CITY OF NEWTON

IN BOARD OF ALDERMEN

PUBLIC FACILITIES COMMITTEE REPORT

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMER 7, 2007

Present: Ald. Schnipper (Chairman), Albright, Salvucci, Gentile, Yates, Mansfield and Lappin
Absent: Ald. Weisbuch
Also present: Ald. Coletti, Linsky, Lipof, Harney and Danberg
City staff present: Sandy Pooler (Chief Administrative Officer) David Turocy (Acting Commissioner of Public Work) Elaine Gentile (Director of Environmental Affairs, Public Works Department), Nunzio Piselli (Public Works Department), Ryan Ferrara (Public Works Department) and Shawna Sullivan (Committee Clerk)

REFERRED TO PUBLIC FACILITIES AND FINANCE COMMITTEES

#291-07 HIS HONOR THE MAYOR requesting authorization to enter into a multi-year contract for collection of municipal solid waste. [09-25-07 @ 3:57 PM]

ACTION: HELD 7-0

NOTE: Before the public hearing was opened, Acting Commissioner Turocy gave a PowerPoint presentation on the proposed automated rubbish collection contract, which is attached. Ald. Coletti pointed out that the current ordinance relating to the placement of trash for collection may need to be amended. The Law Department will need to review the ordinances and supply a draft Ordinance. Ald. Schnipper mentioned that the option of the $3 bag for the occasional overflow is one that the Solid Waste Commission believed would be a benefit to citizens, so that they would not have to deal with a second cart if it was only occasionally that they had extra trash. Certainly, some of the Aldermen have been very concerned about that and that could easily be removed from the proposal if the citizens were unhappy with that but understand that it was an attempt to provide citizens with a mechanism for an occasional overflow. The second cart is something that the Solid Waste Commission is working on and there will be an additional cost to the City for the extra cost that will be passed on to citizens that require an additional cart. However, there is no cost to residents for one 64-gallon barrel and surveys by the Solid Waste Commission show that close to 90% of residents can easily fit their trash into a 64-gallon barrel. Bulk items will still be picked-up at no additional charge but will require resident to call for pick-up, as the automated truck cannot pick-up loose items. The proposed contract is a change of services for residents. Right now, residents can put out anything out for pick-up but the combination of a desire to hold down costs, to have less of the residents' tax dollar going for trash removal and more of it going to programs that are a little bit more important to residents, to try and help the environment by encouraging people to recycle more and to encourage people to reuse has prompted this proposal.

The public hearing was opened and the following people spoke on the proposed contract:

Dan Ruben, 175 Auburn Street, Auburndale: I represent the Green Decade Coalition of Newton, as a Board member and former President. I speak in support of the reduce and recycle incentive

program, which calls for a 32-gallon automated collection system, not a 64-gallon automated collection system and I am going to explain how waste management relates to our greatest environmental threat, global warming. As Winston Churchill said and as Al Gore repeated, "We live in an area of consequences." The consequences that I refer to hear are the consequences of ignoring scientists' warnings about global warming for almost five decades we have failed to heed their call on this issue. We cannot be 100% certain that the record hurricane season of 2005 and the devastation of New Orleans was a result of global warming but we do know that global warming has resulted in stronger more damaging hurricanes that last longer than they did before. We cannot be 100% certain that the record wildfires in southern California this year are a result of global warning but we do know that the wildfire season now starts earlier and ends later then it did before and the fires are more widespread and more intensive. We cannot be 100% certain that the record drought affecting the southeast, which has left Atlanta with only three months of water, is a result of global warming but we do know that droughts have become more widespread as the earth has warmed. We do know for certain that the melting of the Arctic, which portends higher sea levels and danger to coastal cities worldwide, is a result of global warming. What does global warming have to do with a reduce and recycle incentive program and this contract that is before us? Everything, because when we use products and throw them away, we burn fossil fuel that adds carbon dioxide, the main greenhouse gas, to the atmosphere. It takes a hell of a lot of fossil fuel to mine or transport it to a smelter and make it into metal. It takes far less fossil fuel to recycle metal into new products. In fact, it takes 95% less energy to recycle aluminum than to create it from raw materials. The use of scrap steel saves 74% of the energy needed to make steel from virgin materials. It takes a hell of a lot if fossil fuel to chop down trees, transport them to mills and make them into paper and cardboard, that is why recycled paper requires 60% less energy than that used to make paper and cardboard from trees. Once, Newton was a recognized leader in solid waste management. Now, however, we throw away a very high amount of trash per capita and our recycling rate is mediocre. I ask you to restore Newton's leadership by enacting the recommendations of the reduce and recycle incentive program calling for a 32-gallon automated collection pick-up that will greatly stimulate recycling and reduce trash. It is not just the financially prudent action take it is what is best for Newton residents, who face the consequences of global warming, particularly our children.

Ed Craddock, 523 Crafts Street, West Newton: I have been a long time resident of Newton and I have enjoyed their services for a great many years. I have very strong feelings about recycling and I would like to see 32-gallons and opting into the 64-gallons and make people pay for the 64-gallon barrel. There are two of us in the house and I have a difficult time filling up a 33-gallon trash can every three weeks. I don't know who is throwing away 64-gallons worth of trash a week but it has to be something that can be recycled. Therefore, I strongly recommend that the 32-gallon trash can be implemented and that people have to pay for the 64-gallon barrel and I like the bag idea.

