

From: [mimi farber](#)
To: [Finance Committee](#)
Subject: \$45 fee for
Date: Sunday, April 10, 2022 4:46:00 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Pickup of recycling containers. I vote no.
Taxes high enough.
Hard on fixed income folks. Inequitable due to range of real estate values. Have
\$6,000+ bill to pay off from costly city street construction in 2021.
Educate citizens on what goes in recycle cans. Consider other options. Thank you.
Mimi Farber
146 Jackson St.
53704
Sent from my iPhone

From: [Beth Sluys](#)
To: [Abbas, Syed](#); [Myadze, Charles](#); [Finance Committee](#)
Subject: Agenda Item 24, Finance Committee
Date: Sunday, April 10, 2022 8:27:38 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear President Abbas, Alder Myadze and Finance Committee:

Years of experience have shown that to encourage more recycling you have to decrease the amount of waste in the garbage can.

Fitchburg uses a Pay as you throw program and has increased their recycling and people pay for the volume of trash that they toss out. It is so much more fair than a flat user fee and it encourages people to reduce trash and increase their recycling.

https://www.waste360.com/Collections_And_Transfer/payt-recycling-economic-benefits-201103

<https://www.governing.com/gov-institute/voices/col-pay-as-you-throw-higher-recycling-rates.html>

If we truly want to be sustainable, work on reducing trash rather than continuing to build unwanted landfills, and to motivate people to recycle, we need to generate less trash and increase recycling. PAYT programs do this very thing!

Recycling fees will only create more garbage, as people will be less willing to recycle and just get rid of their recyclables in their garbage cans. Here we are building a new landfill at a golf course. Why not put those dollars towards creating a PAYT program in Madison?

Please vote NO on the recycling fee and consider more effective waste reduction policies.

Thank you,

Beth Sluys
District 18

From: [Marylu Green](#)
To: [Finance Committee](#)
Subject: Another city fee-- this time for recycling
Date: Saturday, April 9, 2022 10:43:03 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Some of us are seniors on fixed incomes. And as home owners we are already paying A LOT in taxes. Last year it was the city "wheel tax" and now the city has come up with another possible fee. REALLY!

Please do not impose this additional fee.

Thank you.

Marylu Green

From: [Tracy Doreen](#)
To: [All Alders](#); [Finance Committee](#)
Subject: Finance 24. 70344 - Create a Resource Recovery Special Charge.
Date: Monday, April 11, 2022 3:28:04 AM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Finance Committee and Madison City Alders,

If I wasn't told by friends I would never have guessed that this proposed Special Charge is designed to be a fee for recycling collection. I'm very disappointed that this fee is being proposed without full **community** discussion first. Let's discuss why recycling is costing the city more than it can cover through taxes and also discover from the wealth of thoughtful sifting and winnowing of this great university town other possible solutions. Why instead have you chosen this top down approach? Has this fee already been deemed a done deal?

I have lived in Madison long enough to pay property taxes in total over the years an amount more than double the cost of what I paid for my house. I have told people for many years that while we have some of the highest taxes in the country, at least our leaders have had the wisdom to include basic services without added fees. Perhaps you are needing some counsel from citizens to not lose that wisdom.

Please consider that in adding fees without taking the opportunity to engage in rigorous discussion with community, you may well miss more effective alternatives to this proposal.

Consider the questions below you have on the masthead of each agenda and a few answers and additional questions I have in response to these questions:

Who benefits? - Well for now the city budget, but long term, perhaps not. Could there be an idea that in the long term will be a greater benefit?

Who is burdened?

People on fixed incomes struggling to remain in their beloved community, people who reuse, upcycle and do not buy single use plastics or who do not create waste. Will they pay the same as someone who clogs up recycling with wisheycling?

Who does not have a voice at the table?

When you are not transparent about charging a fee for recycling, many, many people will be caught unaware and not have a chance to voice concerns. It is worth asking everyone to have a seat at the table to be sure the smartest people to deal with the complexities of this issue really are in the room.

