

2004

**An Analysis of an Emerging Trend by Municipalities Toward
Privatizing Garbage Collection Services and a Feasibility Study as
to Whether the City of Sacramento Should Adopt This Policy**

Berman Obaldia

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/capstones>



Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#)

**An analysis of an emerging trend by municipalities
toward privatizing garbage collection services and a
feasibility study as to whether the city of Sacramento
should adopt this policy**

By:

BERMAN OBALDIA

Golden Gate University, San Francisco, California

LD
2001
.G43

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	ABSTRACT	3
II.	INTRODUCTION	4
III.	DISCUSSION	5
IV.	LITERATURE REVIEW	15
V.	RECOMMENDATION	19
VI.	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	22
VII.	REFERENCES	24
VIII.	APPENDIX: TABLES	26

ABSTRACT

The issue of whether the city of Sacramento should privatize residential garbage collection has been the subject of considerable debate in the past ten years. Given California's economic uncertainty and local agencies' dependence on the state's fiscal prognosis, the issue will no doubt continue.

Studies by prominent academics regarding the privatization of garbage services have turned up mixed results. E.S. Savas, who surveyed more than 1,300 cities on the issue, concluded that the extra cost of municipal agencies operating trash collection over private firms was more than 40 percent. On the other hand, Barbara Stevens, who surveyed 121 communities in the Los Angeles area, found that public agencies contracting with private firms saved less than 10 percent. Cities with franchises offered no savings, and private competitive arrangements cost a third more than municipal collection.

The city of Phoenix is held up as a successful model of a public agency that has been able to compete and win garbage collection contracts. The lesson that can be learned from the Phoenix experiment is that, when contracts are put to a competitive bid process, public entities are galvanized into action. And, when faced with the prospect of losing to private firms, they will rise to a level previously not expected of them. Moreover, if given the opportunity to provide input, implement cost-saving procedures, and be given access to private-sector type incentive programs, municipal agencies can not only prevail, but can exceed the success of private contractors.

CITY OF SACRAMENTO PRIVATIZING RESIDENTIAL GARBAGE

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to explore whether the City of Sacramento should privatize garbage collection, and how this should be accomplished. The City of Sacramento is one of the few cities that continue to provide their own garbage collection services. The trend in municipal service delivery has been toward privatization or contracting out. Although one of the latest trends, according to the Director of Public Works of the City of Phoenix, is publicization, which is competitively bidding for the same contracts private firms bid for. The City of Phoenix's successes and failures in contracting out were used as a model to look at garbage collection services in the City of Sacramento.

DISCUSSION

The realities of city government have changed significantly since the passage of Proposition 13 in California. City governance has gone through a continuous metamorphosis since property tax increases have been capped.

According to Arne Croce, City Manger of San Mateo, the ICMA has taken a look at the differences between old realities of government and new realities of government. Those differences have been delineated as follows:

Old Realities of Government

In the old reality of government, the environment in which managers operated was certain, the revenue base was expanding, what they did and how the did things were internally focused and externally driven, communities were homogeneous, local government had a monopoly on the delivery of services, and government operated from a departmental orientation.

New Realities of Government

In the new reality of government, managers operate in an uncertain environment, there is slow growth, a flat or declining revenue base, what they do and how they do things are externally focused and internally driven, population in the communities are diverse, service now operates in a competitive environment, and cities operate from an organizational orientation.

Traditionally, seventy to eighty percent of all public sector budgets are allocated for personnel salaries and benefits. Cities are expected to maintain the same service level with a shrinking revenue base. For these reasons, cities have been forced to take a good hard look at resource management and delivery systems. In order to reduce costs, the idea of "reinventing government" has won national and international attention. Reinventing government is considered to be the government's mode of operation for the 90s and 00s.

One of the recommendations by reinventing-government experts is to contract out delivery of services. Studies have shown that contracting out significantly reduces the cost of government service delivery. While many cities are privatizing services to lower costs, the city of Phoenix is competing on an equal footing with the private sector. The city has been successful in challenging fundamental ideas about service delivery in government.

