

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF  
THE HAMILTON COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT  
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING  
May 17, 2007**

**DATE:** May 17, 2007

**TIME:** 9:30 a.m.

**PLACE:** Hamilton County Environmental Services  
250 William Howard Taft Road  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45219

**PRESENT:** **Policy Committee Members**

Tony DiPuccio, Generator Representative  
Bernie Fiedeldey, Township Representative, Vice Chair  
Tiffaney Hardy, Representative of Largest Municipality  
Dave Meyer, Public Member  
Todd Portune, County Commissioner, Chair  
Larry Riddle, Ex-Officio Member  
Glenn Welling, General Interest Member

**Staff**

Michelle Balz, Program Specialist  
Cory Chadwick, Director  
Holly Christmann, Solid Waste Program Manager  
Sarah Dowers, Public Affairs Coordinator  
Ali Khodadad, Operations Coordinator  
Sue Magness, Education Specialist  
Susan Schumacher, Administrative Secretary, Clerk  
Catherine Walsh, Education Assistant

**Others in Attendance**

Lisa Anderson, Hamilton County Budget & Strategic Initiative  
Kim Baker, Creative Outdoor Advertising  
Joseph Charlton, City of Cincinnati  
Chuck DeJonekheere, Hamilton County General Health District  
Gayla Epure, Resident  
Alice Kennedy, Resident  
Bruce Schmucker, Cornerstone Environmental Group  
Tony Thomas, CSI Waste  
Cindy Weitlauf, Hamilton County Budget & Strategic Initiative

**ABSENT:** **Policy Committee Members**

Tim Ingram, Hamilton County General Health District Representative

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Portune called the meeting to order at 9:40 am. Mr. Portune stated that he has been trying to bring attention to the computer recycling program which is open Monday – Friday, 8:00 am – 5:00 pm at Technology Recycling Group.

Mr. Portune asked Ms. Hardy if she had now officially been appointed to the Committee. Ms. Hardy stated yes. Mr. Portune congratulated Ms. Hardy.

**2. CLERK'S REPORT**

**A. Approval of Minutes – November 16, 2006, January 18, 2007 & March 15, 2007**

Mr. Portune suggested that the Committee vote on the minutes individually. Mr. Portune entertained a motion to approve the November 16, 2006 minutes. Mr. Fiedeldej moved; Mr. DiPuccio seconded. All were in favor and the motion was approved.

Mr. Portune entertained a motion to approve the January 18, 2007 minutes. Mr. Welling moved; Mr. Meyer seconded. All were in favor and the motion was approved.

Mr. Portune entertained a motion to approve the March 15, 2007 minutes. Ms. Hardy moved; Mr. Meyer seconded. All were in favor and the motion was approved.

**B. Additions to the Agenda**

There were no additions to the agenda at this time.

**3. DISTRICT REVENUE UPDATES/ANALYSIS**

Ms. Christmann stated that Attachment B of the Policy Packet included revenue comparisons from January through March of 2006 versus 2007. Revenue has increased roughly \$115,000 primarily from out-of-district waste.

Mr. Portune asked Mr. Riddle if this is looking to be a trend. Mr. Riddle stated that since March was so wet, a lot of bio-solids came in which was approximately 10,000 tons. The trend is leaning more towards out-of-district and he was not sure how long this trend would last.

Mr. Portune asked how this trend affected Mr. Riddle's predictions for the life of the landfill; is there a net increase in total tonnage? Mr. Riddle stated that in terms of annual tonnage, he did not see it increasing that much.

Mr. Portune entertained a motion to accept and approve the revenue update report. Mr. Welling moved; Mr. Fiedeldej seconded. All were in favor and the motion was approved.

**4. POLICY ITEMS**

**A. Creative Outdoor Advertising (COA)**

Ms. Christmann stated that at the November 16, 2006 Policy Committee meeting, the members were introduced to the Concourse which is a waste and recycling container typically placed in high traffic areas. COA services the containers at no cost to the municipality or township and the program is funded solely through the sale of advertising.

Ms. Christmann stated that after the November meeting, the Committee directed Staff to inform Hamilton County political jurisdictions about this program. After the November meeting, Ms. Baker, Mr. Portune, and herself met to discuss the possibility of the District contracting with COA versus COA contracting with individual municipalities.

COA believes that contracting with the District will expedite the implementation of this program. If a community does want the Concourse in their area, COA would have to meet the local ordinances and obtain the local government approval.