How can policymakers mitigate unintended consequences?

Educate, Listen and Consider what alternatives there might be that will REDUCE the cost of recycling and the amount of recycling and trash we produce as a community? What other options are there? Have you looked at the research UW is doing in plastic upcycling? <https://engineering.wisc.edu/news/huber-to-lead-new-multi-university-plastic-recycling-research-center/>

Will the proposed fees be used at least in part to help fund a facility that will be at the

forefront in plastic up cycling? Have you considered partnering with the university and surrounding communities to help make this happen? Have you considered helping fund recycling more than just the few things Waste Management can make a profit with? Such as in this article about mask recycling https://www.wkow.com/news/researchers-at-uw-madison-work-to-recycle-masks/article_fac6ed6-98f5-11ec-aecf-2b24e9243674.html

Have you considered that if people just pay a fee for recycling they may generate more trash and recycling mix and mess, that which costs the city more and takes up more space in the landfill? If the fee is to be used to do what is already being done in the same old way, many may be angry.

I trust you have thought a lot about how you can raise finances to cover the cost of recycling. But in the long run this does not deal with the true scope of the problem - which is more than financial. Please consider investigating deeper and engage with the entire community so we can “sort” out truly efficient and cost conscious solutions.

I urge you NOT to ask for a fee at this time. Step back, get the community involved in the solution.

Respectfully,
Tracy Doreen Dietzel
Madison

From: [Richard Soletski](#)
To: [Finance Committee](#)
Subject: Fw: Recycling tax - under consideration by the Finance Committee and City Council
Date: Monday, April 11, 2022 12:10:24 AM
Importance: High

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

From: Richard Soletski
Sent: Monday, April 11, 2022 12:05 AM
To: allalders@cityofmadison.com <allalders@cityofmadison.com>; mayor@cityofmadison.com <mayor@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Recycling tax - under consideration by the Finance Committee and City Council

Honorable Mayor and City Council:

I am opposed to the proposed recycling tax and ask the Finance Committee and City Council to reject this tax. Yes, it's a TAX. To call it a user fee, or cost recovery mechanism or any other attempt to disguise this tax is an insult to the intelligence of Madison taxpayers.

If the recycling program is not a basic service, but a nicety, let us know. Release the mandatory requirement and let those willing to pay another tax keep their green bins and participate and be billed.

If it is a basic service and a requirement to recycle, then it should be covered by our already high property taxes. By the way, my household recycles religiously.

If you are looking for opportunities to tax people who use services but don't pay for them, the elephant in the room is the tens of thousands of bicyclists who pay nothing for the extra lanes, dedicated paths and use the streets which are maintained, marked for them and plowed (paths whisk-broomed before streets are touched).

Another opportunity would be an admission charge to go to the public market when it opens. If it is such an attraction, a good portion of the customers will be non-city residents and this will be a chance to recoup some of the costs. And city residents who chose to go can pay for the privilege. The same applies to the Garver Feed Mill complex.

Or how about a \$7 or \$8 fare for the rapid transit buses. That would be a bargain for a fast trip downtown, and the people from Sun Prairie or Verona would pay their share over city residents who do not use the service.

Do you see where balkanization of taxing gets you?

Finally, you know very well that this is a shell game. When you raise this tax, you won't lower our other taxes. It will backfill other city spending. Much like you did with the wheel tax when the council and mayor did not want to do the hard work to make revenues balance spending. Instead, raise a new tax dedicated to transportation, and take that money to spend on something else.

When I testified against the wheel tax when it was slammed through in weeks from introduction to approval, Mark Clear, the author of the "forestry tax" which was sold as a response to extra emerald ash borer expenses admitted it. It was a shell game, take money that was appropriated for the forestry program and replace it with the new tax money and have a new pot of money to evade levy

limits.

And taking popular programs, like recycling and trees, are the cover for raising taxes and spending.
A classic disrespectful ploy.

