

Town of Henniker
Solid Waste Disposal Committee
Thirty-Fifth Meeting: Thursday, March 11, 2010, 7:00 PM
At The Community Center

Approved Minutes

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

Absent: Don G. Blanchard, Amanda Gilman, and Linda Patterson.

Chairman John Kjellman called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

- 1) Handouts: Agenda, Draft minutes of February 18th meeting, Updated Executive Summary, Updated MSW Graphic (Fig1), Final Draft of Report to Town (Version 15), Cover letter to Board of Selectmen.
- 2) Chairman John Kjellman began with his introduction:
 - a. Don is not expected tonight, neither is Amanda or Linda. Don is expected to be back for our BOS presentation.
 - b. Ron Taylor has been replaced on the BOS by Leo Aucoin, who beat Ron by over 100 votes. John doesn't know what this means for our report.
 - c. Town meeting is this coming Saturday. Bob Pennock is a bit dismayed by the cuts to his budget. He pointed out incineration costs are up significantly.
 - d. NRRA is promoting its annual sale of compost bins and rain barrels.
 - e. NRRA reporting recycling prices up for fibers, metals, and plastics. PETE is at \$.15/pound, HDPE Natural at \$0.24 and HDPE MC at \$0.18.
 - f. State Senate Bill 301 would repeal the effective date of the ban on combustion of untreated wood at municipal transfer stations. Introduced by Senator Odell of Lempster. No sponsors from our Reps or Senator. Doesn't mean they don't support it.
- 3) The minutes of the February 18, 2010 meeting were reviewed. **Michael French made a motion to accept the minutes with corrections. The motion was seconded by Lia Houk and passed unanimously.**
- 4) John discussed the new version of the MSW graphic, which has been redesigned. He said Linda thinks it is an improvement. Lia asked about graphically showing percentages of trash and recyclables, but John said he didn't think that would work well. The intent was to help explain the definition of MSW, not to provide real data.
- 5) John said he had reviewed the most recent suggestions for change that Michael submitted, and agreed with the substance of most of them and had made the necessary changes to the report. But there is a question in his mind about one statement, and wanted the Committee's views on it. It was decided to say that the Committee was

unable to determine whether or not the T/S could handle 218 additional tons of recyclable material (a year) without increasing labor costs, rather than asserting that it would “be necessary to implement methods of increased quantities of recyclable materials with less labor” in order to handle the increased recyclables without significantly raising costs.

- 6) John said that the copy of the report that had just been handed out was not much changed from the version that was mailed out the previous week. He said he still didn't have the Appendixes integrated into the report file properly, and would work on that problem, and request help from Nicole in the Town Office if needed. He also said that he hadn't put Michael's rationalized recycling spreadsheet in the report, yet, either.
- 7) Lia asked about the difference between the bullet under Findings that asks if businesses should pay for the disposal of MSW, and the bullet that asks if the Town should do things that help businesses lower their costs of solid waste disposal. John said the second item is meant to deal with issues like whether or not B&A Waste should be allowed to dump trash into the hopper (at a price) and contractors allowed to dump their C&D into the C&D Roll-Off to save manual unloading (with physical changes at the T/S).
- 8) Lia also asked about asking the question, “Is the Town ready to make changes?” John said we've asked that question in a variety of ways in the report, but he thinks that putting that question at the end of the PowerPoint presentation as Lia has done is excellent. He thinks the BOS will be swayed by our presentation as much as by the report itself.
- 9) Lia reviewed the “slides” from her PowerPoint presentation. She said she added some comments about the need for significant citizen education for each of the options for change. She also added something for the combination of some of the options. It was agreed that Lia had done a great job. A few changes were suggested, and Lia said that if anybody had any ideas for other changes, they could e-mail them to her.
- 10) The Committee decided that John could finish up the report without the need for another meeting. He said he thought he could get a copy in the Selectman's hands by the middle of the week after next, around 3/22 to 3/24. This would give them at least ten days to review the report before the official presentation. He said he would get the final version in everybody's hands before giving it to the BOS.
- 11) John said he did want to schedule a time when we could all get together for a Committee photograph, sometime after Don returns from California. Perhaps late some afternoon.
- 12) John added that he liked the changes Lia made to Don's Executive Summary.
- 13) Next meeting: Tuesday, April 6, 2010 at 6:30 PM at Town Hall, to present report to Board of Selectmen.
- 14) **The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 P.M.**

Submitted 3/15/2010

By John V. Kjellman

Approved 9/09/2010

Town of Henniker
Solid Waste Disposal Committee
Thirty-Sixth Meeting: Thursday, August 19, 2010, 7:00 PM
At The Grange

Approved Minutes

Present: Don Blanchard, Amanda Gilman, Lia Houk, John V. Kjellman, Linda Patterson, and Steven White.

Absent: Michael French and Rod Pimentel

Guests: Eleanor Glynn Kjellman

Chairman John Kjellman called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm.

