



TOWN COUNCIL WORK SESSION

Tuesday, July 5, 2016 @ 7:00pm

Town Hall, 102 E. Main Street

1. Continued Discussion of Solid Waste – *Director of Environmental Services*

Andrew Heacock, Solid Waste Division Supervisor, presented the following PPT to Council:

Cost and Rate Analysis of Solid Waste Services

FY16 Solid Waste Budget

- Total Refuse Fund -- \$982,100
- Personnel costs -- \$747,840
- Fleet maintenance -- \$70,550
- Fuel costs -- \$80,000
- Landfill charges --\$22,500
- Other Operating Expenses -- \$61,210

FY17 Charges and Fees

- Residential Solid waste services
 - \$14.10 per 96-gallon cart per month.
 - \$12.00 per 32-gallon cart per month.
- Commercial Solid Waste Services
 - Once per week collection -- \$273.00 per dumpster per month.
 - Twice per week collection -- \$358.00 per dumpster per month.
- Other Charges and Fees
 - Second Large Item collection in a calendar year -- \$25.00
 - Third or more, Large Item collections in a calendar year -- \$50.00

Private Collection Service – Additional \$5.00 for solid waste services per month

Services Provided Through Assessed Fees

- Residential Refuse Collection and Disposal
- Residential Recycling Collection and Disposal
- Collection and Disposal of Town Facility Refuse and Recycling
- Commercial Refuse Collection and Disposal
- Commercial Recycling Collection and Disposal
- Yard Waste Collection and Disposal
- Private Collection service
- Large Item Collection Service
- Manassas Ave Yard Waste Disposal Site
- Refuse Services for Town Hosted Events
- Snow Removal

Services Provided To Strasburg – FY17

- Curbside Residential Refuse Collection and Disposal

- Bi-weekly Curbside Residential Recycle Collection and Disposal
- Collection and Disposal of Town Facility Refuse and Recycling
- Large Item Collections

Rate Comparison – FY17

- Front Royal
 - \$14.10 Per Container Per month
 - Weekly Refuse Collection
 - Weekly Recycle Collection
 - Weekly Yard Waste Collection
 - Large Item Collections upon request
 - Twice per week collection of public waste cans
 - Weekly Refuse and Recycling from Town Facilities
 - Other Town Services
- Strasburg
 - \$11.00 per Customer per Month
 - Weekly Refuse Collection
 - Bi-weekly Recycle Collection
 - Weekly Collection of Refuse and Recycling from Town Facilities
 - Large Item Collection Service (less than 2 C.Y.) provided weekly upon request
- Of the \$11.00 per month Strasburg's customers pay for solid waste services, \$2.05 per month for bi-weekly recycle collection
- Strasburg has the option to receive weekly recycling collection per their contract
- Should Strasburg choose to receive weekly recycling collection, the charge for recycling collection would increase to \$4.10 per customer per month, increasing the overall rate to \$13.05 per month.
- Front Royal
 - \$14.10 – Weekly refuse, recycle, and yard waste collection. As well as on demand large item collections, private collection services, town facility collection, and other services as needed.
- Strasburg
 - \$11.00 -- Bi-weekly Recycle
 - \$13.05 -- Weekly Recycle
- Single Stream recycling
 - Increased participation
 - Lower optional costs
 - Increased Route efficiency
 - More convenient for customers

Bi-weekly Recycling

- Further analysis required to determine desire and ability to provide bi-weekly recycling.
 - Pros

- Possibility to reduce required routes and transportation costs.
- Cons
 - Increased eb and flow in operations and materials handled.
 - Decrease in customer participation with bi-weekly collection.

Route Analysis

- Route Structure
 - The Town is divided into 5 different Zones
 - Each Zone corresponds to a day of the week (i.e. Zone 1 = Monday)
 - Each Zone is further divided in 3 sections.
 - Each is section assigned a truck to collect refuse.
 - Trucks start each assigned section the same way each week.
 - Check points have been established
 - Drivers notify Public Works and Supervision when routes are altered.

Goals and Adjectives

- Adopt a “Run LEAN” business model
- Reduce operational costs
- Increase the efficiency and consistency of services provided
- Establish repeatable processes
- Increase recycling participation

Recommendations

- Implement Single Stream Recycling
- Standardize refuse fleet
 - Restructure routes to increase efficiency
 - Reevaluate staffing needs and operational costs
- Reevaluate the commercial refuse program

IN CLOSING

- We as Town employees will never be as “efficient” as a “for-profit” contractor.
- The Solid Waste Department’s main focus is “level of service”
 - We strive for excellent customer service and a high level of service delivered to each customer.
- They may do it faster, but we do it better...

