

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SOLID WASTE ACTIVITIES

December 1, 2008

6:00 PM

Chairman M. Roy called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen M. Roy, O'Neil, Lopez, Osborne, Murphy

Messrs.: K. Sheppard, B. Moore, K. Brown, M. McCray

Chairman Roy addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Update on Solid Waste violations - FY08

Mr. Kevin Sheppard, Public Works Director, stated I submitted this because it has been awhile since the Committee met and I thought the Committee would find this interesting. I brought along Brad Moore, who is our Solid Waste Compliance Officer. I believe most of the Aldermen know Brad. This is just a history of what happened during FY2008. As part of his position you can see that a lot of violations were found and citations were issued. During the winter months you can see in the middle area there 97.03 Throwing & Putting Snow in the Streets that he assists us with that as well. If there are any specific questions we would be happy to answer them.

Alderman Murphy asked what is 97.34 Encumbrances Prohibited violation?

Mr. Sheppard answered I believe what that is is the Highway Department regulates encumbrances of the City right-of-way, meaning no one can block a street or sidewalk without pulling a permit for that, so I believe that may have been something Brad issued a warning on.

Alderman Lopez asked you didn't do any comparison...I know you didn't have enforcement in FY2007 but there is no comparison from before the time you came on the job. Did you look back, for example, at the owner occupied violations for FY2008 compared to FY2007?

Mr. Sheppard responded we don't have a history. We actually just started tracking the history because previous to having a Compliance Officer there really wasn't

much enforcement and I think a lot of the Aldermen realize that. It was hit or miss as far as enforcement. We would send out letters. Follow-up wasn't always the best. We do have the information and we could go back possibly and gather some of that information.

Alderman Lopez responded I am just curious as to when we authorized the Solid Waste Compliance Officer, that there would be some background on it, but besides that can you tell me on 91.64 and 91.69 what do we do? What happens if people don't comply?

Mr. Brad Moore, Solid Waste Compliance Officer, answered if compliance hasn't been met at that point a citation is issued to the individual on the property and another inspection date is set. As you know, we have escalating fines. A first offense fine is \$200 and a second offense is \$300 until the problem or situation is taken care of.

Alderman Lopez asked am I to assume that the 650 then on 91.64, every one of those was taken care of and there were no fines?

Mr. Moore answered on a majority of them, yes.

Alderman Lopez asked so you have no outstanding individuals who got a fine then? Out of the 650 you gave them a warning and they cleaned it up and that is the end of it?

Mr. Moore responded normally that is what happens. Most of the time once the initial warning has been issued to them at that point we are allowed to re-inspect the property and usually by then it has been taken care of or a line of communication between the parties has been opened and the problem has been rectified.

Alderman Lopez asked would you know how much money we have collected in fines?

Mr. Moore answered I don't have that number.

Mr. Sheppard stated to us it is more important that we work with the property owners versus fighting them or issuing fines to them. If we can work with a property owner and educate a property owner versus cite the property owner I think that is more important than generating or realizing a revenue from it. I think Brad's position is more of an education type of position. Citations, when necessary, are issued but we issue those as a last resort.

Alderman Lopez responded I fully understand that and that is the way it should be. I was just curious in all of these violations if anyone did pay a fine, that's all.

Mr. Sheppard replied you can see there were 61 citations issued. I don't know if that is the total number of citations for the year.

Mr. Moore stated yes that would be the total.

Alderman O'Neil asked is there any correlation in the citations issued...actually there are only a small number of out-of-staters, regarding the four, five or six violations? Can you generally say they are the out-of-towners or would I be wrong to make that statement?

Mr. Moore answered I think it is varied. In that case when you have a property owner who is not...you know I use the term absentee landlord but for the person who is not taking care of the property and maintaining it that is when you see issues and problems happening.

Alderman O'Neil asked but are there cases where it could be owner occupied or a Manchester owner that will have multiple violations?

Mr. Moore answered yes we have had that.

Alderman Osborne asked Brad you being out there all of the time now what is the difference that you found in most of the wards between an owner occupied building or an out-of-state or out-of-town landlord? What did you find in these different areas? We are talking 882 Manchester residents. Do you find mostly rubbish? Is it out of the bags? Is it in the toters?

Mr. Moore replied pretty much trash and litter or garbage cans left out all week, and bulky furniture items piled up in the alleyways, streets and sidewalks.

Alderman Osborne asked what has been your best avenue of getting this enforced? Is it the out-of-towners or the City residents?

Mr. Moore answered obviously the City residents.

Alderman Osborne asked what kind of problem have you been having with this as far as you are concerned?

Mr. Moore responded obviously trying to get communication opened up with the property owner and making sure that they are aware of the situation and the

problem. As Kevin explained we are looking to try to educate them and make sure they are aware of the issue so we can prevent it from recurring in the future.

Alderman O'Neil asked Brad is there any correlation between...Alderman Osborne brought up the toters but between those people using toters and those not? Do you find a lot of violations...I know we have some toter regulations I believe by ordinance and then it is voluntary throughout most of the City but do you find any correlation that if the toters are in use you are less likely to have a violation?

Mr. Moore replied well the toters obviously help as far as litter and trash being spread around since the lids are on them and it keeps everything self-contained as opposed to trash bags left out or a regular garbage can.

Alderman Osborne asked when you were out there most of them were what, multi-families right?

Mr. Moore answered yes.

Alderman Osborne asked how many were two family versus single family?

Mr. Moore replied that is a good question. I don't know that off hand. I don't have that number.

Alderman Osborne stated I was just thinking...well we won't even talk about it right now but that is what I was curious about – the one family and two families. I suppose with the single families you shouldn't have too much of a problem.

Mr. Moore responded mostly we are seeing multi-family units.

Alderman Osborne stated there are some two families out there that you can have some problems with. I know that. You don't have any information on that at all? Are there a lot of them or do you figure it is just part of the whole scenario here?

