods if number of haulers limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced road damage from large garbage trucks(fewer potholes!) if number of haulers limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Further reduce permitted hauling days to one day per week the amount of time trash and recycling containers are visible on the curb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uniform reporting improves the City's ability to calculate waste diversion rate and track progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Customers that choose not to recycle pay for the service anyway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May not provide haulers enough time to pick-up residential trash and recycling from entire city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open competition system restricted through limiting number of haulers permitted to do business.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Curbside organic recycling very difficult to implement with multiple haulers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option #2 Comments

- Is it really feasible to only have one day to pick up trash?
- Yes, one day assigned for each ward! (arrow pointing to previous comment)
- City licensing should convey some say where haulers pick up. Directing things to a more efficient way of picking up. Esp. Golden Heights. EDS should be exclusive hauler for Golden Heights. It is 1 mile in, 1 mile out for haulers to pick up a few residences, this is not efficient.
- This is a start but why not put energy on an effort that will provide greater return? This option is not enough to create positive change and meet our future goals.
- Base pick up on per bag (stickers) so a one bag a week person does not pay for someone else’s 10 bags.
- Limit’s free market – we can do better.
- (arrow pointing to previous comment) It’s trash, not a free market. It’s a health issue, not a choice issue.
- Coupons – good idea. Incentives very good on amount of recycling.
- Competitive bid with annual review/renewal. One hauler/city with options for recycle. Add trash cost to water bill.
- Requiring recycle be included in price – they will just raise price – no change.
- AMEN! (to previous comment)
- Coupons or rebates for persons who recycle is a good idea but would work for those customers who recycle at the recycling center because their hauler does not offer recycling.
- Require competitive bids to retain some of the “free market” benefits.
Option #3 - City Assumes Responsibility for All Trash & Recycling

Option #3A: Make Changes or Improvements to the Recycling Drop-off Site
- City financially supports expansion of site through additional bins.
- Expand the number of locations to provide additional drop-off sites for residents.
- Change site security to allow access only to Golden residents.

Potential Impacts of Option #3A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Additional sites in more convenient locations.</td>
<td>• Overflow problems are unsightly and still a risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May reduce vehicle miles traveled.</td>
<td>• Number of trash and recycling trucks on residential roads unchanged or the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open competition for trash hauling remains intact.</td>
<td>• Does not significantly improve air quality - Must still drive to drop-off location, although trip might be shorter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Illegal dumping is a continuing problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Significant increase in funding needed to provide service - Must pay for pick-up service per container at each location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New Locations very limited - Need adequate space and potentially unsightly conditions may occur from wind, abuse, misuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Branch collection may not feasible at additional sites due to space needs, noise and dust pollution from chipping machine.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option #3A would add recycling sites around the City to provide easier access.
Option #3A Comments

- People will be motivated by convenience not by cleaner dump sites.
- This is the best option!!! (If we can’t do single-hauler, 4A/B)
- Have them pick it up more often to reduce overflow. Maybe a little study to see “peak” deposits.
- Good concept. We definitely need more recycling sites & bins. Cons need to be considered.
- Add site in Golden Hills/Heights areas.
- Heavy fines for illegal dumping will help pay for recycling.
- How do you catch illegal activities happening?
- I like this option the best. I use the recycle center and would like it to be free only for Golden residents. Others could pay a small fee to help on funding.
- No motivation to recycle with this plan. I see no improvement.
Option #3B: City Provides Curbside Recycling Pick-up Service only

- For all single-family residences.
- City invests in equipment and staffing necessary to collect recyclables and transport them to a recycling site for processing.
- Trash collection remains as is current - Individuals may choose who to use.
- Service is provided to all residents and paid for through a new charge on water bill.