Council & Staff Discussion:

- The pie chart shown includes the recycling that the Town sells, though the amount included is very minute.
- Strasburg breakdown of refuse expenses does not include yard waste though it does include a landfill expense. Their recycling in Strasburg is collected every other week. Strasburg collects yard waste as a refuse item in the same truck.
- The Town of Front Royal includes yard waste collection, weekly refuse and recycling collection, and large item collection. The Town also does event collection for festivals, etc.
- Mr. Tewalt asked if the Town trucks are getting old and may cost over a million dollars to replace them. He noted that spending millions on trucks would not be cost prohibitive. Mr. Heacock noted that the total cost was about \$120,000. Mr. Tewalt noted that personnel cost

reduction, and truck expense would also be reduced and the Town would be better served and expenses saved if they privatized.

- Councilman Connolly noted that commercial pick up seemed to need more review. Mr. Heacock stated that the commercial program needed changes, noting that it had a lot of customers and did not generate a lot of income. Mr. Burke added that it could be investigated further while other costs were looked into. He noted that an exit strategy could be worked on and the Town could ease into said exit.
- Mr. Connolly stated that residential and commercial should definitely be considered separately. He noted that single stream recycling reports are generally positive and he asked what the Town needed to go towards that direction. Mr. Heacock stated they needed one truck and education. He said there would be an initial investment though it would be a cost savings eventually.
- Councilman Tewalt asked about taking items to Manassas rather than Winchester for recycling. Mr. Heacock noted that they would have far less trips (4-5 trips perhaps) to Manassas, rather than 12-13 trips to Winchester)
- Councilman Meza asked how they could quantify the desired results. Mr. Heacock noted that they have goals, and hope to reduce the fleet and reduce the trips and be able to quantify the numbers.
- Mayor Darr asked if the Town went to private industry, would the County still require the tipping fees.
- Mayor Darr also asked about the yard waste noted in the pie chart. He stated that the cost of administration needed to be shown and the cost of running Manassas Avenue and public trash receptacles (Ms. Egger asked)

No decisions were made at this time.

2. Recommendation on RFP for General Engineering Services – *Director of Energy Services*

Summary: The Town issued a request for proposals for general engineering services to support the Energy Services department. This will require a full range of engineering, design and construction administration consulting services that cannot be provided by Town personnel.

Staff Evaluation: The Town received four proposals from the RFP for engineering services and they were evaluated on the following evaluation matrix: experience of the firm, experience and qualifications of individuals assigned to the project and successful experience in performing similar work. Staff then selected the top two firms and conducted informal interviews to evaluate their qualifications and bid responses in more detail.

Budget/Funding: FY16-17 budget - expense line 9401- 3021

Staff Recommendations: Staff recommends award of contract with Southeastern Consulting to provide the Town with general engineering services to support the Energy Services department. Southeastern Consulting was selected based upon the evaluation criteria and excellent services provided to the Town over the past 30 years.

Mr. Waltz presented the following to Council:

Recommendation on RFP for General Engineering Services

- Annual contract (4 renewals) – to handle full range of engineering consulting services that cannot be provided by Town personnel.
 - Examples – LRP, Main Street Ext., new commercial load evaluation, system analysis and etc.
 - Contract not to exceed \$22,000 a year
- RFP responses
 - Century Engineering
 - HiLine Engineering
 - Power Services
 - Southeastern Consulting
- Staff evaluated responses on matrix
 - Staff selected top two firms for formal interviews
 - Power Services
 - Southeastern Consulting
 - Recommend contract with Southeastern Consulting
- Next step – Contract approval

3. Recommendation on RFP for Power Supply Consulting Services – *Director of Energy Services*

Summary: The Town issued a request for proposals for power supply consulting services related to the monthly review of the Town's wholesale power invoices and additional services related to power supply as requested during the term of the contract.

Staff Evaluation: The Town received three proposals from the RFP for consulting services and they were evaluated on the following evaluation matrix: Experience of the firm, experience and qualifications of individuals assigned to the project, hourly rates, comparable jobs performed and basic monthly review of power bills.

Budget/Funding: FY16-17 budget - expense line 9401- 3023

Staff Recommendations: Staff recommends award of contract with GDS Associates to provide Power Supply Consulting Services for the Town. GDS was selected based upon the evaluation criteria and excellent services provided to the Town over the past 10 years.

Mr. Waltz presented the following to Council:

Recommendation on RFP for Power Supply Consulting Services

- Annual contract (4 renewals) – to handle the monthly review of the Town's wholesale power invoices and additional services related to power supply as requested.
 - Monthly review of power invoices \$12,000 a year
 - Examples of additional services
 - ✦ Evaluation of new generation assets
 - ✦ Power supply planning
 - ✦ Dealing with FERC and other transmission issues

- RFP responses
 - Booth & Associates
 - GDS Associates, Inc.
 - Sawvel & Associates
- Staff evaluated responses on matrix
- Recommend contract with GDS Associates
- Next step – Contract approval

Council Discussion:

4. Town Health Insurance RFP Discussion – Town Attorney

5. Request to Change Street Name – CBM Mortgage – Town Manager

Summary: Staff received a request from Cory Michael, President/CEO of CBM Mortgage, Inc. seeking to change the section of Warren Avenue that solely houses his new CBM facility, to “Hometown Way” with the numeric address to be the number 1. The cost of a new sign is estimated to be no more than \$100.

