



GLEN ELLYN ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION



AGENDA

Tuesday, July 21, 2015

7:30 P.M.

Glen Ellyn Civic Center

535 Duane Street

Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

1. Call Meeting to Order
2. Public Participation
3. Approval of June 16 , 2015 Meeting Minutes
4. Announcements
5. New Business:
 - A. Curbside Composting Program
6. Old Business:
 - A. Green Space
 - B. Single-use Bag Ordinance
 - C. Walgreens
7. Subcommittee Reports:
 - A. Recycling Subcommittee Report
 - B. Health and Wellness Subcommittee Report
 - C. Sustainable Landscaping Subcommittee Report
 - D. Communications Subcommittee Report
8. Other Business
9. Chairman's Report
10. Trustee Liaison's Report
11. Staff Liaison's Report:
12. Confirmation of Next Meeting Date and Adjournment

MINUTES
(Unapproved)

COMMISSION:	Environmental	DATE:	6/16/15
QUORUM:	Yes	CALLED TO ORDER:	7:30 p.m.
		ADJOURNED:	12:46 p.m.

MEMBER ATTENDANCE:

PRESENT: Chairman Adam Kreuzer;
Commissioners Adrienne Gregory, Thomas
Pulver, David Short, Sarah Udlhofer
Jennifer Umlauf, Andrew Van Gorp, John
Zelasco; Trustee Liaison Mark Senak, GE
Park District Liaison Renae Frigo, Student
Liaison Jack Schoenfeld Staff Liaisons Al
Stonitsch and Brendon Mendoza

EXCUSED: Commissioners Benjamin
Lowe

PUBLIC PRESENT: See New
Business/District 87 Expansion

1. **Call Meeting to Order –**
Chairman Kreuzer called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in Room 301 of the Glen Ellyn Civic Center.
2. **Public Participation - See new Business**
3. **Approval of Meeting Minutes –**
Commissioner Van Gorp motioned and Commissioner Zelasco seconded to approve the May 2015 meeting minutes.
4. **Announcements –**
Chairman Kreuzer announced that this meeting would be the last for Commissioner Pellico. After many years of service Commissioner Pellico has decided to move on and devote his time to some other causes. Commissioner Pelliceo told the group that he was proud of all that the Commission had accomplished throughout his years of service and although he would miss the Commission he was confident that the younger generation would step forward and do a great job. All members thanked him for everything and are sad to see him go.
5. **Old Business –**
 - A. **Green Space Event**
Commissioner Gregory gave a quick recap of this upcoming event for the public participants in attendance. She informed the group that many of the vacant spaces in town (such as Hallmark and Giesche) would be filled with “Green” art. She let the group know things were running smoothly.

B. Glen Ellyn Saves the Monarch -

Chairman Kreuzer recapped for the group the details of this event and went on to say the goal was to plant Milkweed at various locations in town. The event is this Saturday, June 20 from 9am-11am at both Crescent/Glenwood and also at Route 53/Pershing by Health Track. Commissioner Umlauf told the group there was an on-line sign up and currently there were about 100 people who were scheduled to plant that day. The Village and Park District will provide the Milkweed and Chairman Kreuzer told the group Public Works Director Hansen received permission to plant extra milkweed along the Prairie Path as well.

C. Mayor's Bike Safety Challenge

Chairman Kreuzer informed the group there was a video on YouTube regarding this event. He also shared the poster created by Commissioner Gregory that was hanging in various places around town to promote the event. Commissioner Pulver informed the group that he finished a video yesterday about the newly installed Bike Station. He was hopeful to have it online ASAP. Chairman Kreuzer lastly challenged the Village Board and all Commission members (including other Commissions) to take the bike safety quiz.

D. Garden Walk -

Commissioner Umlauf told the group this event would be this Saturday and six gardens would be featured. She said she would be on hand for the event as the District 41 Lambert garden is one of the gardens featured. She was hopeful to recruit volunteers through the walk. Lastly, she informed the group that there had already been one delivery of food sent to the Food Pantry from the garden.

E. Volcano Mulching -

Chairman Kreuzer informed the group that 96 letters were sent out to violators. He handed out a copy of the letter and also informed the Commission that he signed it as Chairman of the Environmental Commission.

6. New Business –

A. District 87 - Glenbard West Expansion -

Chairman Kreuzer opened the meeting up to the public to discuss the District 87 Glenbard West Expansion plan. He also recapped for those present what the Commission had been charged with doing by President Demos; they've been asked to review the project and report back to the Board with their consensus and point-of-view. The Commission will then send a recommendation in the form of a letter to help the Board facilitate a fair and complete review. He went on to say that he hoped to send this letter out as soon as possible. Lastly, he told all public participants that they should not use this meeting as a substitute for the upcoming Board meeting on June 22. The current meeting is to ONLY review the projects possible environmental impact to the location and to the community. To formulate an adequate and fair opinion the Commission asked if any members of the public would like to speak to this matter.

The following people chose to speak.

- George Zahrobsky, previous EC member, retired Glenbard West Teacher and namesake to the garden in jeopardy, spoke to the Commission about what he believed it meant to the community. He went on to tell the story about how the garden started and how he generated

the funding. He wasn't sure anything could be done at this point, but he wanted to make sure to express his concern. Chairman Kreuzer told Mr. Zahrobsky that in literature sent to the Commission by District 87, it was reported that he was in favor of the project. Mr. Zahrobsky told Chairman Kreuzer this was not completely correct; he supports the building but does not support all aspects of how it is being designed. Specifically, he doesn't understand the need for such a large use of space to accommodate a loading dock, cooling towers, a generator and other things that would cause a substantial area of the hill to be destroyed. Trustee Liaison Senak asked Mr. Zabrobsky what he would like to see. Mr. Zabrobsky's response was that he was not opposed to the project and didn't dislike the original plans he saw. However, new plans have been drawn up which are more extensive, with a large wall running right through the garden. Chairman Kreuzer read from the literature sent to him from District 87 and it stated "The goal is the improvement and educational adequacy of teaching spaces".