Rodney Farnsworth, III, 161 Edinboro Street, Newtonville: I pay $10,000 in taxes. I get one service. I get my trash collected. I have been told it costs $82 a year to collect my trash. You are proposing to save $8 a year. I don't know how these people fit their trash into 8 gallons. I personally own 30 trashcans I use for recycling, I use for my trash. I get my trash collected. That is what I get for $10,000 a year. I find this proposal absolutely appalling. I have been

recycling absolutely everything that could be recycled since the program began and I am about to stop because this is so offensive to me. I am all for fee based services. I think that the entire city should be run on fee-based services. They should charge for the library. They should charge for using the parks. They should charge for using any service. Call the Fire Department you pay for it. I am fine with paying for the trash. I am not fine with paying for putting everybody else's kids through school. Paying for every other expensive service and when it comes down to the $84 service, the only service that I receive that to save $8 you are going to put us through this appalling mess. It is not going to reduce the trash collection. People are going to buy the same number of things. They are going to buy the same food with the same packaging and they are still going to throw it out. It is just going to get compacted and put in your cans. It is going to go into private dumpsters on private property. It is not going to save any money. Let's look at the economics of it. I am using the numbers that were given to the Newton Tab. $1.8 million a year is the cost of collecting the trash. It is offset by a $400,000 reduction by income from the recycles. It comes out to $14 a person with a 100,000 people in the city. If you are charging $3 per bag, it means you are picking up 4.1 bags per household. I don't believe it. Your expected savings are $500,000. $200,000 comes from collection, $300,000 from disposal that means 40% of the cost is the collection. They are saying it takes 8 seconds to pick up a can that means at $3 a trash bag a $1.20 of it is revenue that is being generated for picking it up that means a trash man is making $540 an hour for this city. I do not believe that is a break-even operation. I don't believe that the trash men are getting paid $540 per hour. I don't believe that they are getting paid $50 per hour, which would be a 1000% mark up on what the real cost of collecting the trash is. This is just appalling. If they are getting paid $25 an hour, which would be a lot for a trash man, that is a 2000% mark up. This is racketeering on the citizens because the $84 for $10,000 being paid in you are going to charge them a 2000% mark up is not going to reduce the trash here. People are going to have the same amount of trash. They may package it differently but they are going to have the same amount of trash. The problem with the recycling and the reason the recycling is going down is because the city is not taking the recycling. When I put the recycling out, it is very frequent that I have to call and request that they come again. I have had people try and shake me down for bribes for taking my yard waste, an illegal immigrant I presume who could not speak English. This is the problem with the recycling program, that is why it is going down, and not because it's these evil citizens, who buy products, which come in too much packaging, and that is the real issue is things are over packaged. Its not that you are paying $82 to save $8 a household except for a few green freaks, who think somehow there is going to be less packaging just because there is a smaller trash can, there isn't. People are going to keep buying the same food with the same packaging and the same televisions and maybe you get some of it in recycling but I think you are going to get a backlash. Everybody that I have spoken to about it is angry about this. They cannot believe that the City is going to start charging and even when you look at you can get a second trashcan - a 32-gallon trash can for $150 a year. Well it is going to cost $74 a year to pick-up a 64-gallon trash can. You are marking it up 400%, the cost of picking up a second trash can. I am not opposed to automation. I am opposed to racketeering and it has a very bad smell to it when waste management which well-known throughout the country as being a mafia run operation and I see that the City is marking up the services 2000%, 400% for an extra trash can, this is not reasonable, this is not fair and I think that there is going to be a big backlash from it. I think I speak for a lot of people on this that we are getting fed up with paying $10,000 and being

told ohh an extra $8 of services to pick up your trash is too much trouble and we want to charge you an extra 400%. I think you are going to end up with trash in the parks. I think you are going to end up getting sued by old ladies, who fall down trying to take their trashcans out. I think that people are going to stop collecting trash in public areas, as I do, because they do not want to have to pay to put it out and I think people are going to move out of this city. I am getting fed up with it and it would just to take ten people like me to move out of my 9 bedroom, six bathroom house and a family with five children that is going to cost you $70,000 a year to educate their kids is going to move in. You have seven of us move out and all of a sudden the city makes no money at all. I think I will stop right there. I think that this is an economically crazy program. I am not opposed to having automated trash collection but billing for their individual trash, limiting how much trash they can put out, telling people who are paying $10,000 and the only service they get is $84 worth of trash collection that no we are going to mark up trash 2000% on you. It is just outrageous. It goes beyond all consciousness.

Marguerite Farmsworth, 55 Pine Grove Avenue, Newton Lower Falls: I have lived in Newton Lower Falls for over 56 years, in the same old house. The house is falling down and the occupant is getting to be more and more handicapped but I don't intend to move if I can possibly stay there until I am in the box and on my way some place else. I do want to address…I think there is an issue here for elderly people. It is that barrel there even though you can push it down the road or your driveway, I have a berm that has a slope in it and I have all I can do to get a bag out and get it on the curb so that it won't kind of roll down into the street. Also, if I tried to lift a bag into that 64-gallon container because I have had some serious problems with my shoulders and I am getting constant physical therapy for all the bones in my body; I can't lift it up that high. I have trouble even when I go to the grocery store getting packages, when I roll it out to my car; I have to have very little in it so I can pick them up and get them over the edge of a cart. I think it was unfortunate that in the presentation tonight on the options prices, they should have been on a sheet of paper with those answers to our questions, just to give us a feeling for the cost comparisons they were making and we did not have that. The slides were very hard to read. I do not understand why this was not put out to bid and that is my understanding that this contract was not put out to bid because the presumption is that Waste Management is going to do a better job than any of the other independent waste collectors. Also, there is this problem with the snow because where my house is unfortunately I am lucky if the plows don't come down and plow right into my driveway, as I am sort of on the corner. I have to call the city and have them remove the snow from the driveway. They push it up on the berm. My own person for my driveway pushes it up into my yard too, up and over the berm and so; I have these huge heaps of snow and not a very good place to put a trashcan that would fall into the street. Therefore, there are considerations that have not been taken and I think it is very important for us to take them. I am probably one of the very few people, who actually have been to the city many years ago and actually read the garbage contract. These contracts are very detailed and I think people ought to read them because you find out things that you never even thought was under consideration. I know that when I went in there, they looked at me as if I had three heads and a fuzzy tail when I asked to read the garbage contracts. Costs and things should have been given to us, options for having out to bid, I don't know why, but I would like that to be addressed because I think that this city has an obligation.