Potential Impacts of Option #3B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If city owns recyclables, city can generate revenue from them.</td>
<td>City must lease or purchase a trash truck(s) to provide service every other week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces vehicle miles traveled by eliminating trips to recycling center by large portion of the public.</td>
<td>Must provide adequate funding and staffing to operate and maintain additional equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized recycling bins improve neighborhood aesthetics.</td>
<td>Eliminates recycling portion of open competition system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial reduction of truck traffic in neighborhoods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All recyclables picked up on the same day.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open competition for trash hauling services remains intact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May facilitate implementation of curbside organic recycling program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option #3B would add a recycling collection program to the Public Works department.
Option #3B Comments

- Doesn’t solve the “too many trucks/vendor” problem.
- Let companies who specialize in this type of work do the job; the city has enough responsibility in overseeing ordinances and compliance.
- And what about apartments, etc? They generate a lot of trash, recyclables!
- Yes, good idea about city picking up recycling only & what price does the resident pay on water bill (how often)?
- This option removes recycling from market driven economy but would be ok to try. Citizens need to know about what the monthly cost would be before council voted to try this option.
- This option privileges single family residences. Suggest combining with de-central drop-off locations.
- Businesses already exist to do this. We don’t need city doing this.
- Skeptical that this is economically feasible.
Option #3C: City Provides Trash and Recycling Services

- City invests in equipment and personnel necessary to collect recyclables and residential trash at the curbside.
- Required participation in service.
- Service is billed to resident on quarterly water bill.

### Potential Impacts of Option #3C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• If city owns recyclables, city can generate revenue from their sale.</td>
<td>• City must lease or purchase a trash truck(s) to provide service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduces vehicle miles traveled by eliminating trips to recycling center by large portion of the public.</td>
<td>• Must provide adequate funding and staffing to operate and maintain additional equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Standardized recycling and trash bins improve neighborhood aesthetics.</td>
<td>• Eliminates entire trash and recycling open competition system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Significant reduction of truck traffic in neighborhoods.</td>
<td>• Residents no longer able to choose hauler to provide service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All recyclables and trash picked up on the same day.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Curbside organic recycling program easily implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option #3C would provide a standardized look of containers for all residences.
**Option #3C Comments**

- Not cost effective
- No market forces to ensure quality performance. Could be based on a [illegible] contract.
- Cost?
- Great idea but at what cost? Will costs increase quarterly or monthly?
- Denver has a similar program – Love it! Same day pick up for trash & recycling is very appealing.
- No. Market economy will always eventually drive up cost. I vote no on eliminating private enterprise.
- Don’t need city doing what others are already doing.
- Container will not work in Heritage Dells area. High winds will scatter any containers (mostly downhill) and containers are too large to keep in garage. Thanks.
Option #3D: Recycling consultations or audits for multifamily complexes and commercial businesses

- City to develop program to assist multi-family and businesses complexes with development of recycling programs for those complexes.
- Program development to occur parallel to residential curbside recycling program development.

Potential Impacts of Option #3D

- State Law excluded multi-family complexes from being regulated by a city-managed single hauler contract.
- City should establish a program that helps design and implement a recycling program for multifamily complexes.
- City to assist commercial businesses with developing recycling programs for their own needs.
Option #3D Comments

- Hauler responsible for a sector should take responsibility for audits and assisting multi-family complexes in that sector.
- I am opposed to a single hauler contract because it stifles free enterprise – it seems this option is only needed if there is a single hauler contract to get around state law.
- I support.
Option #4 - A Single Hauler Contract

Option #4A: A city-wide contract with a flat rate for residential service.

- One hauler for entire residential market.
- Everyone pays the same amount for trash services, recycling services provided at no extra charge.
- City manages contract for all residential accounts.
- Customer can choose another contracted hauler, but still pays for citywide contract service.
- Commercial buildings, businesses, apartment complexes, and multifamily attached dwellings with 8 or more units are excluded as per State law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City would competitively bid contract for services.</td>
<td>Residential dwellings with 8 or more attached units are excluded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economies of scale could reduce residents’ costs.</td>
<td>Open competition for services eliminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to consolidate billing on water bill.</td>
<td>Residents producing small amounts of trash subsidize neighbors with large amounts of trash.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential third party incentive program to pay people to recycle.</td>
<td>No financial incentive to increase amount of materials recycled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced truck traffic in neighborhoods.</td>
<td>May exclude HOAs with large contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved air quality.</td>
<td>Multi-family recycling challenges are not addressed with this option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less wear and tear on residential streets.</td>
<td>City must absorb additional administrative responsibilities related to customer service, billing, contract management, ongoing program administration and periodic re-bidding of the contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick-up routes can be optimized for fuel and time efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease pressure on recycling drop-off facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of recyclables can generate revenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to accurately track and report the amount of materials recycled.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled by residents reduced through eliminated trips to the recycling center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased recycling conserves natural resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased recycling lengthens the useful life of local landfills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option #4A could reduce wear and tear on City streets.
Option #4A Comments