- Dan Buchnart, recent graduate of Glenbard West spoke to the fact that the hill is used by students as a teaching tool. Commissioner Van Gorp also said the space was used for some of his classes when he attended Glenbard West. Mr. Buchnart also told the group he believed one of the reasons the school wanted to develop the space was because more students were taking science classes. He said the number of students taking science classes has doubled as they are now allowed to take more than one. He believed the reasons behind creating the space was legitimate, but he wasn't pleased with the fact that so many trees would be cut down to accomplish the task. He would like to see the school find a way around causing the destruction of the hill as he believed it was a great learning tool.

- Gerould Wilhelm, PHD, Botanist, lichenologist, Director of Environmental Services of the Conservation Design Form and co-author of the 4th edition of The Plants of the Chicago Region, was hired to perform a study of the hill and report on its condition. He gave a very lengthy description of the condition of the hill and why it would be tragic to lose it. He explained that it was rooted in native land or "remnant" land and that there were many native species of flora there that were irreplaceable. Chairman Kreuzer wanted to note for the record that he received the report Dr. Wilhelm put together and will submit it for the record. Dr. Wilhelm suggested to the group that the District reevaluate the needs of the science department and see how those needs could be met while trying to save as much of the hill as possible. He said many of the plants could be relocated but the ecosystem that exists is irreplaceable. He went on to say that native untouched ecosystems of this kind accounts for 1/2 of 1% in the entirety of the state. Trustee Liaison Senak asked Dr. Wilhelm for his opinion on whether any construction would be advisable. His response was that he did not believe any construction should take place there.

- Ron Aubrey, previous Board member of the Glen Ellyn Park District, told that group that he has firsthand knowledge of large scale projects getting done with in the Village as he worked on many; Ackerman, Maryknoll, Village Green, the restoration of Main Street, etc. He told the group that he believed either through ignorance or lack of experience the School District did not follow a process to involve the public. He said in all of the projects he was involved with, he always got residents involved in the beginning so they were part of the process, then they became affiliated with the project and would "buy in". Following this path insures projects get done with little resistance. He went on to say that he was currently working with the school on some projects and was shocked he had not heard anything about

it. He was concerned because when he went to the April 15 meeting, he came away with the idea that there was not going to be a significant loss of trees; this clearly was not the case. He also doesn't like the fact that the project has happened with lightning speed. He referenced the much smaller Churchill Board walk project which took three years to finalize. He believed information regarding the District 87 was not openly shared and not enough effort was made to communicate with the public.

- *Lisa Fagen*, Glen Ellyn resident and parent of a Glenbard West student said she has not received any information on exactly what the school needs the new building for; do they need better equipment or is there not enough room? She hasn't received any literature from the school explaining this. Chairman Kreuzer read the response he received from the District which stated the project was needed to "renovate instructional space to add much needed quality instructional space for students and staff". He went on to say that the literature he received also states that the school "doesn't anticipate any increase in student population any time in the near future".

- *Christina Sedall*, Glenbard West student and incoming president of the ECO club said she didn't believe students and teachers were unanimously in favor of the project and also learned about it quite late in the process. She went on to say she believed learning from the current environment would be more beneficial than learning on top of a green roof.

Trustee Liaison Senak asked other students who were in attendance if they could give their input.

- *Taylor Moen*, a recent Glenbard West graduate said the fact that students don't know about the garden is unfortunate. She would like to see more hands on learning there in the future, as she believed it was an underutilized part of the Glenbard West Campus.

- *Nate Grail*, a current student at Glenbard West told the group that he was not sure what the need for the new space was since it seemed to him that students were learning just fine in their current environment. He would also like to see Honeysuckle Hill better utilized as outdoor learning and suggested that maybe that could be a mission the ECO club could focus on next year.

Chairman Kreuzer asked the students in attendance if they were aware that the school was going to cut down over 200 trees to accomplish this project.

- *Dan Buchnart*, recent graduate of Glenbard West told the group that he had been involved in fundraising thru student government for the new space for the past few years. Originally, he was told that it was for a green rooftop; then the project changed at the last minute. It was only after the money was donated at the end of this past school year that he was informed it was not just going to be a green roof but also a large addition. He went on to say that he was upset that the money raised by student government was now going to be used to cut down so many trees.

Members discussed the fact that it seemed clear to them the students were not aware of the scope of the project.

- Lydia Scott, from the Arboretum, thought the project was not sending a message of conservation to current generations. She talked about the significance of this unique ecosystem and hundreds of years it took to grow. She went on to say that the Hill was part of the beauty of the campus and getting rid of it would be tragic. She (and she was sure many others) moved to Glen Ellyn to experience these exact kinds of things. For the record Chairman Kreuzer said he had a letter from her addressed to President Demos. He asked if she would like it submitted for the record; she said yes.

- Steve Windsor, recent President of Wild One of Greater DuPage, mirrored what others had said previous to him. He also spoke about the uniqueness of the ecosystem on the hill and the fact that so many forms of life make their home there; is it irreplaceable. He also believed that the school was destroying science in the name of science.