Since that meeting, Ms. Christmann stated that she forwarded COA's proposal to the Prosecutor's office for review. Ms. Chin of the Prosecutor's office informed Ms. Christmann that this is something the District could enter into and the Prosecutor's office would review the final COA contract.

Ms. Christmann stated that included in the Policy Packet was correspondence between Ms. Christmann and Ms. Baker as well as a sample COA contract.

Staff and Ms. Baker have met with the City of Norwood and the Village of Fairfax. Ms. Christmann stated that Commissioner Portune conducted a presentation to the City of Cincinnati's Economic Development Committee meeting.

Ms. Baker stated that the Concourse has had a very positive response from the community. As far as the District contracting with COA, Ms. Baker explained that it will expedite the process and gave examples.

Mr. Portune asked what the County's authority was to be the County-wide contracting agency than local jurisdictions and wondered what it would accomplish. Ms. Christmann stated that this was new ground for the District and stated that the HHW contract was set up similar in allowing communities to drop-off items under the District's contract. Mr. Portune

asked if, in essence, COA would become the District's contractor for communities to utilize the Concourse? Ms. Christmann stated yes.

A brief discussion ensued regarding other districts and their communities.

Ms. Hardy asked that for the municipalities who agreed to participate, would there be guidelines or standards set up so it would be consistent throughout the County? Ms. Christmann stated that the District would be promoting the concept of recycling and each community could "add on" as they preferred such as adding the newspaper corral which would not affect the contract.

Ms. Hardy asked if there were any other districts in Ohio that have the district-wide contracting. Ms. Baker stated that COA was currently working with the City of Toledo and Columbus.

Mr. Welling asked if one of the big variables was the content of the advertising? Ms. Baker stated that the contract was very strict regarding the advertising (i.e. no alcohol, no tobacco, etc.) and it would also be approved by the District and the individual community.

A brief discussion ensued regarding specifics of the contract.

Ms. Hardy asked who would claim the recycling tonnage? Ms. Christmann stated that the community could claim the tonnage.

Mr. Portune stated that the City Park Board was installing solar powered trash compactors in city parks and asked Ms. Baker if COA was looking into things of this nature. Ms. Baker stated that COA was constantly upgrading the Concourse.

Mr. DiPuccio stated that he did not think the District should endorse this and it seemed as though the Committee has moved from endorsing/promoting through a letter to Staff promoting this on a one on one basis to communities; and now the discussion has moved to a contracting mode.

Mr. DiPuccio stated that his disagreement had nothing to do with the product but does not think this is a step the District should be taking. Back in November, the District was not going to have to do anything and COA would secure contracts with communities. Mr. DiPuccio stated that now, the District is being asked to sign an exclusive contract with COA without any sort of competitive process and he is opposed to this.

Mr. Portune stated that he respected Mr. DiPuccio's comments and from a competitive bidding standpoint, he thinks that is an issue that the Prosecutor's office would have to answer for the Committee.

Mr. Portune stated that Staff has followed through on what the Committee recommended in November and there has been interest expressed by a few communities. Mr. Portune stated that the District's responsibility was to promote recycling and to introduce new options to the public about recycling and he believed the Concourse was consistent with the mission of the District. Anything the Committee can do to make it easier to recycle or further educate is not an undue burden to the District, it is a legitimate activity for the Committee.

Mr. Portune stated that as long as the District receives Prosecutor approval to enter into a contract with COA or to move forward with a competitive bidding process where COA ends up being the selected vendor, then this is appropriate for the District to do.

Mr. Riddle stated that Mr. DiPuccio's point is well taken but he would be more concerned if public funds were involved but the COA contract is a service contract. Mr. DiPuccio stated that public funds are being expended in terms of Staff time, Staff resources, etc. and gave examples.

Mr. DiPuccio stated that he did not see this as an advantage to anyone but COA because it eliminates the need for them to meet with each interested community and this was not the original approach of this proposal. Mr. DiPuccio stated that negotiating with each community is not an insignificant effort and now Staff is putting themselves in the center of that.

Mr. Portune stated that he would be more concerned with the issue of the expenditure of Staff time if he felt that Staff was going to get involved in 48 different contract negotiations.