Mr. Moore replied mostly it is a rental-type property that we are looking at where the person is renting the property as opposed to owning it and living there.

Alderman Osborne asked how many would you say out of this total figure here is one family versus two family?

Mr. Moore answered I would say under 20% of the units that I inspect are single family.

Alderman Osborne asked do you think toters would help this situation?

Mr. Moore responded well as far as trash being maintained and litter being kept in there, that would obviously help but a lot of the issues again are bulky furniture items and construction debris left out – deposits that the regular City trash men aren't going to pick up.

Alderman Osborne stated of course you know I have been on toters for quite awhile and I think they are the best thing since sliced bread and a lot of education needs to be done out there. There is no doubt about it. These toters are worth a lot more, especially to the females who may be carrying a 30 gallon garbage can. These toters with the wheels are wonderful. I think they are worth every penny and I think a lot of people should get them regardless of whether they are forced to or not. I would like to see that some day, the whole City on this type of program because it is going to help worker's compensation and things of that sort. It would save the City a lot of money in the long run and it will save their backs too.

Chairman M. Roy stated just to remind this Committee we have taken up a number of toter initiatives in the past and while I extremely concur with their usefulness we have looked to eventually make them mandatory throughout the City not only for the ease of people using them but for the safety and worker's compensation issues for our City employees. If you would ever like to make that in the form of a motion...a little over a year ago I made the motion that we phase them in by 2011 and that was shot down. So as people get more used to seeing them and using them, I think it would be pertinent to bring it up again.

Alderman Osborne stated basically these toters are wonderful. There is no doubt about it. The questions I used to get were what am I going to do with the barrels I have now? Some people went out and bought new barrels. I said they are fine and they are great for yard waste. That is what you should use them for. That is what I do with my old one. I think it is a tough call to some people out there, especially single family homes, but I think if they took advantage of it it would be wonderful and they wouldn't be sorry that they did have one after they got one. I have no problem with it myself. I think we should get some sort of recommendation from the Highway Department first to see how many are one family versus two family. That is why I asked that question. I would like to wait to get a report back from the Highway Department and then we can take it from there but to make a motion this evening I don't think is the wise thing to do.

Alderman O'Neil asked Kevin, am I correct that the price for the toters hasn't changed in X number of years?

Mr. Sheppard answered actually recently we have gone up because of the cost of plastic but it wasn't a considerable amount of money.

Alderman O'Neil asked how much for a 65 gallon and how much for a 95 gallon? Do you know off the top of your head?

Mr. Sheppard answered I think it is \$55 or \$60 for a 95 gallon toter.

Alderman O'Neil stated we use one at our house and they are pretty handy and there isn't garbage all over the place. I think it is one of our more successful programs.

Alderman Lopez stated Brad you are part of the NET team I understand.

Mr. Moore responded yes sir.

Alderman Lopez asked Kevin, is this a full-time position? Is that all he does every day is just this or are there other things he does?

Mr. Sheppard answered a majority of his time is solid waste compliance. During the winter months we use him to go around and see if people are throwing snow into the street, which has become a major issue throughout the City. He used to oversee our Drop Off Facility and as you know we have had some issues with the Drop Off Facility and he helps us over there as well. The majority of his time is spent on solid waste compliance and I thought that is why it was important to come here so you can see how active he has been and how many violations he has found. I think most Aldermen would agree that the streets and the alleys in the City are looking a lot better, not only because of the toters but because of the compliance issues that are being addressed.

Alderman Lopez asked if we can keep a record on it as we go along that would be great. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask you a question. I thought we did a complete plan and it was approved by the full Board on a lot of these items as far as toters, etcetera? Wasn't there a plan that was presented or am I dreaming?

Mr. Sheppard answered there was a committee or a group formed when Frank Thomas brought forward some recommendations such as the City limit and who we pick up from like five units and below only and no pick up above five units. It appeared that it would make it through the full Board but it never did. There were a couple of other recommendations. I don't have that with me today but one of the strongest recommendations we had was that we limit who are City customers are or who we pick up with City crews. Right now our policy is we pick up anything

that is out on the curb and we don't find many towns or cities that have a policy like that.

Alderman Lopez stated I vaguely remember some conversation that we were going to charge people if we had to pick stuff up in excess of what we normally do.

Mr. Sheppard responded one thing we did implement is limiting the number of bulky pick-ups per year per address. So we track the number of bulky pick-ups per address now. I forget the limit and I don't know if Brad remembers but I think it was two per address per year so we track that now so anything beyond that the resident has to get it over to the Drop Off Facility.

Alderman Lopez asked maybe we can get the City Clerk to get us the particular plan that was approved because I think there were other items on there. Even though we didn't get it to the full Board I think it is important. There is no sense in reinventing the wheel because it is all spelled out. I remember Frank Thomas doing that.

Chairman M. Roy stated if it would please the Chairman of the Board, I would ask Kevin Sheppard to update the Powerpoint presentation with some of the things we have enacted and include some of the language regarding the single stream recycling, which we will get an update on later this evening. It is a great report and it took quite a bit of time to put together but some of the things have been enacted and some have not and some have died at the Board level. If the Highway Department could update that and get it to all members of the Board, that would be great.

Alderman Osborne stated I want to follow-up on the toters again. I guess education is a big thing with toters. You have to understand if you are paying \$55 or \$60 for a 95 gallon toter some of these barrels out there that are 30 gallons are costing these people \$18 to \$20 so the 95 takes three of those so they are paying the same amount. The other point is that these toters are guaranteed for a full ten years. You have to take that into consideration also. I think if most of the City is educated they will be out getting them because they are worth every penny. I have had two of them since the initiation of the toters way back when and I will tell you I wish they had had them back in the 1940's. You really have to get one to appreciate it and I think everyone out there knows what I am talking about who did purchase one.