- 1) Handouts: Agenda, "To The Dump" courtesy of Linda, Executive Summary by Don Blanchard, Power Point Presentation to BOS, Committee Contact List.
- 2) Chairman John Kjellman began with his introduction:
 - a. Bill Christiano and Donna MacMillan have resigned from the Committee. Bill had wanted to resign in late 2009, but John asked him to remain on the Committee until we got the report done. Donna is an unexpected resignation.
 - b. On the good side, Steven White, a new member of the inactive Henniker Recycling Committee, has also agreed to join the SWDC. Introductions were exchanged between Steven and current members of the SWDC.
 - c. Rod Pimentel is not expected tonight, Amanda Gilman is expected to be late.
 - d. There was a discussion about Bob Pennock's tenure as Superintendent of the Transfer Station. Anecdotal info has it that when he sells his house he will be leaving Henniker.
- 3) John initiated a discussion about what the BOS needs and wants from the committee, and that while he had asked committee members to keep their personal opinions private about what the Town should do while the report was being written, it is now OK to express personal opinions.
- 4) Lia said she believes what the BOS wants is not the opinion of the Committee, rather an assessment by the Committee of what the people of the Town want. She thinks it is mandatory that we present the report to the Town (in the public meeting) in a manner that makes the data clear and unambiguous, so people can form (and express) opinions.
- 5) John asked what the thoughts of committee members were in regards to a good option for Henniker:
 - a. Don said he hadn't thought through to a best solution, but he wasn't excited about PAYT. He likes curbside but thinks it may be too expensive. He thinks a goal should be to expand the footprint of the T/S by expanding into the gravel area. Scales should be a long-term objective.
 - b. Lia admitted to a bias toward PAYT, but now really likes it when combined with single-stream recycling. She supports a larger footprint to facilitate scales and operate more efficiently.
 - c. John asked which T/S would be good for the selectmen to visit if we decided to expand the T/S. It was concluded that it really depends on which option(s) is selected. Lia suggested a photo album of superior T/S.

- d. It was pointed out that Pete Fernandes should be drawn in to the conversation, as he has some definite ideas about possible changes at the T/S. Linda added that Pete told her that he has ideas about lowering labor costs. Lia said she knows that he has ideas for operational improvements.
- e. Steven suggested that if we are looking for a short-term fix, that PAYT is the best option. He likes single-stream as a long-term approach. He said that cost is an issue with single-stream, but John said there is a front-end cost, but long-term it could save money.
- f. Eleanor Kjellman was asked if she had any thoughts she would like to share. She said one of her questions is, what are the underlying goals of the committee, to reduce costs or increase recycling? She said the presentation to the Town needs to incorporate more graphics. Also any option presented to the Town should show how it can save the Town money, increase recycling, or both. Saving costs will resonate with townspeople.
- g. John said people seem to like the “single-stream” processing we have implemented for plastics. Lia said the combination of S/S and PAYT would be particularly effective, as people would know that everything they recycle is saving them money. Eleanor said she resents PAYT, as currently she pays for trash disposal with her taxes. Lia said the portion of her tax bill that is allocated for the T/S will be reduced with PAYT. Eleanor said that may be true, but the point has to be made clear to the townspeople.
- h. Eleanor asked if the Committee had looked at the cost of curbside pickup of both trash and recyclable materials. The answer is Yes, and after some discussion it was averred that the cost is about \$40/month for residential biweekly pickup. John said we’re largely do-it-yourselfers, but curbside pickup would provide the Town with a new service that would more than double the existing T/S budget. Whether or not it is something townspeople would pay for the new service is the big question. It was pointed out that curbside pickup is more difficult in winter, and that it would not totally eliminate the “dump.”
- i. John said his conclusion is that PAYT and single-stream combined is what is doable at this time, with PAYT now and single-stream in the near future. He said he would like PAYT to evolve to a weight-based system. An Easy-Pass type of system could be used to eliminate the need for cash with a weight-based system.
- j. Amanda suggested that we shouldn’t eliminate the “no change” option, as we know there are things that could be improved at the T/S that are not specifically tied to one of the five options for change.
- k. Lia asked if the money collected at the T/S for special items such as C&D matches the cost of disposal. John said there was not enough data to answer that question. That data might make the case for scales. John said other T/Ss say scales pay for themselves within 6 months to a couple of years.
- l. Amanda suggested that the meeting is getting off the track of planning for our public meeting. There was a consensus that we need to be able to explain the options, and to talk about the advantages of the various options, and to determine the opinions of the people who attend the meeting.
- m. Amanda said we don’t have time to collect more data before our meeting on the 28th. We need to take our options and create a general outline, we need to present each option in the same format. Lia said she agreed. She also said we need to tell townspeople something is going to happen so you better show up and make your voice heard.
- n. There was a discussion about doing a mailing. John said he would ask Peter Flynn if we have money to do a mailing. Postage for all postal patrons in Town is less than \$400, according to Amanda. Lia said we could take a shot at developing the wording before we

know exactly how much space we will have. Don's Executive Summary represents a good starting point, although it will need to be reduced.

