

**Town of Henniker**  
**Solid Waste Disposal Committee**  
**Thirty-Fourth Meeting: Thursday, February 18, 2010, 7:00 PM**  
**At The Grange**

**Approved Minutes**

**Present:** Michael C. French, Amanda Gilman, Lia Houk, John V. Kjellman, Donna MacMillan, Linda Patterson, and Rod Pimentel.

**Absent:** Don G. Blanchard and Bill Christiano.

**Chairman John Kjellman called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm.**

- 1) Handouts: Agenda, Draft minutes of February 4<sup>th</sup> meeting, Final Draft of Report to Town (version 14) with markup, Updated Executive Summary, Draft letter to BOS for report delivery (minor revision).
- 2) Chairman John Kjellman began with his introduction:
  - a. He said there was another change to the 2010 Solid Waste Disposal budget. The BOS cut another \$7K from the combined SW and Parks budget, over concern of too much money for tree care (in these troubled times). The new total is \$681,355 (warrant article #30). Last year the total SW and Parks budget was \$693,395 (\$622,335 plus \$71,060). The combined budget is down \$12,040, a nearly two percent drop.
  - b. Hopkinton is putting PAYT on the warrant for town meeting again this year. An informational meeting was held last night in Hopkinton. John did not attend. It is being sold this year as a SMART (Save Money And Reduce Trash) program.
  - c. Town meeting/voting dates: Wed 3/3 HCS Annual Meeting, Tues 3/9 Voting Day, Saturday 3/13 Town Meeting. BOS meets Tues 3/2 and Tues 3/16, then 4/6 and 4/20.
  - d. According to Peter Flynn, the town meeting warrant articles, ballots for open positions, and other info are being (have been?) posted to the Henniker.org website today. Ron Taylor is running again for the one open BOS position, and is being challenged by Leo Aucoin.
- 3) The minutes of the February 4, 2010 meeting were reviewed. **Rod Pimentel made a motion to accept the minutes with two corrections. The motion was seconded by Michael French and passed unanimously.**
- 4) John gave a brief review of the changes that had been made to the latest version of the report. He pointed out the printed copy included markup of all changes since Version 12, and said he realized it made the report more difficult to read, but with the markup people could skip the sections with no changes when doing their reviews. John said most of the changes were in the Steady-As-You-Go section and the summary, and that several of the appendixes were now printed so that they could be

read, but were not printed with the proper headings. He added that he added an analysis of combining curbside collection with single-stream processing. He said the report still needs some technical work.

- 5) Lia Houk said that ERRCO (in Epping) had made a proposal sometime ago to take Henniker's C&D debris, and that ERRCO believed that its proposal would have saved the Town money compared to what it costs to landfill the Town's C&D debris. She said that ERRCO generates some revenue from C&D debris, as it recycles it, which makes its costs lower than landfilling. Lia said she has asked Russ Roy for a copy of the ERRCO's proposal, and the one that was accepted.

There was a discussion about why ERRCO's proposal was not accepted, and Lia supposes that the price ERRCO charges depends on the amount of C&D debris sorting that is done at the T/S. She guessed that Bob (Pennock) probably felt he didn't have enough room at the T/S do any sorting of C&D debris. John Kjellman pointed out that New Boston accepts and charges differently for two grades of C&D debris.

- 6) John said he has talked to Peter Flynn about presenting our report to the BOS. We are penciled in for the 3/2 meeting, but we could do the 3/16 or 4/6 meetings. The 3/16 meeting will focus on organization issues, and election of the chairman for the coming year. Peter suggested that 4/6 might be ideal, because the BOS would be ready to jump into new issues at that meeting. Presenting at the 4/6 meeting would also give more time to finish up. It was the consensus, with no objections, that we should go for the 4/6 date. John pointed out that it is a Tuesday, and that while everyone on the committee doesn't have to be there, the more of us who are at that meeting the better. It was decided our next meeting would be on 3/4.
- 7) Lia asked about the Committee's plans for a PowerPoint presentation. It was the consensus that this would be a good thing to have. Lia said that if she could get the use of the Town's PowerPoint software she would do one, based on Don Blanchard's Executive Summary. John said that would be a big help.
- 8) Lia said she would like to review the PowerPoint presentation with the Committee before it is presented to BOS. Amanda Gilman suggested that instead of meeting next on 3/4, we meet on 3/11. That would allow for three weeks to put the PowerPoint presentation together. Michael added that that would also provide more time for a final review of the report. It was agreed that was a good idea.
- 9) Michael French said he was having trouble with a "big picture" aspect of the report, the assertion made in several parts of the report that increasing recycling reduces costs. He referred to Option 5, the No-Recycling option where we say that the Town could save money if it eliminated all recycling. That says that it costs more to recycle than it does to incinerate, which means if we increase recycling we increase costs, because of the high labor costs associated with recycling, unless labor efficiency is improved.

John suggested that that is not true, because it assumes that labor costs will increase proportionally with an increase in recyclable materials. There followed a discussion about whether or not we have excess capacity and if we handle increased recyclable materials it will increase labor costs. John said that he believed we do, within limits

of one or two hundred tons of recyclable materials, which is generally all we have been talking about, Michael said he did not believe that is the case.

The discussion ended with the agreement that labor costs are the big driver at the T/S, and that any savings from increased recycling had to be predicated on no increase in labor costs, and that that point needed to be made clear in our report. There was also strong agreement that the whole issue of labor costs needed to be looked at, and that the manual sorting of plastic materials was costing more than the plastic is worth, at least at current pricing. John said it was clear to him that it is worth recycling things like paper, cardboard and scrap metal, but he was in agreement that we could save money by dumping all plastics in the trash hopper.

Michael pointed to a few specific sections of the report that he said support his contention that increasing recycling without dealing with labor costs results in increased costs. Rod Pimentel stated he agrees with Michael's point. Again, after discussion, it was agreed that the report needs to better explain this issue.

Michael agreed that he would review the report to see just where changes he thinks should be made, and to get them to John in a week. John said he thought he understood what needed to be changed based on the consensus of the Committee.

- 10) The Committee then turned to a review of Don Blanchard's executive summary, which was last updated by Don on 1/13/10 before he left. John said he has since edited it slightly, including the last paragraph to include Linda's comment that scales not only make things more equitable, they make them more accurate. Lia pointed out that word "trash" should be eliminated in one sentence and Amanda pointed out that the options aren't listed in order of greatest cost savings as it says in the summary. Linda suggested the summary should address the issue we had just been discussing, the fact that labor and efficiency should get a hard look. Linda then asked if the MSW graphic in the report should be included in the summary. John suggested surely it should be included in the PowerPoint presentation, as well as the graph that is in the report. Linda said that the summary needs some sort of pull-it-all-together conclusion at the end, to which the Committee agreed.
- 11) It was agreed that anybody who has suggestions for further changes and/or corrections should get them to John by next week (2/25).
- 12) Next meeting: Thursday, March 11, 2010 at 7pm. A presentation to the BOS is scheduled for Tuesday, April 6, 2010.
- 13) **A Motion to adjourn was made by Lia Houk at 8:35 PM, seconded by Donna MacMillan and carried unanimously.**

Submitted 2/20/10

By John V. Kjellman

Approved with corrections 3/11/10