Ald. Schnipper: We will address it in our discussion.

Marguerite Farmsworth: Thank you very much. I would also like to have you bring up in your discussion what happens with snow removal. I know I cannot use one of those cans because I have to carry it down the driveway and I live by myself and I like it here in Newton but sometimes I get a little upset at some of the kinds of services and what is happening especially with snow removal, which I have not addressed.

Shim Silverstein, 104 Cynthia Road, Newton Centre: I am a former owner of a recycling facility, United Paper Stock Company. We were packers, brokers, exporters of all types of secondary fiber, pulp and finished paper. In addition to that I served on the Rhode Island Resource Recovery Corporation Long-term Planning Board and I left when I sold my business, which was in February of 2004. Couple of things, first of all, I think I heard that the current contract that we are talking about with Waste Management is a twenty-year contract. Is that correct?

Commissioner Turocy: Five-year contract.

Shim Silverstein: Even five-years because there are things changing so rapidly in the industry, I think to get yourself tied up with that type of a contract or proposal is absolutely ludicrous. The other thing is that we are paying a $69 a ton tip fee to bring the material out to Millbury. Just for your information, the State of Rhode Island charges $32 a ton and they don't charge anything for any of the recyclables. We should be looking at a recyclable rate of 50%. I think that the way that this trash contract should be handled should be absolutely tied into a recycling program that would make sense, all in one package. I think that there are some provisions that could be made to go back and take a look at the current contract that we have, see what could be done to tie it all together. I think also that this should be going out to bid. I don't know if it did, but if it didn't it sure should. There are other great companies that are as good as Waste Management, who have the facilities, who have the trucks, who have whatever you need, American Waste, the old BFI. Cosella is another company that has a tremendous recycling facility right here in the Boston area. There is money to be made in recycling. Right now corrugated is selling for about $140 a ton that baled. Newspaper and what they call No. 6, which would be newspapers, magazines, junk mail, sorted office waste is going for $110 a ton. So there should be some rebates coming back to us. I see we are paying to get rid of plastics. That is not right. Clear plastic jugs, water jugs and milk jugs have a value. We should not be paying for that. That should be explored. Mixed plastics have a value, not much, but they have a value. Even glass, which is very difficult to dispose of, has a value because it is being ground and it is being used as a landfill cover. If we are going to charge $3 for bags and use them and have this automated arm come and pick everything up, how is it going to pick up the bags?

Ald. Schnipper: Thank you; we will answer that when we get into Committee.

Bruce Abele, 23 Russell Court, Newtonville: I live right beside the high school, which is very important in this thing. I have real concerns about this but the major concern is that rubbish collection requirements vary dramatically from time to time and I just give you two examples; 1)

I own some apartments and when people leave the apartment it is a major difficulty already getting rid of the rubbish. If all of a sudden we have to put it in bags, even if they have to pay $3 a bag it would be just a catastrophe of major proportions 2) Because I live beside the high school, I've found that the way to solve the rubbish problem is I bought a number of rubbish cans and placed them along Elm Road and they get filled. The high school kids are very good, they are very cooperative and they put their rubbish in the containers. The city will not empty them. I empty them and I put them in my rubbish can. If I have to have a 64-gallon container, that is going to be a big, big problem; so that is the concern.

Mort Glovin, 398 Cherry Street, West Newton: I get up Monday morning, go out in my garage, put the trash into my trunk, the green recycle can into the trunk and drive it to the curb. The driveway is about 500' to the curb. I am very concerned about having to wheel this up. There is an incline and inclement weather. It will be a problem for some us, who have some handicap. I don't know what the answer is but perhaps the city could provide us with a sticker and put it on the old black trash bag that we use now, because they only cost about $.20 and we can leave them on the street as we did before. Perhaps, those stickers could only be given to folks that have handicap placards from the RMV. I fear that the city may be sued at some point from somebody falling, slipping, and breaking a bone and that would be a catastrophe.

Dena Salzberg, 65 Kenilworth Street, Newton: I am actually here as the Chairperson of the Newton Council on Aging. The Council on Aging met and discussed the plan for the trash removal and there has been a great deal of concern about the sizes of the trashcans including the smaller version, which people are very concerned safety for themselves. Some of our seniors having severe scoliosis are hunched over, could end up having that small barrel slide with them down their driveways. There is also concern with the winter coming up being able to maneuver that on ice or snow and also being on hills were trashcans can go way down by themselves. The biggest concern is how will seniors be able to move those trashcans, even though they are on wheels, they are still heavy. being able to lift the covers, as one women just said, they have restricted range of motion. I think that we also have to be concerned about the younger disabled community, who are living in their own homes and have some difficulty with mobility, who will not be able to move and maneuver those cans.