- This is IT! Esp for Golden Heights.
- Consider 2, 3, or 4 city quadrants to allow multi-vendor solution but still have advantages of single-vendor economies.
- This option is ok only if the hauler has 4B program
- 4a/b best option
- I like this option so far. What cost?
- 4 a or b best.
- No! Don’t stifle free enterprise!! And don’t penalize people with small amounts of garbage. This will not improve recycling which should be a key goal.
- 4 a & b is best option. Reducing waste by incentives & promoting recycling by making it free and accessible. Thank you.
- This option is the best way to go for our neighborhood. Allows us less traffic, fuel costs. We are for this in north Golden.
- The “free enterprise” argument is putting ideology before our local needs and concerns. If single provider works best/better: use it!
Option 4B: A citywide Contract with Pay-As-You-Throw
- Recommended by the Solid Waste and Recycling Community Working Group
- Supported and endorsed by the City of Golden Sustainability Advisory Board and the Solid Waste and Recycling Community Working Group
- Tiered rate system - The more trash you generate, the more you pay.
- Recycling services included with trash service.
- City manages contract for all residential accounts.
- One hauler for entire residential market.
- Commercial buildings, businesses, apartment complexes, and multifamily attached dwellings with 8 or more units are **excluded** as per State Law.

**Potential Impacts of Option #4B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- City would competitively bid contract for services.</td>
<td>- Residential dwellings with 8 or more units are <strong>excluded</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Economies of scale could reduce residents’ costs.</td>
<td>- Open competition for services is eliminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Opportunity to consolidate billing on water bill.</td>
<td>- May exclude HOAs with existing contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clear financial incentive to increase amount of materials recycled.</td>
<td>- Multi-family recycling challenges are not addressed by this option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Residents producing small amounts of trash do not subsidize neighbors with large amounts of trash – they pay less than their neighbors.</td>
<td>- City must absorb additional administrative responsibilities related to customer service, billing, contract management, ongoing program administration and periodic re-bidding of the contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Potential third party incentive program to pay people to recycle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improved air quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Less wear and tear on residential roads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pick-up routes can be optimized for fuel and time efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sale of recyclables can generate revenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ability to accurately track and report the amount of materials recycled.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Vehicle Miles Traveled by residents reduced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increased recycling conserves natural resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increased recycling lengthens the useful life of local landfills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option #4B Comments

- Only option/change I support is 4B. If that was done, how would a household’s trash volume is measured for quarterly billing? Also, I’d prefer pay-as-you-go with curbside recycling options.
- Resicle!
- This is my favorite option because it helps to change the mindset of how waste is handled – more recycle/reuse, less landfill!
- Mine too.
- Prefer 4B!
- I want a choice! No on 4B!
- People might recycle more if it were free!
- PAYT with free recycling (SSR) and single (or very limited # of vendors) approach is excellent solution!
- Opt out? Billed on our water bill?
- Best option – 4B. Encourages decreased waste and increased recycling. Like the idea of tags for trash bags as an alternative to specific size bags.
- Pretty darn good option – so far the best one!
- Some kind of latch on cans in case they blow over in wind.
- I am opposed to ANY single hauler contract!! Prepay stickers that would allow a person with little trash to put out a certain size container only as often as needed would be a good idea.
- Pay as you throw is a great idea!
- Ditto!
- This is great!
- More people should recycle.
- This is absolutely the way to go! This is the approach that is “best practice”.
- Exclude yard waste. Pay per bag; sell stickers at city office & grocery store.
- Best option: motivates people to recycle (& compost) by rewarding them. No reason not to recycle…many of my neighbors currently do not.
- Question: how is trash measured and cost calculated? On a weekly, monthly, or other basis? If I have extra trash one week, does it permanently bump the rate up?
- What about adding yard waste pick up? About half of our garbage now could be composted!
- Providing yard waste pickup may help with city beautification (think Golden Pride Days year round!)
Next Steps

1. **Examine open house feedback to further narrow possible options.**
   Your opinions are important and suggestions will be forwarded to City Council for consideration. Council will look at recommendations from the Community Sustainability Advisory Board, the Solid Waste and Recycling community group, and citizens. Council will consider all ideas that are provided.

