

**So ...  
Just how accurate is what  
we're being told by the City?**

- 1 **We agree.** Issue 52 has been generating much misinformation. Let's just see where it's coming from.
- 2 **Not true.** The city is including in this number signatures obtained by the initiative organizer, claiming he is "with Teamsters." He is not. He is a resident. Does the city have a problem with the Teamsters? Is THAT what all of this has been all about? The UA Streets and Utilities crews are still members of this union. Are they the next to go along with leaf pickup and snow plowing?
- 3 **What wasn't said ...** The "18 months of study" was conducted by the Solid Waste Task Force, which did NOT recommend privatization and did NOT recommend any wholesale changes in the solid waste system. City administration and Council totally ignored the results of its 18 months of work. And they tried to keep this group's meetings closed to the public.
- 4 **Not true.** Despite what the Assistant City Manager told Council, there was NO such "window" in the contract. As a matter of fact, it was the opposite; the City could not make any major changes until AFTER January 1. So what was the rush? The only effect of the emergency clause was to block out our right to vote.
- 5 **Not true.** The city kept all but two of the buggies, which they gave FREE to Inland. The city kept one packer, and sold the rest to Inland for \$366,500. They could either buy back the old equipment, or buy new equipment, the cost of which would be spread out over a 10-year period.
- 6 **This is extreme.** Not 9 months ago, the City Manager was quoting sticker prices of \$3.50 WITH NO FEE if we had continued with the garage-side service with city employees.
- 7 **There is no documentation of this.** We submitted a "Public Records Request" for any communication pertaining to the emergency services Inland was providing (per the contract, such arrangements must be in writing), and received just one email from the City Attorney asking Inland's rep to call her. Period.
- 8 **This is ridiculous.** There is no reason to maintain capacity to handle such an unlikely event. City crews with city and county equipment actually performed the bulk of the clean up efforts.

- 9 **What wasn't said ...** The letter written to the city cites the primary reason as being disagreements over very fuzzy and incomplete language in a poorly written contract.
- 10 **That depends.** If the city's getting too good of a deal, Inland is getting the raw end of it.
- 11 **Not true.** Sticker sales for 2008 are averaging 45 per household per year, a 17% decrease from last year, despite the lower price. More residents are finding "alternate disposal means" to avoid buying stickers, placing the burden on other haulers, other communities, and the rest of us who do buy stickers.
- 12 **Not true.** The city has maintained that the outcome of the November 4 vote has no authority in how the city handles the contract. Even if a majority "YES" vote were achieved, the city could refuse to try to negotiate a termination.
- 13 **Ah ... but where was the followup?** The Ohio Municipal League failed to file a Reply Brief with the Ohio Supreme Court. Just how committed are they to the city's position?
- 14 **What wasn't said ...** Those damages do NOT include the entire contracted amount, as the city is including in its "\$8 million to transition" figure. Damages are based on lost profit potential, and if Inland's not making a profit, damages would be hard to prove.
- 15 **Did you know?** The city has retained solid waste workers to pick up medical exemption recyclables and yard waste and to perform callbacks.
- 16 **No support for this number.** Just how is the city calculating this figure?
- 17 **Not true.** The primary image right now is of a city whose government is doing everything in its power to prevent its residents from voting. The Supreme Court filing solidified THAT image.
- 18 **So that's why the city's spam emailing us?** This past week, the city blast-emailed every email it had in its Parks & Recreation, Lifelong Learning & Leisure, and Senior Center database to send out its "message" on Issue #52. This system was not used after the storm to help residents learn what to do, so why was it used for this purpose? How appropriate was it?

**What's missing?**

- 19 The fact that the contract does not require **background checks** (something we were promised).
- 20 The claim that the city would be saving \$5 million over 5 years (again, promised). The new service is actually **costing MORE** than the old garage-side service with city employees.