- Mike Wilson, Citizens for Glen Ellyn Preservation spoke about how Glen Ellyn has changed throughout the years with bigger houses and greater runoff. He is disappointed that diversity now is created by landscapers and much has been lost. He believed that there were other possible locations that might be viable for the project; such as the small building across the street on Crescent next to the tennis courts. He shared with the group the response he received from the District when he sent in a FOYA request asking for information regarding the project. The response was that the information could not be collected until 6/23; which is conveniently after the Village Board meeting to approve the project. All members were concerned about this response and the letter from the District regarding the FOYA request was submitted in to the record.

- Jeff Gahris, from the Glen Ellyn Sustainability Group, informed the group that he was once a member of the Commission and wanted to speak to the group about communication among various groups in town and how it is decimated. He went on to say that he understood the needs to the school, but believed the project could have moved at a slower pace so that better communication and compromise could have been accomplished. He agreed with everyone who had spoken previous to him and said the school district could also have valid points; he doesn't know and doesn't want to take a formal opinion since he doesn't believe he has all the facts to do so. He believed it would be a good idea for everyone to be better informed.

Chairman Kreuzer asked the group if anyone knew if the referendum passed to fund the project stated anywhere that there would be such a mass tree removal. Attendees of the meeting say that this was not shared in the referendum; Chairman Kreuzer commented that he found this troubling.

- April Sedall, Glen Ellyn Resident and mother of Christina Sedall (who spoke previously) told the group how important she thought "hands on" learning was. She spent many years teaching at the Arboretum and spent time with kids who didn't have this kind of opportunity. She believed it would be a tragic loss to destroy the hill. She also believed an alternate location would be a great idea. She would like to see the hill kept as is and used for learning.

- Tom Condon, representing Residents of Honey Hill, told the Commission that of all the meetings he has attended he didn't believe the District wanted to listen to any alternative locations. He spoke of building up; however that would require the district displacing

students through the year in portable class rooms. He also thought the district building at the corner of Crescent and Park would be a viable solution and could offer about 24,000 sq. ft. on one level alone. He told the group that this District project has been in the works for about 5 years now, but has been fast tracked in the past 6 months. He went to say he was sorry that the Conservation Foundation could not be here tonight but he does have a memo from Brooks McDonald, President/CEO of the Conservation Foundation, which details why they believed the property was special and should be saved. He would like to submit this memo for the record. Mr. Condon also offered up a folder of information the Citizens of Honey Hill put together; all of which he would like to submit for the record. Mr. Condon gave the group a detailed overview of the project and showed members exactly what was going to be built, what it was going to house and what would happen to the hill in the process. He also informed the group about the impact of the project in conjunction with the Crescent Blvd. round-a-bout. Starting Friday, the Village will start on the retaining wall adjacent to the round-a-bout. He wondered who would be available to monitor the trees that needed protecting. Chairman Kreuzer was concerned that the EC was not notified about some of the hill being taken and trees being eliminated to accommodate for the round-a-bout; he believed the Commission should have been consulted. Trustee Liaison Senak told the group that when he asked the question about why the round-a-bout was created he was told it was a compromise with IDOT. He said there were so many roads that accessed Crescent in such a finite space that IDOT recommended that one of the roads be closed; the compromise was to create a round-a-bout. Mr. Condon went on to say that the round-a-bout will use 50 pylons; he has no idea how many the retaining wall the district project is proposing will use, but it will be more than 50 and will be 25ft high. Mr. Condon explored with members some alternatives his group had. He went on to say they are not opposed to the project, but they are suggesting changes; moving the building parallel to the school, the use of fewer or no dumpster bays and an alternative location for the cooling towers and back-up generator. All of these changes could make a major impact in saving the hill and he doesn't believe it would be a burden to the project. He also showed the group photos of the 2008 flood and the flood that happened on June 14; he believed both of these would be exacerbated with the construction of the project as it currently stands. He also informed the group that a website was started just ten days ago to help generate awareness at www.savehoneyhill.com. He gave the Commission, for the record, a petition signed by over 1,900 people and commented on by over 500, asking for the District to seek out alternatives. In closing, Mr. Condon said he was in favor of building new science labs but would like the District to consider alternative locations.

- *Tom Whalls*, Glen Ellyn resident living on Crescent, discussed his concerns with the project; which mirror others. He informed the group that he didn't believe the design was well done, it was hurried and alternatives were not investigated. He asked members if anyone knew how hard it was to get a permit finalized when you are building a house or doing an addition. He sees a disconnect between the amount of time permits take and how quickly the Glenbard West Project was being approved. He also went over with the group some of the questions he asked at various meetings: such as what kind of noise will the two cooling towers generate when running? He asked if a noise abatement study had been done and the answer he got was "we did our calculations". He also asked if an EIP (environmental impact study) had been done and he again received no answers. He believed the District was stalling and that it was important for everyone to ask questions in order to obtain information. He was also concerned about the proposed 25 ft wall and how it would affect the view off the Lake. Mr. Whalls said part of the charm of the Village and

the campus is that view. He told the group he also asked to see mock ups showing an inverted view of what the location will look like post construction. He has not seen this and was told the cost was too great. Mr. Whalls told the group that having built two houses in town he doesn't believe this is the case and is concerned the District doesn't want the public to see that view.

NOTE: Bonnie Gahris, Lisa Fagan and Joyce Hetzel (all Glen Ellyn Residents) also attended the meeting but did not speak.

After the Public Participation portion of the meeting was over Commissioners discussed what had been brought to their attention. They specifically discussed the scope of the project, storm water issues and what they as a Commission were allowed to address regarding both. Chairman Kreuzer told the group that from what he could see the Planning & Development and Public Works Departments had done their due diligence regarding the storm water issue and must be comfortable with what they have seen thus far.

Members realize they have no authority to accept or reject plans but want to consider all the information they have received so that they can come to a unanimous decision on how they want to proceed. Chairman Kreuzer told the group they couldn't critique the design but could critique its environmental impact on the community. Commissioner Umlauf told the group that she was confident more trees would die than were predicted and that Oak trees especially could not withstand the kind of impact that would likely happen if construction moves forward.