The mayor benefits from the media doing a miserable job of covering this issue at budget time, and since the introduction in March. The Airforce may be interested in her stealth expertise for their F35 program.

Rick Soletski

3322 Quincy Av

Madison

From: [DOLORES KESTER](#)
To: [Finance Committee](#)
Cc: [Abbas, Syed](#)
Subject: Meeting April 11, 2022 Agenda Item #70344 --added fee for recycling
Date: Sunday, April 10, 2022 6:51:37 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Greetings to Finance Committee:

I have learned that a proposal is being considered at city hall to assess a new fee on Madison residents for recycling. Recycling is a basic city service, like trash pickup, there should not be any new fees on this! It would hit all of us at a bad time with the cost of groceries and fuel costs going up, but it would hit families on fixed or lower incomes the hardest. This would be a regressive tax and I and many others oppose this because of its basic lack of fairness. Please desist from further consideration of this oppressive recycling fee.

**Thank you for your time and attention,
Dolores Kester
1818 Winchester ST
Aldermanic District 12**

From: [Susan Pastor](#)
To: [Finance Committee](#)
Cc: [All Alders](#)
Subject: Oppose Item 24 Resource Recovery Special Charge
Date: Monday, April 11, 2022 11:03:17 AM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Finance Committee Members,

Thank you for your work in service to city residents. I'm writing about item 24, the resolution creating a resource recovery special fee for recycling.

When I heard about this proposal over the weekend, I searched local media to see if there had been any coverage. I could not find any. The city has already imposed a wheel tax, and while some have argued that the tax is not regressive, I am not convinced by those arguments. When people have less disposable income, any increased tax/fee takes a bigger bite than for higher income folks.

This seems another such regressive measure, having a stronger impact on lower income residents, especially at a time when people are concerned about the rising costs of food and fuel.

It's difficult to tell from the text whether the city believes there is any reasonable limit to what the fee could be. The text states that it is reasonable that all or a portion of the costs be recovered — however, the city exists to provide services. This proposal creates the impression that people are here to serve the city, rather than the other way around. I do not believe it is reasonable for the city to “recover” all the costs of a service they are supposed to be providing directly from the people receiving that service, who are already paying property taxes.

Small scale landlords will pass this cost on to renters, further driving up housing costs - and people have already signed leases for the coming year beginning August 15, and those small scale landlords have had no opportunity to figure this in. This seems especially detrimental to small scale landlords who are providing naturally occurring affordable housing. Will property owners be able to opt out and contract for their own services?

Whether a fee is warranted deserves vigorous debate, and if a fee is warranted, there must be clear limits on what it could be - not a blank check.

Thank you for reading this,
Sue

Susan K. Pastor
2502 Green Ridge Dr.

Sent from my iPad

From: [Linda Lucey](#)
To: [Finance Committee](#)
Subject: proposed \$45 curbside recycling special charge
Date: Monday, April 11, 2022 7:49:28 AM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Hello. I am opposed to the proposed \$45 curbside recycling special charge. I'm not opposed to paying taxes, but our taxes are quite high as it is. Has the city looked at other ways to reduce costs associated with the program? I think this "special charge" may reduce costs but only because some people won't recycle anymore. I don't want to see that.

Linda Lucey

From: [Helene C ANDROSKI](#)
To: [Finance Committee](#)
Subject: Proposed Fee for Curbside Recycling Pickup
Date: Monday, April 11, 2022 10:34:15 AM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

The proposed city fee for curbside recycling pickup is a big mistake. Recycling pickup, along with trash collection, police and fire protection, and street maintenance are basic services for which we already pay property taxes.

Helene Androski
505 Riverside Drive
Madison, WI 53704

From: [Norman Sannes](#)
To: [Finance Committee](#)
Cc: [All Alders](#); [Mayor](#)
Subject: Proposed recycling fee
Date: Sunday, April 10, 2022 2:23:06 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Several social media sites have posted information about Madison proposing a “recycling fee.” This would be a TAX, period. Similar to the city sticking a forestry fee on our Municipal Services Bill (what use to be our WATER and SEWER bill).

