# **Refuse Working Group**

#### **Co-Chairs** Supervisor Aaron Peskin Andres Power, Policy Director for Mayor London Breed



#### **CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

Office of the Controller

12.14.2021

# Today's Agenda

- 1. Welcome & Introductions
- 2. Co-Chair Remarks
- 3. Current Residential Refuse Rate Setting Issues
- 4. Proposed Improvements
- 5. Group Discussion and Public Comment
- 6. Next Steps

#### Introductions

# Working Group Introductions

Briefly state your name and organization

# **Co-Chairs Remarks**

- 4
- Our initial goal for this work was to conduct in-depth research on three models for provision of residential refuse service
  - 1. Adjustments to current system
  - 2. Municipalization
  - 3. Contracting out
- Internal discussions concluded that more time would be required to really understand feasibility of #2 and #3
- The urgency of addressing current issues has led us to proposing changes to the current rate setting and monitoring process, while also creating a mechanism to make further changes as determined

## **Goals & Key Questions**

- Accountability & Transparency: How transparent and accountable to the public are the processes managing rate setting?
- Quality of Service: Is service cost-effective and does it meet established environmental and performance standards?
- Residential Rates: Are customers paying appropriate and fair rates for residential refuse services?

#### **Current Refuse System & Issues**

6

**Residential Rate Setting Process:** Refuse provider submits new rate application as needed. Department of Public Works manages rate review and approval process. Rate Payer Advocate contracted for the rate process.

- Timeframe of rates may be too long to correctly estimate costs
- Ad hoc nature does not allow for City staff to build expertise
- Rate calculations are complicated, not transparent, and need improved methodology to ensure accuracy
- The Rate Payer Advocate has limited power and expertise, and has historically functioned in a more informational role
- While the rate setting process has several public touchpoints, it lacks real transparency for rate payers

#### **Current Refuse System & Issues**

7

**Ongoing Monitoring of Residential Rates:** The residential refuse service provider submits quarterly reports to Public Works.

- No annual monitoring of refuse collection expenses and revenues is conducted to ensure residential rates meet agreed upon standards
- Lack of independent audits has led to low public confidence that rates are accurate and appropriate
- Little monitoring of performance standards occurs, including environmental and customer service goals
- Rate Board is not involved in ongoing monitoring outside of rate setting process
- The structure of the 1932 Refuse Ordinance has limited the City's ability to make changes to the system when issues are identified

#### **Proposed Refuse System**

# Establish Refuse Rate Administrator and Group within the Controller's Office

- The Controller is established as the Refuse Rate Administrator
- A refuse rate group within the Controller's Office is created to administer the rate setting process and propose rates to the Rate Board.
- The group is also responsible for ongoing financial and performance monitoring of residential refuse provider, with periodic hearings at the Rate Board.

#### **Proposed Refuse System**

# Modify Rate Board Membership & Role

- Remove Controller from the Rate Board to remove any real or perceived conflicts of interest stemming from their oversight of the Rate Administrator.
- Add a Ratepayer Advocate in appointed position. Ratepayer Advocate recommended by TURN (or its successor agency).
- Conduct annual independent financial audit of regulated revenues and expenses for Rate Board's review. Performed by an auditor selected by Rate Board.
- Oversee ongoing financial and performance monitoring of the residential refuse provider, with at least four public hearings at the Rate Board per year.

#### **Proposed Refuse System**

# Improve the Rate Setting Process

- Full rate setting process is run at frequency determined by the Rate Board, between two and five years.
- The Rate Administrator proposes rates to the Rate Board, and Rate Board action is required.
- The Rate Administrator works with the residential refuse provider, the Department of Streets & Sanitation, and the Department of Environment to develop and review proposed rates.
- The Streets & Sanitation Commission and Environment Commission must hold public hearings and provide recommendations as part of this process.
- The Rate Board is encouraged to establish a balancing account, along with a process to annually review and reconcile budgeted versus actual costs and revenues.

11

## **Principles of the Ballot Measure**

- Service shall be cost-effective, meet established service standards, and rates shall be reasonable and fair.
- Service model shall further the City's environmental goals.
- Rate structure shall encourage rate stability and accountability, and rates may employ a balancing account, a rate stabilization fund, and/or other features that further this purpose.
- The process used to establish and monitor rates shall be transparent and publicly-accessible.
- The work of the Rate Board and the Administrator shall be conducted in line with high professional ethical standards. The Rate Board shall adopt and adhere to a code of conduct, including limitations on ex parte communications during the rate setting process.

# **Overview of Ballot Measure**

- Establishes Controller as Refuse Rate Administrator and requires regular monitoring of expenses, revenues, and rates as well as recommendations to the Refuse Rate Board on proposed rate adjustments
- Appoints a Rate Payer Advocate to serve on the Rate Board in lieu of the Controller
- Authorizes certain amendments to the Ordinance upon recommendation of the Refuse Rate Administrator and with the approval of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor, which could include:
  - Regulation of commercial rates
  - Ensuring that the ordinance remains current

## **Questions & Feedback**

# **Group Discussion Questions**

- What components of this do you like?
- What is missing? What haven't we considered?
- Are there components that raise concerns?

Public Comment (limited to 2 minutes)

# Thank you.

# Further questions and comments?

You can reach out to Natasha Mihal (natasha.mihal@sfgov.org) and/or Glynis Startz (glynis.l.startz@sfgov.org)