Dorothy Roberts, 1564 Beacon Street, Waban: I have grown up in this City. I have seen it change. I feel the City is making promises it doesn't seem to keep and I am afraid that this will be another example or issue similar to the high school. I think that it is too bad that this was not a ballot question that residents could vote on so that more people would be able to be here and comment and people could have voiced their opinion or voted on it all day rather than just at an evening meeting. From the speaker of the City, it sounds like your mind is already made up and what we have to say really won't matter. I am in favor of if we have to go to a new system, a 32-gallon rather than one large 64-gallon because it would be easier to be handled. But I am also distressed to think that we are going from a system where it was unlimited, where you could put out whatever you had and knew there would not be an additional charge and I think it is too drastic a change. I also think that $3 for a trash bag is excessive. I wonder about when you say there will be changes, why you are not considering returning the savings to the residents or at least sharing it rather than being selfish and saving it for yourselves. Newton seems to have

given the residents an opinion that we'll save money if we vote for certain things that the City seems to want and then when they get their way, similar to the high school, you change your mind. The Mayor did say that we will have an override that is the only alternative.

David Del Porto, 448 Ward Street, Newton Centre: I have the honor to serve as Vice-chair of the Solid Waste Commission, Chair of the Sustainable Newton Committee, and Co-chair of the Renewable Resources Committee. I fully support all of the principles presented this evening with one exception. The City should purchase and distribute the smaller containers be they 32-gallons or 40-gallon models compatible with mechanical collection. As you may know, the Solid Waste Commission has a Long Range Strategic Planning Sub-Committee, which I have the privilege of chairing. We developed a strategic plan that was unanimously approved by the Commission, as a whole. In this strategy, the City would use the smaller containers to lower the collection costs for trash, while increasing the positive revenue from enhanced recycling. Therefore, leading with the large containers will tend to keep the trash collection high with little or no impact on the recycling rate. Although, it was suggested that we could later switch to smaller containers, I doubt this would happen because the City would have to convince the ratepayers to switch, who would have no incentive to do so. The city would then need to purchase the new containers and the selected collection contractor may have to make investments in the mechanical system. Neither of these scenarios would likely happen. Additionally, the Blue Ribbon Commission emphasized the need to lower trash costs and increase revenue and this begins to move in that direction. Therefore, in closing, I recommend deploying the smaller containers and optionally offering a second cart for large families. Thank you for hearing my position on this matter.

Kevin Dutt, 34 Tyler Terrace, Newton Centre: I am the Chair of the Citizens for Responsible Waste Management. We are the group, who have been advocating for the Reduce and Recycle Incentive Program. A program that varies mainly in the size of the container that the community would be able to get for free. Our group consists of a variety of individuals and organizations that range from Newton Taxpayers Association to the Green Decade, so there is a variety of reasons to do the 32-gallon and we have brought on board people that support that. We believe that over 95% of the people in the community would actually be able to contain their trash to a 32-gallon container every week, if they recycle properly and that is the big if. The City, I know we just saw a number that said 88% could do a 64-gallon, that assessment was based on a visual of what people have on the curb and it also assumes that people are recycling everything they can recycle. We know that recycling in the city is around 35 to 40%. Groups that do these types of programs attain values; some are in the 50 to 60% range for recycling, which is substantially greater. They also see their trash disposal go down substantially, usually around 20 to 25%. So our assessment was based on the Mass DEP data of Newton and what we throw away, it also includes the characteristics of data that the EPA produced and the density of trash, and we assessed using a statistical analysis. Basically, we assessed and came up with a number greater than 95%, if they recycle properly. There are environmental benefits that have been talked about already but the recycling can go up and trash goes down. The real key here is also the fiscal benefits. We are projecting savings that we see of $1.5 million a year and that would be through this increased recycling and the reduction in trash. I know this is not a politically easy thing to decide on. It is going to meet resistance but the bottom line is we are not asking people to

anything they are not already required to do, which is recycle. We already have recycling on the books. If people actually recycled everything they were supposed to recycle, using a 32-gallon barrel a week is a totally reasonable thing to ask them to do. The second is this is a vote about costs. We can subsidize people throwing away and not recycling or we can use that money to do something else. So, that is a decision we need to make as a city. We are looking at an override and we really need to think long and hard about if we really want to put more money into solid waste as opposed to teachers, firefighters and buildings.

Michele Davis, 81 Central Street, Auburndale: I am here on behalf of the Recycling Committee here at City Hall and also I work with the previous speaker on the CREW with Green Decade. I am here to urge the City to schedule a 32-gallon bin for each household rather than the 64-gallon bin. The 64-gallon proposal does not do enough to reduce trash or promote recycling. Households will be tempted to fill all 64 gallons. I have done many trash audits, I have found many recyclables in Newton's trash, and I think we can do better. If each household is limited to 32- gallons, they will make much more of an effort to do the recycling rather than to have to buy an extra bag or bin to continue their wasteful habits. If we send recyclable trash to our incinerator, it will increase air pollution and use valuable gas and space in the truck to get it all the way to the incinerator. It would be much better to avoid sending it there in the first place. Let's stop subsidizing large trash producers and spend more tax dollars on other City services. I also have a letter from the Newton South Environment Club that I would like to submit. (Attached)

Brooke Lipsitt, 160 Boylston Street, Chestnut Hill: I am also a member of the group that has been pushing the reduction and reuse initiative. I will not repeat the statements that have been made by earlier speakers about the benefits to the amount of recycling that there is associated with using one 32-gallon barrel. I do wish to mention a couple of points that have not been mentioned yet this evening. First of all, it has been said by the Chairman and others that there is a significant change in policy involved in having citizens need to call up to have additional larger items picked up. Frankly, I have not heard anyone talk about that and practice in recent years has been if you have a stove to put out or something substantial, you need to call to get that picked up, for white goods at least. I think that citizens are getting in the habit of needing to make those phone calls. I don't really think that is an issue. I think that when we are talking about change and change we expect, we need to talk about what the meaningful changes are and the meaningful changes that we need to make are about taking efforts that are going to increase recycling and at the same time maintain equity. I am actually a little troubled by the idea that we are suggesting a plan where if a 64-gallon is too big for you than you can request a 32-gallon can because even the person with the 32-gallon can may once in a while have that extra bag of trash and need to put out a little more and buy one of those $3 bags and I think at that point it becomes a matter of equity. I do think we need to have one solution that is going to fit all and I strongly believe that the 32-gallon barrel is the right answer there. I noticed in the handout passed out earlier this evening that the frequently asked question was raised about whether people could start using the proposed 64-gallon barrels prior to the introduction collection and the answer was no, these barrels are too large to be empty by hand, that was the Solid Waste Commission. They are too large to be emptied by hand. They are too large to be handled by many of our citizens, myself included and frankly to the extent that keeping them clean and neat and able to be kept

