Solid Waste Committee Meeting

1

20

2	Monday, January 27th, 2025, 3:30 PM
3	Members Present: Rich Marcou (Chair), LeeAnn Mackay, Kent Ruesswick (BOS rep) Stephen
4	Rasche, Roy Plisko, Elle Bezanson, Greg Heath, Kim Scamman
5	Agenda:
6	1. Call to Order:
7	Rich called the meeting to order at 3:27pm.
8	2. Accept Previous Minutes:
9	Rich made a motion to postpone approval of January 20, 2025, minutes to a future
10	meeting, Kent seconded. No further discussion, all voted in favor.
11	3. New Business:
12	Petition Articles:
13	The committee is moving forward to the public budget hearing on February 3,
14	2025.
15	Ken Folsom advised that the Board of Selectmen would not release the funds
16	without information about the "scope and purpose" on their use. Further data needs to be
17	done by an engineer. Kim has reached out to two engineering companies and Rich has
18	reached out to one as well. The proposals should be received by Friday.
19	The proposal plans are to look at the current site, plans to move the salt shed up to

the municipal complex, and provide this expenditure to the town for review.

Most recently, Aris engineers who did the water testing said they could do it for around \$5000.00 and would get that proposal back to Rich by last Friday but they did not get back to him as of yet. Kim spoke with Barton and Loguidice out of New York, that has an engineer that works out of Northwood NH, they are interested, are major solid waste players, and promised a letter either Friday or Today.

Rich can go to the February 3 public hearing on the budget with the Warrant Article and ask for it to be added to the warrants and have it be presented to the town at the town meeting but would also like to be prepared with a Petition Article.

LeeAnn feels like we are being driven in a different direction that is so opposed to everything that has been discussed for the lasts 6-8 months. She agrees with Rich having to do the political hurdles, what she disagrees with is spending money and time on things that is opposed to everything we determined we wanted to do eight months ago. We are back to the same reason we are objecting to what Steve wanted to do. The solution is to move the transfer station and why are we spending money to solve problems that are going to be solved when the transfer station is moved.

Roy asked if the committee understands the details of the investigation. He asked how far the land goes behind the storage station, and if we could push things back further, how much space, is it suitable or not? Rich passed out a map, from the water testing, and footprint with the landfill with the current location of the salt shed. Kim mentioned that it is a very tight site for this type of facility.

Rich added that it is our intention to get this quote for the building from the engineers, to get a new storage shed priced out, calling Loudon to consider partnering,

getting quotes for town-wide trash pick-up, and delineate all the options so the town can decide.

LeeAnn stated that we are paying to show the town we are doing due diligence because we have done a lot of the legwork already, she does not feel like paying for an engineer just to satisfy appearances.

Stephen disagreed and felt that if you want to spend all that money on a new transfer station, you must be able to tell the town specifics of spending and the only major thing we can't do now is have storage space so we can deal with recyclables. So, if we can do these things on the existing site, he does not see the purpose of going to a new site because what else would you want to do other than that?

Rich mentioned composting. LeeAnn continued, putting in a new compactor, adding any kind of things to stop idling cars from going through the building, which she feels is more harmful at this point than the truck that is parked outside. She noted that we don't know about air testing and that needs to be looked into and many more issues that we can't even do because Ken informed us that DES said "NO". She agreed that having some of the hard numbers from experts will be vital to make a case for what we need.

LeeAnn voiced concern that if the advice we are getting from professionals solves the immediate storage solution, where are we getting with the bigger concerns? Rich responded that it is going to provide hard numbers for the current site, all the recyclables are currently going into the trash and to solve that issue we are going to have to spend money on storage. Roy stated that the dump is not allowed to hold anything longer than a year. Rich said that applies to household waste and it's less than that.

Gregs spoke in favor of moving ahead with the wording of the warrant article and felt that the thought of relocating and the biggest issue of the efficiency of traffic flow works and that is what we have spent so much time on learning how to make it most efficient, was the big attraction of starting over elsewhere. Greg said that this proposal is not fixing problems but gathering data so that decisions can be made, the argument is always going to be what is the cheapest way to solve the problem. Greg spoke in favor of moving ahead with this, he does not see it precluding anything that we have talked about. If we went ahead and built a new facility for storage there and the town built new salt storage, it would lock us into the facility for a long time, however gathering believable data can be expensive.

LeeAnn's biggest concern is when DES shuts us down, it is going to fall on us a committee. Rich felt with the tax climate right now, there was push back, taxes are still going to go up 4.6%, for us to go forward, buying land, building a new facility would have been flat out voted down. Rich expressed that the pushback was not entirely unexpected, and they gave us feedback to get your ducks in a row and that is what he is doing, getting hard numbers, updated numbers for all the options. Rich will need the Gilford numbers from LeeAnn she researched along with dates of those costs.

Kim sees this regardless of what happens, the salt shed needs to be moved and that is one small step forward in the process at the current site, whether the site is moved or closed or stayed as is, we will be gathering data while achieving the task. Roy asked when this was decided.

Kent stated that if we are using that site for holding the sand, you will need a piece of equipment, a loader for both locations, and to keep that in mind. He felt there was probably enough room if we pushed the building towards the road.