Competitive tension is good. Privatizing services has put pressure on local government. Competition in the service delivery area has been very productive for everyone, local government, private industry, and citizens. Opening cities up to a competitive environment has also raised cities' credibility in the eyes of others. The public is more confident that they are getting the best services at the lowest cost.

The city of Phoenix has received national recognition for being a well-managed and well-run city. In the Phoenix case model, competition all began in 1978 when the City Council voted to contract out garbage collection services to cut costs. Ron Jensen, Director of Public Works, decided to also bid on the contract. The city's garbage collection areas were separated into five districts. The city decided to contract out one

district per year, consecutively, each for a five-year contract. For the first four years the private sector won the contract bids. But in the fifth year, the city won the contract bid, and by 1988 had won back all the garbage districts; it cost them half of what it cost in 1978 to deliver the same service.

According to Jensen, the city of Phoenix attributes their success to technology. He feels they also used good management techniques in involving the employees – those who know most about performing their jobs and where best to employ cost-effective measures. Drivers were asked to redesign their routes, Quality Circles were set up, labor-management committees were created, and incentive programs were instituted.

The city of Phoenix believes the costs on performance in service areas are significant because of the competitive process. Discussion of unit costs, customer complaints, downtime and other production line events occur with sustained interest and energy. They also believe there is no need to build bureaucratic reporting, regulatory, and oversight devices. The city of Phoenix believes the public/private competitive process challenges them to find the effective use of competition and cooperation in the same way private firms have done.

One of the reasons the city of Phoenix has won recognition both nationally and internationally as a well-managed city is because of the city's public/private competitive process. City departments and private contractors compete to determine who will provide the best services to the customers.

One feature of competing for business is that it brings awareness to city departments. No longer can they provide costly service and unfriendly customer service.

In the past, cities had the outlook that it really didn't matter what kind of services were provided, because no one else provided similar services. Therefore, there were no incentives to do more with less, or to look at citizens as customers. But after the passage of Proposition 13, where cities were not able to continue to collect the majority of their revenues from property taxes, and as the State's budget continued to find itself in an unbalanced condition, California cities found themselves in a situation where they had to make cuts. For the first time, cities found themselves in a position to start thinking like the private sector in terms of bottom line results. Many in the public sector initially saw this as a negative. But in retrospect, this pressure has had its benefits.

City of Phoenix

According to Jensen, the Phoenix approach was simple in concept and complex in execution. Technically, the idea was easy to execute, but politically, it created a big stir. All too often there are many stakeholders who can get in the way of getting the job done at the least possible cost.

He found that not only are unions unwilling to give up their stake, but managers alike. Managers are not willing to give up their span of control. Contracting out means a reduction of staff, budget, and power. Management staff can see this as a threat rather than a challenge. Jensen believes getting managers committed to a program of privatization is equally as challenging as working with the unions.

Jensen further believes that part of the problem with managers is the way in which they are compensated. Their compensation is dependent upon the size of their budget and the number of employees they supervise/manage. Therefore, properly compensating managers for supporting cost-cutting programs is an important element in the

privatization equation. In Phoenix, all managers are in a Performance Achievement Program for compensation rather than the traditional pay plan.

Phoenix's Claim to Fame

The Phoenix claim to fame all started in the early '70s when they began to look at technology as a way to reduce costs. The city learned of an experimental one-person side-loading collection system that was operating in a California city. The system allowed one person to operate the collection of trash. The drivers would drive on the right side of the truck, step off at each refuse stop and manually load the refuse into the side-loading hopper. When the body was full, the driver/operator moved to the left side and drove the truck to the landfill.

During this same period, Scottsdale, Arizona was experimenting with a mechanized truck called "Godzilla." This new invention allowed the picking up of 300-gallon containers with a mechanical arm attached to a front-loading garbage truck. Eventually the arm was replaced with rails, allowing the lifting, dumping, and replacing of refuse containers at a faster pace.