inside one's house, they are too large for that too. The bottom line is that we need to find ways to reduce our trash collection. The Acting Commissioner has said that the proposal will reduce in a 15% decrease in trash collection. The experience in cities and towns that have gone to 32-gallon barrels is that the reduction in trash collection has gone down by 25%, not 15% and an extra 10% reduction in trash is a lot of dollars and an extra increase in recycling is more dollars in our pockets. I urge the Committee to step up to the plate, to ask our citizens to do what they are prepared to do and to adopt the 32-gallon plan.

Deb Crossley, 26 Circuit Avenue, Newton Highlands: I am here tonight speaking on behalf of the League of Women Voters of Newton. The League has a very large and active environmental committee, who approached the Board recently with information about this contract and unanimously asked us to speak to this item. I will read the League Board's statement. First of all, the League wishes to thank you for your good work and foresight on behalf of our city in supporting a solid waste contract that includes consideration of increased recycling, in addition to reasonable disposal costs. The League strongly supports the initiative to move toward a program that will provide greater incentive for increased recycling. We believe that a contract, which both saves the city dollars and benefits the environment, is a good idea. Accordingly, we hope as well as others I have heard tonight that you will reconsider the proposed use of a 64-gallon trash container and instead recommend the use of a sturdy 32-gallon container as the standard for the contract. We believe that the smaller container will prove, as it has for other Massachusetts communities to provide greater incentive value to recycling while being sufficient for the needs of the great majority of Newton's residents. We strongly support your efforts to increase our recycling rates, create cost savings and benefit our environment.

Fred Gordon, 125 Grasmere Street, Newton: I think that the City of Newton ought to encourage change of behavior in the public benefit but not to the point that it produces onerous burdens on any of its citizens. I think that a smaller container, 32-gallon container, is about right. I mean it is a size that we with three kids currently don't fill up except occasionally and it is the kind of gentle nudge that over time changes citizens' attitudes and then works its way up the supply chain to the people who produce packaging actually get involved in the reduction of waste. My sense is that it is about right that it is a little push but it is not a painful one.

Elaine Pierce, 60 Beacon Street, Chestnut Hill: I commend the City for trying to adopt further measures to help the City manage its trash problem and encourage citizens to participate in managing their trash because I think like many other speakers that a lot more can be done. I am personally very discouraged as I look down the block of Beacon Street, near Boston College, to see that only two of us make a real serious effort to fill up those recycling containers every week. I could really use two or three containers except I don't want to have to store that many in my garage, so I work everyday towards consolidating recycling and it fits very nicely as a general rule in one container. I see plenty of people that in fact have their recycling refused or trash refused because they do not break down boxes and don't do things that are simple to do and it will help us all manage trash better. We are a family of four, I realize that there are bigger families that have bigger needs but my first thought was I don't need anything like either one of those containers and I would like to see the City save the money on buying me a container because currently I throw my trash out in a paper or plastic grocery bag every week and that

includes what I pick up that has been thrown out of cars on Beacon Street and by passers by to and from Boston College, even on game day. I pick up all that stuff from the sidewalk and the street and my bushes and put it in my trash and that is because I think you can if you work at it generate five times the volume in recycling that you do in what you expect to put in a landfill. Therefore, what I would like to say to the city is please skip both of the containers, go straight to the bags. Whatever economics need to be charged, whatever allocation can be given to people that is fair that is fine but I think that only if people are forced into the smallest containers. Something that is easier to manage, maybe using bags only and not having a big container will help those that can't manage something that size or that have difficult landscapes to hold onto something with wheels and I'm in that boat, as well. I just think that going straight to the bags and making people pay for what the asking the City to dispose of is the best way to give people the incentive they don't seem to have right now.

Chester Conrad, 17 Brush Hill Road, Newton Highlands: We have been making a fairly serious effort at recycling for many years and I support the concept. I am a little disturbed though by the idea that…Everybody lets face it, even people who recycle, occasionally have a week where there is some kind of material that is neither donatable nor recyclable and which has to be discarded and the idea of them having to pay these $3 bags is frankly irritating. It is being nickeled and dimed. Every new service instead of calling it a tax it is called a service fee. There should at least be some mechanism for allowing for occasional overages without having to go to Home Depot and buy $3 bags to throw out the trash because everybody will occasionally have that kind of situation. In terms of the size of the containers, it is hard to say. I think that probably most weeks I could probably use a 32-gallon container but if we were subject to a $3 charge for every bag over, we would take a 128-gallon container if we could get one. So I think you have to consider that. The only other thought is that the gentleman who was talking about potential other contracts, I think is an interesting thought that at least in the documents that were on-line there was no information presented about possible alternatives. I imagine that is something that has been considered but if it has not been, it certainly seems like it would be worthwhile.

Raymond Roberts, 1564 Beacon Street, Waban: One thing that concerns us, and it may be just a simple answer to the question, does this have any effect on yard waste collection.