Rich, regardless, it is a task we are addressing, and it is the only way forward without battling the powers that be and undermining any good that we have done. He received comments that they appreciate all the committee is doing from the budget committee. Regarding the task at hand, he still does not know if this will get put on the warrant.

Kent felt this is a much better way to study the dump issue and learn what you need to do, it gets you to the point where the committee can credibly give more data.

LeeAnn would like to strike "and suitability" out of the wording. Greg suggested it should say, "of the current transfer station or the towns future or current needs". Rich, you mean the current site is not suitable for upgrades. Roy, feasibility means affordability, suitability means will the land allow us to do it. Agreement was made on the wording.

Ken Folsom emailed Aries, CC'd Rich and they called Rich. He gave Aries the scope that the committee is looking for. They said with their past experience at the dump, knowing the footprint, extent of the landfill and it not being capped, location of the test wells. The rep did say there was an anomaly with one of the wells. It does not look like it has spread very far and is not getting worse. Leeann asked to explain further. Rich said there was a problem with one of the tests wells, not sure of the hydrology and that PFAS, recently also showed up. Kent said there was a fire up there and some other town arrived with PFAS in their water which is in fire retardant foam, they spread it around and now it

is showing up in our wells. It is not something that we should see continuously, it is a one-time thing as he understands. The engineers found this abnormality in one of the wells, not a concern yet but is something that needs to be watched.

Greg felt that this shared news was problematic, without adequate information for the residents who live closest, what they found and why they are not concerned but just knowing that it has happened in some way, we may have a significant PR issue to address. Roy said we need data-based answers not anecdotal answers. Kent said Aris engineering pulls water samples off every year, so things will show up quicker if there is a problem and it is a town budget item.

LeeAnn stated that this is her greatest fear, good with rebuilding, making better use of the site, the moment that changed was when DES said we can't do anything up there.

Rich reiterated that right now, we need to look at providing storage. Tipping fees are going up, adding more trash, spending more money, it would make more sense that we need a place to put the bales because of the need every year to use the space for the salt shed.

Greg felt that they are on the same page, we are talking about what to recommend to the town relative to using these funds. We need to get the data to move forward to solve the long-term issues and did not see any objection to that. He suggested moving forward. Roy was in favor of moving forward environmental engineering over structural engineering.

Rich asked how the committee feels about waiting to the last minute, hoping that the selectboard is going to approve the language and let us put it on the warrant and give us access to approximately \$7000.00.

Kent responded that if you prove to the town that the money is going to be spent on engineering to justify that station staying where it is or moving, you need to do that work this year. You need to demonstrate that it is going to be a study, he felt that it would be accepted. Greg is in favor except he would like to add the words "to be" after fund and move the question. Rich is going to give Ken the language in a warrant article and hopefully they move that and put it on the warrant.

Plan B: The committee will solicit 25 signatures and be ready to submit them on February 4th should this fail on February 3rd.

Roy is in favor of getting access to the funding for suitability, but felt suitability should be first. Rich felt suitability and feasibility come hand in hand.

Greg responded that an engineering firm would be assessing if our goals can be suitably met and if the answer is no, then all the feasibility questions come into terms of cost or doing it somewhere else. Kim, regardless of how you say it the engineering firm is going to do it the way they do.

Roy felt that there is no point in putting a new salt shed on the old site if there is going to be a new site. Rich responded that it is data. He said if we were to stay at the current location, we need a storage location, and for us to do that we need to provide a salt shed up at the municipal building.

Greg does not think this language is going to solve that, the is about the transfer station. Tearing it down and building something else there would be covered by this.

LeeAnn asked if this would fall under the road crew umbrella? Roy replied that if the land is not suitable, it is going to have be moved up there anyway and if we need storage, it is going to have to be moved up there as well.

Stephen, the wording says renovate/expand, not move it. Greg said that you could interpret that to say that it would cover the cost of moving something there. Kent said the shed would not be moved it would be demolished. Greg shared then you just get a quote from A and B lumber for a pole barn for the purpose of sand and salt storage, you don't need an engineering firm to tell you that.

Rich is proposing the language to put on a warrant, then give it to Ken to propose adding it on the warrant at the budget public hearing. If it is accepted then we are done, if it is not, we have to have a back up and that is the other language and, we need to have 25 signatures by the 4th.

Kim asked if we have signatures, are we obligated to submit the petition? Rich said it should be at the committee's discretion. Greg, the intent of the signatures is accomplished by the selectmen, so he did not see how withholding putting it on the ballot is anything other than a minor technicality. All were in agreement.

Rich will draft up something in paper. The committee suggested Rich email to committee members, and they will collect signatures. Get 25 signatures within the committee. Then bring the document with the signatures needed for the next meeting on the $3^{\rm rd}$.

Adjournment:

Stephen motioned to adjourn and LeeAnn seconded at 4:23 pm.

Next Meeting: February 3, 2025, 3:30 PM in the Meeting House.

- 176 Respectfully submitted,
- 177 Michelle Hammond
- 178 Secretary for the Solid Waste Committee