- o. Lia and Amanda agreed to work together on the outline to be used for comparing the options. Lia said we need more time, but the consensus was that we should stick to the current schedule.
 - p. There was a discussion, which was not concluded, whether or not the options to eliminate all recycling and the "steady as you go" option should even be mentioned. There was an agreement that we should hand out the executive summary to all attendees at the meeting, and have copies of the report available for those who want them.
 - q. The question was asked about why the BOS created the Committee in the first place. It was concluded that Rod Pimentel (not present at the meeting) was frustrated not seeing any changes at the T/S, and proposed a new committee to the BOS to look at the issues.
- 6) **A motion to adjourn was made by Don Blanchard.** Linda asked about Pete Fernandes attending our next meeting, and it was agreed to defer his visit to our 9/23 meeting. **Don's motion was then seconded by Amanda Gilman and carried unanimously.**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 P.M.

Submitted 8/29/10
By John V. Kjellman

Approved 9/09/10

Town of Henniker
Solid Waste Disposal Committee
Thirty-Seventh Meeting: Thursday, September 9, 2010 at 7:00 PM
At The Grange

Approved Minutes

Present: Don Blanchard, Michael C. French, Amanda Gilman, Lia Houk, John V. Kjellman, Linda Patterson, Rod Pimentel and Steven White.

Absent: None

Chairman John Kjellman called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm.

- 1) Handouts: Agenda, Draft Minutes 3/11/10 meeting and 8/19/10 meeting, State Senate Bill 301 regarding burning of untreated wood, draft of public notice about our 9/28 public meeting.
- 2) Chairman John Kjellman began with his introduction:
 - a. John thanked the Committee for the gift certificate for dinner at the Centennial Inn in Concord. He said he hadn't had an opportunity to use the certificate yet, due to his recent hospitalization.
 - b. John also thanked the Committee for the flowering plant it sent to him at Catholic Medical Center. It had pretty flowers and followed him from nurses' station to nurses' station as he moved around the hospital. The plant is home with John now and is very healthy.
 - c. John said he talked with the admin assistant at Naughton & Sons Recycling and she said they are hauling trash to the landfill in Berlin, in a 100-yard trailer. They are saving money compared to hauling it to the COOP in Penacook. There is no direct cost to Henniker this year for this change at NSR, but it is likely to result in higher tipping fees in Penacook next year.
 - d. Henniker is considering licensing commercial haulers so as to limit their ability to make changes which cost the Town money.
 - e. Senate Bill 301 pushes out the date three years when clean wood can no longer be burned at transfer stations.
 - f. John said he detected a leaning toward PAYT followed by single-stream processing as the best way forward for Henniker, but Linda and Rod pointed out that while they didn't disagree, they hadn't made up their own minds on the subject.
- 3) The minutes of March 11, 2010 were reviewed and one typo was noted. **Lia Houk moved to accept the corrected minutes. Michael C. French seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**
- 4) The minutes of the August 19, 2010 meeting were reviewed. **Linda Patterson move to accept the minutes as submitted. Steven White seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, with Michael C. French abstaining.**
- 5) Lia presented her draft of a flyer to be mailed to all postal patrons in Town, "advertising" the Committee's public meeting on 1/28/10. It was pointed out that it would be a public informational meeting, and not a public hearing. Other suggestions for improvements were made, and there was a discussion about the quality of the cost estimates in the report. It was agreed that they are good enough, we're trying to educate, not make a final decision.

- 6) John presented his idea for something to be included in the “community calendar” sections of the *Monitor*, the *Villager*, and the *Messenger*. It was suggested that we refer not to the cost of options, but refer to “options for change.”
- 7) Amanda Gilman presented her PowerPoint presentation, which was about one-half complete. The Committee made many comments and offered suggestions for improvements, and Amanda asked the Committee for clarification on some of the points that should and should not be included in the presentation. It was agreed that the important numbers belong on slides, but the detailed description should be verbal.
- 8) John announced that the next meeting is scheduled for September 23, 2010, at which time we would do a final review of the presentation. Committee members should send any additional suggestions for change to Amanda right away.
- 9) **Lia made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Linda. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 8:43 PM.**

Submitted by:
John V. Kjellman
9/27/10

Town of Henniker
Solid Waste Disposal Committee
Thirty-Eighth Meeting: Thursday, September 23, 2010 at 7:00 PM
At The Grange

Approved Minutes

Present: Don Blanchard, Michael C. French, Amanda Gilman, Lia Houk, John V. Kjellman, Linda Patterson, Rod Pimentel and Steven White.