Ald. Schnipper: No, that is part of the recycling contract and will remain exactly as it currently stands.

Raymond Roberts: That is wonderful. The other thing I wanted to say is that this woman was talking about how she is able to put everything into small bags but not everyone is that versatile and I think that 64-gallon bins though it is large does not really hold that much. We have four to five barrels each week and I don't think we are missing any recycling opportunities because we always have our green barrel full, sometimes we even have two of them out and I think going from no limit as my wife said to a limit of 64 is bad enough. If you consider going to 32 and then citing Al Gore as a good reason for doing it, when England will not let that movie be shown over there without some explanation to the things that are not accurate. I think we ought to consider very carefully not changing Newton so drastically that people are going to have to go

out of there way to buy the bags at a grocery store, fill them up, or pay $120 to $150 for another barrel when the City is hand over foot saving lots more money than that barrel would cost the homeowner to have and some families with one person obviously are not going to need a 64-gallon barrel but families with five or six people in them are going to need more and I think taking it down to a 32-gallon barrel, although it might be better to have two 32-gallon barrels than one 64-gallon barrel for ease of use for some residents. They are heavy. We have them up in Goffstown, NH, where friends of ours have property and they are automated but the person who has to take it 500' down his driveway to the end of the driveway it is kind of a ridiculous situation and making this drastic change with no public notice than what we heard in the TAB to weeks ago is a bitter pill to swallow.

Jonathan Zalesky, 244 Austin Street, Newtonville: We live in a two-family that is on a pretty steep hill. The only access between the house itself and the street is 25 stair steps. So, regardless of which option we go with, we want to make sure it is safe option because I don't think that managing that 64-gallon trashcan down steps. I know that the video showed nice flat areas but I know with some of the (inaudible) as well as the more drastic situation that we are in with trying to manage it down the stairs, it is a pretty big deal. We also between each household, each throws away 32 and 64 gallons. So taking the 32-gallon option does not seem appropriate because it basically is making us have an inequitable choice just based on the fact that we can't manage the 64-gallon option. We are also expecting a child, so we don't know what the impact is on the amount of trash that we are going to be throwing away due to diapers and that sort of thing. So, that is another thing we are taking into consideration. So, if we cannot leave the bin at the bottom of the steps, as according to one of the FAQs in here, that we have to move it back to next to the house or not in the front yard; some solution needs to be determined for that as well.

Jean Macrae, 107 Day Street: I would like to speak in favor of the 32-gallon container for the same reasons that have already been stated. I do have a concern also about the disabled and elderly and I can see why there are concerns about managing the containers. I wonder what you have learned from the experience of these other towns and cities that have used this system because there must be experience with this in other towns and whether there are solutions that will be workable.

Ann Dorfman, 9 Henshaw Street: I am a member of the Solid Waste Commission. I am also a professional in the field of recycling and solid waste management and I have been managing the solid waste program for the Town of Concord for the past ten years. It has become common for communities to restructure their municipal collection program to create opportunities to reduce costs. Currently, 30% of the municipalities in Massachusetts have implemented some form of a fee based system and other communities have limited the amount of materials that citizens can put at the curb in an effort to limit the amount of materials that are out there, increase recycling and reduce the cost to the municipality. The decision to recommend the 64-gallon trash container was not arrived at easily or lightly and was not fully a unanimous vote. We did feel that the question of whether the container should be 64, 32 or 40 was reasonable for the Aldermen and citizens to look at that issue and consider what the appropriate size would be. The Solid Waste Commission understood that our responsibility was to find the most cost effective

method to responsibly manage our waste, while maintaining a high level of service for the citizens. With this in mind, as well as looking at the most environmentally sensible, with this in mind we recognize that motivating citizens to remove recycling materials from their waste and encourage them to replace them in the recycling bins was obviously a way that the city could save money for our citizens and also free up money for other services. While the 64-gallon container limits the capacity and may incent some residents that generate large quantities of waste to recycle in order to have adequate disposal capacity, for many residents, we have not determined the number but many would argue well over 50%, a 64-gallon cart is not going to provide any incentive at all to recycle. For many households you could take all your trash and all your recyclables and fit them easily into a 64-gallon cart. Therefore, the 32 is a size container that would actually be more responsible for many households and would provide an adequate motivation to pull out the recycling and separate that and set that out in a separate recycling container. The opportunity to recycle citizens with only a 32 container at no cost and charge an additional fee for a bag or a cart would provide adequate capacity for most households on most days as long as they made an effort to recycle. It would do more to reduce the costs and increase recycling by getting the recycling out of the trash and into the recycling. It would give people an opportunity to still dispose of additional materials for a fee. Everybody would have the same basic service. Citizens who wanted to have a way to dispose of additional items that were above and beyond that would still have an opportunity to do that at a nominal fee.

Rodney Farnsworth, III: I want to point out that I am one of the few people who spoke about the actual numbers. $8 per household according to your numbers, are the savings that you are projecting. $8 per household, $4 per person, that is what you are saying this recycling program, if it actually works the way you think it is, and I don't think it is going to, $8 per person, $2 per household those are the savings if they are realized those are the bottom line numbers and I wish people would actually talk about the dollars that are involved here rather than talking about wonderful ideas.

Elaine Pierce: I disagree with the gentleman about his calculation of the numbers. I think what you should do is you should either put it out very clearly in the TAB or mail to all the citizens exactly what the numbers would be and how they are calculated so we can all evaluate them. I don't think those numbers are correct. I think there is a potential for savings and if you do some of the things that we are suggesting like eliminate the cans or go only with smaller cans you can have even greater savings.

Rodney Farnsworth, III: These numbers were given by the first speaker who represented it. $82 is what it costs today, you are projecting $74. $8 savings.