You can put my down as opposed to ANY NEW FEES or TAXES.

Norman Sannes
5345 Queensbridge Rd
Madison, WI 53714

From: [Mary Charnitz](#)
To: [Finance Committee](#)
Subject: Public comment for April 11 meeting
Date: Monday, April 11, 2022 11:40:21 AM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

I'd like to register in opposition to agenda item 24 regarding a special fee for recycling.

I'm opposed to "special fees" being used instead of using property taxes.

Property taxes should be used to provide basic services such as garbage pick up and recycling. If the budget doesn't allow funding of recycling then cut back on other non-basic services that may be nice to have but only if property taxes can support them. If you can't make those cuts then raise property taxes and take ownership of your decision.

Please vote no against approving agenda item 24. Thank you.

Mary Charnitz
537 Shady Wood Way
Madison

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

From: [Joanie & Karen](#)
To: [Finance Committee](#)
Subject: Public comment on item 24 of the City of Madison Finance Committee April 11, 2020
Date: Sunday, April 10, 2022 2:51:42 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Members of the City of Madison Finance Committee,

We would like to go on record as opposed to the new fee being proposed at the April 11, 2020 meeting of the City of Madison Finance Committee. This is item 24 on the agenda - Creating Section 4.097 of the Madison General Ordinances to Create a Resource Recovery Special Charge.

This should not be a separate charge; it should be part of the property taxes that we pay. It seems reasonable that properties not using the service should not have to pay this fee. But, will this then allow residents to opt out of having recycling services? That seems only fair. Of course, those recyclables will then go into the trash bins.

Recycling benefits all residents of Madison. It keeps the recycled products out of the landfill, extending the life of the landfill by years, if not decades.

What will be the next service that the city decides to have residents pay for? Our public library services? Our city parks? In both those cases, not everyone uses the libraries or the parks. Should everyone be expected to pay for those for the common good of the community? Our answer is yes.

It is important to inform residents of this additional fee/tax, so we are all aware of the direction that the city is going to fund common services. We are headed down a slippery slope.

Karen Gunderson
Joanne Kanter

91 Golf Pkwy Unit F
Madison WI 53704

From: [Joanie & Karen](#)
To: [Finance Committee](#)
Subject: Public comment on item 24 of the City of Madison Finance Committee April 11, 2022
Date: Sunday, April 10, 2022 3:04:46 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Members of the City of Madison Finance Committee,

We would like to go on record as opposed to the new fee being proposed at the April 11, 2022 meeting of the City of Madison Finance Committee. This is item 24 on the agenda - Creating Section 4.097 of the Madison General Ordinances to Create a Resource Recovery Special Charge.

This should not be a separate charge; it should be part of the property taxes that we pay. It seems reasonable that properties not using the service should not have to pay this fee. But, will this then allow residents to opt out of having recycling services? That seems only fair. Of course, those recyclables will then go into the trash bins.

Recycling benefits all residents of Madison. It keeps the recycled products out of the landfill, extending the life of the landfill by years, if not decades.

What will be the next service that the city decides to have residents pay for? Our public library services? Our city parks? In both those cases, not everyone uses the libraries or the parks. Should everyone be expected to pay for those for the common good of the community? Our answer is yes.

It is important to inform residents of this additional fee/tax, so we are all aware of the direction that the city is going to fund common services. We are headed down a slippery slope.

Karen Gunderson
Joanne Kanter

91 Golf Pkwy Unit F
Madison WI 53704

From: [Gregory A. Humphrey](#)
To: [Finance Committee](#)
Subject: RE: Proposed Recycling Fee Agenda Item 24..70344
Date: Sunday, April 10, 2022 2:05:27 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

RE: Proposed Recycling Fee Agenda Item 24....70344

What is concerning is not the amount of the fee, but the principle of the fee, itself.