2. **Waste Hauler Request for Proposals (RFP)**
   If City of Golden residents are interested in one or more of the alternatives that involve a city-wide contract, state law requires that the City notify waste haulers in our area that we are considering issuing a contract for city-wide service. **An RFP does not bind the City to any agreement, nor does it mean that City Council has decided what type of program is appropriate, if any.** Issuing an RFP indicates that the City is interested in looking at prices and what type of qualifications trash hauler companies may have to suit the City’s needs.
   City Council may consider an RFP process at a future meeting. Please check the City Council agenda online or at the city clerk’s office for more information.

3. **Further research into alternatives**
   Over the next several months, City Council may direct staff to research the following possible changes to the current system:
   a. Determination if any or no changes are needed
   b. City upgrades existing recycle drop-off site or adds new locations
   c. City provides waste & recycling service through a new trash hauling department
   d. City provides recycling service only through a new city department
   e. City creates new recycle program to help multifamily (condos, apartments) and commercial businesses.
   f. Change the current waste collection ordinance to require recycling services for all residents or limit the number of days and trucks that can operate in the city.
   g. City-wide contract for one hauler with a flat rate to everyone
   h. City-wide contract for one hauler with a pay-as-you-throw tiered rate system.
   i. Your idea here….We want to include it!

   Each option will be thoroughly researched for costs, benefits and impacts to residents.

4. **Outreach efforts to residents like you!**
   Your input is critical to this process. The results of research into any or all of the above options will be conveyed to affected residents. Information will be mailed and posted to the City website, [www.cityofgolden.net](http://www.cityofgolden.net) well in advance of City Council consideration.

5. **City Council review and decision**
   If City Council determines that there is interest in new methods of trash and/or recycling collection, councilors will review the information and research, meet with residents, and hold several public meetings prior to taking any action.
If you have a preference for one of the options, which one?

- #1 – we have a right to choose.
- 4 & 4B – especially if multi-family units will eventually be included.
- 4B – helps promote changing the mindset of how to handle waste.
- Single hauler – pay as you throw.
- 4B & 3D
- Not really, there are pros & cons on all.
- 4D – But don’t like eliminating competition. If there is one company & they are like Allied it would be a problem. I also like option 3B as I really support recycling.
- 4B
- 4B – encourages increased recycling and decreased waste.
- Increase items that are recycled; more bins, etc. Paper, cardboard, glass and plastic (too limited – not broad enough) 9/10 of what comes into my house would be recycled in England!
- Pay per throw is good. One hauler would be nice, either for whole city or by neighborhood. Transparency in hauler selection contract is required. Senior citizen discounts should remain.
- Pay as your throw – single hauler – more recycling locations (i.e. southeast area!)
- I like 4B – but anything that reduces # of trucks & allows curbside recycling is fine with me.
- We support the Sustainability objectives, but have the following concerns. We now contract with EDS to serve our 24-unit townhome complex. Our cost is $500 per quarter for weekly trash pickup, and twice monthly single-stream recycling (less than $7 per month per household). We don’t want to pay more to an exclusive contractor. Also, we maintain our long U-shaped driveway, and require EDS to use small trucks (1-ton chassis) for their pickups, so as not to cause undue wear & tear caused by heavy trucks. Thanks for your consideration.
- 4B but I’d prefer it leave curbside recycling optional as I prefer to drop off our (small) recycling bin 2x/week. Thank you for all of your work on this!
- 4A – I appreciate this option, and it would save the city streets tremendously.
- #3
- 4B
- 4B
- 4B, then 4A
- 4A and 4B
- 4a/b (32 gal container is the size we would use)
- 4B
- City-wide contract which includes waste pickup & recycling. We need wind-resistant container
- #3
- Pay as you throw
- Single stream recycling & single hauler with conditions that provide better service than now to homeowners, and at reasonable cost.
- Single hauler with city contract like in Lafayette (pay as you throw)
- Most ideas presented have good and bad points. Don’t want “City Trash”. One trash company for city is great but make sure contract is with local Golden company & that they “guarantee” the lowest
rate. Set “pickup days” for the city – 1 day for each ward and fine any company not abiding by that law.

