



APPROVED Meeting Minutes

2017 Nashua Region Solid Waste Management District Meeting

March 2, 2017

Attendees:

Steve Doumas	Town of Merrimack	Joan P. Cudworth	Town of Hollis
Tom Bayrd	Town of Hollis	Tim Roache	NRPC
Bruce Berry	Town of Amherst	Jill Longval	NRPC
Jim Solinas	Town of Brookline	Karen Baker	NRPC
Troy Brown	Town of Litchfield	Tanya Reinert	NRPC

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:06 am by Longval as Hyland was not in attendance. There was brief discussion on who should run the meeting. Longval said she would be happy to run the meeting if there were not others that wished to. Longval proceeded.

II. Approval of the January 5, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Longval referred to the draft minutes of January 5, 2017 and asked for comments or if accurate, a motion to approve. Berry motioned to approve the minutes of January 5, 2017 with a second from Cudworth. The motion passed.

III. Distribute NRSWMD Binders

Longval passed around Household Hazardous Waste Information binders to each member town represented at the meeting and proceeded to review the contents with the group. She noted that the Cooperative Agreements & Exhibits in the *Introduction* section were still draft. Solinas suggested the Table of Contents page in the binders be posted on the NRPC website and distributed at the Transfer Stations. Longval noted this and informed the group she would be doing some refreshing the HHW pages. She moved onto the Emergency Procedures tab, pointing out the event site maps and emergency contact lists for each event location.

Longval informed the group about an opportunity to complete additional outreach work through the EPA’s Healthy Communities Grant Program. NRPC has been awarded two previous Healthy Communities grants for energy efficiency and climate resiliency projects. The grant will fund projects up to \$25,000, which can be spread over 1-2 years. She stated that she was looking to apply for a HHW related education program that would include a redesign the website to help

expand participation rates. Longval noted that the 2016 participation rates were only 2% of the region-wide population. She stated that 79,000 households are not being reached and wanted to develop a new way of messaging about toxins in the household. Longval noted that March is National Poison Prevention month and that children are a focus area for the grant. The idea is to provide education on reducing toxins in the house to limit exposure to HHW. Longval noted that realtors are also another area to tap into and pointed out that 5,000 homes sold in 2016 in the region. Dumas suggested an information packet to the Welcome Wagon group. Solinas suggested a mailer to go to the 79,000 households not reached to ask for feedback from households and to do it every month to get a gauge. Berry asked if the time spent to do the grant would fall under the NRSWMD budget. Roache noted that it would fall under the NRPC Dues. Longval informed the group that the deadline is April 7th for the initial proposal. Cudworth said she had several ideas geared towards children. Solinas said he would help out as well. Solinas suggested having someone in the towns to raise awareness on household hazardous waste and visit the schools. He also suggested a documentary or video. Longval informed the group that she would pursue this based on the interest of the group.

Longval informed the group of the Lakes Region Planning Commission’s outreach campaign, which will include a virtual tour of a house to identify where the HHW commonly found. She added that it will be set up like a video game and that when it is complete we will have a link to it on the NRPC website. Longval noted that the second piece of the campaign will be a comic book on personal care products.

There was further discussion on other ideas for outreach and education on HHW. Berry commented that whatever it takes to generate excitement would be good. Solinas felt it was important also.

IV. Review of 2017 Collection Schedule & Accepted Materials

Longval noted the 2017 HHW collection schedule, pointing out that there would be an additional collection in Pelham again this year. Collection events for 2017 are as follows:

Day	Date	Time	Location
Saturday	April 22	8:00 am - noon	Nashua Public Works Garage
Saturday	May 6	8:00 am - noon	Milford Public Works Garage
Thursday	June 1	3:00 pm - 7:00 pm	Nashua Public Works Garage
Saturday	August 5	8:00 am - noon	Nashua Public Works Garage
Saturday	August 26	8:00 am - noon	Pelham Village Green
Saturday	October 7	8:00 am - noon	Nashua Public Works Garage
Saturday	November 4	8:00 am - noon	Nashua Public Works Garage

Longval referred to the handout distributed at the beginning of the meeting on “Antifreeze, Batteries, CRTs Bulbs, & Mercury Containing Devices” which contained instructions on steps to take for proper disposal of universal waste and directed residents to check with their local Transfer Station first to see if these items are accepted. She also asked members present to

confirm which items are accepted at each of the Transfer Stations. Solinas had questions on Mercury disposal. Cudworth explained the Mercury Program available as well as some other programs for Transfer Stations to utilize for proper disposal.

V. Review of 2017 Outreach Materials

Longval reviewed the outreach materials included in the NRSWMD binders. She noted that items not accepted at collection events are discussed in a handout titled “What do I do with?” This handout is distributed along with the Latex Paint Flyer at collection events.

VI. Discussion of HHW Vendor RFP Process

Longval stated that per Berry’s request at the January 5th meeting of the NRSWMD, she went back to Veolia to request pricing of materials collected at all of the 2016 collection events. Longval informed the group that they did send her back the info requested but only for the Nashua events. She did not get any data back for the Milford or Pelham events. She showed a spreadsheet with the group comparing per-unit pricing to the flat fee. Solinas asked what other vendors had she talked to. Longval said only to Veolia regarding a possible 1 year contract extension. Berry explained the Request for Proposal (RFP) process that the NRSWMD conducts every three years to contract with a HHW vendor.

Longval stated that the NRSWMD’s first choice is to have flat fee pricing from a vendor and 2nd choice being the per-unit pricing. After doing research with other entities that run HHW programs in the state, she came up with some pricing info to use as a comparison.

- Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission’s HHW program pays by volume, holds 4 events per year, and is currently going through bid process. She provided a side by side onscreen for comparison.
- The City of Keene pays a flat fee but holds 24 events per year in 21 municipalities. They use Triumvirate who is not accepting new clients right now.
- Lakes Region Planning Commission’s HHW program is currently in a 3 year contract and pay by volume. They have a 3% increase annually on disposal and setup but the vendor only ships full containers except for after the last event. They hold 6 events per year and in 2016 they collected 31,175 lbs from 701 households (44.47 lbs/household). For comparison, she noted that in 2016 the NRSWMD collected 93,385 lbs from 1,736 households (53.79 lbs/household).
- Manchester uses Clean Harbors and pays a flat rate per event for set-up, is charged a per-car rate, and holds 2 events per year.

Longval showed a spreadsheet of who the RFP was sent to in 2014 and who bid.

Solinas asked how much revenue was collected vs. the cost for an event. Longval stated that there is a \$10 fee per household collected at the events. In 2016 the District collected \$18,646.15 in user fees which is a little more than what we pay for one event. Solinas asked how this is absorbed. Longval said the program is funded through a DES grant, municipal assessments, and user fees. Longval provided more information on the RFP process.

Longval talked about the municipal materials collected at the events noting that they currently accept waste from municipalities and technically we only accept waste generated by households that have been abandoned on municipal property or disposed of illegally at transfer stations. Municipalities need to comply with SQG rules for waste they generate. Over the years we've seen an increase in the amount of waste we collect from municipalities. This municipal waste (abandoned or generated) will impact pricing. This was an issue 3 years ago with a flat fee. Maybe a limitation should be placed on abandoned waste that can be brought for free to collection or have SQG pricing for municipalities to cover waste they generate.

Solinas asked how the gifts left behind at transfer stations that are brought to the collections are handled. Longval said that it is currently absorbed by all in the District. Berry felt that cost should be absorbed by the municipality who is bringing the extra waste because there are some that don't bring any at all. Solinas suggested having more flexibility for households who bring HHW to the transfer stations or holding the residents accountable or have quarterly or monthly pickups.

Berry referred to a DES certification class for Transfer Stations. Cudworth did not think they were doing the classes anymore. There was discussion about having municipalities pay SQG fees if they bring HHW that they generate to the collection events. Cudworth commented that municipalities need to have an avenue to get rid of gifts that are generated by residents and dropped at their transfer stations. She asked if the towns should get a warning about taking advantage of this. Longval suggested that the upcoming RFP request SQG for municipalities that want to bring materials they generate. Solinas suggested going another way and inviting the vendors in and asking them before the RFP process how they deal with this before assessing a price. Solinas also suggested using multiple vendors for different types of waste. Berry did not feel it would be cost effective to have different vendors deal with different types of waste. He also noted that the administrative costs would go up and felt there could be other issues with storage and EPA rules. Longval said that logistically, we would not be able to have 3 vendors at the collections running the event, storing the HHW, and picking it up. Longval also explained that the RFP process is open to all licensed in the state and interviews with vendors are part of the process after proposals are received.

Solinas clarified that he was suggesting splitting the process into categories of low, medium & high. There was further discussion on multiple vendors for events, the liability, and how this could complicate the process.

Brown summarized what he understood and commented that with the fixed price contract, municipalities could bring extra material without increasing costs. However, under a unit pricing contract municipalities do not want to subsidize one another. Therefore, an additional fee is needed for materials generated by a town or the town will have to find another way to dispose of the material. Cudworth felt there might need to be some education to the towns on what should be in their budget. Roache felt this was a good idea and that the Town Administrators should be notified and communicating with the Transfer Stations. Cudworth said the issue is a matter of people not understanding. Dumas suggested sending a general letter to the towns that they can distribute to their staff explaining that waste generated by the town must be treated as a SQG and paid for by the town.

Longval said it would be good to get the RFP out ASAP unless they decide to go with the 1 year extension with Veolia. She added that it would be helpful to have pricing estimates in time for the annual budget meeting in June. She also noted that the 2017 collections are under the existing contract.

VII. Other Business

Longval stated that the Cooperative Agreements are currently being reviewed by the City of Nashua Legal department. The main issue being discussed is the storage facility and how to structure that portion of the agreement. Berry made a comment about the District maintaining the facility but the City owning it. Longval said the agreement has to go through the Board of Aldermen and the Public Works Board before going to the Mayor. Longval replied that storage facility is a permanent structure when asked by Brown. Longval added that the City received an EPA grant in the 80's to purchase the facility, but the District has been responsible for maintaining it. Berry commented on the amount of money that has been put into the facility to maintain it, just alone in the last few years. Longval showed pictures on screen to the group of the storage facility. She added that it is very useful and will be financially beneficial, particularly if we move away from flat fees per event. Brown asked if they have environmental insurance. Longval stated that in the contract, the vendor is considered the generator of the waste and therefore holds the insurance. Berry stated that the vendor is also required to conduct weekly inspections on the facility. He added that is another reason why it would not be good to have multiple vendors. Longval said her goal is to have all the Cooperative Agreements signed by July 1st.

The meeting ended at 11:25am.