Mr. Portune stated that the way he understood the process would be as follows: Assuming we can negotiate with this vendor or some other vendor which will depend on whether we need a competitive process or not, whether the selected is COA or someone else. We would then negotiate, as we saw it a "one size fits all" contract that would be a service that the District would make available to the 48 political subdivisions of Hamilton County. It would then be the free choice and will of the 48 boards of township trustees or village councils to decide whether they want to have that service as we are making it available to them or not. It is completely their choice; they would have the choice to go with and pursue some other vendor if they like. Frankly, they would have the choice to approach COA and say that they like their service but do not like the

contract and want to negotiate a separate contract. If COA was willing to entertain that, that would all be on their dime and their expense and their doing. It would not be the District negotiating all of those contracts individually.

Mr. Portune stated that where he comes down with support of this is that yes, originally it was up to the jurisdictions and the immediate response or lack of response suggests that people felt it may be burdensome and there are a lot of smaller communities that simply do not have the staff or the resources to engage in that kind of activity. Mr. Portune stated that he thinks that the District is making it easier to promote recycling county-wide by offering this service. Mr. Portune stated that it is to COA's advantage or any vendor's advantage who would be a part of this program but simply making it easier for them and making it easier for other jurisdictions in the County does not mean that the District does not benefit. By making it simple for everybody, the District then makes it more likely that people would be able to consider doing this and if they do, then the District benefits in having promoted recycling County-wide.

Mr. Portune stated that he does think there is benefit that goes all the way around for everyone and it is a shared benefit.

Ms. Christmann stated that Staff is meeting with the City of Cincinnati next week to follow up with the Council Committee meeting to find out how interested they are.

Mr. Welling asked when the Staff Recommendation was developed, was additional Staff time that will be required taken into consideration? Ms. Christmann stated that she didn't see it as being that much and that when herself and Ms. Baker met with a couple of communities, she opted to attend because the District does have a close relationship with those communities.

Mr. Portune stated that he saw this as being part of the duty and responsibility of Staff anyway in terms of reaching out to communities and encouraging new efforts and activities as it relates to recycling and other components of the mission of the District. He agrees with Ms. Christmann that it will not be that much time, because the District will not be negotiating 48 different contracts. The District is saying that this service is available and here are the terms; just let us know if you want to do it.

Ms. Hardy stated that as the representative of the largest municipality, she thinks it would be something great for the City and is not sure about the interest level of the actual implementation of it but currently curbside recycling is not offered downtown. The Concourse would allow the City

to continue to market their recycling program and increase their recycling program in efforts to increase their residential recycling incentive grant.

Ms. Hardy asked Ms. Baker if COA has done any market analysis to see the increase in recycling rates, advertising, etc. Ms. Hardy asked Ms. Baker basically, how will COA “sell” this idea to communities. Ms. Baker stated that in the contract, there is a weekly maintenance requirement section that is required which is a benefit. Ms. Baker stated that as far as marketing and the advertising goes, local businesses are the focus which means that the business is the sponsor of the site. This way, the business can take ownership in the entire program and other communities have told her that this works.

Mr. Portune asked if the revenue from the advertising is shared with the local jurisdiction and gave an example of regular bench billboard advertising. Ms. Baker stated yes.

Ms. Hardy asked Ms. Baker if COA had a local staff that would be located in the Greater Cincinnati area. Ms. Baker stated yes and gave examples of the maintenance requirements and also gave examples of how the whole operation worked.

Mr. DiPuccio asked what the contract negotiations status was with Metro. Ms. Christmann stated that COA and the District were working with Metro to help identify potential locations and an initial list of approximately 35 locations had been identified. Mr. Portune stated that Metro did not have legal authority to just place benches anywhere. Mr. DiPuccio stated that this was a misunderstanding on his part. A brief discussion ensued regarding Metro’s involvement with the project.

Mr. DiPuccio stated that he disagreed with Mr. Riddle regarding the fact that this was a service and therefore not subject to competitive bids; it’s a service as in servicing a fleet of vehicles and he did not see any difference in that. Mr. DiPuccio stated that the focus was advertising and that was their business. Mr. DiPuccio gave an example using the City of Cincinnati putting out a request for bids for trash containers for the streets and asked what if the City wanted something else that was not included in the District’s contract. Mr. Portune stated that it was entirely up to the individual jurisdiction.

Mr. DiPuccio stated that he would prefer an approach of, rather the District signing a contract, the District come with a model contract for communities to use as a basis to shape their individual contracts with COA and reiterated his disapproval.