- 4,5,7
- 4B
- option 4B
- Golden should license only one hauler for either the entire city or at minimum for larger divisions. I would favor a service that picks up recyclables every week. It’s hard enough to change people’s habits, so make it convenient.

I’d like to see the following included in a new waste & recycle program:

- Pre-pay stickers per certain size can so that people with very little garbage are not penalized large items that don’t fit in a can need to still have a way to be picked up at no extra cost to the homeowner.
- If the city wants to contract some company to do curbside, recycling only that might be a good way to see if and how it would work. Although this removes recycling from pure market driven this would be ok with me.
- Double trash cans at all existing trash can areas, 1 for recycle, more trash cans all over city & parks. All trash collectors take everything without raising prices.
- I’d like to look into composting.
- A preference to contract with a locally-owned waste/recycling contractor (i.e. EDS) and not a large, nationally-owned company. We’d like to continue our good service we get from EDS.
- Awareness, kick off celebration, campaign to bring all people in community to get on board.
- Single hauler in each sector. (You can have multiple haulers in the city, but only one in each sector.) This worked where I lived in Utah. Each hauler can do the accounting and billing for each home, keep track of size & number of bins used at each address, etc. City can use that data for statistics, and also get recycle statistics to use to calculate revenue and credit that haulers should be considering in their fee structure. I also like the leaf/yard waste drop-off idea. If that’s hard to do on its own, some kind of discount program to use Rooney Road might be an option.
- Composting of kitchen scraps & yard waste.
- Local tax for use of plastic bags. Tax goes to sustainability efforts. Tags for trash bags as an alternative to specific size bines. Bins seem to fly away in the wind. Also curbside composting. My trash has decreased by 50% since I started composting.
- Divide the city – award more than 1 contract. 3 to 4 would be fairer to the businesses.
- Single hauler service in Golden Heights presents a lowest cost option for trash pick up. It is a mile in and a mile out for trash haulers to get in and pick up a few residences. EDS is located at the entrance to Golden Heights and presents the most logical starting point to convert zones of the city to single hauler services. Talks with EDS in the past have yielded a reduction in cost for service. If 90% of Golden Heights subscribes to EDS. Let’s get on this & start saving fuel & $$.
- We should make sure our recycler doesn’t just toss the recyclables as trash – w/recycling just a green “feel good” option.
- More recycling locations.
- One truck – curbside recycling (each week would be good – we have every 2 weeks now and it’s a lot to keep around!)
- Pay as you throw as my family sorts all trash & now generates only 1 trash bag per week but 3 to 4 bags of recyclables.
- 1 private contracted company.
• Garbage
• Mandatory recycling provided.
• Recycling
• Recycling is mandatory & city provides services
• Free to use recycle at location of choice church works
• E-waste recycling – yearly for computers & electronics
• Pay as you throw
• Limit collection days to 1 or 2 per week. This is already the case, right?
• 4B
• same trash cans for everyone
• combined trash & recycle pick up – curbside
• Consideration of cogeneration plant development with other cities to dispose of flammable trash.
• Single stream
• More bins, policing of area
• De-central drop-off, i.e. at King Soopers, CSM….
• Curbside organic recycling program
• Haulers should be put on notice that the city will renegotiate its contract or solicit a different provider under the following conditions: labor disputes in which employees of the hauler complain of non-competitive wages; new government incentives to hybridize the dump trucks; Golden happens to have both academic and engineering expertise in town with CSM and NREL. Let’s see what they can contribute. Ideally we could turn our trash system into a showcase for integrated solutions (egg. Biodiesel using local restaurant grease, subsidized diesel-hybrid trucks, etc.)

