

## **SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SOLID WASTE ACTIVITIES**

**April 26, 2010**

**5:00 PM**

Chairman Craig called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Craig, Lopez, Osborne, Greazzo, Arnold

Messrs: E. Chesley, R. Gaudette, T. Arnold, K. Sheppard, B. Moore

Chairman Craig addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Presentation from Mr. Earle Chesley, City of Concord, General Services Director, regarding the Pay As You Throw Program.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Arnold, it was voted to discuss this item.

Chairman Craig stated Kevin Sheppard and I have spoken briefly and I have spoken to Mr. Win a few times and you have had great success in Concord and I was wondering if you could share with the Committee some of the planning that you did moving into the program that you have in place and some of the results.

Mr. Earle Chesley, City of Concord General Services Director, stated our planning work at the staff level probably started several years ago, but really heightened in the year leading up to the City adopting Pay As You Throw. We are a member of the Concord Resource Association which is a waste energy facility that handles our solid waste. We were looking at a rather dramatic fee increase and that acted as a catalyst for us to take a hard look at how we handle solid waste in the City of Concord. We had a solid waste advisory committee that is made up of members of our city council as well as other residents within the community. They looked at the entire solid waste program holistically, recognizing that the direction that it was going was going to have some significant increases in costs. At the end of those deliberations, they recommended to the city council to adopt Pay As You Throw as a means to help support the solid waste and the ability to recycle. Last July, the city adopted it.

Alderman Arnold stated I don't have the material, but I believe there was a letter or a memorandum. My question is about illegal dumping. Since the City of Concord adopted Pay As You Throw, have you experienced that? Is it an issue at all?

Mr. Chesley replied it is not an issue. It does occasionally occur. We took the policy that we would not tolerate illegal dumping. There were incidents, if we added them all up, there were fewer than ten illegal dumpings that could be attributed to Pay As You Throw. We have aggressively tried to find the orphaned trash. In many instances there will be an address in the orphan trash and we will contact the parents of the orphan and we share that information with our police department.

Alderman Greazzo asked did the City reduce the tax rate to compensate the additional charge or did they tag on for throwing away your extra trash on top of the taxes already paid?

Mr. Chesley replied if you could repeat the question please, I just want to make sure that I understand it.

Alderman Greazzo asked when you implemented your program, did the city reduce the tax rate and then start charging everybody to throw away their trash or did they just add the fee?

Mr. Chesley replied I would have to go back and take a look at the finances. I'm not trying to avoid your question. The tax rate as a whole when Pay As You Throw was adopted was not increased at all for city services in that particular budget period. Basically, if you take a look at our solid waste budget from a very simplistic standpoint, the revenues that are generated through the sale of bags supports the collection and disposal costs of solid waste. The general fund supports recycling costs, collection and management of those materials as well as what I would call legacy solid waste costs. By that I mean closed landfills and monitoring those types of things. At the time when Pay As You Throw was adopted, the tax rate was not increased in the Concord.

Chairman Craig stated based on the documentation that you provided us, it looks like you are stating that you had a 45% decrease in solid waste disposal and a 57% increase in recycling materials. Is that correct and still consistent?

Mr. Chesley replied that is consistent. We prepare a quarterly report that we present to the mayor and city council and those are figures that came out of that report. We saw a rather dramatic drop in solid waste volumes almost instantaneously when Pay As You Throw was implemented. It wasn't a behavior

that changed gradually; it was a behavior of the residents that changed dramatically. We also saw a similar increase in recycling. Those figures that you are quoting from are from our curbside collection of solid waste. If I could step back and explain a little of how the city services the community, the city provides residential solid waste and recycling collection to all residential properties, single family homes as well as apartments and condominium complexes. We have received a drop in solid waste volume in our curbside program and those are the people who participate in the Pay As You Throw program.

Chairman Craig asked is that only single family or does that include multi units?

