

Town of Henniker
Solid Waste Disposal Committee
Thirty-Second Meeting: Thursday, January 21, 2010, 7:06 PM
At The Grange

Draft Minutes

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

Absent: Don Blanchard

- 1) 1) **Chairman John Kjellman called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.**
- 2) 2) Handouts: Agenda, Draft minutes of January 7th meeting, Annual Report to Town (for Town Annual Report), Table of Expenses, Revenues, and Materials (for report), Report Executive Summary, Rationalized Recycling Rates Spreadsheet, BOS thank you letter to Lia Houk.
- 3) 3) Chairman John Kjellman began with his introduction:
 - a. a. Don Blanchard is not expected, he is off for two months in California.
 - b. b. John reviewed a letter by the BOS thanking Lia Houk for work on HRC that was read publicly at BOS meeting 1/19/09
 - c. c. John noted that the proposed budget for T/S for 2010 was \$707,355, up 14% from 2009. But, the BOS cut it by \$19K at last BOS meeting, to new total of \$688,355 (up 11%).
 - d. d. John pointed out that the public hearing on the Town budget will be on 2/2/10 at 6:30 pm at Community Center
- 4) 4) The minutes of the September 29, 2009 meeting were reviewed. **Donna MacMillan made a motion to accept the minutes with one correction. The motion was seconded by Bill Christiano and passed unanimously with Amanda Gilman abstaining.**
- 5) 5) John reviewed the committee's Annual Report he wrote for the Town Report and had been previously emailed out to the committee for feedback. **Amanda Gilman made a motion too accept the Annual Report as submitted. The motion was seconded by Linda Patterson and passed unanimously.**
- 6) 6) Amanda Gilman reported that she and her newborn son Mason Russell were both doing well.
- 7) 7) The business survey spreadsheet was handed out on 1/7/10. No changes were made and no further discussion occurred.
- 8) 8) The committee reviewed Michael French's spreadsheet on Rationalized Recycling Rates. Discussion ensued as to the importance of the spreadsheet for the report. John suggested that Michael write a brief summary of the spreadsheet findings rather than including the entire spreadsheet in the report. Rod noted that he thought the information on the spreadsheet was important and should be included and Michael agreed. Discussion

ensued with the committee agreeing that Michael should write a summary and pare down the spreadsheet and the committee would review it again and consider it for inclusion.

- 9) 9) Review and discussion of version 12d of the draft report to the selectman and plans for version 13.
 - a. a. John has updated the spreadsheet that is to be Appendix 7. His calculation of Henniker's recycling rate for 2008 based on Bob Pennock's reported numbers is 39%. However, Bob Pennock has his recycling rate listed in the town report as 31.8%. John has emailed Bob asking him to clarify this. The committee discussed possible reasons for this discrepancy. Leah Houk pointed out that it is possible that Bob Pennock didn't include items that can't be sent to the incinerator, such as propane tanks, motor oil, etc. The committee is awaiting clarification from Bob Pennock.
 - b. b. Discussion on figure1 pg.4, graphic on Municipal Solid Waste (MSW): Linda Patterson and John have been discussing this figure. Linda points out that the sizes of the boxes might unintentionally imply incorrect volumes to the reader. The committee discussed actually making the boxes proportional and including the actual percentages of unrecyclable solid waste and recyclable solid waste based on national averages, as well as the % incinerated, the % requiring special handling, and the % recycled or reused based on Henniker's numbers. Discussion ensued that doing so would require that an explanation be written as well. However it was decided that this was not the intention of the graphic, it was merely to graphically explain to the reader a general understanding of MSW. The committee agreed to remove the boxes surrounding the categories and to leave the lines between them merely as dividers so as to eliminate the implication of actual proportions of the components.
 - c. c. Michael French asked if the statistic of 60-70% possible recycling rate is included in the report. He pointed out that if it is, perhaps the rationalized recycling rate spreadsheet might not be needed. John agreed and has already begun to include this in the report, showing that this is an achievable long-term goal.
 - d. d. Michael French asked if increasing recycling would in fact modestly reduce transfer station costs as it is stated in the Findings and Discussion section, pg. 23, line 34, as this fact is not clear to him. John responded that by increasing recycling rates there is an avoided cost of disposal, a small amount of revenue generated and hence a decrease in the total cost, although modest, as there may be an associated increase in labor costs. Michael asked to what extent our transfer station could absorb an increase in recycling without increasing the workforce. The committee agreed that this is not a number we can quantify at this time but that it is clear that increasing recycling would decrease costs to a point where handling the recycling required an increase in labor not just an increase in efficiency.
 - e. e. Linda Houk addressed some areas of the report she wanted to discuss. She will send her suggestions to John via email:

- i. i. Pg. 5, line 11-12 noting that the revenue stated doesn't list the revenue from recycling of \$64,000, even though it is included in the actual number and the committee agreed this should be explicitly stated.
- ii. ii. Pg. 8, starting with line 27, saying a more thorough introduction should explain that the costs of PAYT bags can be used to either fully fund the transfer station budget or to just cover part of the budget. The committee agreed that this should be explained more clearly.
- iii. iii. Pg.8, Line 36 should include some theoretical numbers to make it more clear.
- iv. iv. Pg.10, Line 13 should state that any additional revenue would be held in a designated revenue fund so that it does not roll back into the general fund of the town budget. This way it may be used to offset future costs like a capital expenditure fund. In Lia's experience, all other towns that institute PAYT set up this revenue fund from the cost of the bags.
- v. v. The end of the PAYT section should have a blurb similar to other sections discussing the combined options of PAYT with single stream recycling and or curbside pick up.
- vi. vi. Pg. 13 shows a reduction in recycling revenue itemized as an expense. Lia noted that it is more of a revenue reduction not an actual expense. The committee agreed. John will restructure this.
- vii. vii. Pg. 13, Line 48 shows the reduction in recycling revenue that would occur with single stream recycling but doesn't show where the numbers came from. John noted that he had already changed this in the next version of the report showing historic figures for the revenue from single stream recycling per ton.
- viii. viii. The curbside collection section doesn't state how this would impact the transfer station, i.e. trucking solid waste and perhaps single stream recycling directly to the incinerator or a single stream facility would reduce handling at the transfer station.
- f. f. Mike French addressed another point from Pg. 6, Line 22 requesting that the words "one of" be added to the beginning of the section. As there are many big issues. The committee agreed.

10) 10) Review and discussion of Don Blanchard's Executive Summary: John's feeling is that the presentation to the BOS will have more bearing than the executive summary or the actual report and that the summary as it is written seems more like an introduction. John asked the committee to review the summary and bring comments to the next meeting.

11) 11) Mike French raised the discussion of his spreadsheet again saying that he is now thinking it doesn't need to be included if John is going to change the report. Linda noted

that a column or two might be added to her spreadsheet to help better explain the discrepancy in numbers reported by other towns. John again suggested that he write a summary to be considered for inclusion in the report. The discussion began again as to whether a 70% recycling rate is actually attainable, and that showing what other towns are achieving might give a more attainable goal for Henniker.

12) 12) The committee engaged in a discussion about what the future may hold for recycling. It was suggested that a graph showing the rising costs of tipping fees as well as the increasing revenue from recycling would shed tremendous light on the fiscal side of recycling.

13) 13) Next meeting: Thursday February 4, 2010 at 7pm and February 18, 2010 at 7pm.

14) 14) **Motion to adjourn was made by Michael French at 2047, seconded by Linda Patterson and carried unanimously.**

Submitted 2/2/10
By Amanda Gilman