Chairman Kreuzer asked PD Liaison Frigo for her opinion and she informed the group that she did have specific Park District concerns and she addressed those with her director. Her concern was the proximity of the project to the lake and stormwater issues; knowing that the area floods. She was also concerned with relocating any plants she could: it is not an optimal solution, but better than losing them all together. She also told the group that her director had made phone calls to various Village officials about the project to gather information. She went on to read a statement on his behalf. PD Liaison Frigo went on to say that as long as the project adheres to county storm water ordinances, and the Village has no objection, the Park District will go along with the Village's recommendation.

Commissioner Van Gorp read excerpts from the Kane-DuPage Soil and Water Conservation District Land Use Opinion 15-021 Report which Planning & Development Director Hulsberg sent to members. The report recommended some kind of storm water management and runoff system be in place where water could be maintained and released at specific rates. Commissioner Van Gorp expressed concerns that the project could exacerbate flooding issues that already exist in the area. Chairman Kreuzer told the group from what he understood the Village had already reviewed the land use opinion report. They have also approved the storm water evaluations that have currently been submitted. However, he added that there would be further permitting process moving forward. Chairman Kreuzer asked if anyone had further comments about storm water issues. Park District Liaison Frigo told the group that if the green roof was not maintained it would not be an effective tool for storm water drainage. Members are concerned no system was factored in to the plan to maintain this space.

Discussion was had about permits that would need to be obtained for the project. PD Liaison Frigo told the group that when she did the Board Walk project at Churchill she had to get permits from the Village, the Army Corps of Engineers and the Storm water Conservation District. Members wonder why the scope of the Glenbard West project doesn't require the same amount of permits. They were also concerned at the speed at which the project is getting approved.

Chairman Kreuzer told the group that their directive from President Demos was to review the District 87 project in terms of its environmental impact on the community. President Demos would like the review to help the Board understand the POV of the Commission.

Possible Items to Be Included in POV Letter:

- Should the project proceed at all with respect to its environmental impact to the Community and the Lake.
- Address alternatives to the site and ultimately to the scope of what is currently planned. They were not sure that they could address what a new location could be, but they could encourage exploration of options.
- Project should be slowed down to allow for more community involvement and research on the part of the Commission.
- Concerned over lack of public input and believed there should have been more community collaboration.
- Concerned about short notice given to the community.
- Would like to see more public knowledge and better deliberation about alternative sites.
- Explore decreasing the footprint.
- Deliberate/entertain alternatives to the current location and footprint.
- Comment on the invitation given to District 87 to attend this meeting, their declination to attend personally and their decision to send written information instead.
- Express concerns about the hill, the environment, the ecosystem, the history and weather the current plan has been sufficiently vetted and deliberated.
- Encourage Board to allow full and complete deliberation on this issue.

Members discussed the fact that District 87 wanted to have this project completed by the fall of 2016. This being said, any request for delay in the project would not be favorable to the timeline laid out by the District. Trustee Liaison Senak told the group that the Superintendent, the Asst. Principal of Operations and the Architect presented at the most recent Arch. Review Commission meeting and members may want to review those minutes. He also encouraged the group to make clear in any letter they sent to the Board, what the Commission did to formulate their opinion. Also, to note that public comment was solicited from the community. He encouraged the group to let the Board know whether the EC was in favor of the project moving forward or not. He also suggested the group explain their decision and what solutions they might have to address it. He also said he would like to know if the Commission was completely opposed or if it was a split vote; a completely opposed vote would clearly have more weight as far as he was concerned.

Chairman Keruzer motioned to proceed with a vote to approve or reject the plan as presented currently and is seconded by Commissioner Pulver. Commissioner Van Gorp motioned to reject the plan as presented, and was seconded by Commissioner Short and passed unanimously.

After some discussion Chairman Kreuzer, Commissioner Short and Umlauf decide they would draft the letter of recommendation that will be sent to the Board. Chairman Kreuzer would send out a final copy to all Commissioners after it was completed.

- 7. Subcommittee Reports**
 - A. Recycling Committee - NONE**
 - B. Health & Wellness Subcommittee – NONE**
 - C. Sustainable Landscaping Subcommittee Report– NONE**
 - D. Communications Subcommittee Report – NONE**
- 8. Other Business - NONE**
- 9. Chairman Report – NONE**
- 10. Trustee Liaison Report – NONE**
- 11. Staff Liaison Report – NONE**
- 12. Confirmation of Next Meeting Date and Adjournment –**
The next scheduled regular meeting will be held on July 21, 2015.

Respectfully submitted by:
D'Arcy Greenleaf, Environmental Commission Recording Secretary

Reviewed by:
Brendon Mendoza, Environmental Commission Staff Liaison

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairman Kreuzer and Commissioners
FROM: Brendon Mendoza, Administrative Intern
DATE: 7/17/15
RE: Update on Curbside Composting Program



Background

At the Environmental Commission's request, staff has begun conducting preliminary research into the feasibility of implementing a curbside composting program within the Village. Curbside composting is simply residents collecting acceptable materials, such as yard waste or food scraps and then placing the materials into a compost container. The compost container is later placed at the residents' curbside for weekly pickup similar to refuse and recycling. The organic material then is picked up and transferred to a station that creates compost out of the collected materials. Nationally, curbside composting has slowly begun to gain further acceptance among municipalities as it is starting to be considered an alternative way to dispose of food waste and other various bio-degradable waste.