Michael Spitaels, 29 Eden Avenue, West Newton: The one thing I think isn't accounted for here is that there are very different size families. We have six. We could probably get by with 64. I don't think we could get by with 32. We have neighbors on our street with one or two people in their household. They could get by 16 gallons. So, I think you have to have some allowance based on the number of people. If I had a two family house, I might have one person in each apartment. I would get two barrels. I think that there should be some leeway for the number of people in the house, while still encouraging recycling.

Marguerite Farmsworth: I would just like to revisit the elderly situation because about two weeks ago I happened to be at the Lower Falls Improvement Association meeting. We did not get out on Sunday until about 7 PM. So, when I got home it was dark and to get out my trash, we had a lot of leaves outside, I went outside and this is why I am talking about the danger to elderly that was when I had one of my falls. The leaves were blowing across the driveway. There was a little stone in there. I had my walking stick with me and I had my bag of trash that was not that heavy because I do a lot of recycling and I step on a stone underneath the leaves and I fell over and I injured one of my shoulders, which was already in bad shape. I couldn't get up and I was very fortunate that two men were walking a dog because if they hadn't been they would have been home watching the Sox game. I asked them if somebody could help me get up. I figured I had not broken anything. So they came but before they came up the driveway, they had a discussion and one of the men said to me, you could create a liability for us. Talk about the milk of human kindness. I thought to myself even as hassled as I am at times I would certainly go out to help somebody. People who live alone, who are elderly and I think they want to stay in this community do face problems. Finally, they had another discussion and they came up and they helped me up and that is all I needed but I am saying that these are the kinds of problems and in the winter, you could have a slippery place in your driveway even if you put out the stuff and it is on a slope. All of these things are problems that would have to be considered when you are trying to have a barrel and you are supposed to be first lift it up to fill it. I don't need a big one because of my lifestyle. I don't buy a lot of prepared foods so I don't have too much and I try to compost but other people who are working have their children have a lot more trash than I do and I can tell you I don't think they recycle as well but there are a lot of things you cannot recycle. They buy pizza boxes. They are not to be recycled because they can contain food waste you can't get off them. There are a lot of things that these people have that I don't have to consider but I do have to consider whether I can carry stuff out and put it in that thing or whether I can take a little black bag and take it down the driveway and put on the curb. Besides that, it does not roll off on the uneven berm. So I would just like to say when you are doing all this I hope you will consider the fact that this community still has some old folks in it that are living alone and hopefully be able to stay here until they are taken away.

The public hearing portion of the meeting was closed and the item was brought back into the Committee. Ald. Schnipper explained that refuse collection is exempted from the public bid process. What you did not see presented to you but was presented at the aldermanic meeting was a comparison of many surrounding communities, who have gone out to bid and what their bids were and that was the basis of the decision to enter into exclusive negotiations for a limit period of time, understanding full well what the current market was and having a clear goal in terms of if we could bring it in at a certain point. We did, at the same time, prepare a Request for Proposals (RFP) that we were prepared to go out on the street with had we not received what we considered a very favorable contract. The issue of the cost for bags, as I said at the beginning, the Commission has come forward with that, there are Aldermen, who have concerns about it and it may be that it is removed from the proposal. It is to deal with the occasional overflow. If the City goes with an automated truck, one of the things that need to be understood is that bags cannot be picked up with the automated arm of the truck. Therefore, the truck is going to have to stop and the driver is going to have to get out and manually pick up the bag. Much of the cost of

the bag is what the city would be charged by the trash company with some small administrative cost and the disposal fee associated with that bag. The bag is certainly on the table and it may not survive the Committee discussion. The proposal for a sticker for handicapped residents was very interesting and creative and the Solid Waste Commission will discuss that at the next meeting. Also, the concerns regarding senior citizens have been heard loud and clear and will be discussed at length.

Ald. Yates asked that the factors relating to the choice of Waste Management could be made much more public. Ald. Yates is aware that there are specific comparable costs from other communities and it would be helpful if those were laid out. Secondly, Ald. Yates asked for clarification regarding the placement of the barrel on the property and if the container can be located closer to the street. It was not Ald. Schnipper's impression that the containers would be located in people's homes. She thought that the barrels would likely be kept in garages, the side of driveways; the side of a house, etc…The City does not want the containers kept on front lawns as that may be a little unsightly.

Elaine Gentile researched where the containers are kept in other communities. She suspects that if people keep the trash barrels in their front yards many neighbors will complain. However, nothing specifically prohibits where the barrel can be placed. The Department of Public Works is not specifically designating a spot. Ald. Yates pointed out that if the barrels are hidden by landscaping it should not be a problem. Ald. Gentile asked Ms. Gentile how other communities handle the issue of disabled people and senior citizens managing the barrels. Ms. Dorfman spoke with one of the manufacturers of the carts and that person stated that in fact many of the elderly prefer the 64-gallon to the 32-gallon because the 64 is quite stable. Many elderly people do not like to drag a barrel to the curb or carry a bag to the curb and this provides them with a stable well-constructed container that they can safely and securely transport materials. Ms. Dorfman believes that there are plusses and minuses. She believes that some of the seniors will like it better and some that are going to find it more of a problem. Ms. Gentile will look further into the issue and try and obtain further information.

Ald. Gentile inquired whether the City was missing an opportunity by not trying to deal with the recycling contract, which expires in two years, and the solid waste contract at the same time. Ald. Schnipper responded that the current recycling contract is incredibly favorable to the City financially. The City will not be able to replicate it. The Commission, however, is committed to looking at that and bringing the two contracts in sync, as soon as they are able to move the solid waste contract forward. Ald. Schnipper agrees that it would have been nice to have both contracts come up at the same time.