Mr. Portune stated that regarding the issue of competitive bidding, he is not sure if Mr. DiPuccio is right or wrong; the Prosecutor needs to make that decision. Mr. Portune stated that the Committee was not making that decision today nor is the Committee moving forward and inking a contract without regard to competitive bidding requirements.

Mr. Portune stated that what he thought would end up happening is, assuming all the questions are answered, and the District negotiates a contract and the County signs it, it then becomes a service or program that is available through the District to all 48 municipalities.

Mr. Portune stated that as with any other program the District offers, communities can take it or leave it and gave examples.

Mr. Riddle stated that what he was hearing Mr. DiPuccio saying was that he supports the program but is concerned about the legalities of the contract, bidding, etc. Mr. Riddle suggested that while the Prosecutor is reviewing the question, could Staff come back with another recommendation that basically provides support from the District without a contractual relationship to the District yet encourages communities to do exactly what the contract says as an alternative to having a contract.

Mr. Portune stated that he appreciated the effort of compromise but he would not recommend it because he did not see that as being any different from what the District was planning on doing anyway. Mr. Portune reiterated his earlier discussion regarding what Staff was going to do.

A brief discussion ensued regarding what should be included in the contract.

Mr. Portune stated that the Committee was discussing to decide, as a matter of policy, if they wanted to make this service available District-wide under a contract through the District. If this is the case, then the matter will be referred to the Prosecutor's office for the purpose of deciding whether a competitive process is needed and if so, for the purpose of assisting the District in developing the request for proposals and if not, for the purpose of moving forward and negotiating the terms and conditions of such a contract with COA subject to approval by the Board.

Mr. Portune stated that if anyone wanted to make a motion, the above would be included.

Mr. DiPuccio stated that he did not think the District should be a contracting party to this for which his reasons had previously been stated. With the final reason being that the District is the contracting party and if

Colerain Township takes advantage of “our contract” and COA is not complying with the provision of that contract, Colerain Township would not be a party to that contract so they would have no right to do anything; the District then becomes the party who would have take care of enforcing that contract and he does not think this should be a role the District should be playing.

Mr. DiPuccio stated that regarding the competitive bidding issue, his feeling is that even if the Prosecutor’s Office finds a provision that states that the District does not have to do it that way, he thinks the District should take that approach; maybe not on a competitive bid basis but a letter of interest to see what else is out there and there might be other firms or organizations that offer the same type of proposal.

Mr. Fiedeldey stated that normally the Concourse is placed in public right-of-way’s and there may be existing benches already there and wondered how COA would address this. Ms. Baker stated that it would depend on the municipalities permitting program and gave examples from Toledo.

Mr. Charlton stated that the Department of Purchasing has already been in discussions with COA in regards to their proposal per the direction of City Council and there will be another meeting shortly.

Mr. Portune stated that he recommends that the Committee move forward along the lines that he previously outlined and would entertain a motion to that effect. Mr. Welling moved to authorize the District to enter into contractual negotiations because he thinks that it furthers the mission of the District providing an incentive and valuable service to increase recycling and it is an appropriate course of action if, in fact, the legal review comes back that states that the District is on solid ground with respect to the competitive status of the contract. Mr. Meyer seconded.

Mr. Fiedeldey asked if the Committee was putting the cart before the horse. Mr. Portune stated no and that the Committee is asking legal for the report. The Committee is basically saying that we want to move in this direction and we are asking the Prosecutor as follows: a) to answer the question of whether we are required to put this out for bid or not. If we are required to put it out for bid to move forward in concert with the District in developing a request for proposals and b) if we do not need to put it out for bid, to then move forward in concert with the District for the purpose of negotiating terms and conditions of a contract between the District and COA subject to further debate, deliberation and approval by the Board.

Mr. Fiedeldey asked if included in the contract would be “subject to the local jurisdictions approval” Mr. Portune stated obviously and he would think to the point of what Mr. DiPuccio made regarding who enforces and

that sort of thing clearly is a matter of contract law in local jurisdictions are what are deemed in contract law third party beneficiaries of the contract and he would think that a contract would be written to a third section of the local jurisdiction would have full right and authority of enforcement of the terms and conditions of the contract. Anywhere that service was provided, that jurisdiction would have the authority to enforce the contract and take action for breach to do any of those sort of things.

Mr. Fiedeldey stated that if they modified the contract then they would be the ones signing the contract. Mr. Portune stated that was correct and that they would be the direct party to it.

