

West Boylston Solid Waste Advisory Team
DRAFT Minutes
May 10, 2010
Town Hall Offices, 127 Hartwell Street

Present:

Julianne DeRivera, Chair
Janet Vignaly, Member, Clerk
Elise Wellington, Member
John Westerling, DPW Director

Not Present:

Craig Gonyea, Member
Judy Doherty, Member

The meeting began at 10:37 a.m.

I. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Wellington moved that the minutes of the April 26, 2010 be approved. Ms. DeRivera seconded and all approved.

II. SWAT Annual Report

Ms. Wellington reported for the record that she did SWAT's Annual Report for the Town Report. All members received the report and had the opportunity to comment before it was submitted.

III. Year to date on PAYT program

Mr. Westerling passed out the actual trash revenues and costs for FY2010 (attached)s. He included his projections for the remainder of the fiscal year (given in yellow in the chart he handed out). He said from the \$313,000 budgeted from the general fund for the year, there would be a balance of \$36,000 that would probably end up as free cash. Mr. Westerling explained that the \$313,000 figure came from the Override money—the amount of money the Selectmen believed should continue to pay for trash. This amount had been increased by inflation, and the selectmen were concerned, Mr. Westerling noted, that if we needed less for the trash budget line item that the town would need an underride.

The team worked out some comparisons in the numbers between the trash budget from FY09 and FY10. Members asked Mr. Westerling to compare the total tonnage of trash this year to a year ago. Mr. Westerling said it had gone from about 8 tons per day in FY09 to about 5 tons per day in FY10, a decrease of about 37%. Mr. Westerling said he would get the more exact numbers on tonnage.

Members asked about avoided disposal costs due to the implementation of PAYT.

Mr. Westerling reported the following numbers:

FY10 projected disposal cost = \$110,794

FY09 disposal cost = \$153,824

The change was mainly due to the fact that PAYT has significantly reduced the amount of trash the town is producing, resulting in reduced tipping fees. (The other factor was that the town's tipping fee went down during the second six months of FY10, but this savings was offset by the town's tipping fee going up during the first six months of FY10.). So the avoided disposal cost was about \$43,000.

Ms. Wellington summarized the effects of PAYT that the town has seen in FY10. Looking at the bag revenue and bag purchase cost, there will be anet revenue to the town of about \$76,000 from the

bags—this is revenue the town did not receive before PAYT. This revenue was used to offset the cost of disposal.

The other effect of PAYT was that the town's disposal costs have gone down significantly by \$43,000.

Thus, the net savings to town from FY09 to FY10, resulting from PAYT, would be \$119,000, which is almost exactly what SWAT projected a year ago.

Mr. Westerling compared some other figures from the 2 years:

Disposal cost FY09 = \$153,842	Disposal cost FY10 = \$110,794
Collection cost FY09=\$211,668	Collection cost FY10 = \$241,667
Total cost FY09 = \$395,492	Total cost FY10=352,460 (less \$76,484 net bag fee revenue = \$275,976)

III. Options for MSW and Recyclables

Mr. Westerling passed out a new chart (attached) showing just the low bidder (E.L Harvey) and the current hauler's (Allied Waste) bids on the new collection contract.

Ms. DeRivera pointed out that Option 4 was bi-weekly single stream recycling, which would not make sense since weekly collection would be the only reason to convert to Single Stream.

Mr. Westerling suggested also not considering Option 3, since it costs the town more because the town would have to buy toters for every household .

Ms. DeRivera asked what savings would result from Single Stream. Mr. Westerling explained that he looked at if you follow the results observed in Worcester, which had 2% less trash after switching to Single Stream. This would result in \$2,200 savings in West Boylston.

Mr. Westerling explained Option 1 with a New Contract with Allied Waste. He said that Allied Waste has agreed to treat all the town's recycled paper as #8 paper (a status defining higher quality paper). This change could result in about a \$6800 annual return to the town, therefore the net cost of Option 1 with Allied Waste could be \$235,200. (#6 paper is currently bringing \$45/ton while #8 paper comes in at \$90.) This potentially gets us a higher return, but depends on the market value of paper.

Mr. Westerling also clarified that the new contract has no build-out increases—no added cost to the town if there are more households built in town that are collected.

Mr. Westerling explained that E.L. Harvey just recently started municipal solid waste collection in 2 towns. Normally they are subscription (private) haulers. They have limited experience with municipal curbside collection. He suggested he go back to Allied Waste and see if they can fine-tune the numbers and see if they can match Harvey's bid. He said he has had an excellent rapport with Allied Waste, and very few complaints. He also said Allied Waste's bid was very thorough, and included a lot of different proposals, including Recycle Bank. Mr. Westerling said he is leaning toward working with Allied Waste, trying to get them to come down in price, or recommending that the town go with a little extra expense for a known good product.

Ms. DeRivera said she was still against Single Stream. She acknowledged that Single Stream was more convenient, but asked what price would be paid later for that convenience, that more convenience could begin more problems later. Ms. Wellington said she did not go for Options 3 or 4 because she didn't think the town should put out money to buy toters and encourage people to put out more solid

waste. She said she is torn between Options 1 and 2. Ms. DeRivera said that if you look at other countries who are leaders in recycling, you don't see single stream. She asked how long single stream has been in use—it's so new, she said, how do we know it will stand the test of time, or will it go the way of Recycle Bank (which Southbridge and other towns have given up, according to Mr. Westerling)? Ms. Wellington asked, if the recycling market collapses, is it possible that the consumers of recyclables would start taking just dual stream and we would have to convert back to dual stream?

Ms. Wellington made a motion that SWAT support Option 1 with Allied Waste as printed on handout. Ms. DeRivera seconded.

Ms. Wellington made an amendment to the motion, proposing Option 1 but pursuing the idea that Allied Waste drops their price to below \$236,000 in exchange for keeping the benefits of paper recycling, as well as the risks. Ms. DeRivera seconded. . The motion passed 2 to 1. Ms. DeRivera and Ms. Vignaly were in favor and Ms. Wellington was opposed.

Ms. Wellington explained her reasoning, saying that she thought Option 2 (single stream) offered more convenience to the residents, so this was her way of showing her preference for Option 2, but she also supports Option 1 .

IV. Other Business

Ms. Wellington referred to the April 9 letter from the Commissioner of DEP about Sustainable Materials Recovery Program (SMRP) grants and asked if the town has applied for any of the DEP grants for recycling bins or compost bins?

Mr. Westerling said that Mr. Leon Gaumond had sat through the DEP presentation in Northborough and he'll get the update. He thought some of them were matching grants where the town would have to come up with much of the money, so he wasn't sure what would benefit the town.

Ms. Wellington said she has seen recyclables put out in black trash bags and when she asked the hauler about this he said he ripped those bags open to make sure there only were recyclables in them but this took more time. Ms. Wellington said it might help for the town to invest in containers, as it might help save time for the hauler. Mr. Westerling pointed out that the town pays the same amount no matter how much time it takes the hauler to collect.

Ms. Vignaly asked about the current practice of the hauler. She said she noticed the hauler comes around and picks up the recyclables separately from the trash. She asked if that was the general practice of the hauler and if that affected the amount of fuel used each day. Mr. Westerling pointed out that it could be due to a number of things and he wasn't sure of the reason. He said that the collection cost wouldn't change if they spent more money on fuel.

Ms. Wellington said she did the Town-wide Survey on the Internet. The 2 questions on trash were asking if 1) town tax money should be spent to "improve" trash services. She asked what "improve" meant and how she should answer if she wanted the system improved, but by upping PAYT bag fees rather than use of tax dollars. The second question was asking if 2) residents want to bring trash to a collection area. She thought it was interesting, as the SWAT had never discussed that option. She wondered why SWAT wasn't consulted, and Mr. Westerling said he wasn't consulted either. She said she was discouraged that there was no mention of PAYT in the survey.

Ms. DeRivera said she would look for the PowerPoint slide she had prepared for the last town meeting. Ms. Vignaly offered to put together and give the presentation at Town Meeting, which will give an overview of the first year of PAYT and show how its results compare to the projections SWAT made a year ago.

Members agreed to meet at 6:30 pm the following Monday, May 17, preceding Town Meeting.

The meeting adjourned at noon.

Submitted by,

Janet Vignaly, Secretary