Curbside composting is an environmentally friendly method to dispose of organic waste that can be reused for other purposes, such as providing organic compost for residents and supplying organic compost for farmers. The added benefit of such programs divert the amount of excess bio-degradable waste placed in landfills, further improving efforts for sustainability. There are many acceptable materials, such as food scraps (e.g. fruit/vegetables scraps, table scraps, pasta, and coffee grounds) that often times are thrown into refuse containers that could afterwards be easily thrown into composting containers and reused instead of transferred to a landfill. Another benefit is that curbside composting has an added convenience factor for residents as they're able to place grass clippings, garden vegetation, leaves, and brush into the composting containers without need to purchase stickers or yard waste bags.

Some municipalities have started implementing pilot programs, while others have added voluntary curbside composting as an additional service provided to residents. Curbside composting has even become mandated in some large cities such as San Francisco, California. There are various benefits to curbside composting as seen in the Village of Oak Park. Oak Park has reported to divert over 50,000 lbs. of food scraps alone, in just 4 months of curbside composting from landfills in their pilot program of 760-800 households. As part of the program Oak Park provides 96-gallon composting carts for weekly collection at \$14/month and is three times the volume of a regular sized yard waste bag and eliminates the need to purchase yard waste stickers.

One creative promotional idea would be to set up an event in the future where compost that has been collected by our Village is dropped off at a location for residents to come for free and utilize the compost for their own backyard as an annual event.

Major Decision Points:

As with any new program, there are many points that must be considered prior to considering implementation of a customized curbside composting program. Listed below are several factors to be considered as the Commission further considers a potential program for Glen Ellyn.

- ✓ Pilot Program of select areas or implement village wide:
 - ✓ Mandatory or voluntary participation?
- ✓ Composting Containers:
 - ✓ Size of Curbside Container: Provide multiple options?
 - ✓ Household Kitchen Containers: for food scraps?
 - ✓ Village purchases containers or resident leases as part of a seasonal subscription?
 - ✓ Neighborhood sharing of service/container?
- ✓ Implementation Date: Could be as soon as April 2016
 - ✓ Allows time to further develop program and propose to Village Board for consideration in Quarter 4, along with ample time to adequately market the new program and educate the community.
- ✓ Fees:
 - ✓ Residents billed monthly or per season, first composting bins provided by Village and afterwards replaced at expense of owner, if ownership of own bin possibly cut down on subscription based pricing slightly.
- ✓ Billing/Account Set Up:
 - ✓ In house billing with all of program on one Village services bill or Republic handles entire composting program and bills residents separately.

Option B: Compost Container Reimbursement Program:

Similar to rain barrel program, resident purchases a rear-yard composting container and would be reimbursed for purchasing price. No Village services are provided.

Next Steps:

- **Further Research**
 - Data collection of existing programs (including pricing and fees of similar contracts in other municipalities)
 - Analysis of data of Republic and pricing with comparable communities
- **Refine curbside composting program with Environmental Commission for August 18th meeting**
- **Prepare proposal for Village Board Meeting in 4th quarter of 2015**

Attachments

1. Village of Oak Park curbside composting program information
2. Executive Summary of curbside composting program from Cambridge, MA

Attachment

1.



2015 Oak Park Composting Program

What is the Composting Program?

The composting program collects yardwaste, food scraps and food-soiled paper to be “recycled” into compost instead of going into the garbage. Residents collect the food scraps and paper items in kitchen pails provided by the Village, and transfer them to their new 96-gallon Waste Management composting cart for weekly collection at a cost of \$14 per month. The collection cart is three times the volume of a yardwaste bag and does not require green yardwaste stickers. *However, residents cannot put food scraps into kraft paper yardwaste bags or 32-gallon yardwaste cans used in the current program due to Health Department regulations and pest (animal) concerns.*

Why recycle food scraps?

Food scraps and food-soiled paper are the largest unrecycled portion of the residential waste stream, making up as much as 35 percent of what residents throw away. By turning food scraps into compost, residents are able to help save landfill space and create compost.

What items can be recycled in the CompostAble cart?

All food products, including fruit, vegetables, breads, cereal, dairy, meat (including bones); coffee grounds, filters and tea bags, pasta and food-soiled paper, including paper towels, plates, napkins, pizza boxes, paper food packaging and lunch sacks can be mixed into the new 96-gallon Composting collection cart with your yardwaste, including brush. **Items that are NOT accepted** include plastic packaging (including bags and Styrofoam), plastic serving ware such as plates, cups and utensils, glass, metal, sanitary products, diapers, dairy cartons and pet waste.

How is this different from back yard composting?

Materials such as meat and bones, which should not be composted in back yard systems, can be collected and processed in this program. The food scrap recycling program is a convenient alternative for people who don't have time or space to compost and allows them to recycle almost everything. If you maintain a backyard compost pile, you may consider sharing a composting collection cart (and the cost) with neighbors for those additional items accepted in the composting collection program.

Where will the compost collection be taken?

The materials collected in the program will be taken to Land & Lakes, Willow Ranch Compost Waste Facility, 3171 N. Joliet Road, Romeoville. This was the first facility in the region to obtain IEPA permitting to accept food scraps with yardwaste. This commercial composting facility sells the finished product in bulk to suppliers who bag it and resell it at home improvement and garden stores. It takes a lot of space, equipment and about 3 months to create the finished compost from yardwaste and food scraps.

Food Scrap Recycling Reduces Green House Gases

There are essentially two ways that food scrap recycling reduces Green House Gases (GHGs): 1) by removing organics from the landfill we reduce methane production; and 2) through the use of compost made from food scraps. Food scraps emit more methane than any other material in the landfill. Keeping food scraps out of the landfill reduces the amount of methane produced. Methane is 23 times more potent a GHG than Carbon Dioxide (CO₂).