Chairman M. Roy asked does anyone have any further questions on the solid waste violations?

Alderman O'Neil answered no, I just want to thank them for doing a great job. I think the City is cleaner and I think Brad deserves a lot of credit for that.

Chairman M. Roy stated thank you Brad, and as we go into the single stream recycling and get that facility up and running I think Brad's job is going to be even more important in educating people where they can save tax dollars by recycling as well as keeping the quality of life of the City up.

Chairman Roy addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Discussion relative to the Save Money and Recycle Trash Program (SMART).

Mr. Sheppard stated in the spring of this year, Kristin Brown...this is Kristin Brown of Green Waste Solutions. She is a consultant working with the U.S. EPA. In the spring of this year she approached me because the EPA has an initiative to work with towns and cities throughout New England. They had picked ten towns and cities in New England to work on what is called the SMART Initiative. It is Save Money and Reduce Trash. So in the spring she approached us and I talked to the Chairman, Mark Roy, as well as Sean Thomas from the Mayor's Office. They felt it was something that the City should participate in. There was no cost for the City. Kristin works up and down the East Coast with this program. She gathered some information and what she has put together is a final report on the SMART program. I will turn it over to Kristin and she can maybe give you more detail on who she is representing and the project that she will be submitting to you tonight.

Ms. Kristin Brown stated the project is called American Big Cities are Smart and it is not just the northeast but it is the entire east coast. There is a west coast initiative too and that is not done by me. I am just the east coast person. I work for the EPA in Washington, D.C. and I work with different communities each year. Some of the target communities this year that we are in coming up are Philadelphia, PA; Providence, RI; and Bridgeport, CT. One of the other cities this upcoming year is Boston, MA. Also Charleston, SC; Atlanta, GA; and Tallahassee, FL. So, there are a lot of cities and really the criteria is that the city has to be over 100,000 in population and the recycling rate has to be in the high teens or in the twenties. So we target these communities specifically to talk to them about what is called SMART Waste Management. This presentation is going to have three parts and I will try to go pretty quickly so you don't get too bored with me. The first part is what is SMART, the second part is how would it work for Manchester and then the third part is an array of different options on how you could actually implement a SMART program. I call this presentation redefining the way Manchester residents value trash and that is because in communities that have SMART Waste Management Programs residents completely change their

behavior. It is this behavioral change that creates long-term sustainable waste reduction, which is what the EPA is looking for and what the city is looking for as well. Save money and reduce trash. All of us in this room understand that if Manchester generates less waste, the City itself is going to save money through avoided disposal but individual residents themselves in their households don't really associate wasteful behavior or throwing away trash with costing more money. So the principal behind SMART Waste Management is basically unit based pricing and it can be achieved in many different ways. Unit based pricing is sort of looking at trash more like a utility like your electricity or your water. Your trash has value and once residents realize there is a cost to being wasteful, they really dramatically change their behavior. Looking at it as a utility for me, and I talked about this earlier today, I have two kids so we are a family of four and we create one bag of trash per week because obviously I am an avid recycler. My neighbors, who I love dearly, have one child who is three and they create about five bags of trash and they still put some recycling in the recycling bin, and whenever I talk to my neighbor I try to remind her that she can do this or that but she still can't seem to understand that you can recycle red wine bottles. You can recycle white ones in her mind but not the red ones because they are green and she can't really get past that. So putting some kind of value on trash, a unit cost on trash, makes people think twice and read the directions and look and realize that the peanut butter jar is recyclable and the Tide laundry detergent is recyclable and take that extra step and that is what SMART is all about. There are a few different ways to do SMART. One, which you are very familiar with, is using a bag as a unit base. They do it in Massachusetts and all throughout New Hampshire. One ideal city is Worcester, MA. I use these two cities, Worcester and San Francisco, because they are totally different cities but have the same diversion rate. Almost 70% of their waste is diverted from landfills. That means a 70% savings. Worcester, MA uses a bag as their unit base so they actually charge a cost for the bag. There are several cities across the U.S. that use bags. The state of New York with Binghamton and several other cities who have implemented this has actually given a tax reduction, so the cost of tipping has come out of the tax base and instead people pay as they go per unit, per bag to throw away trash. San Francisco also took it out of the tax base and instead of getting part of their tax bill a few hundred dollars a year for trash disposal or tip cost, they choose a container size. The containers that you are looking at there are all 32 gallon containers. 95% of the population uses a 32 gallon container for their trash. The 32 gallon container is \$23 per month. The next size up is \$46 per month and the next size up continues to double the price in a unit based way. So residents want to choose the 32 gallon container because they only want to create 32 gallons of trash. If they go over, they actually use a tag. The San Francisco program that you are looking at, the black container is for trash and the other containers are for recycling and compost. There are 7,000 communities across the U.S. that do unit based pricing. There are three states that make it mandatory. Washington, Minnesota, and