The city of Phoenix experimented with these mechanical devices and utilized the new process in their first major contract. The city's bid package included 35 mechanical collection garbage trucks. The successful bidder would be given title to approximately \$1 million worth of equipment and could start on the contract with a minimum of capital outlay. Phoenix believed this program would save them money by making the bids lower and they were able to rid themselves of equipment the city no longer needed and for which they did not have a ready market available. As many fear with contract services,

Phoenix had problems with the quality of service provided by some of their contractors. They received numerous complaints from citizens and the city was left with thousands of homes that had uncollected trash. It was at this point that the Public Works Department struggled to begin winning back the bids.

The impact on the morale of the employees was tremendous. Both field employees and management experienced feelings of pride and accomplishment. The City Council and the community developed a high regard for the city's sanitation program. The citizens appreciated receiving the high level of service they expected and paid for, at the lowest possible cost.

The city of Phoenix believes that under the competitive concept, there are opportunities for the private sector to approach government with a challenge rather than a "takeover attempt." The idea of competition is an American method of determining who is the best one to do the job. But as in any bidding/contract process, price alone cannot be the determining factor. Other important factors must be considered, i.e., quality, control, and flexibility.

Phoenix Summary

The Phoenix model may not work successfully for the city of Sacramento; however, the concept of competition is healthy. As Jensen believes, there is tremendous potential for an expression of the public/private partnership in providing public service. Both sides have a lot they can learn from each other, and this type of mix gives the taxpayers the most for their tax dollars.

Jensen warns that taking a strong position that all government services should be turned over to the private sector is doomed for failure. Likewise, he says, a strong

position that the public agency can provide all public services at the lowest possible cost without the pressures of competition is equally dangerous.

According to The Effective Local Government Manager, issues to be considered in contracting out are cost of service, financial cost to citizens, choices available to service users, quality effectiveness of the service, distribution of services in the community, service continuity, feasibility and ease of implementation and potential overall impact.

Solid Waste Management

Americans dispose of more than 150 million tons of trash each year. The average person generates 3.4 pounds of refuse a day – composed of roughly 37 percent paper, 17 percent leaves and lawn trimmings, and 10 percent glass, metal, and food detritus. Two-thirds of all American cities have some type of private trash collection, whether through free competition among firms, exclusive franchises, or contracts with city governments. In 45 percent of the cities, only private firms pick up the garbage, while in 33 percent, municipal sanitation departments have a monopoly. Adjusting these figures by size of the cities suggests that between one-third and one-half of American households have their trash collected by private firms. The private sector role in waste management, moreover, has grown steadily in the past few decades. In 1964, 18 percent of surveyed cities contracted with private firms to pick up residential garbage; in 1982, the proportion had risen to 27 percent.

Intuitively, private garbage collection seems like a good idea. Tradition affirms that a competitive market is a good device for discovering the best and cheapest means of carrying out clearly defined tasks. The issue is quite simple: Pick up the garbage and

take it away. If the quality of service can be monitored, price competition should lead to the best deal for consumers. Meanwhile, theory suggests a number of drawbacks to government delivery. Lack of competition is the most obvious. The more layers of organization that stand between the consumer (citizens) and the trash collector, the more diminished the likelihood for providing any incentives for rewarding efficiency.

Privatization

Advocates of privatization base their advocacy on a major theoretical premise -- that the provision of public services via the private sector rather than the public sector will invariably be more efficient and cost-effective. This theory is based on an examination of the incentives present in both services.

Delivery of services by the public sector usually involves a monopoly situation where a public entity such as city, county, or special district invariably has a monopoly over the provision of that service. In this situation there is no incentive to provide public services more efficiently, cut costs, or enact reforms, as this usually results in calls for future reductions in the budget of the entity that has instituted the reforms. Under the politics of the budgetary process, such reductions are to be avoided as it not only reduces the power and influence of the managers of the affected entity, but also makes the "muscle" of their organization more vulnerable to future unanticipated cutbacks, and frequently makes it more difficult to obtain future budget augmentations. In the absence of competition, there is simply no organizational reward for cutting costs or instituting reforms to make service delivery more cost-effective.

Similarly, with civil service protection and pay scales, there is frequently no personal monetary reward for public sector managers to advocate and implement cost-

cutting measures to make the delivery of public service more cost-effective. If the effort is made and is successful, there is frequently no special reward through personal salary increases than those that would otherwise normally occur, with or without these efforts. Successful efforts can lead to the creation of opposition within the organization that can hinder the manager's career, and, if the efforts are unsuccessful, it can halt a manager's career advancement.

