

**Town of Henniker  
Solid Waste Disposal Committee**

**Seventh Meeting: Thursday - October 23, 2008  
The Grange**

**Approved/Corrected Meeting Minutes**

**Present:** Chairman John Kjellman, Don Blanchard, Bill Christiano, Amanda Gilman, Lia Houk, Ron Lavallee, Stephany Lavallee, Donna MacMillan, Linda Patterson, and Rod Pimentel

**Absent:** Michael French

**Also Present:** Sheila Mitchell, Recording Secretary

Chairman Kjellman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

▪ **Introduction by Chairman**

- ❖ The Chairman reported that five members of the Committee had attended a forum in Hopkinton the evening before. The subject of the forum was saving money and reducing trash. Including the five individuals from Henniker, attendance came to approximately 35 to 40 people. Hopkinton plans to charge \$1.59 per bag for disposal, which they estimate should cover all foreseeable expenses. Their plan has been in the making for the past three years.
- ❖ Don Blanchard has given the Chairman a report on the history of the Henniker landfill.
- ❖ Mr. Kjellman noticed an article in the newspaper that reported the City of Concord is going to have a vote in the near future on a “paper smart” program.
- ❖ The Chairman distributed printed copies of a budget analysis for possible conversion from source separation of recyclables to single stream recycling for the Town of Henniker, which was prepared and presented by Consultant Elizabeth Bedard when the Committee met on October 9, 2008.

▪ **Review of October 9<sup>th</sup> Minutes**

The minutes were reviewed and minor corrections given to the Recording Secretary. **A motion was made by Amanda Gilman to approve the minutes as corrected; the motion was seconded by Stephany Lavallee, and carried.**

Members agreed that, from now on, the Chairman will review and correct draft minutes before they are distributed to the rest of the Committee.

The Chairman emphasized that material revisions should not be made to minutes of a public meeting without being discussed at a subsequent public meeting.

▪ **Member Reports**

Ron and Stephany Lavallee:

Ron and Stephany have begun to compile revenues and costs for 2008, covering the year from January through September so far. Ron distributed printed copies of this preliminary report for review and discussion.

Statistics for 2008 show that nine towns in the region reduced the volume of solid waste for an aggregate reduction of 2,523 tons. However, four towns in the region increased their combined volume of solid waste by 124 tons – and Henniker had the largest share by far. Salisbury increased by 4 tons, Loudon by 3 tons, Hillsborough by 5 tons, and Henniker increased its volume by 112 tons. Henniker's total solid waste volume in 2008 to date comes to 2,645 tons.

The Chairman said he would contact Bob Pennock, Transfer Station Superintendent, to discuss this dramatic increase and hopefully ascertain the reasons for it.

Both Amanda and Lia suggested the importance of precisely determining and distinguishing the volume disposed of by private haulers versus residents who come to the transfer station themselves. This year, 1,084 tons has been collected by one private hauler from commercial (75%) and large residential (25%) sources. The other private hauling company has transported 295 tons, solely from small residences.

Disposal operating costs for Henniker have been impacted by staff overtime expenses, amounting to \$11,778 in 2007, and more than \$13,000 to date in 2008. Suggestions were made about overtime oversight and possibly revising the operating schedule for the transfer station.

Amanda Gilman:

Amanda has been investigating laws pertaining to solid waste disposal. She said she did not have very much to report at this point. She had found the laws to be sparse and subject to interpretation. So far she has looked at internet references provided by the N.H. Department of Environmental Services and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Another member suggested she consult the N.H. Revised Statutes Annotated on line.

Chairman Kjellman remarked that a study commission has been meeting on disposal of electronic waste. That commission is due to make a report and offer

recommendations to the State Legislature by the end of the year, which will likely result in new State regulations regarding electronic waste disposal.

Bill Christiano:

Bill reported on a study he has been making of hazardous waste collection, informally surveying the five communities of Henniker, Hopkinton, Webster, Bradford and Sutton. These towns have been coordinating their efforts and offering collection days once per year. The most recent event cost \$9,000 to administer, a cost that was shared among the five towns.

Bill wondered aloud if once per year is enough to capture all the hazardous waste, but said he had been cautioned that the minimum set-up fee is something to consider (reportedly around \$700). The State of New Hampshire reimburses municipalities up to \$2,900 per event.

