

**Hopkinton-Webster Landfill Committee
Slusser Senior Center
Final Minutes
February 5, 2009**

There was a meeting of the Hopkinton/Webster Landfill Committee on Thursday February 5, 2009. The meeting was held at the Slusser Center in Hopkinton and began at 7 P.M. Bob Drown, Linda Hook, Sally Embley, Stretch Kennedy, and Steve Clough were present. Bob Lapree joined the meeting a little late due to a meeting at his regular job and Karen Irwin excused herself due to a Budget Committee commitment. Tom Mullins and Frank Davis attended the meeting as members of the public.

In a review of 2008 minutes it was found that there was no copy of the January 2008 minutes on record. Committee members were asked to check their own records but no copy of that month's minutes were found. Steve will notify the Hopkinton Selectmen's Office that they have been lost. The committee proceeded with the approval of current minutes.

The December 2008 Minutes were reviewed. Louise had incorporated one of the changes made at the January meeting. Karen had another paragraph to be added to the minutes but it wasn't available. It was decided that in the interest of getting meeting minutes up to date that approval of the minutes would be voted on subject to amendment. Bob made a motion to approve the December 2008 Minutes, Linda seconded the motion, and acceptance was unanimous.

The January 2008 Minutes were reviewed. After discussion Bob made a motion to approve the January 2009 Minutes, Stretch seconded the motion, and the acceptance was unanimous. These Minutes are also subject to amendments.

A process for dealing with monthly Minutes was agreed upon. Minutes will be sent to all members immediately after each meeting and members will be given 24 hours to comment. They will then be posted to the Website in draft form. Every member will be responsible for reviewing the previous month's Minutes before coming to the next meeting. Minutes from the previous month will be approved at the beginning of each meeting subject to amendment. This process will facilitate the committee's compliance with requirements and hopefully prevent a backlog of minute approval.

Steve presented committee members with a rough sketch of the facilities and went over the current working structure. All of the production areas are centrally located so that the shortest distances and a minimum of man-hours are required for processing, storing, loading, and shipping. Possible future expansions were reviewed.

If the strategy of maximizing recycling revenue is continued there may have to be some dry storage constructed and/or a modification of the existing Recycling Center which would include the installation of a horizontal baler. These improvements would allow the towns to export materials as well as receive higher prices on some materials due to baler efficiency and compacting. These are projects that can be easily analyzed in

terms of a return on investment. They may become practical as the volume of recycling increases.

The expansion of the drop-off area was reviewed. This project would involve constructing another, somewhat duplicate, drop-off building. The road and approaches to each recycling avenue would also be widened. This plan would relieve some of the current congestion and also provide a more accessible drop-off for commercial recycling vehicles. This plan could go forward whenever the committee deemed appropriate. The actual design and costing would be done for final committee approval when that decision is made. The proposal would then go the Boards.

The Environmental Center project was discussed. How the proposed site was dictated by other restrictions and operational considerations were explained. Costly sacrifices in the handling of other materials would have to be made in order to locate the Center up in the current operational area. It would also create a traffic nightmare and have no room for further expansion.

The Environmental Center would be a continuation of current strategy. It would be focused on education, reduction, and reuse as well as recycling. There are no easy ways to decrease expenditures and increase revenues without developing new approaches. Every 100 tons of waste removed from the disposal stream saves about \$6,000 today and will save more in each succeeding year. If the project were done well it would pay for itself at some point. It would also hopefully increase recycling by giving residents more programs to participate in. This project is part of an overall strategy and can be voted on by the committee at their discretion.

Webster still has a seat open and will hopefully fill it by the next meeting. The vote for a new committee chairman was deferred to the March meeting. Steve offered to help Bob or Linda with agendas and procedural issues if one of them decided to accept the chairmanship.

Tom went over recent developments at the Cooperative and the Single Stream project. The clause to protect non-participating communities has been dropped from the charter. The participating towns will receive any potential financial benefits from the proposed facility but all of the Cooperative communities will be responsible for any liabilities. Cochrane Environmental is offering a tour to towns of their proposed Single Stream facility in Manchester.

March's Agenda will include the Election of Officers again and a review of 2008 final figures by Steve. Webster has a town wide meeting on March 5th so the next meeting will be on March 12th at the Webster Town Hall.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:30