The mayor and alders should not need to be told that the basics of city government, be it trash, fire, police, and street maintenance, are considered to be covered by our tax payments. No add-on fees for the basics! Before we build public markets and do things that are perhaps nice to have, we need to make sure that **the basics** of city living are financed and ready to operate.

So, what's next? Charging for trash pick-up? After all, not everyone gets trash pick-up (e.g., commercial properties, apartment buildings). Once upon a time, these charges for the public good were paid for by tax dollars.

If the mayor or alders need to have more cash they need to do like everyone else during the pandemic. Cut here and there and come up with the funds. **But do not seek it from the city residents who already are knowing they have paid for the city services with their property taxes.**

I ask that the Finance Committee not recommend this matter to the city council.

Sincerely,

Gregory Humphrey

902 Spaight Street

Madison, Wi

From: [Robin Chene](#)
To: [Finance Committee](#)
Subject: Recycling tax
Date: Monday, April 11, 2022 10:55:17 AM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

I am retired and living on a fixed income in the Bay Creek neighborhood. My property taxes have greatly increased in the last several years and are already almost beyond my ability to pay.

It seems everyone in the city benefits from recycling whether or not they directly use it!

Perhaps a much smaller fee, say \$5, would alleviate the perceived unfairness.

Thank you, Robin Chene

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

From: [Mary Ann McBride](#)
To: [Finance Committee](#)
Subject: Resource Recovery Charge
Date: Monday, April 11, 2022 2:20:20 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

To the Finance Committee,

I am very much opposed to the “Resource Recovery Charge” that you are proposing.

First, please stop naming unprecedented charges for our recycling pickup and other city planned costs these disingenuous names that hide what our city government is actually proposing. (I am also thinking of the “Imagine Madison” action that tried to push 6 story zoning on Williamson St., and 4 story zoning into the Marquette neighborhood in the name of “Infill”. No one knew what the city was proposing until a week before it would have gone into effect!)

Secondly, our garbage and recycling fees are already covered in our taxes. I am opposed to the city government pulling out various services and charging for them. I believe that if the government is able to start charging for discrete services, it will be the beginning of more and more separate charges for items that previously were included in the budget.

Your job is to keep costs within the budget, not pull out services and charge for them.

My taxes are very high. I am living on a fixed income. I do not want to be forced out of my home by additional surcharges and charges. Work the budget!

Sincerely,

Mary Ann McBride
1310 Spaight St
Madison, WI 53703

--

Mary Ann


From: [C Debevec](#)
To: [Finance Committee](#)
Subject: Say NO to recycling tax ummm I mean fee
Date: Monday, April 11, 2022 1:30:25 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

- 1) could someone at the meeting tonight pls explain this excerpt from Journal sentinel article (see below). Sounds like we cant really add on a new fee without losing the same amt of tax levy ? Or does the city attorney believe by calling it "recycling" instead of "trash" we can circumvent the law?
- 2) the proposed method of applying the fee is unfair and not based on actual useage (unlike say water and dog parks). I own a small two flat and live in one of the units - at most 2-3 of us live at this address and generate very little trash OR recycling, just by how we choose to live. So why am I needing to pay so much more for my recycling (because I have a two-flat) vs the single family that's generating tons of trash every week?
- 3) do we know for a fact that all larger apts use private services? Ive seen places where there's 10-20 city trash cans lined up on trash day.
- 3) Taxes/fees should have some logical purpose and not just be added "because we can." Pls hit pause on this, and look into other more innovative (and justifiable) proposals such as taxing plastics at the point of origin.

Thank you for your consideration
Cathy Debevec
1885 E Main St.
Madison, WI 53704

[What you pay for garbage collection in Milwaukee area suburbs depends on where you live](#)



State law

Regardless of the charging practice of each community, odds are it won't change anytime soon — unless a state levy-limit law changes.

The law essentially says if a community in 2013 funded any of five services through the tax levy — garbage collection, fire protection, snow plowing, street sweeping, or storm water management — if it switches to charging a fee for the service, it has to reduce its allowable levy by that amount. That had the effect of freezing the status quo in 2013.