Absent: None

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

- 1) Handouts: Agenda, Draft Minutes 9/9/10 meeting.
- 2) Chairman John Kjellman began with his introduction:
 - a. John thanked Lia for doing a great job on the mailer to every household in Henniker promoting our 9/28/2010 informational meeting.
 - b. The consolidation of the Highway Dept, Transfer Station, and Parks and Rec is still under consideration. A decision will be made at a special Board of Selectmen meeting on Monday, September 27, 2010.
 - c. John said he edited the Committee report that was presented to the BOS, and corrected typos and embedded hyphens, but made no change of substance. The edited report is up on the website.
- 3) There was discussion about preparations for the 9/28/2010 presentation, and what final arrangements are needed, such as a projector and screen.
- 4) There was a review of Linda's spreadsheet of the six options, and it was agreed that it is too brief to be a good handout at the meeting.
- 5) There was a discussion of the economics of unit pricing. Rod Pimentel pointed out we could expect the overall costs to decrease due to increased recycling. Lia Houk said we should show how much people would save on their tax bills versus the cost of buying bags. Don Blanchard asked about people using commercial haulers, and it was agreed they don't figure in with unit pricing.
- 6) There was a review of the slide that compares the economic benefits and costs of the six options, and some concern that the data might not be precise enough. But the consensus was that the data was "good enough" for the intended purpose, to educate townspeople about the relative merits of each option.
- 7) Amanda Gilman then ran through her PowerPoint presentation and Committee members made comments and suggestions, and reviewed the data being presented for each option. Numerous suggestions for improvement were made, which Amanda said she would incorporate into the presentation. At the end, there was a summary review of the presentation, and a discussion about what was needed to be ready for the presentation, such things as the number of copies of the PowerPoint presentation.
- 8) **The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 PM.**

Submitted by:
John V. Kjellman
10/14/2010

Town of Henniker
Solid Waste Disposal Committee
Thirty-Ninth Meeting: Thursday, October 14, 2010 at 7:00 PM
At The Grange

Approved Minutes

Present: Michael C. French, Lia Houk, John V. Kjellman, Linda Patterson, Rod Pimentel and Steven White.

Absent: Don Blanchard, Amanda Gilman

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

- 1) Handouts: Agenda, Draft Minutes 9/9/10 and 9/23/10 meetings, statistics from 9/28/10 informational meeting.
- 2) Chairman John Kjellman began with his introduction:

John said a decision has been made not create a new director of public works position and that the Highway Department and the Transfer Station will continue to be managed separately. The Town is advertising for a new superintendent to replace Bob Pennock. The staff at the Transfer Station will be reduced from four to three after Bob retires.
- 3) The minutes of the September 9, 2010 meeting were reviewed. **Linda Patterson made a motion to accept the minutes without change. The motion was seconded by Rod Pimentel and passed unanimously.**
- 4) The minutes of the September 23, 2010 meeting were reviewed. **Rod made a motion to accept the minutes without change. The motion was seconded by Steven White and passed unanimously.**
- 5) John thanked Lia Houk for her help in getting out the word about our 9/28 meeting, and her help to Amanda Gilman during the 9/28 meeting. He also thanked Linda for making notes of the questions and comments that people made at the end of the presentation.
- 6) John reviewed the statistics he compiled from the 43 ballots that were cast at the informational meeting, as well as a list of the comments submitted on the ballots and comments and questions made at the meeting following the presentation. (The data were shown on one of the handouts.) He noted that while more people voted for no change as first choice (42%), only 30% voted for no change as 2nd choice, and 40% voted for single stream as 2nd choice. And a majority voted for some change (versus no change) for both 1st and 2nd choice. The 1st choice votes for change were 21% Mandatory, 19% PAYT, 16% Single stream, and 2% curbside pickup. The 2nd choice votes for change were 14% Mandatory, 7% PAYT, and 40% Single stream.
- 7) John then asked committee members for their thoughts on the meeting and the resulting statistics. Rod said that single-stream was a lot like steady-as-you-go, as it would just be simplifying the existing system. It was pointed out that it would require an up-front investment. Linda asked if anybody mentioned scales, and the answer was yes. Scales would eliminate the need to “guesstimate” the weight of C&D debris. Rod pointed out that we need to be mindful of how much we charge to dispose of C&D debris, relative to other towns. If we’re low, people may bring C&D debris from other towns to Henniker. There was a discussion about people who work in Henniker bringing their trash from other towns, for convenience or to save money. But it was pointed out that people who work in other towns may be taking trash from Henniker to those other towns. Linda made the point that we should be charging enough to cover our costs, regardless of what other towns charge. Rod said we need to be competitive with other towns, regardless of our costs.

Linda asked if we know what the impact will be on our tipping rate at the Penacook incinerator as a result of Naughton taking the trash it picks up to Berlin rather than Penacook. John said we have no way of knowing. There was further discussion about the Town's power to license the commercial haulers and perhaps require them to haul Henniker's trash to Penacook. John said it is not clear exactly what the Town can and can't do in that regard. It was agreed that the impact of Naughton hauling to Berlin rather than Penacook is not going to influence our costs very much.

Steven raised the question of whether or not the 70 people at the informational meeting were representative of the whole Town. It was agreed it wasn't a random sample of opinions, but the Committee was satisfied that it was reasonably representative of the Town as a whole.

Michael French said that the problem in N.H. is there is no state law that says people have to recycle. He said Vermont has a law saying no recyclable materials can go into landfills. If we had such a law it would change the dynamics of solid waste disposal.