**I don’t support these ideas:**

• The main reason I don’t support most options presented is that I don’t want to see the pressure of free market to go away.
• 3 and 4. I don’t want the city to be in control of my trash.
• A central recycling facility, unfortunately, does not work because the general public doesn’t follow dumping rules. Also, non-city residents dump their recycling there. It would be better to offer curbside pickup of recycling for citizens.
• Status quo.
• PAYT is still unfair if one has ½ loads. Maybe some mod!
• Losing competition
• Doing nothing
• Don’t like the city buying trash trucks and running the business though. Can single hauler private companies set up a pay as your throw??
• Single hauler, single price – it discourages recycling and limiting trash.
• Leaving trash as is but adding city-operated curbside recycling (ie. Option 3B).
• Plastic vs. paper; both require natural resources to make – petroleum vs. trees. But we have more petroleum than trees.
• Composting, wait a while.
• Paying high prices for current trash removal system.
• (some of) Trash service should not become a monopoly and reduce quality of service.
• Separate trash & recycling – option #1. It is difficult to get a call back from EDS regarding recycling.
• No plastic bags allowed from businesses.
• Multiple haulers like we have now.
• #1
• Trash hauling has become a national franchise with 2 or 3 companies dominating most markets. They may be better positioned to offer successful bids than locally based small businesses. This has the potential for shutting down those local businesses, leading to a quasi monopoly by the big players. At the same time, the trucks of those local haulers are ancient and probably pollute more than newer fleets of the big companies. They may also lack the capital to take advantage of government incentives to improve their fleet’s air pollution.

Other comments:

• We use the Waste Management recycling bins at King Soopers. This allows us to avoid driving out of our way (i.e. the Golden Gate Canyon recycling center), but be able to empty our recycling bin (an old BFI curbside bin we bought years ago in Lakewood) several times per week.
• Any system must be cost effective and NOT subsidized by the city.
• All restaurants recycle cooking oil. If we can get as green as possible – this gets the city mentioned in many publications. Follow other cities programs that label them as a “green” city – attracts tourism.
• Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to comment on this!
• We need to continue the efforts to create change.
• City guidance re electronics/TV recycling. City to research and recommend vendors, so citizens are sure they’re using an appropriate, responsible choice.
• Has a cost benefit analysis been conducted for all the options? It would seem that cost & efficiency should dictate the ultimate solution. Good job!
• Love the free trash day that Golden has but they don’t take hazardous materials & might want to consider this on the free day also!
• But does a 4b concept work in other munis? Examples? Would a local company bid? EDS (good customer service) or McWaste Management (impossible to reach a human)?
• Must decrease number of vendors driving our roads.
• I’d like to know what Boulder County, Lafayette, etc. are doing – comparative research is important to me.
• How many trucks will pick up regular trash, recycling, & organic recycling “grass, leaves, branches”? 3 different trips?
• Love the fact we’re thinking about this! We’re a family of 3 and have very little trash. Most goes in recycling!
• My current concern is how to recycle shredded paper. I hesitate dumping a plastic bag full of bits & pieces since the big containers are often left open & we have high winds & thus shredded paper blowing around the area.
• Monitor water use by residents to look for waste.
• Tired of services that pick up trash late/high winds that blow pollution into neighborhood.
• Accommodate for usual small trash w/occasional large trash (Xmas/garage clean out).
• Thank you for creating such a comprehensive display.
• Encourage recycling at more events/meetings. Like recycling containers on sidewalk areas at parks/Wash. Ave.
• I walk the 6th Ave/Fossil Trace Golf course trail 5 days a week. There is a trash can by the bridge, which I seem to fill up –it’s emptied out once a month, sometimes more! This is trash I pick up off the trail. Please add a trash can by the “Triceratops Trail” sign, so I can do the same on the other side of the trail.

• Thank you for bringing this issue to the residents of Golden!

• Single trash & recycle collector should handle all cardboard, slick mags, metal containers, plastics, etc.

• Thanks for doing this!!

• During yearly cleanup (May?) please put bins in Golden Hills/Heights area like used to – new site not convenient.

• Consider sending sustainability coordinator to Konstanz, Germany for experience exchange.

• Trash is a basic city service that poses problems not addressed with unregulated market solutions. We don’t have competing police forces or fire departments either. What is more important than potential price benefits from competition is to have a well-run service that does not externalize the true costs of garbage disposal. Impact on communal roads, diesel air pollution, landfill hazards are substantial factors, yet in a privatized unregulated environment they are not part of the equation. City government must have decisive input to minimize those less visible but real costs.