Oregon all have mandatory unit based pricing so every individual municipality must have unit based pricing as part of their solid waste management plan. Iowa does not make it mandatory but if you do not have a 25% recycling rate you have to go to a unit based program. Massachusetts for years had tried to make it mandatory but they now actually have five people who work for the DEP and specifically help community's implement unit based pricing programs. I think they are at about 145 communities as of today. Now what does unit based pricing mean and why would we want to take this big step? Well there is a dramatic difference between communities that have unit based pricing and communities that don't. This is one waste energy facility in Massachusetts near Worcester and what you are looking at is the green lines represent communities that have unit based pricing or Pay-As-You-Throw systems and the blue lines represent those that don't. We know that all of these communities are promoting recycling, but the green lines produce 44% less waste residentially than the blue lines. So it is very significant. The EPA looked at all of Massachusetts and this is actually more than 300 communities all squished in there together but what was interesting was they came up with exactly 44% reduction across the board, so the communities that have residential Pay-As-You-Throw programs are disposing of 44% less trash than those that don't. The numbers up there are hard to read. The average community on a Pay-As-You-Throw program produces about 500 pounds per person per year of waste. If you are not on a Pay-As-You-Throw program, you are producing about 916 pounds per person per year of waste and that is residentially. Just so that you know, it is not just Massachusetts or New England but it is all over the world. This is Seoul, Korea. They implemented unit based pricing and call it BGCS. They implemented it about seven years ago now and they also went down to about 500 pounds per person per year and reduced their waste by 42%. This is a quick look at Switzerland who also has unit based pricing and again they reduced their waste by 41% and they are in that 500 pounds per person range as well. The UN Pay-As-You-Throw...I have this up here because the UN actually has a 500 page manual in all different languages on how to implement unit based pricing. From Australia to Vietnam, pretty much every country has one or more Pay-As-You-Throw programs. Europe calls it the "Polluter Pay System." This is of particular significance to me because in the late 1980's I worked in Europe for the largest recycler of waste paper and one of my jobs was to write articles for a local newspaper on different community recycling initiatives. Some of the countries I worked in were Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany, Austria and all of these communities were in the same position as Manchester is today. They were in the close to 20% recycling rate trying to figure out how to change behavior. Today most of these communities have unit based pricing in all of their towns, especially Germany and Sweden, and what is really significant here is 400 to 600 pounds per person per year. So again this 500 pounds per capita mark is really significant. If you look off to the far side you see the U.S. at 1,035 pounds per person per year on average. Some of the countries in the middle like the United

Kingdom, Ireland...in fact Ireland is now all Pay-As-You-Throw and the United Kingdom is trying to go to Pay-As-You-Throw pretty much country wide. So are Greece and Spain. This is my last slide on this but again these are some larger cities around the U.S. from Portland, OR to Portland, ME and everything in between. When these communities implemented unit based pricing, the per capita waste went down again to that 500 pound range. Portland, ME is actually at 357 pounds per person per year and Worcester, MA is at 390 pounds per person per year. So where is Manchester? This is looking at the State of New Hampshire and Manchester is about 997 pounds per person per year. The average for New Hampshire is 866 and some of your neighboring communities are listed there. I will tell you when I spoke to Peterborough and Raymond and some of these other communities, I said this is amazing and are you sure these numbers are correct? Really when you look at yourself against some of these peer communities you can make some really big steps just by reorganizing the way the residents value trash. Just quickly I know you are going to single stream recycling so I wanted to mention this. I think Bath, ME implemented single stream recycling about one year before they implemented Pay-As-You-Throw and they were still able to reduce their waste by 58% after implementing the Pay-As-You-Throw program. This one I like because the city of Dartmouth, MA actually took out an ad after they started the program because obviously it was controversial and it is a big step but the city reduced their waste by 51% so they actually took out a color ad in the newspaper so that the residents would understand that it was a big benefit. Saving money is obviously important but I am here representing the EPA so one of our other big initiatives is reducing your carbon footprint and climate change and up until recently we have always looked at waste as an important sector but not nearly as important as energy and transportation, but when you look at solid waste and you realize it is not just about the degradation and the methane gas that is given off from the degrading waste and the transportation but it is also about the life cycle of the products that are being recycled, reduced or reused. So if you look at aluminum, aluminum saves about 80% of the energy if you use recycled aluminum in manufacturing, plastic about 70% and paper about 40%. So it is not just about the money but it is also about the energy and the greenhouse gas savings as well. Looking at Manchester here and comparing you to the U.S. average, you are much better than the U.S. average, not quite as good as the NH average and you have a way to go to get to the SMART average but I think it is very possible to do. These are some of the other communities that I have worked with in the past – Providence, Bridgeport, Monroe, Brookhaven...these are all people I have currently worked with and some of these others I have either worked with or I just know of their success. When you look at the difference, it is just amazing to me every time I sit in front of a council like yourselves and I say that this is going to happen. Everyone looks at me and I know you think I am crazy but when I go back after you do it, it does happen. Chip Laffey, who is the Public Works Director for Needham, MA said to me, the only regret I have is not doing this

when I first heard about it and not figuring out a way to get it passed. This is just looking at your cumulative solid waste tonnages. You have been running about the same since 2003. 2007 is down a little. I will say that everyone across the country seems to be down a little and I think that is related to the economy. If you look here at Manchester specifically, your recycling rate total is about 19%. About 8% of that is commodity material and 11% is yard waste. This is looking at your waste stream before SMART and then again after SMART. Before SMART you are about 19% and what we would project just by putting you into some EPA models is that your recycling rate would go up to about 46% and you would also have source reduction of about 11%, which would mean that you would have an overall decrease in waste of about 47%. It is very significant and that really relates to money. Now I know it is hard to believe that this can happen so I just put out a waste characterization. This is based on the Franklin Associate's 2005 U.S. Waste Characterization but it looks at what would be in one of your households' trash. So you have about 338 pounds of paper, yard waste, food scraps, plastics...you have a lot of room for pulling out these materials and putting them into a recycling container. Of course, just looking at your overall disposal cost as part of your Public Works solid waste budget, it is about 61% of your overall budget so reducing it by 47% is a very significant number. So how do you get to this and what does this really mean? If you look category by category there are different ways to do this. I heard you all talking about containers. This can be done with containers or bags or a combination of both. You are not really limited in how you do it but I am really here to encourage you to take the steps to do it. This is looking at the idea of a bag program similar to Worcester. Bags would be about \$2 each. With bag sales at \$2 each, if you went with an all bag program it would be about \$4 million in bag sales. You would have, of course, additional recycling revenue and I made that a very low estimate. You would also have the most important number, which is avoided disposal which is about \$1.5 million annually from where you are today. It would give you a total overall benefit of about \$5.3 million. There is another way to do it which has been successful in different places. There are positives and negatives with all of these ways and this one is called a free container. Residents are allowed one free container of waste included in their taxes and then they have to buy a bag for additional disposal. This still creates revenue. It generates the same recycling revenue approximately and has an avoided disposal number of about that \$1.5 million a year. So it gives a benefit to the City of about \$2 million annually. Another way to do it, which is I think one of my favorites over the free container is 52 free bags. The free container is sometimes difficult to monitor as you were talking about enforcement earlier. Rubbermaid containers and their competitors have 44 gallon containers, 32 gallon containers, etcetera, so it is hard to pick that container and really know is this the right size container that they have out front. So unless you are making a standard container, the idea of 52 free bags or one bag per week free and then you pay for additional bags, is another option on how to do it. This brings in about