Can we put cardboard and paper into the composting cart?

Yes – if it is soiled with food (i.e. pizza box, birthday cake paper plate). Recycling is the best option for clean paper products, but it is OK to put it into the compost cart, too. On the other hand, food soiled paper should never be put into your blue recycling cart.

Can we compost butcher’s paper, waxed paper or parchment paper?

Yes, but be careful here. Some “coated” paper has a thin layer of plastic, which is not compostable. An easy way to tell is to lightly tear it; if it tears easily and the edges show only paper fibers, it is OK; if it is difficult to tear you will probably see that thin layer of plastic. As with recycling, when in doubt, throw it out to prevent contamination of acceptable materials.

Do we need a biobag for the kitchen pail or could we use it without a bag and just dump the kitchen scraps from the pail directly into the cart?

A compostable bag liner is not necessary to the composting cart program but is provided to alleviate the “yuk” factor some users might experience. However, the kitchen pails provided in the program come apart easily for washing. It is important to note that food scraps put loosely into the cart may attract unwanted pests.

If we can compost coffee grounds and paper towels, can we also compost coffee filters and paper towel rolls? If I run out of the biobags, can paper bags be used instead?

Yes, coffee filters and paper towel rolls may be included and paper bags or newspaper may be used in place of compostable plastic bag liners.

Where can I buy BioBags?

Green Home Experts, 811 South Boulevard, carries a brand of compostable pail liners at an “economy” price of \$6.99 for 50 bags. They also carry 13-gallon compostable bags at \$7.50 for 50 bags and 45-gallon compostable bags at \$4.25 for 10 bags. BioBags may be available at Walmart and Ultra Foods and can also be purchased online. Some residents use paper bags and some don't use bags at all and throw the pail into the dishwasher. You can also wrap food scraps in newspaper.

What does this program mean to Oak Park?

Residents participating in the program have been reducing and diverting waste from the landfill, which is one of the initiatives outlined in the PlanItGreen Sustainability Plan. Many residents are now able to use the smaller refuse cart to save over \$4 per month on refuse charges and some neighbors have saved even more by sharing refuse and organics carts.

Where can people get more information?

For more information contact Karen Rozmus at 708.358.5700 or Rozmus@oak-park.us.

COMPOSTABLE

YES

- Fruits & vegetables including peels, pits & rinds
- Bread, pasta & other grains
- Meat & bones
- Dairy products & egg shells
- Tea bags, coffee grounds & filters
- Food-soiled paper including plates, napkins & cups
- Pizza boxes

NO

- Plastic packaging/bags
- Disposable serving ware
- Sanitary waste
- Diapers
- Pet waste

Questions? Contact Public Works at 708.358.5700.



VILLAGE of OAK PARK FOOD SCRAP COMPOSTING PROGRAM OVERVIEW

A food scrap pilot program was implemented for the 2012 seasonal yardwaste collection program from April 6 to November 30. Waste Management provided 96-gallon mobile carts for "organics" which is comparable in volume to three bags or containers of yardwaste collected in the current yardwaste program. The program is offered on a voluntary, subscription basis. Subscribers using the organics cart are not required to purchase yardwaste stickers. The monthly subscription cost is \$14.00 per month which is about the cost of one bag with a yardwaste sticker per week. Residents who maintain backyard compost piles or who mulch grass clippings are able to share organics carts and costs with neighbors to allow participation in the food scrap collection program. Food scraps must be placed in organics mobile carts and are not allowed to be collected in kraft paper yardwaste bags. The 2012 pilot program served 110 households, nearly 10% of the target area.

The Village received testimonials from twenty-four residents to support the continuation and expansion of the program. The participants in the pilot area received collections on a bi-weekly basis for the winter months. In January 2013, the Village expanded the program village-wide and sent an updated education piece to every household that included a return postcard to sign up for the program. The 2013 expanded program gained an additional 270 households in April 2013. Today there are 775 households and 8 schools participating in the program diverting as much as 97% of their lunchroom waste stream. The program is also utilized by 3 churches, 2 Park District facilities, the Oak Park Food Pantry, Farmers Market and various special events.

Program participants receive monthly email updates and information has appeared in various publications and on Facebook and VOP TV. Village staff has made presentations to community groups and schools and worked with Seven Generations Ahead to host three Community Forums. Funding provided by the Cook County Department of Environment was used to purchase kitchen pails and BioBags for participants. GLAD bags read about the project and provided an additional 500 boxes of compostable bags that are used as an incentive for participants to submit surveys or sign-up their neighbors. Keep Oak Park Beautiful provided some money for printed materials using funds from a grant from IL EPA through Keep Illinois Beautiful.

The Village collected resident surveys at the beginning and again at the end of the program to gauge the response from pilot program participants. Waste Management provided monthly tonnage reports for collection routes in the pilot area. The winter collection is an important component of the program as it allows the Village to measure the amount of food scraps being collected rather than the estimated amount that is mixed with yardwaste.

The question most asked is if residents will be able to receive some of the finished compost. The Village worked with the Park District to obtain a location to dump a truck-load of compost. Participants were invited to "bring their bags and shovels" and take as much as they wanted. The free compost was advertised to program participants only. Waste Management provides finished compost that is offered to program participants in both the spring and fall.

Sign up for CompostAble

Food Scrap Composting Pilot Program

With the goal of decreasing the amount of organic refuse sent to landfills, the Village of Oak Park is offering a food scrap composting pilot program to residents throughout the community. Participants will receive a special mobile cart for organics that is comparable in volume to three bags or containers of yardwaste collected in the current program. Subscribers who use the organics cart for their yardwaste and food scraps will not be required to purchase yardwaste stickers.