Mr. Welling stated that he would like to amend his motion to include Mr. DiPuccio's recommendation of even if legal comes back and says that we are on solid ground with respect to the sole provider, he thinks it is in our interest to open that letter of intent as well just to make sure we are on solid ground.

Mr. Portune stated that if he understood it correctly then Mr. Welling was asking, as an amendment to the motion, is also asking Staff to solicit whether there is interest by other vendors. Mr. Welling stated that even if legal comes back and says that it is not required. Mr. Portune asked Mr. Welling if he meant that he would put it out to a bidding process regardless. Mr. Welling stated that he did not think this solely is a bidding process, Mr. DiPuccio was talking about just a letter of interest to see if there were other options for a similar type of service.

Mr. Chadwick stated that Environmental Services just went through this process looking for a toxicologist. Environmental Services sent a letter of interest and invited all vendors in and spent many, many meetings with them and in the end, Environmental Services only had one vendor who made a bid and actually that was a rebid because no one bid the first time. Just by going out to get a letter of intent to see if they are really interested does not guarantee that you can find anyone else that would be interested.

Mr. DiPuccio stated that Mr. Chadwick did get a good sense of as to the capabilities that were out there and it probably helped down the road in the process in this case ultimately negotiating to find the one even know you did not get a competitive bid in from more than one person. Mr. Chadwick stated that additional information was obtained that helped finalize the contract.

Mr. Portune asked Mr. Welling if he was proposing an amendment to the original motion. Mr. Welling stated yes. Mr. Portune asked if there was a second to the amendment. Mr. Meyer seconded.

Mr. Fiedeldey asked if Mr. Portune would restate the motion and amendment. Mr. Portune stated that Mr. Welling has moved that for the purpose of promoting the mission of the Hamilton County Solid Waste District in the area of litter prevention and recycling that the Policy Committee refer to the Hamilton County Prosecutor the proposed program of contracting, District-wide, with a vendor of bench billboards that include an interval part and a component part of the bench billboard containers for recyclables in addition to municipal solid waste as proposed by the vendor, Creative Outdoor Advertising, and that such program be available to every member of the District that the Prosecutor first, answer the question of whether such a program that contemplates a contract with a vendor requires such to be competitively bid by the District and if so, to then work with the District for the purpose of creating the terms and conditions of a formal request for proposals that will then be issued by the District. If competitive bidding is not required, that the Prosecutor's Office working in conjunction with the District and with the vendor, Creative Outdoor Advertising, negotiates terms and conditions of a contract to be entered into by and between the District and COA covering the District that would in turn be made available to all members of the District.

Mr. Portune stated that this was the original motion. Mr. Portune stated that the Committee did not have a vote on that motion and while that motion was on the table, we had an amendment that was offered and seconded. Mr. Portune stated that the amendment was "during such time as the Prosecutor's Office is responding to the original elements of the motion that Staff for the Hamilton County Solid Waste Management District develop an issue, a letter of interest, to be disseminated publicly and to potential vendors of the same or similar product to determine whether interest exists beyond Creative Outdoor Advertising to provide such a service to Hamilton County.

Mr. Portune stated that this amended motion was seconded and as a matter of procedure, what is on the table first whether the Committee amend the original motion with that amendment. Mr. Portune stated that the Committee would first have a role call vote on the amendment and that will either pass or fail and depending on if that passes or fails, the Committee will then have a vote on either the original motion without the amendment or the original motion with the amendment.

The role call vote took place as follows: Mr. Welling – Aye, Mr. Meyer, Aye, Ms. Hardy – Aye, Mr. Fiedeldey – Aye, Mr. Portune – Aye, Mr. DiPuccio – Aye

Mr. Portune stated that now the Committee would have a role call vote on the motion as amended: Mr. Welling – Aye, Mr. Meyer, Aye, Ms. Hardy – Aye, Mr. Fiedeldey – Aye, Mr. Portune – Aye, Mr. DiPuccio – Nay

Mr. Portune thanked Ms. Baker.

**B. 2008 District Priority Grant**

Ms. Christmann stated that each year, Staff brings to the Policy Committee meeting recommendations on solid waste issues that will be identified for the District's Priority Grant. This year the grant applications will be going out in the summer to communities and non-profits. Staff has identified three issues outlined in the Manager's Memo which are: recycling outreach, public recycling, and organics.