\$1.5 million in revenue and that is if the City supplies a special trash bag for everyone. There is obviously another way you could do it and they could be allowed to put out one free bag, any bag, just a Glad Hefty bag or something out on the curb and anything else would be in a special color bag. The final option is 26 free bags. This might be easier to see in the slides that I am passing out. What I like about the 52 free bag program is if you were giving away 52 free bags per year and they are a special City bag you can always the second year go down to 26 free bags or even in five years from now go down to 26 free bags and that helps your overall benefit and revenue to go up. In this scenario, the bag sales is about \$2.4 million annually and then the overall benefit about \$3.4 million. So what I am talking about here is not only something that helps the environment and reduces gases and saves natural resources but it also creates a lot of avoided disposal savings as well as revenue potential. There are different ways that communities handle this program. One way is to actually reduce taxes like I mentioned in New York and give some sort of tax reduction to each household. Another way is to allow them a free container with the tax base that they have paid. Another way is to somehow come up with a happy medium and actually use some of the revenue benefit as a recycling rewards fund, something where you maybe partner with a Wal-Mart or Home Depot or several of your retailers within the community and give back a portion of that money to each household before the Christmas season to stimulate the economy. It is a lot of new cash coming into the City and this way residents feel like they are really part of the success. So there are many different ways to handle it. I think the most important thing for me is to let you know that we feel this is the best way to go and how you actually implement it is totally up to you. There are two things that generally come up so I thought I would bring them up. One is illegal dumping. A lot of people ask does illegal dumping...is there too much of it? Well Duke University did a study in 1997 and they used 212 municipalities who had gone to Pay-As-You-Throw and about 76% of them experienced no increase in litter whatsoever, while 6% actually experienced a decrease, which is sort of strange, and 19% did say that they had some increase. I bring this up specifically because when you read the study they actually go in and ask these communities if they experienced this and was it significant and really everyone answered no. It was minimal relative to the huge benefit that they got and none of them actually had to increase labor or add employees to handle the illegal dumping. So what I like to say is it may happen a little bit but it is not really a deal breaker. Secondly, what about low income families or people who are renting? How can you make this fair to them, especially low income families? One way is as we discussed earlier giving out free bags or coming up with some sort of coupon system or voucher system for low income families or again the recycling rewards fund where everybody can benefit from some of this extra generated revenue. The main point is that by ending this wasteful behavior it is going to save all Manchester residents in the long run. This avoided disposal of \$1.4 million is a real number and it is a number

that will happen year after year after year and it is very sustainable. The suggestions that we come up with and the main thing we would like you to do is not necessarily stand up, jump for joy and tell me “we can’t wait to implement tomorrow” but create some kind of advisory committee or some kind of a group to really look at this and look at the different ways that other communities have implemented it. Looking at rental units and multi-family and illegal dumping and all of those specific issues, which are obviously going to come up because nothing is simple. Putting this committee together is really our biggest recommendation to you. Also one thing that I feel and I did write it in a report that you will receive is if you are going to look at doing this, doing it along with single stream recycling would be a great time. You are already making some changes and it is a great time to implement a SMART program. Also in looking at the single stream and looking at this, it is a good time to review the items that are recyclable and see if you can add additional items. In summary, Pay-As-You-Throw is smart. This is the EPA’s press release for this year. Basically what they say is while other initiatives may have positive benefits, Pay-As-You-Throw is the single best way to prevent waste and reduce greenhouse gases.

Chairman M. Roy stated the Clerk has given me a note that we have 15 minutes left and we still have one item on the agenda so if the Committee has questions, which I am sure you do because this is the best attended Solid Waste Committee meeting ever, I would like to remind the Committee that we can have further discussion at another meeting and absorb all of this.

Alderman Lopez stated I have a couple of questions. I agree with Kristin that a committee should be formed. I think Kevin and those people can work that out and get some recommendations to us. I know, and he probably told you that paying \$1 per bag is probably unheard of in the City of Manchester so I will leave that out. I was curious about one other area or two areas actually. One is taking everything out of the tax base and secondly is your comparison to other cities versus 100,000 where Dover, NH doesn’t have 100,000 people. How did you come up with that?

Ms. Brown responded I tried to take random cities. I used Dover because they are in New Hampshire; some of the cities I compared you to, though, are larger cities.

Alderman Lopez asked what about the tax base? Are you saying take everything we pay in solid waste out of the tax base and then charge the resident \$23 per month?

Ms. Brown answered it depends. You can do it proportionately. I have one client currently, Brookhaven, NY. They have 450,000 people and they are planning to take everything out of the tax base and put that into the monthly charge but you

don't have to do it that way. You can just take a portion out. There are many different ways to do it. The idea is to make it unit based so that one unit saves \$10 and the next unit is \$20, etcetera. So you are always going up.

Alderman Lopez responded I think it is a good program. It is a lot to absorb and I am sure you recognize that. Could you work out with Kevin and give a comparison of all of the places you mentioned that you are involved with as to what they do in that area – whether they take it out of the tax base or do the bags or do the container? If this information can be given to the committee that is put together they can maybe give us some idea in the long run.

Ms. Brown replied yes and I also have a full report that Kevin has read. The EPA will e-mail it and you will get a copy of it. That has some more detail in it as well.