From: [Jennifer Argelander](#)
To: [Finance Committee](#); [Abbas, Syed](#)
Subject: Subject: Finance Committee Agenda Item 24, Legistar 70344
Date: Monday, April 11, 2022 11:52:47 AM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear President Abbas and Finance Committee members:

I oppose instituting a new recycling fee as an additional tax on all who would recycle. Those who are concerned about buying groceries or paying for other expenses will just throw everything into the trash thus killing the environment protection recycling provides. I understand that recycling is no longer creating a profit but it is critical to provide this service to everyone. Recycling is an essential service and should be covered in the regular yearly taxes. Or there may be other ways to pay for this essential service.

Please vote NO on the recycling fee and consider more effective waste reduction policies.

Jennifer Argelander
1715 Erie Court
Madison, WI 53704

From: [Percy Mather](#)
To: [Finance Committee](#)
Subject: Support for Recycling fee
Date: Monday, April 11, 2022 12:05:12 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

I want to register as being in support of the proposed recycling fee, estimated to be \$45 annually. A monthly fee of \$3 to \$4 is a small price to pay for handling recyclable materials in an environmentally responsible manner. We are fortunate in this country and this city to be materially well off. We should respect the resources we use by managing them in a way that does not damage the environment. I also suggest that the City collect an additional dollar from any residences that are not low-income and establish a fund that would pay at least half of the recycling fee for elderly and low-income residents, something like the Energy Fund that MG&E has.

Percy Mather
641 Sheldon Street
Madison WI 53711

(608) 233-1955

From: [Mary Charles](#)
To: [Finance Committee](#)
Subject: Taxes on Recycling
Date: Sunday, April 10, 2022 10:29:14 AM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Regarding your upcoming meeting on April 11.

For the record, this property owner is strongly AGAINST any add on fees for recycling. Our taxes are high enough without adding on additional fees for services we're already taxed for. Maybe just managing our tax dollars more efficiently would be a better consideration. Seems we should offer incentives to recycle, not discourage.

M. Charles

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Edward Kuharski](#)
To: [Finance Committee](#)
Cc: [Benford, Brian](#); [Heck, Patrick](#); [Mayor](#)
Subject: Tonight's Agenda Item #24 - Recycling collection fee
Date: Monday, April 11, 2022 8:50:48 AM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Finance Committee Members, I am writing in opposition to this proposal as currently written. If the city seeks to develop another revenue source not limited by bad state law, it should be applied to ALL refuse collection. A fee for only one of the services will create a perverse incentive to place materials in the wrong bin, which will defeat the purpose of separating recyclable materials and/or incur increased costs of culling non-recyclable materials that are placed in the green bins.

The recycling program provides a partial offset to landfill costs, which are borne by all taxpayers. To add a surcharge to residents who do the right thing both environmentally and fiscally is a misguided policy. It is reminiscent of the state surcharge to motor vehicles with higher efficiency and lower emissions, and is thus at odds with the city's stated objectives of reducing negative impacts on the environment.

The ordinance repeatedly claims that the recycling program is wholly separate from the city's Solid Waste Collection programs. That may be nominally true, but it is emphatically NOT the case in actual practice. Residents cannot, and should not, have the option to opt out of the recycling collection program.

City policy should reflect actual conditions and recognize overall impacts to the city at large, rather than promote a narrow and perverse form of discrimination that enacts a surcharge for good behavior that benefits the entire city as well as the environment.

It is not helpful that the proposed ordinance defers the mechanics of the actual imposition of the surcharges. The Municipal Services bill is used for metered services which the resident has ability to partially manage by mindful usage. I fail to see how a similar regime could be applied to collection of recyclable materials.

Warm regards, Ed

Edward Kuharski, Architect, AIA, LEED AP
GREEN DESIGN STUDIO
405 Sidney Street
Madison, WI 53703
608/469-5963 mobile
ekuharski@aol.com

"The best way to predict the future is to help create it."