Mr. Chesley replied that includes properties with up to eight residents on the parcel. They manage their trash at the curb and our larger apartment and condominium complexes are served by dumpsters or single stream recycling containers.

Alderman Lopez stated you are still in the pilot stage from readings on this information going onto the 2011 budget. I notice in your financial matters that the department continues to monitor performance of the program. On a scale of one to ten, is it successful? What number would you put it at?

Mr. Chesley replied I would say that given that the objectives were to reduce solid waste volumes and increase recycling rates, it has been successful.

Alderman Lopez stated did you have any problems with making the multi families have dumpsters?

Mr. Chesley replied no, we did a lot of work in the couple of months leading up to Pay As You Throw. Prior to Pay As You Throw, the multi families only received solid waste collection and did not receive recycle collections. As part of the Pay As You Throw Program, we provided single stream recycling collection to those properties. Pat went out and met probably with every property owner and manager and helped them right-size their dumpsters and helped them locate where they should put the recycle containers.

Alderman Lopez asked do you have what it cost for the program before you began and what it costs now?

Mr. Chesley replied I don't have those figures with me, but I can give them to Kevin Sheppard subsequently.

Alderman Greazzo asked what do you consider illegal dumping?

Mr. Chesley replied illegal dumping is any waste that is not placed at the curb in the proper receptacle.

Alderman Greazzo asked do you consider people burying trash in their backyard illegal dumping?

Mr. Chesley replied I would consider that illegal dumping, yes.

Alderman Greazzo asked how many instances of those have you encountered or would you be able to encounter?

Mr. Chesley replied I'm not aware of any instances where we had people burying solid waste in the backyard.

Chairman Craig addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Presentation from Rick Gaudette regarding Recycle Bank.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to discuss this item.

Chairman Craig stated we have read an awful lot about Recycle Bank and we are happy to have you here if you could give us a brief overview of your program and the Committee probably has some questions.

Mr. Rick Gaudette, Recycle Bank, stated Recycle Bank is a rewards and royalties company. We are located in New York. We have about one million customers under contract. What we do is provide a reward for people to recycle. If you think about the value of a ton of recyclables, it is probably worth \$5 or \$10. If you were to have people recycle and just pay them in cash value, you couldn't really have enough of a reward or motivation to make them do anything, but using rewards, which are non cash, we are able to give people the equivalent of \$130 to \$150 for an average recycler to go out and recycle. That is enough to change people's behavior. As a country, we have gotten into the habit of what we call linear consumption. We buy, use and dispose of it. In Manchester that amounts to 42,000 tons a year for your residents. We were able to change recycling by modifying behavior by giving people rewards. Typically, our activated accounts or households recycle in the range of 700 to 800 pounds per household. To give you a point of comparison, Manchester right now is about 232. The good news is that there is lots of room to improve recycling and our approach is to use motivation and rewards to do that. We consider ourselves the carrot and the Pay As You Throw is a bit of a stick. As a combination of those you can come up with

a pretty effective program. We are in Everett, Revere, Hartford and a whole slew of other cities. I'm happy to answer any other questions. We did do a model on Manchester and to give you some of the highlights, we think we can bring recycling up about 400 pounds per household, which would bring it into the 700 range. That would give people about \$130 worth of rewards for the people who are in the program and that would generate to the citizens about \$5.6 million worth of reward value. We try to recruit local reward partners as well as a national base in order to get local economic development going as well as some of our national partners. What we are trying to do is move the reluctant recycler to recycle. We also want to incent the recyclers who are green anyways. The reluctant ones are usually the ones you have trouble with. We work in single and multi families and hopefully that is the short extent of what we have.

Alderman Osborne asked are you dealing with single or dual stream mostly?

Mr. Gaudette replied we started with single stream in carts, but we have moved to dual stream also so we can do single and dual stream and we can do carts, bins and barrels too.

Alderman Osborne asked which one do you feel works the best, single or dual?

Mr. Gaudette replied for volume, single stream works the best.