Ald. Lappin was wondering whether the Commission had considered per person, not just per household. Ald. Schnipper responded that they had not. Ald. Lappin asked about whether the city should not be paying for some of the recycling they have picked up. Ald. Schnipper stated that the Solid Waste Commission will be investigating the best possible contract for recycling. Commissioner Turocy has made the point that the City does pay less per ton to have recycling taken away than we do to have trash taken away but the city made back over $400,000 on the sale of those recyclables. It is a revenue stream; however, that market is not consistent.

Ald. Coletti stated that not everyone on the Board of Aldermen is sold on this proposal. The contract has not been put in written form. He is pushing his non-support of the contract until it is in written form because he does not agree with the $3 bag charge. It is costing the City $1.8 million for the recycling to get back $400,000. He is concerned that when the City enhances the recycling that it will create litter, as the bins will not contain it. There are many ways to recycle beside curbside. Ald. Coletti is also would like the Law Department to draft an ordinance specifying how the barrels are placed. Ald. Coletti has also requested that the Mayor publicly acknowledge that he will not institute a trash collection fee. The Board needs to carefully review the contract to be sure it is in the City's best interest.

Ald. Mansfield stated that he is not ready to take any action on the docket item. He has some concerns that there is no printed contract. He would like the figures concerning the contract made more public. He is also concerned that there was not enough notice to the public on the item. He would like additional information from cities and towns in the northeast using the automated system regarding experience of the residents. He also asked that the Law Department review the current ordinances for clarity and consistency with the proposed contract. Ald. Schnipper pointed out that there have been several articles stating the time and place of the public hearing, there have been legal ads in both the Newton TAB and the News Tribune and Ald. Schnipper announced the public hearing at every candidates night that she attend, several of which were televised. The meeting has also been on the city's website.

Ald. Albright feels that the Commission did the work but did not give the Board the pros and cons for each method. She asked that all the information gathered by the Commission be made available to the Committees and the public. Elaine Gentile stated that there was a significant amount of research done by the Solid Waste Commission and she has all of that research. She is willing to sit down with individual members or the Committee and review all of the material.

Ald. Salvucci stated that he also has an issue with a charge for the additional bag, as residents already pay taxes for the service. Ald. Salvucci is not sure that the savings generated by automated collection are worth the aggravation the changes are going to cause. Ald. Lappin asked that sheet with the different costs and options regarding trash collection and the changes that may need to be made to the ordinances be available at the next committee meeting. Ald. Gentile asked that the cost for the option of a second barrel be reasonable.

Ald. Yates moved hold for further discussion, which carried unanimously. The item will be discussed again on November 28, 2007 following the tax classification hearing. There are additional letters and information provided by Ald. Yates on two communities using the automated collection attached.

#353-07 ALD. SCHNIPPER proposing a Resolution in support of the Mass Recycles Paper! Campaign. [10-25-07 @9:34 AM]

ACTION: APPROVED 7-0

NOTE: Ald. Schnipper read the resolution into the record. The mayor has agreed to sign the resolution and there is going to be an event on November 15, 2007. Unfortunately, the full Board will not have an opportunity to vote it by November 15, 2007 but the Mayor will note that the Board's substantive Committee supports the resolution. The resolution and supporting material are attached. Ald. Mansfield stated that he supports the resolution; however, the City needs to be a model for its citizens and needs to do a better job at recycling within City Hall. Ald. Yates moved approval of the Resolution, which carried unanimously.

All other items were held without discussion.

Respectfully submitted,

Sydra Schnipper, Chairman

Public Facilities Committee
Automated Trash Collection Public Hearing

City of Newton

Department of Public Works

November 7, 2007

Current Solid Waste Collection

- **Contractor - Waste Management - MA:**
- **20 Year Contracts:**

- **Trash – Collection/Haul/Disposal:**
  Expires June 30, 2008
  FY 08 Budget - $4,079,430

- **Recycling – Collection/Haul/Disposal:**
  Expires June 30, 2010
  FY 08 Budget - $1,849,073
  *** FY 07 – Recycling Revenue - $415,895**

Solid Waste Commission Recommendation

Automated Trash Collection with Waste Management

- Why Waste Management:
  - Successful Collaboration for past 20 years
  - Resources to support city size

- Why Automation:
  - Lowest price of all options considered
  - Reduces volume and disposal costs
  - Encourages increased recycling
  - Improved appearance curbside of materials
  - Incorporates most recent advancements in technology

Automated Collection Video

Option Prices

	Manual (5-yr Contract)	Automated (City carts)
Collect & Haul		
Annual	$2,340,000	$1,767,000
Bulk Pick-Up	0	$150,000
Carts (7 yr. amortization)	0	$200,000
Total Cost	$2,340,000	$2,117,000
Cost per Household	$82	$74
Disposal		
Tonnage	29,900	25,900 (Est.)
Cost/Ton	$69	$69
Total	$2,063,100	$1,787,100
Total Collect, Haul & Dispose	$4,403,100	$3,904,100
Savings Automated v Manual		$496,000
Savings (5-Year contract)		$2,480,000

Proposed Model - Trash

- 64 Gallon Cart standard
  - Double the size of “regular” barrel
  - One per Legal Address (2-Family gets 2 Carts, etc)
  - Homeowner may choose 32 Gallon Cart
- Provisions for overflow waste
  - Optional Bag purchased through City @ $3/bag
  - Options for one second cart (32 gal) @ $xxx/year
- Bulk Pick-up - by appointment
- Expanded recycling collection–reuse old trash barrels

- Provisions for additional subscribers at no cost to City
  - (apartments, condos, businesses/other entities)