

Issue:	An additional can results in cans in front of residences for half of the week unless there is a fundamental change to how we provide service.
Solution:	Instead of providing pickup for one can three days per week, provide pickup for three cans on the same day.
Pros:	<p>Aesthetics - Any given area of the city will only experience "can-clutter" on one day per week, instead of the current two times.</p> <p>City liability - Fewer times refuse truck drivers will need to avoid vehicles parked too close to cans.</p> <p>Resident participation - Residents won't have to remember to place cans out and retrieve them multiple times.</p> <p>Parking disruption - Street parking will only be disrupted once per week, instead of the current two times.</p>
Cons:	<p>Alley pickup service - Alleys are too narrow to accommodate refuse trucks and three cans per residence. Those using alleys will need to move cans to streets.</p> <p>Parking disruption - On one day per week, street parking will be limited in residential areas.</p> <p>Resident education - Residents will need to be diligent in maintaining space between cans and/or vehicles. Also, lack of street frontage may require creative solutions in cul-de-sacs.</p>

Issue:	In a one-day-pickup scenario, street parking will be limited due to number of cans on the street, particularly in cul-de-sacs.
Solution A:	Provide specific can placement instructions for residents living in cul-de-sacs. Instruction on removal of obstacles.
Pros:	<p>Ease of pickup - Refuse truck will be able to quickly maneuver to pickup properly placed cans free of obstacles.</p> <p>Fewer missed cans - Many cans must currently be left for future pickup due to poor placement/obstacles.</p>
Cons:	<p>More effort by residents - Ideal placement of cans in cul-de-sacs may require putting the can further away than the front of the residence.</p> <p>Voluntary participation - There is nothing compelling residents to place cans in ideal locations or remove obstacles.</p>
Solution B:	Institute fee system for picking up cans that could not be picked up during normal route due to improper placement or presence of obstacles.
Pros:	<p>Increased revenues - Useful to offset additional expense of unnecessary, repeat service to residents.</p> <p>Widespread participation by residents - Avoiding fees is something everyone wants to do.</p>
Cons:	<p>Additional administration - Staff would need to put more time into enforcement, tracking, and collection of fees.</p> <p>Unpopular - Avoiding fees is something everyone wants to do. Additionally, obstacles may not be placed by the resident affected.</p>

Issue:	Revenue may decrease as residents choose to substitute 90-gallon black cans to 60-gallon black cans at a lower rate.
Solution A:	Stop providing the option of a reduced rate for 60-gallon cans while still allowing the use of 60-gallon cans. Grandfather in those currently receiving the rate.
Pros:	Revenue integrity - Guaranteed to prevent revenue reduction as a result of the recycling program.
Cons:	Fewer alternatives - residents will have fewer choices for refuse pickup.
Solution B:	Allow for limited number of 60-gallon cans to be issued per year, creating a waiting list once that number is reached.
Pros:	Revenue integrity - Would limit revenue reduction as a result of the recycling program. Maintains options - Residents will still have the available use of a 60-gallon can.
Cons:	Limited revenue reduction - While revenue reduction will be relatively small, it will still negatively affect the budget.