Alderman Arnold asked how many accounts do you have?

Mr. Gaudette replied under contract about one million.

Alderman Long asked is your program specifically for residential or do you have a business community model also?

Mr. Gaudette replied we don't at the moment have a business community model, but we do bring businesses into the program through the rewards, not through the recycling. In some communities, and we can talk about this, for small business that just put out a cart anyway, we might be able to include them, but larger businesses that do large scale commercial recycling, we don't do it. We do multi family, up to about eight and we have a program underway to look at larger multi families like the high rises in New York, but it is not currently available.

Alderman Long asked who gets the reward in the multi family model?

Mr. Gaudette replied the household, the individual.

Alderman Long asked so if it is a seven unit place...

Mr. Gaudette stated you might put three carts out there and one cart would be assigned to two households or you could have one per floor. The way the program works is when people recycle there is a RFID tag associated with the bin or the cart they put the recycling in. As that is participated and recorded we then allocate points back for them to use for their reward.

Alderman Lopez asked when you go into a city and implement a program, if it is approved, do you have nine or ten rewards already built in or do we have to find our own?

Mr. Gaudette replied we have 1,900 already built in. We have a lot of national rewards.

Alderman Lopez asked how many rewards would we expect to have, all of those 1,900 from your company or a certain portion?

Mr. Gaudette replied half of those are national rewards partners, Home Depot, McDonalds and the like, so you would have access to that half and then we have a local rewards team that would meet with your organization and ask who makes sense to have as a local rewards partner. We are trying to make these connections between local rewards and local action.

Alderman Arnold stated my last question is basically one of how you get from the beginning to the end. Once you or the household accumulates points, they simply go online and select what they would like to cash it in for. Is that right?

Mr. Gaudette replied there are two ways to do it. You can go online and that is our preference because it is easy to manage and it is an online experience or for other populations that don't want to go online, you can call an 800 number that is manned in both English and Spanish and is available for people who want to do it that way. Once they select what they want, the online experience can be automatic, but the phone experience will have the reward mailed.

Alderman Arnold stated out of curiosity, when someone calls the 800 number, I'm thinking of the senior demographics, is it all automated?

Mr. Gaudette replied no, there are people. We have it manned in Philadelphia and another group from the Midwest.

Alderman Osborne asked how would you keep track of the point system with all these different apartment and homes? We take advantage of all these points, the landlord or the tenants?

Mr. Gaudette replied just tenants, just the household that is doing the recycling. We are trying to change people's behavior and not reward the landlords.

Alderman Osborne stated you have an area in a ward that has a lot of transit. It is quite difficult because they are always moving and coming back and forth. In other words, you have a handle on all tenants. How do they go about that? Do they have to sign up?

Mr. Gaudette replied yes, they do. Let's say you use carts and you roll the carts out. They have a RFID and they get assigned to the household. Then people call up and say that I am in X household and we know what cart they are assigned. Now the cart and the recycling that comes through it and the household are assigned. If that household moved, then they would reassign themselves to a new cart. Their points go with them though. The points stay with the person.

Alderman Osborne asked if they move out of town or state are the points lost?

Mr. Gaudette replied the points are lost, yes. As a matter of fact, one of the things that we are doing is interesting. We aren't a bank and we are not a recycling company. We actually don't touch any of the recyclables. What we do is reward people for doing green actions. The first green actions are recycling. We now have underway or soon to start green actions for energy efficiencies. We have other ones for reuse and others coming out for transportation. We are trying to have a common denominator, the rewards, that are available for getting people to do the right thing.

Alderman Osborne stated it is almost like the green stamp stores years ago.

Mr. Gaudette stated very much like that actually.

Chairman Craig stated I have two quick questions. I wanted to ask whether or not you provide education to the community prior to launching this program?

Mr. Gaudette replied yes, our outreach is pretty extensive in the beginning of the program. We also have what we call a Green Schools Program. In that same way that some people would like to use a McDonald's coupon because that's what we reward them, some people don't want the rewards and want to be able to give something. The Green School Program has the local school apply for a grant and then once we approve the grant for some green action like solar cells on the roof or a butterfly garden, then people can funnel their points to that schools and we will fund that program using those points.

Chairman Craig stated you talked about the savings that would be generated for the citizens, but could you touch upon how the City would fund it or what the program is in terms of the City working with you?

Mr. Gaudette replied in your particular case, the value of diverting a pound of trash to recyclables is about three and a half cents. We need about \$8 per household to run the program. That can either be done from diversion or blending it with a Pay As You Throw Program. It only takes four bags in a Pay As You Throw Program to pay for the whole thing. As a way to appease people, that is an option. It is usually the diversion savings that you get that fund the program. Your numbers are so low that there is a lot to do. We do have some of those, but it is more like you buy a Dunkin Donuts coffee and you get one free. The reason a local business might get involved is because it might be a two for one dinner on a day that they don't have the business. They offer the benefits to get increased business. For the recycler, it is a reward they wouldn't get otherwise.

Alderman Ludwig stated this is not at you, but my immediate take on this would be that some of these rewards are inflated so to speak. I could go out and get something for \$10, but through the rewards program I'm going to look in the book and it will be worth \$15, but I can get it for \$10. You have never been asked that?

Mr. Gaudette replied no, they usually aren't structured that way. They are structured to be a discount off of something or a two for one or free. It is not going to be an inflated price and then reduced.

Alderman Ludwig stated if people recognize that there isn't the value that they think they should be getting then they are not going to participate.

Mr. Gaudette stated we have a world class rewards group that goes out and structures the rewards so they are incentives for people who are both active recyclers and reluctant recyclers.

Alderman Long asked what information is on the ID chip?

Mr. Gaudette replied it is just a number and basically the RDIF number, like you would do with an Easy Pass. It is associated with a household back on our computers. We have pretty strict privacy walls so what the person does for recycling is available just to the person and not to anyone else.

Alderman Long asked so on the bin there would be an ID chip that would have a number and that number is associated with 1 Elm Street, Unit 2, Patrick Long, resident?

Mr. Gaudette replied it is associated with the person and a household.

Alderman Osborne asked what is the percentage if we do this or we don't do this? Would there be more going to the general fund for the taxpayer? We have to get this incentive going. In order to get the incentive with the people to do it...in other words, you know where I am coming from...

Mr. Gaudette replied I think so. Your diversion or your recycling right now is low enough that we expect that we could get 400 pounds of lift out of it. It should pay for itself.

Alderman Osborne asked how much are we spending for that increase? Is it going back into incentives? Is there still something left or not?

Mr. Gaudette replied there should be some left to pay for parts, depending on how you structure it. I guess it depends. If you blend it with a Pay As You Throw Program, four bags will pay for it. If you pay for it straight out of funds, it is about \$8 per household a year. Then you look at how much diversion you get and that is about \$200 pounds of incremental recycling that will pay for that.

Alderman Osborne asked so if the City was to go out there with single stream and the people all knew this, do you think there would be a big difference if we just did the single stream or if we took on this Green Schools Program?

Mr. Gaudette replied I know there will be. If you look at the evidence from a lot of cities, including Boston, single stream by itself is not enough to change behavior. It changes a little bit because it is more convenient for people, but I consider what we do nudge marketing. We nudge people at the point where they have to make a choice. Do I throw this away or put it in recycling bin? We nudge them that extra amount because they are going to get a reward for it.

Alderman Osborne stated you are always going to get those types of people anyway who won't do it either way. They don't have the time or patience to do it.

Mr. Gaudette stated we come at it from multiple angles.

Alderman Osborne stated that's what I'm trying to say. We don't know until we try it.

Mr. Gaudette stated I think what I have heard is that you get 15% to 20% lift going single stream itself and we are talking two and a half times lift, so twice as much.

Chairman Craig addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Update on the Corcoran Contract.  
(*Note: Communication from Mayor Gatsas is attached.*)

Chairman Craig stated I would ask the City Solicitor to please update us on the status.

Mr. Tom Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, stated as you can see in your package materials there is a memorandum from the Mayor notifying the Committee that back on May 5<sup>th</sup> the City and Corcoran entered into a stipulation. Basically, that stipulation was to have Corcoran, as part of the bankruptcy, either accept or reject the contract through the City within 45 days from the day the court approved the stipulation. The court approved the stipulation on May 8<sup>th</sup>. Consequently, Corcoran had up until the 22<sup>nd</sup> of this month to file a motion to assume the contract or to elect to reject the contract. On the 22<sup>nd</sup>, as you might image, Corcoran did file a motion to assume and assign the contract. What that means is that they want to continue the contract and assign it to a trucking company out of Fitchburg, Massachusetts. Having read the motion, it appears that Corcoran is not looking to build the materials recycling facility anymore and is apparently attempting to assign the hauling portion of the contract, the recyclable and yard waste hauling, to the company in Massachusetts. I, along with the City's main counsel, Michael Keith, are attempting to set up a meeting with Mr. Corcoran's attorney. We had hoped to do that tomorrow afternoon, but I don't know if that will come to pass or not, but we will be setting up a meeting shortly in order to clarify what Corcoran is actually proposing as part of bankruptcy and what they are not proposing. Based on that clarification, the City, probably this Committee, will be deciding whether to file an objection to the motion to assume and assign. I probably shouldn't say maybe the Committee. We have until May 16<sup>th</sup> to put an objection into the motion so that I guess would leave little time to convene the Committee so we will probably meet with the Committee Chair and the Mayor to make some decisions as to where we are going. I would assume at this point, given what we have determined so far, that we would probably object to the motion to assume and assign. That will mean that there will probably be a court hearing on the motion, which has already been schedule for May 26<sup>th</sup>. I would be glad to try to answer any questions if you have any.

Alderman Lopez stated Tom, I thought that the contract as a whole for the building...you're indicating that the bankruptcy court said that they can haul it?

Mr. Arnold replied no, I am not indicating that. I'm indicating that that is what the motion indicates or that is what they are trying to accomplish. I'm not saying that the bankruptcy court will allow that. There will be a hearing over it and we will

object, I presume, after sitting down with Corcoran's counsel to any attempt to perform part of the contract, the hauling without building the materials recycling facility or without the revenues streams or that type of thing.

Alderman Lopez asked am I correct in saying that we have the intention of saying the whole contract and not portions of the contract so you would have the object to the ruling?

Mr. Arnold replied our interpretation of bankruptcy law is that in order to assume the contract, Mr. Corcoran needs to cure all the defaults under the contract. That would include building the materials recycling facility. If it does not do that, we think it is a very sound basis for objecting any attempt to assume and assign the contract.

Alderman Lopez asked so we should move forward with that then? Why do we have to wait?

Mr. Arnold replied I think that at this point the thinking is that we ought to meet with Corcoran's counsel to get some clarification about what he is actually proposing. In certain sections of the motion he says that he is going to cure all the defaults and in other portions they talk about modifying the City's contract by replacing paragraphs nine and ten which are the paragraphs dealing with the lease of the Dunbarton Road site and building the materials recycling facility. Again, I think we would probably want to meet with his counsel to get some clarity and proceed based on what is presented.

Chairman Craig stated Alderman Lopez, you raise a very good point. The City Solicitor does know that it is anticipated that he should be filing objections as soon as possible. The deadline is March 13<sup>th</sup>, but the intent is to do it as soon as possible.

Alderman Lopez asked okay, he is going to move forward?

Chairman Craig replied yes.

Chairman Craig addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Comparison of single-stream recycling versus dual-stream recycling.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Greazzo, it was voted to discuss this item.

Mr. Kevin Sheppard, Public Works Director, stated as part of your agenda package, item six, I know this Committee has asked in the past what is the cost comparison for single stream program versus dual stream program. I know Alderman Roy had asked that question once before. What I tried to do is put together a simple comparison based on some assumptions. Following it across, you have the dual stream at the top and single stream at the bottom. The assumption is that the contract amount will be the same. That is what would happen under our existing contract with Corcoran. The participation rate, if we went to a single stream, would only go up 10% which I think is very conservative. I feel that with a single stream program we could see an increase beyond the 20%. If you go across for tons of trash, based on our current program, we have 41,400. If we divert an extra 10%, our tons would go down to 36,800. The difference between those that we could potentially divert, if we diverted that 4,600 tons at \$67.18 per ton, which we currently pay, would be a savings of roughly \$309,000 a year. We have the investment of purchasing the toters for the residents, which is about \$1.7 million. If you divide the \$1.7 by the \$309,000 the pay back period is roughly five and a half years. If that participation rate went up to 25% or the diversion rate went up to 25%, the pay back is roughly three and three quarter years. The Committee had asked for this information and I just put this together, working with Alderman Craig. I think the payback is there. I believe a single stream program is the way to go and will create the diversion that we need.

Alderman Greazzo asked Mr. Sheppard, who are we contracting with to do our recycling now if Corcoran isn't in business?

Mr. Sheppard replied Corcoran is still performing the contract. They have a subcontractor, Pinard Waste, but they are providing the curbside service. Even though they are in bankruptcy they are providing the service.

Chairman Craig stated I was looking at these numbers and I think that I would be very happy with 20% at single stream, but from the information that I have read from other communities there seems to be a 30% or 40% increase. I know we want to be conservative, but I want to be sure that I got these numbers correct. If we have a 30% increase, the savings would be a little over \$600,000 and a 40% would be a little over \$900,000.

Mr. Sheppard stated that's correct and it makes a quicker payback. Anything beyond that is additional revenue.

Chairman Craig stated the contract that we have with Corcoran includes the purchase of the toters in terms of a payment plan over a number of years. Correct?

Mr. Sheppard replied correct. It was a five year plan.

Chairman Craig addressed item 7 of the agenda:

7. Update on Solid Waste Compliance Officer activity.

Mr. Sheppard stated in the past we have given the Solid Waste Committee an update. The Aldermen, a few years ago, created a solid waste compliance officer within the Highway Department. I think it has been very successful. We have worked with Alderman Osborne and I think he would agree. The handout, attachment seven to your agenda I think is very clear and shows how effective Brad Moore our compliance officer has been at cleaning up. Before we had this position, many Aldermen complained about litter issues with trash in the alleys and material being out at the curb all week and those are the types of issues that Brad addresses with property owners. We try to work with property owners. We are not out there sending citations or fines as soon as we see an issue. Brad tries to contact the property owner by phone and follows that up with a letter. We do everything in our power to clean the issue up before we send out a citation. There may not be many citation issues and I think that has a lot to say about Brad because he addresses those issues before it gets to that point. Brad can answer any questions.

Alderman Osborne stated I want to commend Brad Moore. He has done an excellent job since he has come on. I know I call him quite a bit because of Ward 5 being the worst ward in the City and according to this, next to it is Ward 4. It has brought the percentage down quite a bit here. I really commend you for it.

Alderman Long stated Brad, there appears to be a decrease in violations as we move forward. Do you credit that to just having a compliance officer or are there any other initiatives that we are getting out there for people to comply?

Mr. Brad Moore, Compliance Officer, replied I think having someone out there to address the problem on a daily basis definitely has made an increase in that. Before this position was put in, we really didn't have someone set up to do this. I'm out there every day. Alderman Osborne can attest to this. I am going up and down the alleys and the streets, trying to address these as soon as they come up. A lot of times it is a matter of educating the public and letting them know what the proper way of handling debris is within the City of Manchester. I think that fact that we are out there full time doing this continually keeping up on this and addressing it as soon as it happens is making a definite impact.

Alderman Long asked are you confident that you are going to see violations decrease as we move forward?

Mr. Moore replied I think to a degree you are going to. I don't think you will ever get rid of it completely. Obviously, in the areas downtown there are a lot of apartment buildings and transient individuals who are constantly coming and going. There is always going to be that kind of issue, but I think we are going to get it to a place where it is manageable where if we keep up on it, it will be a much better situation than it was three years ago before this position.

Mr. Sheppard stated I would like to add also that Brad has done a great job in developing relationships with some of the larger property managers here in the City so if there are issues, he can call them. I think that phone call and that relationship with the property managers has made a big difference.

Alderman Arnold stated I have a question about the violations. Understandably, the bulk of violations are when there is a solid waste problem on someone's property.

Mr. Moore stated we handle the right of way issues.

Alderman Arnold stated I'm also wondering about...it is a violation of the City to have litter on vacant property? Who do you issue the violation to?

Mr. Moore replied obviously, if it is a vacant property and there is no building on it, it is owned by an individual person and we contact them.

Alderman Arnold stated I know it is a small number, but I was wondering if it is vacant if you contact the property owner.

Mr. Moore stated the property owner or the bank. A lot of times if you have a foreclosed property you would contact the bank. A lot of times the bank will set up a local real estate agent or property management company to oversee the property until it is sold. Those are the individuals that we would contact.

Alderman Osborne stated I think the whole program is excellent. I think the big problem still is the Ordinances and if we could have better teeth in the Ordinances with the summons and so forth because a lot of this stuff stays on the street too long. When someone puts it out to the curb when they haven't called Highway yet...especially when you have to look at this, especially in my ward on Spruce Street or Lake Avenue where there is a lot of traffic, it becomes a real blight to a lot of people going up and down those streets. They ask what is being done about this garbage, sofas, chairs or televisions. They are out on the sidewalk too long. There is something we have to put together to get that stuff either back on their

property until they call the Highway Department or we have to pick it up quicker. It is out there too long.

Mr. Moore stated as we go along with this and I have noticed like Kevin brought up, being able to get a conversation going and communicating with the property owners is a lot of times the best way. Once you open up those communications and being able to call them and work with you hopefully to get it off the property completely or at least get it moved up on the property. It is a popular service that we offer. You have one truck servicing the entire City of over 100,000 people so it does keep him quite busy going out there on a daily basis picking up bulky furniture items.

Alderman Osborne stated there is still a lot of illegal dumping as I call it when people dump TV sets because they don't have a way to bring them to the dump to get rid of them. They dump them off on other people's property. It is really hard to keep track of. I really feel bad for a lot of people who have called me and said that it isn't their stuff, but it is on their property. Some people just won't take that and dump it somewhere else so where do you stand? We are liable to pick that up I guess.

Mr. Moore stated that's just it. We're trying to get every property owner to take the responsibility of looking after their own property. As you said, many times it is not your tenant who put it out; however, we don't want it sitting there because it becomes a blight to the area and it ends up going from one mattress to two mattresses. It becomes a magnet for more debris being dumped there. If we can get people to be proactive in addressing that, especially people who live in the community because that is their home and where they live, we can get them to take pride in that and clean up and work with us. Getting that cleaned up I think will make a difference as well.

Alderman Osborne stated that is the biggest problem now, that stuff just lying there too long.