Michael said more education won't have a big effect – we've been educating and educating for years. Linda said she disagreed, that many people don't know what's recyclable or not, and that we need more signage at the Transfer Station showing what is recyclable.

- 8) John asked Committee members what we should tell the Board of Selectmen during our 10/19/2010 meeting with the Board. Lia said that planning for single stream made sense, as well as some facility upgrades such as the addition of scales. Rod added that if we add single-stream and tipping fees go up, that it might be easier to add something like mandatory or PAYT because of the cost advantages. Michael asked why we shouldn't go for PAYT or mandatory now. Lia suggested those things wouldn't pass at town meeting this year. There's a lot of anxiety now and people don't want changes. Rod said if Concord and Hopkinton are successful with PAYT that will help us to move that way. The consensus was that this year is not a good year to introduce changes at the town meeting. Michael said we shouldn't be too concerned about losing the first vote, that it often takes multiple attempts to get changes passed at town meeting. It's a matter of persistence. Henniker has been stuck in a rut for a long time, while surrounding towns are moving forward with PAYT and mandatory recycling. Michael said we should move forward, too. Lia said the BOS should move forward to gather more data about the cost of implementing single-stream and PAYT. The BOS should also look at getting a truck scale and expanding the Transfer Station into the gravel pit to the north of the T/S, so we can have more options. Michael said we should ask the BOS for a budget to study the issue of changes at the T/S. John pointed out that we will soon have a new superintendent and that person should have a chance to make his or her own proposals. John also noted that if Pete Fernandes gets the job, he has said he could reduce costs with a three-person staff.
- 9) There was a discussion of the future of the Committee, and the fact that several members have the feeling our task is done, and want to resign from the Committee. John mentioned that Amanda Gilman said she was going to resign, and other members indicated they were thinking of resigning, also. The consensus was that the BOS should take the ball and run with it. John asked if the Committee should remain intact, and just not meet for a while. Rod and Michael said they would rather see the Committee disband, but they would consider joining a new revived committee, depending on the task assigned to that committee.
- 10) John said he thought the Recycling Committee should be combined with the Solid Waste Disposal Committee. Rod suggested a new name, The Solid Waste Committee. Lia said that was a good idea, she thought the Recycling Committee had gotten a bad name, and that a few people don't recycle just to spite the committee.
- 11) Michael asked John what he thought the Town should do. John said he thought PAYT was an obvious choice because it can be implemented cheaply and easily, and the single-stream made

sense for the longer term. He said the problem is that there are a number of things that need to be done at the Transfer Station, and cumulatively they could be expensive, even though they would save money long-term.

12) Rod said he has long thought there should be an ongoing solid waste committee that would advocate for change. Michael said the task of the solid waste committee should be waste reduction and cost reduction. Linda said the committee should review and have a say (advisory only) on contracts that are issued by the Transfer Station.

13) A motion to adjourn was made by Linda Patterson at 8:24 PM. It was seconded by Lia Houk. The motion passed unanimously.

Submitted by:

John V. Kjellman

10/29/2010

Approved 11/5/2010 by E-mail by 3/5 of those attending the meeting,
with no dissentions.

Town of Henniker
Solid Waste Disposal Committee
Thirty-First Meeting: Thursday, January 7, 2010, 7:00 PM
At The Grange

Approved Minutes

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

Absent: Amanda Gilman

- 1) **Chairman John Kjellman called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m.**
- 2) Handouts: Agenda; Draft minutes of December 3rd meeting; Notes on interviews with B&A Waste, Naughton & Sons, and Gerry Cornett, manager of New Boston Transfer Station; Spreadsheet and key of business survey; New York Times article on Cancer From the Kitchen?; Report Version 12d, with Appendix 7 separately.
- 3) John reviewed the list of handouts and said that the article on Cancer From the Kitchen has nothing to do with the Committee, except it points out how very tiny amounts of toxic chemicals can affect our health, and why the proper disposal of solid waste is important.
- 4) He went on to say that Tom Watman has resigned as chairman of the BOS, but is still on the Board. Leon Parker is the new chair and Kris Blombeck is the new vice chair. John said that the change reflected some differences about the development of Class VI roads in Town, and Tom said he (Tom) could no longer represent the views of the majority so he was resigning as chair.
- 5) John said that New London is planning to bring the issue of Single-Stream recycling to the Town at this year's meeting. This follows a presentation to the New London BOS by Liz Bedard of the Concord COOP. The board also voted to switch to a PAYT system at the time S/S recycling goes into effect, if possible, but separately, otherwise.
- 6) The minutes of the meeting of December 3, 2009 meeting were reviewed. **Don Blanchard moved to accept the minutes as submitted, Rod Pimentel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, with abstentions by Michael C. French, Lia Houk and Donna MacMillan.**
- 7) Don Blanchard mentioned that he is leaving for California next week, and will be gone a couple of months. John said he will meet with Don before he leaves, to talk about the executive summary, and a way to get Don's signature and approval on our final report.
- 8) John said that Amanda had updated the business survey spreadsheet, and that it was one of the handouts. He said he hadn't reviewed it yet, and said he wasn't sure how useful the spreadsheet statistics would be, but that he thought the reports that committee members made about their interviews were very useful, and helped shape the report. He said the survey was a very useful project.

