

Options for a differentiated Tonnadoonah dues structure

5-16-2023

1) Keep uniform dues but make dumpster service optional. One difficulty here is that someone might indicate they won't use it, but then go ahead and use it anyhow but attempt to do so surreptitiously. Ostensibly that could be policed with the use of a camera which is currently indicated as being in use. (I'm not sure if the sign is a ruse, but even if there is one in place, monitoring the images and trying to determine if people are using the dumpster without paying would be very difficult.) In spite of that challenge, *I recommend this course of action simply because it largely maintains status quo and would avoid further legal expenses for myself and the Association.*

2) Use a 3-tiered dues system. This would make everyone's dues subject to a defined "lifestyle usage adjustment factor" based on the 3 different living situations, but all services would be included.

3) Make dumpster service a size / usage category differentiated fee. The remainder could either be a flat fee, or could be tiered. (Or it could even be based on the taxable property value.) There are a number of methods that could be employed for making dumpster service a differentiated fee. This could include: graduated by the 3 different lifestyle situations, differentiated by dwelling size, or a combination of both. (Various proxies for dwelling size can be used, such as actual square footage, or more simply the number of bedrooms or bathrooms. Taxable value could also be considered.) Note: This model is demonstrated in detail in the document below, as I think it is the best model to fairly apportion the dues to everyone.

4) Change to a combination of 96-gallon bins and a locked dumpster used only at peak weeks or on demand (for a fee). This would likely mean combining 2-3 non-homestead families per bin, and would require at least a concrete pad and probably a fair-sized shed near Ferry Road to locate them all.

I believe option #3 is the one that is most broadly fair to everyone as much as possible. While that option may seem complicated, there is a relatively simple solution to the situation that could be employed based on a draft proposal I created for such a method. But that would be more complicated and also it would be politically difficult to consider which is why I currently recommend option #1, even though there is slight a risk people could try to take advantage of that one if they opt out but cheat.

Hal Wolff