

## Letters

---

### **Letter: What happened to savings from trash service change?**

Published: Wednesday, February 18, 2009 9:07 AM EST

To the Editor:

I just opened my newspaper today and read the millions of dollars saved by outsourcing refuse collection in UA is not enough to pay for recycling for the elderly and disabled with medical exemptions.

So, the disabled must drag their recycling to the street or add their recyclables to their trash, increasing the number of stickers used and increasing their costs, and adding aluminum, plastics and paper to local land fills. Aluminum and plastics do not break down quickly and paper, until recently, was profitable to recycle.

As recently as last October, before the issue was taken off the ballot because our city manager does not need the approval of City Council or the people of UA to make changes that affect every household in UA, everything was going well. If the people of UA had the right to vote on this issue, we would not be discussing this. We had a refuse collection and recycling program that was world class. What we had was a model that responsible, earth-friendly communities could follow to reduce the negative impact on the environment.

Now our assistant city manager is recommending that the elderly and disabled throw their recyclables in the trash because Inland isn't making a profit. Whose problem is this? We heard that there is a contract that cannot be broken. We heard about millions of dollars in savings. Over 300 residents attended a council meeting, over 2,000 signed the petition and 7,438 residents voted to get out of this flawed contract. That was 52 percent. This information is still on [uatrash.org](http://uatrash.org).

A UA councilman joked on July 2, 2007, that if this didn't work out, there would be seven former members collecting trash. It looks like they will get to drive those little buggies.

Frank Milillo