- 9) John reviewed his interviews with Ben Tokarz of B&A Waste and George Naughton of Naughton and Sons Recycling, and mentioned that his notes from the interview were part of the handouts. He said both interviews were good, although it was a bit harder to track down George. Both companies seem willing to cooperate with the Town when they can.
- 10) John said he (John) thought it would be beneficial to Ben and his customers if Ben could dump his trash in the hopper at the Transfer Station, as he once did, for a fee. He could weigh at one of the scales in Town.
- 11) John also reviewed his visit with Gerry Cornett, manager of the New Boston Transfer Station. Gerry is a former employee of the Henniker Transfer Station. John said he runs a very impressive operation, and has a very sophisticated software system that allows him to keep track of everything that comes in and out at the transfer station. John said he thought Gerry would be a good candidate for Bob's job when Bob retires. New Boston has mandatory recycling and Gerry opened a bag of trash to inspect while he was there. Gerry said it was a new resident. He doesn't inspect the trash of people of people who he knows knows the rules.
- 12) John said George told him (Naughton) is now making one run a week, starting up north at New London, picking up commingled recyclable materials from dumpsters. He takes the collected material to Hooksett, where it eventually goes to a single-stream recycling facility. In Henniker, only New England College is using the service. George said he does charge for the service, and would be happy to pick up more dumpsters, but most businesses don't want to pay for the service, and many don't have room for another dumpster. George also charges to pickup cardboard. Ben doesn't, because it saves him money.
- 13) John said one thought for the Town is that if we could implement some sort of collection service at the same time we switched to single-stream recycling, perhaps we could avoid the expense of a new compactor at the transfer station, and we could have the commingled material trucked out of Town without going through the T/S.
- 14) John reported on the Kjellman family (4 adults plus two very small businesses which generate paper mostly) recycling rate over 84 days: 66% w/home compost, 60% if garbage was taken to T/S, it would be 78% if home composting counted. John said the point is to indicate that recycling rates from 50-70% are feasible for most households.
- 15) John reviewed the latest incarnation of the Committee report (Vers 12d), and said that he felt it was pretty much complete in terms of content and organization, that he had redone the introduction and consolidated the three final sections into one, based on the comments members made when we reviewed the previous version on 12/3/09. But he also said he wasn't sure of all the numbers and enclosures, and would be working on that next. He said the summary spreadsheet isn't done yet, either. He asked for a critical view of the writing only.
- 16) John reviewed some of the report conclusions, which the committee discussed. Rod Pimentel suggested that any type of single-stream processing that encouraged

material to be picked up in Town and brought to the T/S, where it would be consolidated, would not be good because it would mean extra handling.

- 17) John said he was surprised when he saw data that showed that trash loads from the T/S to Penacook are not always full. He said that Bob told him that it is a scheduling issue, Bob can't reliably call the trucker just when the trailer is full, he needs to schedule the pickups, which means the trailer is more full sometimes than other times. Bob told John that he also has to worry about overloads. The committee discussed that issue a bit, wondering if there might be a potential for cost savings in this area.
- 18) Michael French said that one of the things Concord does is it charges commercial haulers a tipping fee that is higher than the Coop's, a PAYT system for the commercial firms. They use the extra revenue to help pay for the recycling program. Michael said they were charging \$58/ton, before the price went up. (The COOP's fee was \$45.90, a spread of 12.10/ton). Michael said that we have been giving our commercial haulers a deal by only charging them the actual COOP tipping fee. If we charged them more, it would give them and their customers an increased incentive to recycle. Don asked if adding an additional fee could be enough to run someone like B&A Waste out of business. Michael suggested that if he was running his business properly, he would raise his rates to compensate for his increased costs. Don said he thought that Ben was reluctant to raise rates. Lia Houk said she knows B&A Waste caters more to residents than businesses, and that they are more sensitive to a price change of a few dollars per month.
- 19) Linda Patterson wondered if the Town did do something to allow B&A Waste to dump its trash at the T/S, for a fee, if it would be legal not allow Naughton to do the same. Rod said perhaps the service could be reasonably limited by truck size.
- 20) Rod said another way to look at it is to add the premium for dumping trash, but to give the haulers some sort of economic incentive to pickup more recycling, so what they lose on trash they could get back on recyclables.
- 21) Michael pointed out that when we talk about PAYT for individuals, we don't talk about that as a penalty, so adding a fee to the haulers shouldn't be looked at as a penalty, either.
- 22) John mentioned that he had been wondering what a town's responsibility is for solid waste disposal, and had found RSA 149-M, which lays out State policy and says that towns must provide for access to a solid waste disposal, but it doesn't say much about what that facility must do, and it does not require recycling. He said State policy prefers incineration over landfilling. Towns do have wide latitude for imposing fees and even registering commercial haulers.
- 23) Michael said that one concern he had with the previous version of the report is that he thought some of the projections for saving and increases in recycling rates were too conservative. He thought that achieving a 50% recycling rate at the T/S is

doable, and that we should look at the potential for higher recycling rates from the commercial sector. Linda suggested that we also need better numbers of exactly what we handle at the T/S and what it costs to process it. John said that he calculated that 5% of the solid waste picked up by the commercial haulers is being recycled as cardboard at the T/S.