Alderman Osborne stated like Alderman Lopez has said we have lots of questions but we don't have the time for that tonight. The main thing with me is you said it needs a minimum of what, 20% of the population? Is that what you said before?

Ms. Brown asked as far as participation? No, you would have to do it with all households.

Alderman Osborne asked so this would be a mandatory situation?

Ms. Brown answered yes, it would have to be a mandatory situation.

Alderman Osborne asked well, what do you do with the center cities in these different places? How do you get the residents...of course the homeowners can understand but the residents you have that are transient and things of that sort, how do you handle that and what kind of education do you put out there for these people?

Ms. Brown replied it actually works really well in inner cities surprisingly and generally depending...it is shocking. A good example is Central Falls, RI. They thought that it would be difficult but it has been so easy and so smooth. Again, if you put together a committee they are a good city to talk to. Dallas, TX is a good city to talk to. There are many cities that have done it and it has been a lot smoother than they ever imagined. Yes, you need leaflets in different languages and you definitely need education in that area.

Alderman Murphy asked is this something you recommend be phased in all at once or do cities break it up in areas and say, okay we are going to start it here?

Ms. Brown answered a city your size could easily do it all at once. That is what I would say and I would definitely say that doing it along with the single stream is a good time to do it.

Alderman Murphy asked are there federal grant monies available for educating the public and disseminating this information?

Ms. Brown responded there is no federal money for that. I am not sure about New Hampshire money. I know they love Pay-As-You-Throw but I don't know if they have money for it.

Alderman DeVries stated I have a quick question for Kevin or Kristin. I had seen on one of the Boston news stations, I believe Winthrop, MA has a private recycling company that is working that coupon system. It looks like they are giving out coupons at the time they are picking up trash and if you could let us know or let the Committee know how that system works compared to Pay-As-You-Throw because certainly it seems that it was seamless in implementing that and it isn't a mandatory program so maybe we would like to see that here in Manchester.

Mr. Sheppard responded that program is actually a private company that comes in and they take 50%, according to Kristin, 50% of your savings to implement that program. That is a program the City could implement ourselves and take that 50% for ourselves versus recycle bags, which is that private company. That was Everett, MA. I actually saw that program but I can get further information on it because Alderman Lopez asked about that as well.

Ms. Brown stated from an EPA point of view, the Recycle Bank is a private company. It is an initiative that seems to be working. What Pay-As-You-Throw does differently is we believe in reduce, reuse, recycle and the reduce and reuse comes from the Pay-As-You-Throw whereas the recycle comes from it as well but with the Recycle Bank type thing you are just going to be getting that recycling. You won't be getting as much of the reduction or any of it and the reuse.

Alderman O'Neil stated I a little bit aware of Worcester's situation but not in the detail you provided. Do you happen to know if there was a formal report done at some point following up on...I know you touched on Worcester in a number of your slides but is there a report that exists that would show an analysis of...

Ms. Brown interjected I have not seen a full report but I do have a slide presentation from the city that they have given me in the past to use and pick slides from, so that I have. I am sure they have something in writing.

Alderman O'Neil asked is that something you could maybe get to Kevin and he could forward to us?

Ms. Brown answered yes, that is no problem.

Chairman M. Roy asked Kristin, your availability for future meetings?

Ms. Brown responded I am not really available again. I am available, though...I am working on Boston like I said and also Albany so I am pretty flexible. If there is a date that I am up here that works for you I can come over. The budget for the EPA is so heavily travel related that if I am here they will say go ahead but if I have to take a flight and all of that...I live in South Carolina so if I am here I am happy to come and I told Kevin that he has me for free on the telephone as long as he wants to talk to me.

Chairman M. Roy stated if the Committee would like...the Chair of the Administration Committee said we could do another round of questions. Is there anything pressing anyone wants to ask or do you want to absorb this and come back for future discussions?

Alderman Osborne stated getting back to the inner City, I can't comprehend how my ward anyway would react to something if they have to pay \$1 a bag or whatever it might be. There is a lot of transient and low income residents and they are throwing garbage out the third floors now. So I can't comprehend that one yet and if you give it to them free even that still would be hard. I can't see them doing...what they are doing now in my ward as Brad would know because I call him enough, it is hard. I can see this working in some of our wards like Ward 1 and 2 but when you start talking about Wards 4, 5, 7, 11 and different areas where there are a lot of transients it is a very difficult thing to do in Manchester. Manchester is a little different than Worcester. They live a faster life there I guess than Manchester. It is just hard for me to swallow this right now and believe it.

Chairman M. Roy stated Alderman Lopez suggested that we put this back in the hands of the Highway Department and work out some of the kinks. Looking back at some of my reports, it was November 16, 2004 that this Board first heard of the long term plan that came out of our last roundtable discussion so this has been in front of us for awhile. There will be a tax savings when we go to the single stream recycling and it would be good to capitalize on having people who use more waste pay more than people who don't and see that benefit. Any other final comments or questions?

Alderman O'Neil asked Kristin, how do you answer Joe Q Public that says I am paying for that service in my taxes?

Ms. Brown answered that is a typical question and that is why you want to look at the idea of a rewards fund or some communities will sell it by saying we are going to go up less on taxes because this is a savings to the entire community or some sort of small tax rebate or credit based on the tip costs or a portion of the tip costs. That is definitely the biggest question but in reality trash costs money and it is a way of having people pay for what they are using.

Alderman O'Neil responded I agree with what you are saying but I am not sure that some of those things are applicable by NH state law.

Mr. Sheppard stated in the past we have talked about that. The answer to a person who asks that question is right now they pay the same fee as their neighbor who doesn't recycle anything while they might recycle a lot. Everyone pays the same fee and with a Pay-As-You-Throw or universal pricing program you can control what you pay. If you want to recycle more you can buy fewer bags, and therefore, it will cost you less. If you don't want to do that you have to buy more bags and it will cost you more, but when it is in your taxes everyone pays the same fee so whether I recycle one can or five bags a week I am getting the same benefit when it is in the taxes. I think by doing a Pay-As-You-Throw program you can control your costs by recycling more. You can reduce your costs.