Who Can Participate – The expanded program is available to single-family residences, up to and including five-flat households using Village refuse and recycling services. Organics carts will be delivered during the last two weeks in March. Organics pick-ups will begin on your regular collection day starting April 1. Return the card at the bottom of the page to sign up. Please be sure to include your email address for monthly program updates and event information.

How the Program Will Work – The program will be offered on a voluntary, subscription basis. The subscription cost will be \$14 per month, which is about the cost of one yardwaste sticker per week. Residents who maintain backyard compost piles or who mulch grass clippings may wish to investigate sharing organics carts and costs with neighbors.

Collection Plan – Residents who participate in the project will receive a 96-gallon cart for the weekly collection of organics, an under-sink collection bucket and a box of compostable bags for food scraps. Both yardwaste and food scraps may be placed in the organics cart. However, food scraps must be contained in a bag labeled *compostable* that meets ASTM 6400 standards.

Distribution of information by a community group in accordance with District 97 policy does not imply, directly or indirectly, that the group's program(s), event(s) and/or service(s) is sanctioned, sponsored or endorsed by the district, the Board of Education or the superintendent.



Beye School's lunchroom is 97 percent waste-free, owing in large part to this program!



Return the reply card to request your new compost container.

Be sure to note your local District 97 school so your sign-up can count toward the Heritage Oak contest. (See reverse for details.)

YES! I want to participate in the CompostAble pilot program.

I understand that \$14 per month will be added to my water bill.

Please deliver my organics cart to:

Homeowner

Address

Phone

E-mail

Local District 97 Elementary School

CompostAble: Questions & Answers

What is composting?

Composting is the process of organic waste decomposing into humus, a natural fertilizer. When the composting process is complete, the resulting material looks like deep rich soil and smells sweet.

What are the benefits of composting?

- Materials will be diverted from landfills
- Materials will create a valuable end product
- Since yardwaste and food scraps are high emitters of methane, a gas more potent than carbon dioxide, composting these materials reduces air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.



Help your school win a Heritage Oak tree

When you sign up for the CompostAble pilot program, be sure to include information about your local District 97 school. The school that recruits the most households into the program will receive a Heritage Oak tree planted on school grounds this fall.

Heritage Oaks are white oak trees grown from acorns collected in Oak Park. White oaks were common in the area prior to the arrival of European settlers, and a few white oaks from that era still thrive in the village. These majestic trees provide an important link to the past. For more information, contact Public Works at 708.358.5700 or email publicworks@oak-park.us.

Place
Stamp
Here

Village of Oak Park
Public Works Department
123 Madison Street
Oak Park, IL 60302

**Compost
Correctly**
Clip and Save

What can be collected in the CompostAble program?

Acceptable materials:

- **Yardwaste** (grass clippings, garden vegetation, leaves, brush)
- **Food Scraps** (meats, breads, vegetables, table scraps, dairy, coffee grounds, pasta)
- **Unsoiled or food-soiled paper products** (paper towels, paper bags, pizza boxes, napkins, paper cups, newspaper, paper food packaging)
- **Compostable plastic bags** that meet ASTM 6400 or ASTM 6868 standards

Items **NOT** acceptable Include:

- Plastics that do not meet ASTM 6400 & 6868 compostable standards
- Plastic packaging, bags and serving ware such as plates, cups and utensils
- Pet waste
- Sanitary products
- Diapers
- Dairy cartons



ESTIMATED FOOD SCRAP DIVERSION

Yardwaste tonnages are affected by weather such as rain which may increase tonnages or drought which may decrease tonnages. January Yardwaste figures are typically Christmas trees collected. The average January collection is 49.8 tons (before organics collections). Since food scraps are mixed with yardwaste in the program, it is difficult to estimate the amount of food scraps collected for most months.

Month	Total Tons Collected	Avg Before Food Scraps	Total estimated Food Scraps	Convert to Pounds	Divide by # HH	Divide by Wks per Month	Estimated pounds per HH per Wk
DEC 2014	32.10	4.33	27.77	55540	73.08	16.88	16.88
JAN 2015	75.30	49.84	25.46	50920	63.65	14.70	14.70
FEB 2015	13.10	0	13.10	26200	32.75	7.56	7.56
MAR 2015	28.70	0	28.70	57400	71.75	16.57	16.57
APR 2015	195.90	168.88	27.02	54040	67.55	15.60	15.60

The average tons of yardwaste collected is based on tonnage reports from 2004 to 2012 before the food scrap program was implemented.

The estimated pounds per household per week is calculated for the winter months of 2014 and 2015 from 760 households (Dec 2014) and 800 households (2015) participating in the Village-wide CompostAble Program.

April 2015 tonnage reports show that the estimated amount of food scraps is consistent with the estimated amount collected in winter months.

Many experts report that 1 gallon of foods scraps weighs 7 lbs. If the CompostAble kitchen pail (1.9 gal) were full, it would weigh approx. 13.3 lbs.

Attachment

2.

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE – DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

**CURBSIDE ORGANICS COLLECTION FROM RESIDENTS
PHASE 2 REPORT**



**BY: RANDI MAIL RECYCLING DIRECTOR AND
EVERETT HOFFMAN, ORGANICS PROGRAM ASSISTANT**

SUMMER 2015

Executive Summary

Background

The City of Cambridge has worked for nearly 10 years to increase diversion of food scraps (a.k.a. organics) from the waste stream in many ways: backyard compost bin education and sales, workshops on vermicomposting, establishment of compost pickup for businesses, public schools and public drop-off sites. In 2012, the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) awarded the City a 2 ½ year grant for \$73,304 through the Sustainable Materials Recovery Program to research, plan and possibly implement a pilot curbside food scraps collection program for residents. Phase one of the project was a feasibility study, which was completed in 2012 and in 2015, the City completed phase two of the project – a one year pilot program for curbside organics collection. Reports for both projects can be found online at CambridgeMA.Gov/CompostPickup.