- 24) Michael said that his rationalized recycling rate spreadsheet offers some data that can be useful in setting our recycling rate goals.
- 25) Next meeting: Thursday, 1/21/10 at 7:00 pm at The Grange.
- 26) **A motion to adjourn was made by Don Blanchard at 8:24 PM. It was seconded by Donna MacMillan and carried unanimously.**

Submitted 1/11/2010
By John V. Kjellman
Corrected and Approved
1/21/2010

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

Approved Minutes

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

Absent: Don Blanchard

- 1) **Chairman John Kjellman called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m.**
- 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) Chairman John Kjellman began with his introduction:
 - a. Don Blanchard is not expected, he is off for two months in California.
 - b. John reviewed a letter by the BOS thanking Lia Houk for work on Henniker Recycling Committee that was read publicly at BOS meeting 1/19/09.
 - 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. 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) The minutes of the January 7, 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) John reviewed the committee's Annual Report he wrote for the Town Report, that had been previously e-mailed to the committee for feedback. **Amanda Gilman made a motion to accept the Annual Report as submitted. The motion was seconded by Linda Patterson and passed unanimously.**
- 6) Amanda Gilman reported that she and her newborn son Mason Russell were both doing well.
- 7) The business survey spreadsheet was handed out on 1/7/10. No changes were made and no further discussion occurred.
- 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. The Committee will review it at the next meeting and consider it for inclusion.

- 9) Review and discussion of version 12d of the draft report to the selectman and plans for version 13.
 - 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. Lia 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. Discussion on figure 1 pg.4, graphic on Municipal Solid Waste (MSW): Linda Patterson and John have been discussing this graphic. 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. It was decided that this was not the intention of the graphic, it was merely to graphically provide 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 specific proportions of the components.
 - 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. Michael French asked if increasing recycling would in fact modestly reduce transfer station costs as it is stated in the Findings and Discussion section, under the Unit Pricing Option, 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.
 - e. Lia Houk addressed some areas of the report she wanted to discuss. She will send her suggestions to John via email:

- 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. 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. Pg.8, Line 36 should include some theoretical numbers to make it clearer.
 - iv. Pg.10, Line 13 should state that any additional revenue could 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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) 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) 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 to Michael

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) 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) Next meeting: Thursday February 4, 2010 at 7pm, and a following meeting February 18, 2010 at 7pm.
- 14) **Motion to adjourn was made by Michael French at 8:47 PM, seconded by Linda Patterson and carried unanimously.**

Submitted 2/2/10

By Amanda Gilman

Reviewed 2/3/10

John V. Kjellman

Corrected and Approved 2/4/10

Town of Henniker
Solid Waste Disposal Committee
Thirty-Third Meeting: Thursday, February 4, 2010, 7:00 PM
At The Grange

Approved Minutes

Present: Michael C. French, Lia Houk, John V. Kjellman, Donna MacMillan, and Linda Patterson.

Absent: Don G. Blanchard, Bill Christiano, Amanda Gilman, and Rod Pimentel.

Chairman John Kjellman called the meeting to order at 7:07 pm.

- 1) Handouts: Draft minutes of January 21st meeting, Final Draft of Report to Town (version 13), Updated Executive Summary, Draft letter to BOS for report delivery, Article from Eagle Tribune of 1/7/10 of changes at Pelham Transfer Station.
- 2) Chairman John Kjellman began with his introduction:
 - a. He said thanks to Linda Patterson for pointing out that the Parks and Rec budget is being combined with the Solid Waste Disposal budget this year. It makes this year's proposed increase less significant than what he indicated at the last meeting. Last year was \$609,012 plus \$71,060 for Parks & Rec for a total of \$693,395. This year Bob proposed \$707,355, up two percent, not the 14% he indicated. The BOS has reduced it to \$688,355, which is actually a reduction of about one percent. He said he hadn't heard any public complaints from Bob about the reduction.
 - b. John explained he followed up on a comment made by Lia, and reviewed the issue of reconciling the T/S recycling rate published in last year's Town Report. He said when he deducted materials that the EPA does not consider when calculating recycling rates, namely used clothing and brush and leaves, that he come very close to the 31.8% reported by Bob. The only difference seemed to be that Bob probably included used oil, and the EPA definition does not include that. There were only 9 tons of oil, so it didn't affect the calculation by much.
 - c. John said Peter Flynn e-mailed him the info about changes at the Pelham T/S. He used to be TA in Pelham. The changes seem in keeping with the trends we see at the bigger and better transfer stations. John's e-mail with the agenda had a link to a nifty video about the remodeled T/S at Pelham.
 - d. John said the copy of the Executive Summary handed out at last meeting wasn't Don's latest effort. It is part of the handouts tonight.
- 3) The minutes of the January 21, 2010 meeting were reviewed. **Lia Houk made a motion to accept the minutes with one correction. The motion was seconded by Linda Patterson and passed unanimously.**
- 4) Michael French briefed the Committee on his continuing study of recycling rates in Henniker and other New Hampshire communities. He said he had focused on two

basic rates, the rates reported by transfer stations, where there is generally good data on what gets recycled and what is disposed of as trash, and town-wide recycling rates as reported by NH DES (Don Maurer).