Ms. Brown stated and what you find is, just so you know, since it is kind of shocking looking at these numbers the average household on a Pay-As-You-Throw program uses 1.37 bags per week. So think about your own trash and how much you would reduce and then think about what that real cost is at \$1.00 or \$1.50 per bag. It doesn't amount to that much and the savings is so significant on the other end. You just have to weigh if it is possible for you to get it done and if you can, it is worth it. Every community that does this is so glad they got it done.

Alderman O'Neil asked are you aware of any situation...and I think with your presentation you either accept it or you don't, correct? Are you aware of any example in this country where they did an incentive for people to recycle more and there was a tax credit to do it where it wasn't adopted throughout the City but it was kind of...for instance people go out voluntarily now and buy toters. It has made our City cleaner but there is no incentive for them to do it. It is a personal choice. I think most of us on this Board live in single family homes and we all do it voluntarily. Is there any program that would give an incentive without forcing every household in the City to do it?

Ms. Brown answered no specific program other than possibly ward by ward or area by area, specifically mandatory, but none that was voluntary. Not that I know of.

Alderman Lopez asked Kevin, do you think you could get something to us by the end of January or sooner?

Mr. Sheppard answered I can look up the past report and gather some more information on this.

Chairman M. Roy stated I will ask the Clerk or the Solicitor. Do we need to give Kevin any authority to set-up an advisory committee to work on this?

Alderman Lopez stated he is just doing it for the Committee.

Chairman M. Roy stated then Kevin, if you want to set that up to share the workload that would be great. Kristin, one of the questions I am going to have and you talked to Kevin about not talking about it tonight, but how can we absorb our downtown businesses into something like this and how can we possibly get them to recycle more? I know in Worcester every commercial property is mandatory to have a private hauler/dumpster. That was one of the main differences between here and Worcester so I would look to find a solution. Our Chamber of Commerce has a green committee and recycling committee and they are entirely on board with us making some positive changes throughout the City, so I would look to see if we can come up with some good downtown plans as well.

Ms. Brown responded we have addressed that a little in the report that I wrote.

Alderman Osborne stated I have one more question for Kevin. Can you work in some sort of incentive rather than a mandatory or a charge for this particular program? I still say in my ward that I can't see them...they would rather buy a scratch ticket than buy a bag. I am sure of that.

Mr. Sheppard replied Kristin has laid out a couple of options like containers, bags...the Recycle Bank...

Alderman Osborne interjected I would like to know how much each bag as an average is worth and make an incentive out of that bag rather than charging them for that bag and make them do what they are doing when they don't want to do it. That is all I am looking for.

Chairman M. Roy stated Kristin, thank you for your time and effort and the analysis. It is greatly appreciated.

Ms. Brown responded thank you for having me.

Chairman M. Roy addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Update on the single stream recycling.

Mr. Sheppard stated we have a couple of representatives from Corcoran Environmental who can give you an update probably more specific than I can regarding the single stream recycling. We are hoping to go to single stream. Their facility is before the Planning Board right now.

Chairman M. Roy stated just so everyone knows, we are four minutes over our allotted time for this meeting.

Mr. Michael McCray, Facility Manager, Corcoran Environmental, stated to my left is Peter Fagley, the engineer on board for getting us into the facility. I will just quickly hit on a few highlights of what has transpired concerning the single stream recycling. We have secured a facility here on Gay Street. We have done the application process and the traffic studies and have submitted to the Planning Board as well as the Department of Environmental Services, all of which seems to be getting a positive reaction. At the present time it has been a very expensive process. We are just exceeding \$300,000 of investment at the present time for this year. Are there any questions I can answer?

Chairman M. Roy asked what is the expected roll-out date of the toters, as well as the plant being fully operational?

Mr. McCray answered provided that we have the permitting process passed on the next go round on December 11, we would be 16 weeks for the building and equipment and four weeks for an install date so we would be looking at May 1st to open doors for process. The toters I can't speak to. Mr. Corcoran and Kevin have been speaking about that.

Mr. Sheppard responded we have been talking about the toters and obviously the toters are being replaced before the single stream recycling is implemented. The intent is that a toter will be delivered to every household in the City, giving everyone the opportunity to participate.

Chairman M. Roy stated my understanding...and I believe we have talked about this...is that the toters would actually be the property of the City of Manchester.

Mr. Sheppard responded correct.

Chairman Roy stated so whatever property we deliver them to is where they would stay and they would be used for recycling and proper ordinances would be written so Brad could enforce that.

Mr. Sheppard replied right, and the information will be delivered with the toters to explain that.

Alderman Murphy stated I live in Ward 12, which has a lot of garden style condos and apartments and in fact I live in a condo. What is the probability that recycling is going to be available for those units?

Mr. Sheppard responded if it is not available now...

Alderman Murphy interjected then it will not be available going forward?

Mr. Sheppard replied correct.

Alderman Murphy stated boo. Can we work on that?

Chairman M. Roy stated I believe there have been discussions regarding some of the private properties and working with the condominium associations or ownership to install actual dumpsters or a larger toter facility that can be used for recycling.

Alderman Murphy stated the reason I ask that is that I have had two condo association presidents approach me in Ward 12 and asked if they request it if it is an option or not.

Mr. Sheppard responded the RFP that went out basically explained that the City is going to be collecting refuse and recyclables from existing customers or any new single family or multi-family homes that are on public streets. The program doesn't provide for collection for condos unless that material is brought to the curbside on the City street and placed there. We do not go onto the private roads of the condo complexes.