Mr. Christiano had contacted Bob Pennock to obtain a copy of the manifest for the last hazardous waste collection event, and he read portions of it aloud to the Committee Members, highlighting such things as: number of cars (171), households participating (205 families), new participants (71), plus types and quantities of hazardous materials collected.

Finally, he reported that the Henniker Transfer Station handed out hazardous materials guidelines at the event. Then it was discussed briefly that, while this literature is made available at that time, it is not widely disseminated or known in other places and at other times.

Rod Pimentel:

Regarding the questions of an incinerator or a new landfill, Mr. Pimentel reported that he had not had time to conduct much research.

He did contact the sales department of one manufacturer, and the smallest incinerator they offered would process 200 tons of solid waste per week, which presumably would be more capacity than Henniker would need. Don Blanchard suggested Canterbury or Sutton might have data on incinerator use; however, it was agreed that their incinerators would be outdated for the standards of today or the future.

Linda Patterson:

Linda said she had nothing to report at this meeting, but she did ask the Chairman later for clarification to hone the focus of a comparative analysis of solid waste practices in local communities before the next meeting.

**▪ Plans for Report to the Selectmen**

A loosely structured discussion was initiated by the Chairman to focus on aspects of preparing a report to the Board of Selectmen on potential Solid Waste Disposal options for the Town of Henniker. At some point during the discussion, Lia Houk volunteered to examine and possibly modify the conversion budget analysis prepared for Henniker by Ms. Bedard.

New Landfill

The consensus seemed to be that this would be an uneconomical, difficult-to-site, virtually impossible solution to propose. In addition to addressing what might be considered for Henniker, the Chair suggested the Committee's report might also refer to experiences encountered by the Concord Co-op and the N.H. Department of Environmental Services in trying to site a landfill.

Incinerator:

An incinerator would be a considerable capital expense. It would need to comply with low emission regulations. As mentioned under Mr. Pimentel's report, the smallest incinerator he found would have more capacity than Henniker should need.

Curbside Collection:

This might be feasible for businesses or for certain areas of town, but would not be practical for less accessible areas. This has been implemented in Goffstown and in the downtown area of Littleton. Perhaps more information would be obtained by contacting those towns.

Status Quo: Present Solid Waste Disposal Program with Pre-Sorted Recycling:

- ❖ Efficiency improvements need to be sought.
- ❖ Expenses need to be reviewed.
- ❖ Revenue rate projections (with increases) need to be included in calculations.

Present Solid Waste Disposal Program with Single Stream Recycling:

- ❖ Labor would be affected.
- ❖ Equipment would be affected (second compactor needed, balers not needed).
- ❖ The economic benefit of increased recycling is not clear at the moment.
- ❖ Revenue share is not certain.
- ❖ Possibly borrow methodological approaches from the Co-op.
- ❖ Possibly survey towns that have instituted single stream recycling through means of out-of-state facilities.

Present SWD Program with Pay-As-You-Throw or Smart Recycling Program:

A smart program was started in Lancaster, and recycling increased by 60 percent.

- ❖ What would a smart program in Henniker look like?

- ❖ Economic benefit?
- ❖ Revenue increase?
- ❖ Implementation costs?

Other questions and issues:

- ❖ Business solid waste should be analyzed:
    - Which types of businesses generate largest volumes of solid waste?
    - What types of waste do they generate?
    - Businesses are presumed to be paying the cost of disposal for solid waste; therefore, an incentive to recycling would be decreased disposal costs.
  - ❖ Cost-Benefit Analysis needed for commercial/industrial solid waste.
  - ❖ Cost-Benefit Analysis needed also for residential solid waste.
  - ❖ Should solid waste disposal be operated like a self-sustaining utility?
  - ❖ If so, should revenues be deposited to a dedicated fund?
  - ❖ Take into account current cost sharing measures in Town and how those would be affected by a changed funding method.
- **Next Meeting - November 6, 2008**
    - ❖ The agenda for the next meeting will be to assemble reports and analyses.
    - ❖ Rod Pimentel will not be able to attend because he will be out of town.
  - **Future Meeting Dates**
    - ❖ Don Blanchard will not be able to attend Committee meetings from the middle of January onward.
  - **Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn was made by Stephany Lavalley, seconded by Donna MacMillan, and carried with all in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Approved Meeting Minutes

Respectfully Submitted

by Recording Secretary

Sheila Mitchell

Corrected by Chairman, John V. Kjellman, 3/26/09

Added Linda Patterson as present at the meeting.