Director of Planning/Zoning Jeremy Camp has submitted comments in his email:

This email is in regards to the request submitted by CBM Mortgage to rename the portion of Warren Avenue located north of N Commerce Avenue. Specifically, I understand that the Applicant has requested to rename this portion of Warren Avenue to “Hometown Way”, and to assign the new address of “1 Hometown Way” to the former Social Services building. An aerial image is shown below for reference. Below are my review comments for consideration:

- “Hometown Way” does not present any duplication issues with 911 addressing and could be used. “Way” is a valid suffix, although uncommon.

- The number “1” is a concern for the following reasons:

- a) #1 is an odd number on the side of the street that should be an even number;
- b) #1 is out of sequence from the numbering pattern in the area, which is the 900 block; and
- c) #1 would not leave any numerical space for future addresses that may be needed on the property immediately to the south.

- Changing the street name and address would impact the address assigned to the Park on the east side of the road (903 Warren Avenue). I would recommend input from Warren County Parks and Recreation and/or Warren County Administration. I did speak with the Warren County GIS Coordinator about the request and he was in agreement with the above comments.

- In addition to Warren County, there are multiple other property owners along Warren Ave, including the following:

- a) Cai, Shuyi. Mailing Address: 1103 Moorefield Hill Ct. Vienna, VA 22180
- b) Llewellyn, Ronald L & Corinne W. Mailing Address: 905 Virginia Avenue Front Royal, VA 22630
- c) White, JD & Jane A Family. Mailing Address: PO Box 590 Front Royal, VA 22630

Council Discussion:

6. Liaison Committee Meeting Items for July 21st

Summary: The next Liaison Committee Meeting is scheduled for July 21, 2016. The May meeting was cancelled due to a conflict. The County of Warren has requested the addition of one item for discussion – Current Town of Front Royal Transportation Priorities. Council will vote on any additional items at the July 11, 2016 Council Meeting.

Ms. Berry noted that it was Councilman Tewalt's turn to represent Council at Liaison with Mayor Darr.

1. Local Labor Joint Resolution
2. Update of Corridor Agreement Pertaining to Funding from Warren County
3. Leach Run Parkway
4. Wastewater Treatment Plant/Septage Receiving Facility
5. Building Inspections Software
6. Development Review Committee
7. McKay Property Update
8. Warren County's in-Town Projects
9. Avtex Property – Main Street Extension
10. Main Street Application
11. Town Commercial Waste Tipping Fee Structure
12. Chris Ramsey Boundary Adjustment Request

7. Planning Commission Term Expires

Summary: Deborah Langfitt's term on the Planning Commission will expire August 31, 2016. She has asked to be considered for re-appointment. The Planning Commission has 4-year terms.

Council Discussion:

8. Council Discussion/Goals

9. Closed Meeting – Performance of Town Manager; Disposition of Publicly held Property; and Investment of Public Funds

Motion to Go Into Closed Meeting

Councilman Connolly moved, seconded by =====that Council convene and go into Closed Meeting for the purpose of 1) assignment, appointment, promotion, performance, demotion, salaries, disciplining, or resignation of specific public officers, appointees, or employees of a public body, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711. A. 1. of the Code of Virginia; 2) Discussion or consideration of the disposition of publicly held real property, specifically, the former Afton Inn property, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711. A.3., of the Code of Virginia and 3) the purpose of discussion or consideration of the investment of public funds, regarding the Town's possible participation in the Economic Development Authority sponsored People Inc. New Market Tax Credit investor(s) financial investment transactions funds and loans, where competition or bargaining is involved, where, if made public initially, the financial interest of the governmental unit would be adversely affected, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711. A. 6. of the Code of Virginia.

Vote: Yes – Connolly, Egger, Hrbek, Meza, Tewalt and Tharpe

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – N/A

(Mayor Darr did not vote as there was no tie to require his vote)

Motion to Certify Closed Meeting at its Conclusion

Councilman Connolly moved, seconded by ===== that Council certify that to the best of each member's knowledge, as recognized by each Council member's affirmative vote, that only such public business matters lawfully exempted from Open Meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act as were identified in the motion by which the Closed Meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered in the Closed Meeting by Council, and that the vote of each individual member of Council be taken by roll call and recorded and included in the minutes of the meeting of Town Council.

Vote: Yes – Connolly, Darr, Egger, Hrbek, Meza, Tewalt and Tharpe

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – N/A

(By Roll Call)