In sharp contrast to this are the incentives present in the private sector where competition, retention of market share, and the profit motive provide organizational and personal monetary incentives for managers to provide services in the most cost-effective manner. These efficiencies and cost savings are passed on to the public via reduced prices charged by private firms for the delivery of public services

Advocates of privatization argue that it is the presence of incentives that make the private sector a more efficient and cost-effective provider of services than the public sector. Therefore, they argue it is better to entrust the delivery of public services to private firms than through public sector entities. This is the theoretical basis that underlies privatization. Based upon this premise, there are a number of methods that have evolved whereby private firms furnish public services. In the delivery of garbage collection services, contracting out and franchises are the two most recognized.

Contracting Out

Under this form of privatization, a state or local government contracts with another local government entity (e.g., for profit firm, nonprofit agency, or a neighborhood organization) to provide a public service. Contracts may be awarded to provide all or a certain portion of garbage collection within a city or county.

Franchise

These privatization contracts involve a government entity awarding an exclusive authorization to a private firm to provide services. Private citizens pay the franchisee directly for services rendered, and the local government typically receives a percentage of the gross receipts as reimbursement for the exclusive authorization granted the firm.

Proposition 13

In California, the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978 established a political basis for the trend toward privatization. Faced with a prospect of severe revenue cuts, local officials were faced with two choices – cut back public services, a move that would involve substantial political risk, or find alternative means of financing these services. Many officials discovered privatizing garbage collection services as one means of solving budget shortfalls.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A number of studies have focused on the comparison of the costs and benefits in the delivery of services of the public and private sector, and the best method of delivery of services. Studies by prominent academics regarding privatization have turned up mixed results. E.S. Savas, who surveyed more than 1,300 cities on the issue in 1975, studied the costs of four methods of collecting residential garbage: public sanitation departments, private contractors, private franchises, and open competition. Savas concluded that municipal contracting with private firms was about 9 percent cheaper than direct municipal collection. Franchising offered no savings, and private competitive arrangements cost a third more than municipal collection. (*See Appendix, Table 1*)

The most ambitious study that compared private and public sector delivery of garbage collections services in the United States was done in 1984 by Barbara J. Stevens, having been commissioned by the department of Housing and Urban Development. Stevens surveyed every community in the five counties in the Los Angeles area, focusing on public services delivered by both contractors and city agencies. Among the 121 communities surveyed, local governments paid for or delivered thirty-eight different services.

Stevens selected eight functions: street cleaning, janitorial services, residential trash collection, payroll preparation, traffic signal maintenance, asphalt laying, turf maintenance, and tree maintenance. Mindful that municipal accounting methods often fail to reflect real costs, Stevens attempted to measure the direct costs of the resources

used – including administrative, maintenance, and support functions usually reported on separate budgets.

Stevens found that for every service, except payroll preparation, a reliable cost advantage for private contracting was evident. The excess cost of municipal delivery, Stevens estimated, ranges from 37 percent for tree maintenance to 96 percent for asphalt overlay application. Trash collection came in at 42 percent. Stevens found that an operation serving fewer than 20,000, or using fewer than four trucks, is apt to operate somewhat more inefficiently. According to Stevens, "This suggests that, aside from any other differences between civil service and profit seeking organizations, smaller cities start with a technological disadvantage if they try to run their own sanitation departments."

Private municipal contractors, Stevens found, are more efficient than public sanitation departments, and are less costly than house-by-house competitive arrangements. For cities of more than 50,000, Stevens' findings suggest that contracting out costs about one-quarter less than public trash service. In all but the smallest and biggest cities, competitive garbage collection scored worse than public collection, and for all cities it was more costly than contractual arrangements worked out between city officials and private haulers. Competitive firms, Stevens concluded, cost 10 to 25 percent more than municipal sanitation departments, and 25 to 50 percent more than contractors. *(See Appendix, Table 2)*

