

Recycling Center Advisory Committee

Minutes Nov 5, 2020 12 Noon to 1 PM

Present: Rachel Bartlett, Chair, Jon Lounsbury, Member, Robb Ball, Recorder

M/S Minutes for Sept 30 2020, approved

Discussion of Mixed Container Recycling: In other towns, tipping and hauling fees, benefits and costs of town taking on transport, i.e. effect on costs; Town resident fees vs current costs of disposal and handling. There is currently minimal income from the current methodology of handling and selling mixed containers.

To up our game, methods and tools for segregating and managing (crushing, baling, breaking and hauling) should be examined and cost benefits detailed.

The costs and logistics of hauling to Walpole for adding to their stream and their sale thereof still creates increased management and sorting on our end. This is a move may have an effect on personnel and volunteers but may be an interim move while we move toward a more complex waste management plan and process which would entail slowly growing our program and equipment.

This could begin with Heather's recommendation of changing out our sea container for mixed paper to one like Ron's recommendation: a gambrel with side ports and a full cover in lieu of doors.

Jon discussed drafting a set of recommendations for the Board laying out a waste management reorganization with a volunteer group of ten persons to evaluate and recommend reorganization suggestions. This group should also consider the various complaints town patrons may have such as a closure forcing the use of the Keene Waste Management facility, fees, distance, et cetera.

The old dump and now our transfer station is an important town resource and a valued service.

Rachel discussed the Minnesota Recycling recommendations and the potential of using the Town Facebook page to increase knowledge in citizens and the potential value for conceptual buy-in. The buy-in is critical to any effort the town initiates and the big question is how do we increase it?

The group discussed an Interim Report of the Advisory Group's work and recommendations. A big picture outline:

- What are the first recommendations?
- Our Recycling Program is inefficient, producing quite modest income
- The Market is changing with demand for waste paper and cardboard significantly increasing due to Co-vid and an incredible increase in shipping of online purchases, a significant and potentially lasting impact on value of recycled paper/cardboard. We could begin to take advantage of this change.
- Moneys made in waste stream can begin offsetting increased waste stream mgmt. cost
- Recommend compactor purchase to make product market worthy and increase income
- Invest in storage and sorting structures on site
- Invest in larger and new construction of Free Cycle building

- With a bigger and more functional Freecycle building we suggest a volunteer management making it more efficient and effective (rather than a junk shop – with the town eventually taking costs of disposal – volunteer management enforces appropriate donation)
- Re-work traffic flow in facility to increase compliance with, and ease of use for recycling access, Safety, Congestion, Socialization – all supported by redesign. Routing can be used to “force” behavior. Re engineer site with periods of repositioning trials to determine more effective flow; a diverse team of users may add considerable value to planning as many players bring broader perspective. The flow needs to be conducive of behaviors we seek to encourage and reinforce. Coherent, Convenient, and encouraging of waste separation.
- Recognize and build in incentives to increase recycling
- If Bag Program with Cost (like Walpole’s) is used, it may increase recycling compliance

Further discussion of recommendations included Elm City Compost, our own sorting and glass crushing and transport to Keene or Walpole, promotion of gambrel paper container, segregation of waste stream can decrease costs – issue is incremental beginning and process, prevention of safety issues, volunteers to ensure clean recycling stream. Clean material is profitable.

Advisory Group should prioritize recommendations. We can detail what we have looked at and determine what rises to level of importance. The data need to be made available for informed decision making and reflection without drowning readers in minutia.

The town subsidizes waste management, and should be looking at neutralizing costs of waste stream management through innovation. Fee-cost sharing by bag program with cost shift onto user, fee rates for stickers be considered. All of these efforts should be a coherent long term, gradual adoption plan.

The waste will become far less disposable as time progresses. Begin change now or have it forced, through market dynamics, later.

One possibility in a long- term waste management program could be hiring a person with a passion for waste management to handle the multiple agency and organizational contacts, build recycling program, deal with vendors; all in a 2-year period of learning, adapting program, and growing. This could result in some “Bow wave” funding pushed forward, to be gradually neutralized over the growing period of the program. Current and near-term investment will significantly mitigate longer term impact and costs. This person and the program should be supported by an advisory group (particularly not a contrarian model).

Next meeting will be November 30<sup>th</sup> 2020

Agenda is to finalize recommendations

Goal of recommendations to Board by yearend

December 7<sup>th</sup> invite Frank Reeder for 1 PM meeting for review of preliminary recommendations

Submitted RS Ball recording