Ms. Christmann gave examples of each grant opportunity for which Staff would like to see applications.

Ms. Hardy asked Ms. Christmann about the timeline for the grants. Ms. Christmann stated the applications will go out in August, due to the District by the end of September, be approved by the Policy Committee in November, and grant funds will then be available January 1.

A brief discussion ensued regarding specifics of the grant program.

Mr. Portune entertained a motion to approve the Staff Recommendation for the 2008 District Priority Grants. Ms. Hardy moved; Mr. Fiedeldej seconded. All were in favor and the motion was approved.

**C. Plan for Balanced Budget**

Mr. Portune stated that in the past there was a range of carry-over balances that the Committee discussed and the Staff Recommendation of the minimum balance to rely upon is appropriate given the range that the Committee discussed.

Mr. Portune stated the Committee could continue to debate the specifics but the recommendation is in line with the conversation the Committee had and appropriate fiscal policy given the revenue source of the District and the impact a potential interference could have on the revenue source. The target of getting into balance by 2010 is aggressive enough to show fiscal responsibility by the District but not so aggressive that it will harm or impact the programs or services the District provides.

Mr. DiPuccio asked if in 2010 the District's carry-over balance would be approximately \$2.2 million. Ms. Christmann stated yes.

Mr. Portune stated that he would entertain a motion to approve the recommendation for a target of a balanced budget by 2010 with a minimum carry-over balance equal to eight months operating costs or by

January 1, 2011 of approximately \$2.2 million. Mr. DiPuccio moved; Mr. Welling seconded. All were in favor and the motion was approved.

**D. Grant Opportunities for District Programs**

Ms. Christmann stated that in looking for ways to balance the budget, Staff is researching grant opportunities for District programs. Attachment F of the Policy Packet includes a list of grants for which the District is eligible.

Ms. Christmann stated that Staff has been working with Cindy Weitlauf who is the Grants Coordinator for Hamilton County. Ms. Weitlauf stated that regarding the priorities, U.S. EPA, Department of Agriculture, Department of Energy, and Ohio Department of Natural Resources may be a good starting point.

Mr. Portune thanked Ms. Weitlauf for assisting the District in seeking out grants.

Mr. Portune suggested that Staff and the County Grants Coordinator move forward in pursuing potential grant opportunities and he would entrust the discretion of Ms. Weitlauf with respect to prioritization.

Mr. DiPuccio thanked Mr. Portune for making Ms. Weitlauf available for the Committee.

Mr. DiPuccio stated that he liked the idea of Staff being involved with Ms. Weitlauf as the coordinator because it insures other County departments will not be competing against the same grant.

Mr. DiPuccio stated that he had a concern about applying with not-for-profit agencies and that their mission statement should be looked at to ensure they are in line with the District's. Ms. Weitlauf stated that the problem with going through a foundation is sometimes they will not give to a local government. Mr. DiPuccio asked if the District was classified as a local government. Ms. Weitlauf stated that it depended on where one applies and the foundation would be contacted prior to applying.

Mr. Portune stated that to approve this Policy item, he would ask to approve the policy of working in a collaborative fashion with the Hamilton County Grant Coordinator for the purpose of identifying grant opportunities in pursuing funds pursuant to those grants that would benefit the work of the District. Mr. Welling moved; Mr. Fiedeldej seconded. All were in favor and the motion was approved.

**5. INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

The Policy Committee accepted the information/discussion items as written in the Manager's Memo.

**6. TENTATIVE FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

- Update on the Emerald Ash Borer
- Wood Waste Project

**7. POLICY COMMITTEE MEMBERS' COMMENTS**

Ms. Hardy stated that the City Manager recently announced that Andrew Glenn was appointed to the position of Department of Public Services Director. Ms. Hardy gave brief background information about Mr. Glenn and hoped he could attend the next meeting and meet Staff and the Committee.

Mr. DiPuccio asked if the City was going to reinstitute the Office of Environmental Services and if so, were they looking for someone to head it up? Ms. Hardy stated that the Office has been established and currently, the City is looking for a director.

**8. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments at this time.

**9. UPCOMING DISTRICT MEETINGS**

The next regularly scheduled Policy Committee meeting will be **Thursday, July 19, 2007 at 9:30 am** at Hamilton County Environmental Services.

**10. ADJOURNMENT (Target Time – 11:00 am)**

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 11:06 am.