Alderman Murphy asked just so I am clear though, it is financial...the more we recycle, the more money Corcoran makes and the more money the City makes as a result correct?

Mr. Sheppard stated yes, Corcoran makes more money and it doesn't cost the City any more. If they have a private contractor then they don't recycle. We will collect, and that is part of the policy that Alderman Lopez was talking about earlier, basically anyone that brings their trash to the curbside we will pick it up.

The problem is that a lot of condo associations want it picked up on private property or within their organization.

Alderman Murphy asked is the transfer station on Dunbarton Road going to remain open for drop-offs?

Mr. Sheppard answered yes and that is free. Recyclables are free to drop off there.

Alderman Murphy asked and it is Monday through Friday business hours and then the first and third Saturday of every month?

Mr. Sheppard answered yes.

Alderman Lopez asked you said May 1st you would be up and running?

Mr. McCray answered that would be the intention, sir.

Alderman Lopez asked and the single stream recycling...do those bins go back to the City, Kevin?

Mr. Sheppard asked the existing bins?

Alderman Lopez answered yes.

Mr. Sheppard stated those are actually paid for by Corcoran. In the previous contract they would belong to the City but all of the new ones belong to Corcoran. Those are provided by and paid for by Corcoran.

Alderman Lopez asked so what do I do with the two green bins I have then?

Mr. Sheppard answered as part of this process Corcoran will probably be collecting those. I believe they plan on using them in other municipalities.

Alderman Lopez asked when is the recycling...did you say September?

Mr. Sheppard asked for what?

Alderman Lopez answered single stream.

Mr. Sheppard stated hopefully roughly the same time in May when that facility opens. That facility needs to be open before we can begin our single stream program.

Alderman Lopez stated I can't wait for that. I am tired of separating everything.

Mr. McCray stated we can't wait either.

Chairman M. Roy stated Kevin, we heard a lot about the Pay-As-You-Throw in Kristin's presentation earlier. What is the expected dispersion rate once we get to the single stream recycling? Right now I believe we are at 19%. What is the expectation?

Mr. Sheppard responded I think based on Corcoran's experience they are telling us we could be in the 30% or 50% range or higher.

Chairman M. Roy asked so we should see a bump that we can look at for FY2010?

Mr. Sheppard answered I would like to guarantee that but I can't. Hopefully it will be there.

Alderman DeVries asked Kevin, where are you at with the contract with Corcoran?

Mr. Sheppard answered Patrick's attorney sent a draft to Tom Clark. Tom Clark received it. I have commented on it and gotten back to Tom, and Tom and I are supposed to sit down before it is sent back to Corcoran's attorney.

Alderman DeVries stated as you are aware there have been some items that were under discussion and I think Corcoran has agreed to most of them, so I don't think anything is too onerous here but the Health Department in the e-mail they sent to you indicated that they are going to have real difficulties enforcing any kind of pest issues like flies or rats and I know it is not going to be an issue and I am not suggesting it is going to be an issue but it is difficult without going through the courts and they suggested that that be included in the contract.

Mr. Sheppard replied right, and I know it is being addressed through the Planning Board and the state review.

Alderman DeVries responded that doesn't void the courts if it is being addressed through the Planning Board. I think it was a suggestion of Tim Soucy that it be addressed in the contract.

Mr. Sheppard stated that is part of the list for when Tom Clark and I meet. I was going to mention that to Tom Clark and ask what type of wording would get in there regarding that, and I am sure Corcoran would be more than willing to work with us on that.

Alderman DeVries stated I think Corcoran has already agreed to some kind of controls on litter, something that addresses that so litter won't be an issue. Also, the traffic that has been discussed at Planning and there won't be cut throughs through that residential neighborhood and the traffic will be directed as it can out to 293. I understand that not everybody is headed to 293 and there may be some Litchfield or Hudson traffic coming in from the other direction but I think you have already stated at the Planning Board that those aren't real issues for you and you can work with your drivers. I just would like to see some language that addresses that in the contract because that is where we get to have the working relationship with you, if you would, that is easier for us as Aldermen.

Mr. McCray replied as we stated at the Planning Board, we have already had quotes for pest control as most businesses do here in the local area. Also we already addressed the litter issue not only publicly but it is also in our lease contract that the Planning Board has a copy of. As far as the traffic issue, not only do we have some influence on the drivers as they travel to the facility but our driveway happens to dump directly onto Raymond Street. That is the easiest exist from our property.

Alderman DeVries responded we were also trying to assure that you will direct as you can the majority of your drivers out to 293 rather than allow them to go down the length of Brown Avenue where the new Airport access is. As I stated, because all of those are items that you have agreed to it shouldn't be a problem to get some kind of language into the contract because that is where we get to have that ongoing conversation and I don't want to say enforcement because it is not but it is just easier if there is a change of ownership or whatever. It is easier for us to have the continuity if it is addressed through the contract for those items. I hope that you can work, Kevin, on the language for those three items and maybe share that with me.

Mr. Sheppard stated originally we were talking about pest and litter control. Are you talking about getting the traffic control in the contract as well?

Alderman DeVries responded pest, traffic and litter.

Mr. Sheppard replied I can talk to Tom Clark about that.

Chairman M. Roy stated to reiterate what Alderman DeVries is saying, our only authority is what is actually written in those contracts so even though everyone who has come before us has said we will maintain the quality of life and traffic patterns and excellent community cooperation, without it being in the contract we

don't have any actual authority and that is why we are looking for the contract to mimic what has been stated over many months.

Mr. Sheppard stated if there are specific items though, maybe I can talk off line...you know when we talk traffic...and I think I understand traffic issues...and with pest control are we talking twice a month or once a month and litter are we talking once a day...perhaps I can talk off line to get some more specific information.

Alderman DeVries replied I would appreciate that.

Chairman M. Roy stated I think Alderman DeVries has an excellent grasp on what she would like to see in that area for protection of the residents.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Murphy, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee