

Minutes of Life after NESWC Steering Committee

Meeting held June 9, 2004

Room 204

Town Hall

Attendance: Steering committee members Robert Johnson, Peter Ashton, David Stone, Pat Clifford, Ann Chang, Carol Holley, John Murray

Others present: Garry McCarthy, Sally Edwards

Meeting was convened by Chairman Robert Johnson at 7:10 pm.

The chair introduced a discussion of the objectives of the committee and tasks; members had been provided with a draft "Life After NESWC" goals and strategy document prior to the meeting.

Discussion ranged on a variety of topics in an effort to provide information and elicit discussion of issues to investigate:

Do we have to cap the landfill? Current status and DEP's position regarding the landfill was discussed. The estimated cost to cap it is \$2.5 to \$3 million; it was suggested we see what other communities have done with landfills – GM offered to help in this regard.

The brokerage program helped cover the costs of an expensive and very unprofitable contract for trash disposal signed in the early 1980s

Current transfer station is permitted for 27,000 tons; citizens contribute about 4,000 tons. Rest is made up made open market; we have an obligation for 9,500 tons. We could get a permit for a larger station.

Trash market has been weak this year; other years it has been strong – hard to predict. Industry consolidation has hurt as has uncertainty over what the state will do in the future regarding existing landfills. Our location is an advantage and has served as a hub for trash haulers in the past

The issue of how we reduce the generation of trash was raised – recycling, pay as you throw programs were mentioned – SE indicated a desire to work on this issue if the committee was interested. Others indicated that some of these options will cost more money which the taxpayers may or may not support. It was pointed out that the survey did indicate strong support for a recycling program.

The group discussed identifying specific options vs. setting up subcommittees by task. Various general options were discussed including the status quo, reduced service to residents only, privatization, exit the business entirely. A number of policy issues have to

be addressed as well as the analysis of each option in terms of financial impact, environmental impact and what the citizens desire.

PC raised the issue of what time frame we should be interested in; the group generally believed that 5 years was a reasonable time frame for evaluation.

BJ stated that he believed that recycling had to be examined and JM stated that curbside pickup also should be examined. DS mentioned interest in looking at what other communities were doing especially with regard to recycling.

The committee then discussed developing an initial list of solutions and form small groups to begin a study of these options.

DS/PA would look at the status quo option and possible variants from that.

AC/JM/PC would look at the privatization option including curbside pickup

CH/SE/BJ would examine recycling options

GM volunteered to compile information on other community models, market intelligence and other information

The committee agreed to meet at 7:30 pm on June 21st.

Meeting adjourned at 9:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Ashton