Chairman Craig addressed item 8 of the agenda:

8. Update on the Downtown Recycling pilot program.

Mr. Sheppard stated in your package, item eight, we developed a downtown pilot recycling program. It is a policy we want to implement. I have worked on this with the Chairman as well as Stephanie Lewry of Intown Manchester. We have tried to keep the policy somewhat simple. Our plan is to implement this. You can see on schedule, during the week of May 10<sup>th</sup> we are going to do some education

and follow that up with some more education and hopefully begin the program in the beginning of June. Stephanie Lewry has contacted some of the property owners and has gotten some input from some of the property owners from the downtown district who would be receiving this single stream recycling. Obviously there are some concerns. Our intent is to work with every property owner to implement this program. I believe it can be successful. I believe every property will be able to participate in this. Our intent is not to go out there and force...if there is a little bit of recycling, because mandatory recycling is part of this program, in the solid waste containers, I don't think we are going to be knocking on doors. The intent is to catch as many of the recyclables in the downtown district as possible.

Alderman Osborne asked do you need a motion, Kevin, to go ahead with this or approval?

Mr. Sheppard replied I think the Committee has already approved the downtown recycling program. I would ask that the proposed contract with Goffstown get moved on.

Alderman Osborne moved to enter into a contract with the Town of Goffstown related to a single stream recycling project as proposed. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Greazzo.

Alderman Long stated I already spoke to the Chair with respect to the solid waste. For example you have Monday, Wednesday, Friday and Sunday so Friday morning will have solid waste picked up. Friday and Saturday are the busiest days so you would have Friday night's trash out there all day on Saturday and then you would have Saturday's trash out there that you would pick up Sunday morning. I know from speaking with a representative from the business community saying that it may be okay for one day of solid waste, but the issue, particularly in the summertime, is the smell and the people who are going through the trash who are getting cans or what have you. If we could look on weekends to maybe have a pickup for Saturday morning and Sunday. I'm not sure what could be worked out, but weekends are the heavier solid waste days and it would appear to me that we would want to pick that up Saturday and Sunday mornings and then if Monday was a holiday, the next pickup wouldn't be until Wednesday. Actually, you are looking at two days: Friday morning as a pickup so you have Friday all day which is busy and all night, and then you have Saturday which is also busy and not to be picked up until Sunday for the solid waste issue. That would be a concern if we could maybe try to figure that out. I understand that the week of May 10<sup>th</sup> there is a meeting with property owners and the businesses that are leasing these properties also to let us know their concerns and then the following week there is a follow-up with them. That may be the time where you would want to address whatever their

concerns are. My other concern would be available storage. I'm not sure what businesses have a separate cornered off area for their garbage or do they just leave it somewhere outside their property. Do they have that room if they needed more totes? Some of the businesses have said that they believe that they are going to need more totes because they are dedicated totes now, one from solid waste and the other for recyclables. Just to let the business know that on the weeks of May 10<sup>th</sup> and May 17<sup>th</sup> this Committee is dedicated to answering those concerns and working something out.

Alderman Arnold asked are there opportunities to address what Alderman Long was referring to and the like concerns of the business owners down there?

Mr. Sheppard replied I believe there are. One way we look at this is that the volume of trash and recyclables is going to remain constant, so as far as the need for additional totes there may be a need for one additional toter, but instead of putting it in the trash, you are putting it in the recycling totes so the volume is staying the same; the tonnage isn't going up. Regarding the Saturday collection, I understand Alderman Long's concern, but working with Ms. Lewry from Intown and from what she gathered, this was the preferred schedule from a lot of the businesses in the downtown district. I think it will be important to have that meeting the week of May 10<sup>th</sup> and listen to the property owners. Ms. Lewry received a lot of feedback on this and we are going to be working on that and hopefully address most of those issues regarding providing a Saturday collection. That is a possibility, adding Saturday collection throughout the year. It would probably be a cost of about \$20,000, but if we can create a savings perhaps we can look at providing Saturday collection for both recyclables and solid waste.

Alderman Arnold stated in our discussions about the prospect of Saturday collection are we constrained by whatever the contract is that we are entering into with Goffstown?

Mr. Sheppard replied I believe they are open on Saturdays. I don't think that will be an issue as far as recycling. Worst case, that could be stored in the truck overnight. As far as the trash, we do Saturday collection now so I don't think that would be an issue.

Chairman Craig called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee