

To; House Committee on Natural Resources and Energy

Re: Materials Mgmt. Summit Document Submission

From: Town of Canaan Selectboard / Solid Waste Review Committee

Re: ACT 148

1. The Selectboard agrees with the intent of the act and feel that it will further our goals to reduce wastes going to the landfills. The E-cycles Program, Lamp Program has been successful and we are looking forward to participating in the Paint Care Program.
2. We have two concerns. Having to join a district and the other is the requirement for the town to hold two HHW Events. First we will address joining the district.
3. We use to belong to NEKWMD. We didn't have our SWIP and they covered this requirement until we did get a SWIP approved. We left the district because we are geographically located on the northeastern part of the state and could not really use all the services they provided. We were satisfied with the services they could provide. We belong to the Coos Recycling Center which is made up of seven towns in the local area. We have been using them since 1992. The center is located across the Connecticut River in Stewartstown, NH. We have invested monies in the center and they provide a valuable service for us on a weekly basis as they pick up all our recyclables each week or as needed. They provide two closed top roll offs for our glass, tin cans , aluminum cans and plastic bottles etc. They also provide us with Gaylord boxes for all our paper recyclables.
4. In 2005 we established a Solid Waste Review Committee. Made up of selectmen , educators, businesses, waste haulers, town recycling crew. The Town had curbside pickup for both household waste and recyclables. And on the surface this was a great service. This service was paid for with taxes based on the appraised value of your property. This payment structure did not provide the incentives to recycle and didn't involve everyone.
5. The SWRC after reviewing our current system made the following changes:
 - a. Changed our tax bills to show each category of spending. So now everyone could see what was actually being spent on waste disposal.
 - b. We visited nine towns in our general area both in NH and Vt. that had transfer stations and got information on their site layouts and operating costs. What we found out is that the towns with their own transfer station and Pay as You Throw system had the lowest waste disposal costs and higher recycling rates. There was only one town that had its own town trash bag.
 - c. The committee decided that having our own trash bag with our logo was the best way to go. This identifies all users as town residents and we don't get other towns using our transfer station. The bags are sold in a sleeve of ten bags. They are sold locally at the town office, grocery store and mini mart. There is no markup. They do this as a community service. Having your own town bags and paying for them upfront frees up the transfer station manager from collecting money. The manager has more time to manage the site.

- d. In 2007 the SWRC proposed a plan to build our own transfer station and to go to a PAYT system. The town approved the proposal.
 - e. In 2008 we opened our transfer station for business. We held an open house prior to opening the site for business so the residents would be familiar with the site and process.
 - f. We also offered curbside pickup for those who wanted that service. We no longer have that service as there were not enough users to make it financially viable for the hauler.
 - g. We are very pleased with the results.
 - i. We went from hauling MSW waste to the landfill every week to shipping once a month. We went from shipping an average of 545 tons per year for the previous seven years to a yearly average of 333 tons. This includes all waste streams MSW , C/D and town approved dumpsters for businesses.
 - ii. Our annual budget for the previous seven years went from an average of \$114,000.00 to \$57,000.00. We added a Stump Dump Attendant and \$2,000.00 annually for a capital reserve fund that were not previously budgeted.
6. The second issue we have is with the requirement of holding two HHW Events. As part of our SWIP we are required to hold two events each year. What we were doing was setting up two days back to back that were the same days that our transfer station is open. Friday afternoon and Saturday morning. Four hours each day. What this did was allowed our residents the opportunity to bring their trash to the transfer station and then drop their HHW materials at the same time. Our contractor would set up package the materials and would only have to make one trip. We were told that this practice is not acceptable and we had to go to having one in the spring and one in the fall.
7. Our participation rate:
- a. 2010 – 18 (Two days back to back)
 - b. 2011 - 37 (Two days back to back)
 - c. 2012 – 11 (Two days back to back)
 - d. 2013 Spring event – 8
 - e. 2013 Fall Event – 14

Note: This is a four year average of 22.5 participants. One might conclude that we don't advertise enough. We advertise in the following ways.

- f. Town Report
- g. Town Carrier. This is a quarterly newsletter. We include the dates and HHW materials that are accepted.
- h. Two post offices. Canaan and Beecher Falls
- i. Transfer Station
- j. Town Garage (Events are held here)
- k. Local Newspaper
- l. Town Web Site. Website also lists the materials that will be accepted at the HHW event.

8. Our previous hauler provided us with reasonable rates and we were happy with their service. They have gone out of business. We are now faced with finding a new contractor. We were given some contacts and their prices are much higher than our previous contractor. Some Examples:
 - a. APT Environmental, Inc. Set up fee. \$300.00 Per Event – Annual Cost \$600.00
 - b. Clean Harbors, Inc. Set up fee. \$4048.00 Per Event – Annual Cost \$8096.00
 - c. Clean Ventures, Inc. Set up fee. \$1,900.00 Per Event – Annual Cost \$3800.00
 - d. Enpro Services, Inc Set up fee \$2,500.00 Per Event _ Annual Cost \$5000.00
 - e. Note these are set up costs only and additional fees will be charged for the waste materials.
9. Looking at our participation rates and the costs just to set up, does it really make any sense for the town to hold two HHW Events. Most of our HHW products are paint and stains. Given the fact that Act 58 and Paint Care are kicking in this will further reduce HHW materials coming to our HHW Events. We have an attendant that sits with the contractor and all residents are required to sign a participation sheet. They are not charged for the materials this is done for our records.
10. This is where we are at odds with the program regulating HHW materials. The Town of Canaan could hold one event and meet all the needs of the town and ANR's intended results. The districts get away with having one event in each town. The way they get away with this requirement is that if residents miss the collection event they can drive to Lyndonville and drop these materials off at their site. With the high cost of gas does anybody really think that people from Bloomfield or Norton Vt. or any other town for that matter will drive to Lyndonville to drop off HHW materials.
11. In closing we worked hard at making the improvements that we have achieved with our transfer station and PAYT system. We support the efforts of ANR to keep materials out of the landfills using a material management approach. We would like to see a sensible compromise when it comes to the requirement of holding two HHW events. Wouldn't it make sense to have one in the fall. Most people would buy all their supplies in the spring (gardening supplies, automotive supplies, pest controls, paint,) and want to get rid of any left overs in the fall. Having one in the fall then in the spring is almost like having them back to back isn't it? When you consider what the impact is on the environment and the cost to have a contractor come to Canaan for two HHW Events when one event would meet our needs does it really make sense? There can only be one answer. NO