FIGURE 1 CAMBRIDGE COMPOSTS LOGO

The City's motivations to pursue a curbside residential organics program were to reduce waste, curb climate emissions, control trash disposal costs, address rodent control, and meet public demands for compost services. Curbside organics is a key strategy to meet the City's goals to reduce trash by 30% by 2020 and 80% by 2050 over 2008 levels, aligning with the goals in the MA Solid Waste Master Plan. In terms of pounds (lbs) of trash per household (HH) per week the goals are 16 lbs/HH/wk by 2020 and 4 lbs/HH/wk by 2050. A 2011 Cambridge City Council resolution supported curbside composting and a public meeting was held.

The Cambridge Department of Public Works (DPW) ran implemented the one year curbside organics pilot from April 7, 2014 to March 30, 2015. Participating households will continue to receive curbside compost collection from a DPW crew through the fall 2015, at which time the service will be provided by a private hauler. The final results: 647 participating households in 424 residences diverted 85 tons or 170,000 lbs of organics from incineration and landfill. This avoided 76 tons of CO₂ emissions.

Pilot Overview

A specific area of the Monday collection route in North Cambridge was selected for the pilot because of its mix of housing and lack of access to existing food scrap drop off sites. The City's goal was to recruit 500-800 participating households. From fall 2013 to winter 2014, the City encouraged eligible households to sign up for the pilot via the monthly recycling e-newsletter, A frame signs in the neighborhood, info tables at key community locations, and a letter to families from the Cambridge Public Schools. Eligible residences included single family homes and multifamily buildings (MF) with up to 12 units with City trash service.

554 households signed up by the first collection day of the compost pilot, April 7, 2014. Participating households received a green kitchen container to collect food scraps and soiled paper, a year's supply of BioBags to line the kitchen container, a green curbside bin (to share at multi-family buildings), free collection on the normal collection day (same as recycling, yard waste and trash), a few requests during the pilot to answer online surveys, monthly email program updates, and finished compost great for gardens available at the Recycling Center, April-October.

Based on national estimates available of 8-12 lbs/HH/wk of organics, DPW estimated that households would generate 10 lbs/wk of organics. Before the pilot, the City collected and weight the trash from all participating residences and found 18.8 lbs/HH/wk. During the pilot, the average organics collected was 6.6 lbs/HH/wk reducing trash by nearly 35%. During a pre-pilot trash audit, 43% of the trash was organics at 7.4 lbs/HH/wk. This suggests an 89% capture rate of organics. The total truck weight averaged 3364 lbs and were brought to Rocky Hill Farm in Saugus, MA for composting.

DPW identified vendors for supplies and services, and developed or strengthened working relationships with all involved. BioBag USA donated the MaxAir kitchen containers and compostable bags, curbside green bins were purchased from Orbis Corporation (on MA state contract FAC87), SureClose donated some kitchen containers, education materials were printed by Sterling Printing and Classic Graphx, supplies were delivered to all participating residences by Delta Global, organics were composted by Rocky Hill Farm, and for part of the pilot load scales were used at Northgate Recycling. The Recycling Director designed all educational materials.

During the pilot, the City communicated regularly with participants to encourage best practices and issued six surveys, collecting demographic information and feedback on user experience. The program maintained a satisfaction rate of 95%. During each weekly collection, the Organics Program Assistant (OPA) monitored bins for fill level and contamination. Most bins were under 50% full and the organics stream was very clean with contamination being extremely uncommon. On average, 83% of all green bins were set out at the curb for weekly collection.

Program Expansion

Based on the success of the pilot, during FY16 budget planning the City decided to expand curbside compost pickup to all eligible residences in the Monday route in the fall 2015. The intent is to expand city wide within two years, and to 13+ unit multi-family buildings on a case-by-case basis in subsequent years. This decision was based a general feeling that the pilot was a success, given high satisfaction levels among participating households, the potential to reduce trash by up to 35%, and demonstrated impact on reduced climate emissions.

The City will initially contract for collection with a private hauler to achieve collection efficiencies needed, primarily for logistical reasons. Similar to the curbside yard waste contract, the hauler will be required to determine the compost processing facility. Once a citywide program is mature, the City will reevaluate whether DPW crews could be utilized. The City requested proposals from several haulers with appropriate experience.

The City hopes that participation will reach at least 40-60% of approximately 2,525 eligible residences in the Monday route, or 1010-1515 stops. The City estimates this program will divert 200-500 tons/year.

With the experience of the pilot and lessons from other communities with curbside organics programs, here are some best practices and learned for effective programs:

1. Provide supplies for free to make participating easy.
2. Aim to engage with as many buildings as possible, in person in the neighborhoods through door to door outreach is best. Internal household participation is secondary and staff energy can be better spent on engaging new buildings.
3. Collect email addresses of participants to communicate regularly.
4. Plan to eventually make participation mandatory, even without an enforcement mechanism.
5. Provide training programs to residents/building managers with incentive to receive supplies or rebates.
6. Conduct recurring outreach to large multi-family buildings. Target high turnover times of year to re-educate residents.
7. Engage landlords as primary point of contact in large multi-family buildings.
8. Involve children to bring message into the home and build cultural norms. Use high school students as volunteers.
9. Determine community policy and messaging for bags (compostable or plastic). Providing compostable bags for kitchen containers or strongly encouraging their use will minimize yuck factor and ensure high participation and diversion rates. Ventilated kitchen containers Wet anaerobic digestion facilities typically will screen out bags during processing.