City of Sacramento

The city of Sacramento's population, according to the 1990 census, was 369,395. The city has 105,000 single-family residences and 38,000 apartments and mobile homes. The city generates 700,000 tons of garbage per year. On average, the city collects 885 tons of garbage a day and 220 tons of green waste (grass clippings, leaves, etc.) the city's solid waste division operates 39 residential side loaders (fully automated), and four neighborhood clean-up rear loaders. The solid waste division employs 190 individuals including management and administration. A typical single-family residence in Sacramento pays \$17.83 per month to have garbage collected. (*See Appendix, Table 3*)

When questioned as to the viability of Sacramento's privatizing its garbage collection services, Gary Van Dorst, Technical Service Manager in the city's Solid Waste Division, argues that as long as private concerns can provide a more cost-effective means of collecting garbage, privatization efforts will never be quelled. Van Dorst, who does not dispute studies that have documented the cost savings of privatizing, feels that, "Once you let the genie out of the bottle, it's very difficult to get it back in."

According to Van Dorst, "When factoring in the total cost of garbage pick-up, you must consider that the city is responsible for picking up garbage at a number of city locations such as city parks, community centers, etc. These costs are absorbed throughout the system, which account for the city's higher costs." (*See Appendix, Table 4*)

Nine years ago, Sacramento automated their trash trucks. The results allowed them to go from a two-man crew to one. In addition, a study done by the Department of Health Services found that automation led to a 40% reduction in the number of back and

leg injuries to city garbage collection workers. However, Van Dorst adds, "Automation resulted in an increase of neck and carpal-tunnel claims from workers."

Although a case can be made, based on the significant cost savings from privatizing residential garbage collection, Van Dorst feels that "privates" are not terribly interested in bidding on residential collections; instead they are more interested in procuring commercial accounts.

According to Van Dorst, "They (private firms) are already taking a loss on the commercial end; why would they want to take on residential collections?" He adds, "A private vendor will charge \$30 per month to pick up a 2-yard dumpster once a week. He then has to pay \$21 "tipping fee" (emphasis added) each time he goes to the dump. A number of privates have operated at a loss in order to gain market share. Privates have diminished from 30 to only several today."

Tom Norris, Regional Controller for Waste Management, one of the country's largest private refuse collection companies, disputes Van Dorst's remarks about private firms' unwillingness to bid on residential garbage collection. According to Norris, "Depending on how the contract is structured, which may include adding commercial pick-up, it may help subsidize residential delivery." He adds, "The city can only benefit from going private. There is no capital investment, no rolling stock, an immediate influx of capital, and the city can establish a revenue stream through franchising."

RECOMMENDATION

After studying the city of Phoenix model, there is no question that the city of Sacramento should open up their garbage collection services to a competitive process. The competitive process forces everyone to take a look at costs, which normally are taken for granted. During the budget process, base budgets are generally not challenged in terms of costs. But as a result of competitively bidding for a contract against the private sector, managers and employees alike are forced to look at procedures, processes, equipment, technology and human resources.

There is a spirit of competition throughout the whole process from bidding to servicing. Everyone works together to provide the best services at the lowest cost possible. Competition gives the employees a chance to buy-in to the process. They now have a purpose to look at the cumbersome rules and regulations that have driven public costs upward. Employees have an incentive toward cutting costs and implementing cost-effective measures wherever possible. Just as much as the private sector wants to win and keep a public contract, the public sector now has a reason to fight just as hard – if not harder – to win and keep the contract in-house.

Of course, there are many factors to consider. Ron Jenson (Director, Public Works, Phoenix, quoted earlier) argues that unions are most opposed to cities contracting out services. This is not because of the employees, per se, but because they are afraid of losing influence; and the unions stand to lose the most. Therefore, cities looking at turning toward the competitive process will find that unions may stir up negative energy, which employees can easily accept if they are afraid of the unknown and afraid of change. Jensen also says that he finds he has problems not only with unions but with

management and their staffs as well. Jenson claims they "quietly oppose it (competitive contracting) instead of enthusiastically supporting it."

The whole idea behind competitive bidding is to determine who can do the best job. It appears after looking at the Phoenix model, that competitive bidding is a win-win situation for all involved: managers, employees, and the citizens.

Issues to consider with having a private contractor collecting residential garbage are the reduction in labor costs, avoiding undue political influence, and having the ability to manage competently. Of course there are disadvantages to consider as well: contract administration, breach of contracts, interruption of service delivery customer complaints, and low-ball procedures.

On the plus side, the public sector, viewed as weakened due to budget cuts, is believed to have enhanced its efficiency as a result of private sector competition. The public sector is assured of having a lasting role in the solid waste field. Regardless of who collects the garbage, the public sector has an eminent responsibility to the public.

A key to success is coordinated policy implementation at the local level. This requires an integrated approach including a combination of control and preventative disposal alternatives, policy and financial assistance from all levels of the governmental system, creative program design, and implementation.

One last issue for the city of Sacramento to think about is the methodology in comparing public and private service contracts. According to Martin L. Lawrence, School of Public Administration, Florida Atlantic University, in the absence of generally accepted and consistently applied methodology for comparing the costs of public and private sector delivery, claims of the cost-reduction of contracting out are frequently not

verifiable. In the absence of a standardized methodology, cost comparisons are subject to criticism that they are biased toward supporting already-made decisions.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The hypothesis of this project has been to review and analyze emerging trends in residential garbage collection throughout the United States; identify one municipality that has experienced financial and positive results from

Primary Data – Key Informant Surveys:

Primary data was collected through key informant survey's, which were sent to #10 stakeholders that have an extensive experience and knowledge of public policy issues in California and specifically in Sacramento.

The following categories of stakeholders were sent key informant surveys:

Public Sector Employees (2)

Private Sector Employees(2)

Stakeholders (2)

Developers (2)

Public Policy makers (2)

The key informant survey was sent by email through the use of www.surveymonkey.com. The survey began with a brief introductory message introducing the researcher and use of the survey results. The key informant survey was comprised of eight questions. The first two questions asked the respondents political affiliation and a background on the emerging trends towards privatizing garbage collection. The remaining six questions assessed survey participants perceptions

regarding private sector contracting, potential saving associated with privatizing garbage collection and finally, whether they supported privatizing Sacramento's garbage collection services.

Survey Results

Respondents were generally pleased with the way garbage collection services are conducted in Sacramento, with seventy percent (70%) supportive of the current method of garbage pickup by city employees. Sixty six percent (66%) of the respondents felt that the private sector could do a good job of providing the same level of service. In terms of interest groups that have influence on local policy makers unions edge out the business community in the degree of influence. Fifty percent (50%) of those surveyed felt that unions had the greatest influence on the cities elected leaders followed by business interests at forty percent (40%). Eighty percent (80%) supported privatizing garbage collections services if there were significant savings to the city and if those savings were used for vital services. Finally, seventy percent (70%) would vote in favor of privatizing Sacramento's garbage collection services.

To summarize, respondents are generally pleased with the job city employees collecting Sacramento's garbage, but if offered an alternative, that is, if a private concern were to perform the same task, that would not rule it out. But more importantly, respondents, overwhelmingly support privatizing t Sacramento Garbage collection services if they significant saving can be achieved, thus proving my recommendation that the city should consider the privatizing its garbage collection services.

References

City of Sacramento, "proposed utility rates for solid waste services".

Savas, E.S., "Privatization and Public Private Partnerships in Phoenix", Baruch College
(City University of New York)

Savas, E.S., "An Empirical Study of Competition in Municipal Service Delivery", Public
Administration Review 37, no.6 (November/December 1997): 717-24

Sheifer, Andrei, "State versus Private Ownership", Department of Economics, Harvard
University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Croce, Arnie, "New and Old Realities of Local Government", International City/County
Management Association, ICMA,

Newell, Charles, "the Effective Local Government Manager", 3rd edition, ICMA Press

Lawrence, Martin, "Public Policy and the Administrative State," Handbook of
Organization Theory and Management.

Stevens, Barbara, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Survey of Los Angeles.

Osborne, David and Ted Gaebler. 1992. Reinventing Government: How the entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector. Reading, MA; Addison-Wesley

Morris, Tom, Regional Vice President, Waste Management Inc., phone interview.

Donahue, John, "The Privatization Decision; Public Ends", private Means; 1989

Fleming, Sibley, "Solid Waste Services: Playing for Keeps", American City & County, September, 2004

Franciosi, Robert, "Garbage in, Garbage out: An examination of Private/Public by the city of Phoenix" (Phoenix, AZ: Goldwater Institute, 1998:6.

"Managed Competition" , the Phoenix Experience, Frontier Center for Public Policy and Perspectives. 10/2000.

Van Dorst, Gary, City of Sacramento, Public Works Department, phone interview.

Privatization in Competitive Sectors: The Record to Date. Sunita Kikeri and John Nellis.

World Bank Policy Research Working Paper2860, June 2002

APPENDIX – Tables

Table 1

Garbage Collections: Options & Costs

<u>Organization Form</u>	<u>Cost Per Ton</u>
Public	\$28.28
Private-Contract	\$25.78
Private-Franchise	\$28.23
Private-Competitive	\$38.5

Table 2

Estimated Gains from Privatization

<u>Function</u>	<u>Extra Cost/Municipal Serv. vs. Contractor Serv.</u>
Asphalt Overlay Construction	96%
Janitorial Service	73%
Traffic Signal Maintenance	56%
Street Cleaning	43%
Trash Collection	42%
Turf Maintenance	40%
Tree Maintenance	37%
Payroll Preparation	0

(Source: National Productivity Review, Autumn 1984, p. 401)

Table 3
Breakdown For Residential Garbage Collections Cost

Function	Cost
Collection	\$5.60
Disposal	\$4.33
CIP	\$.97
Code Enforcement	\$.35
Neighborhood Clean-Up	\$.82
Curbside Recycling	\$.69
HHW	<u>\$.20</u>
<u>Subtotal</u>	\$13.06
Garden Refuse Collection	\$4.29
Street Sweeping	<u>\$.48</u>
<u>Subtotal</u>	\$4.77
<u>TOTAL</u>	\$17.83

Table 4

	<u>Hourly Pay</u>	<u>Benefits</u>
Private	\$12-14	25%
City	\$14-16	32%

(Source, Table 3 and Table 4: Gary Van Dorst, Technical Service Manager, Sacramento Solid Waste Division)

SURVEY:**Privitazing Sacramento Garbage Collection Services**

My name is Berman Obaldia and I am a graduate student at Golden Gate University's Executive Master of Public Administration Program. As part of my capstone project, I am evaluating whether the city of Sacramento should privatize its garbage collection service. Your responses will be kept confidential.

Thank you in advance for your willingness to participate in my study.

More than 50 percent of U.S. cities contract all or part of their refuse collection services. A 1995 study of 120 local governments in 34 states found that between 1987 and 1995, the percentage of cities contracting out for solid waste collection increased by 20 percent.

The survey below is designed to gauge Sacramento residents willingness to explore the contracting/privatizing of the cities garbage collection services.

1. Are you a Democrat or Republican?

- 1. Democrat
- 2. Republican
- 3. Declined to state

2. Do you work in the private or public sector?

- Private. 1
- Public. 2

3. There is a growing trend towards privatizing government services such as water treatment facilities and garbage collection. Do you think this is a positive trend?

I strongly support 5
I support 4
I neither support or against it 3
I don't support it 2
I strongly do not support it 1

4. Sacramento residential garbage collection is conducted by city employees. How would you rate the city's garbage collection service?

Excellent 4
Very good 3
Average 2
Below average 1

5. Do you think private firms can do a better job of providing garbage collection services than municipal governments?

I strongly support it 5
I support it 4
I neither support or against it 3
I do not support it 2
I strongly don not support it 1

6. Who do you feel has too much of an influence in local governments?

Unions 5
Business community 4

Environmental groups 3
Developers 2
none of the above 1

7. If the city of Sacramento could save over \$2 million a year by privatizing its garbage collection services and use the savings for vital services, would you:

I strongly support 5
I support 4
I neither support or against it 3
I do not support it 2
I strongly do not support it 1

8. If there were a referendum on the ballot to privatize Sacramento's garbage collection service, how would you vote?

yes. 1
no. 2