Michael said he identified 11 communities with transfer station recycling rates at least as good as the 39% (which is actually 31%) reported in Henniker, and found the average was about 50%. That includes communities that report as high as 70%, due in part because, in the case of Plymouth, they accept recycling but no trash from businesses. Michael concluded from this that 50% is a reasonable goal for Henniker's transfer station.

John said he agreed, and based in part of Michael's earlier discussion, he had raised the goal for mandatory recycling to 45% in the report. He said that he thought that 50% is achievable. The Committee agreed that there is no way the Town as a whole could achieve a 50% recycling rate without a big increase in recycling by the customers of the commercial haulers.

John pointed out that looking at national numbers he was amazed to see that composting accounts for a significant percentage of recyclable material nationwide, and that a composting program could boost the Town's recycling rate, even though many people are already home composting. Lia Houk said that with sufficient space, composting can occur year-round, but that there is some resistance to public composting because people think it would attract animals and be smelly, but that isn't necessarily so.

Linda said Stone Falls accepts leaves and yard trimmings, but no household garbage.

Michael said he identified seven communities with town-wide recycling rates of 19% or better (approximately Henniker's reported rate). He said the average of these communities was a 29% recycling rate.

The Committee discussed the significance of that rate. On one hand it seems reasonable, but only if some sort of program was established to collect recyclable materials from the customers of the commercial haulers. It was pointed out that NEC is a major customer of Naughton (perhaps half of the trash Naughton picks up in Henniker is from NEC), and that NEC is putting more life into its recycling efforts. It now has one dumpster dedicated to commingled recyclable materials.

Michael pointed out that if a program could be put in effect to collect all the recyclable materials generated by the College, it would have a big effect on the Town's overall recycling rate. Lia said there are almost 1,000 students at NEC.

John said it would be interesting to know if there are any national statistics regarding recycling on college campuses.

Michael said we should not only set a recycling goal for the T/S, but also one for the Town as a whole, perhaps 29%, perhaps some other number.

Michael said he has updated his spreadsheet, and he thought it would be good to include it as an appendix in the report, as it could help to explain some of the numbers and assumptions used in the report. There was a general agreement that this makes sense.

- 5) Review and discussion of version 13c of the draft report to the selectman and plans for report finalization.
 - a. John said that he still had not finished the report, but had pretty much incorporated all of the editorial comments he had received from Committee members, except for a few from Lia which he just received this past weekend. He said the comments and suggestions have been very good, and he has incorporated most into the report. He said the latest copy shows all changes since version 12d, and has many new footnotes, many of which contain the calculations used for numbers in the report.
 - b. John said he would try to get an updated version of the report to Committee members before next weekend, so committee members would have time to review it before our next meeting. The goal is to have a report that could be approved at the next meeting, but the commitment we've made publicly is to have it handed in to the BOS before Town Meeting.
 - c. John said it is possible we could make a presentation to the BOS before Town Meeting, but he wasn't at all sure about that. He said he hoped there would be some sort of public informational meeting to discuss the report.
 - d. Linda asked what the procedure would be for presenting the report to the BOS. John said the Committee would deliver the report to the BOS, and that it was up to the BOS to decide what to do next. He said by not asking the Committee for recommendations, the BOS has made the next step more difficult in some ways, as it now has to review the information and decide what to do next. We have presented the BOS with some philosophical issues they need to grapple with before deciding on any changes. Lia pointed out that she expected that the BOS would come back to the Committee and ask for more information on specific options.
- 6) There was a discussion of Don Blanchard's Executive Summary. Michael asked if it had been reviewed previously, and he was told that Don had been continually updating and revising it, in response to comments made by Committee members when it was reviewed at meetings, and in response to changes in the report as it evolved. It was agreed that it should be reviewed again, and that it should be presented to the BOS along with the full report. Linda said she had a question about the last sentence in Don's report, she thinks that scales for weighing materials not only make things more equitable, they make them more accurate.
- 7) John said he has drafted a report delivery letter to the BOS, which Committee members should review before the next meeting. He said that he needs to add a reference to the Executive Summary in the letter.
- 8) Next meeting: Thursday February 18, 2010 at 7pm.
- 9) **Motion to adjourn was made by Michael French at 8:19 PM, seconded by Donna MacMillan and carried unanimously.**

Submitted 2/9/10

By John V. Kjellman

Corrected and Approved 2/18/10

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 4th 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