

**Town of Cape Elizabeth  
Solid Waste & Recycling Long Range Planning Committee**

Meeting Minutes  
March 25, 2015

**Present:** Councilor Jessica Sullivan (JS) (Chair), Anne Swift-Kayatta (ASK) Bill Brownell (BB) & Charles Wilson (CW)

**Also Present:** Randy Tome (Woodard & Curran) & Megan McDevitt (Woodard & Curran)

**Staff:** Robert Malley (RM)

**Absent:** Jamie Garvin (JG)

**Public:** William Schmitz – Resident and Member of the Recycling Committee

**Call to Order:** Jessica Sullivan called the meeting to order @ 2:00 PM.

**Citizen Opportunity for Public Comment**

Bill Schmitz addressed the committee. He noted a reference to the Swap Shop in one of the committee documents and is concerned about any potential recommendation from the Committee to eliminate it. He did not see a reference to any ADA discussion in any meeting minutes. MM responded that ADA requirements applicable to any proposed changes at the Transfer Station would require an interpretation from the Town's Code Enforcement Officer. Any new facility would need to meet any applicable requirements, but it is unclear how it would affect any proposed modifications to the current facility.

**Meeting Minutes**

The March 11, 2015 meeting minutes were approved as written (4 Yes 0 No).

**Review of Conceptual Sketches and Costs Associated with Transfer Station Options - Woodard & Curran**

RT & MM reviewed four conceptual sketches for potential drop-off solutions of MSW (municipal solid waste) and recycling at the Recycling Center. The options were identified as Option "A", "B", "C" and "D". The presentation of each conceptual sketch was followed by a question and answer period from committee members. There were discussions about the width of travel lanes, a proposed "satellite" office and accommodations for public works-related radio equipment in any proposed office. RT stated the "satellite" office could be used for transactions so users (and the attendants) would not have to cross travel lanes to an interior office located in a compactor building.

There was discussion about Concept "C", which utilized a compactor-less set up with "live floor" trailers. CW expressed concerns that it may pose operational challenges to the Public Works staff who may have to shift the trailers during the day. CW also expressed concerns with Option "D", which he felt would affect the level of service if users have to make multiple trips to the hopper for both MSW and recyclables.

RM inquired if any of the proposed options would require a Maine DEP permitting since they appear to encroach into an adjacent wetland southwest of the existing compactor building. MM stated that aerial maps did not delineate a wetland in that area, but existing conditions may identify one that is not currently mapped. The consultants will look into that and report back to the Committee.

RT began a review of the capital costs associated with each of the options presented. This generated a wide ranging discussion by the Committee about the overall costs and the cost/benefit achieved given some of the

options being proposed. BB stated that the Committee should think more modestly and allow walk-in and back-in access in any proposed solution. He has concerns about a project estimated to cost over 2 million dollars and how that would be received by the citizens. ASK stated that the Committee should consider the proposed options with respect to multiple factors. These factors or “criteria” should include additional staff needs, hauling costs, safety, risk assessment and environmental impacts. CW stated that any option should take into account the cost associated with the temporary drop-off of MSW during any construction related to any proposed solution. He also added that any option needs to include the handling of food-waste composting and recyclables, but he is concerned about costs.

ASK stated that any proposed option will be an “investment in the community” and the Committee should recommend what they feel is best for the long term. She said the Committee should not rule out options even if the cost of them exceeds expectations. CW asked if we can make incremental changes and still keep the same model. He thinks that recyclables need to be handled better as part of any proposed solution.

RT reviewed the operational costs associated with each option, which also included costs of the current program. There was an extended discussion about the structural integrity of the existing compactor building and its useful life given 37 years of use. It was RT’s opinion that the building would not sustain itself another 40 years given the stress associated with its use over the years. BB asked RM if the structural deficiencies noted in the 2003 Refuse Materials Planning Committee Final report were addressed. RM stated that they were addressed and completed for the most part. There were also discussions about the useful lives of compactors and transfer trailers. ASK stated that replacement costs of those should be factored into any 30-year operational program.

The consultants reported that they inquired of EcoMaine about accepting single-stream recyclables that were compacted and/or mixed with cardboard. RT reported EcoMaine has no problem accepting compacted recyclables at this time.

CW expressed concerns associated with Option “D”. In particular, he was concerned about the amount of walking required by users to drop off MSW and recyclables. There was an extended discussion about combining certain aspects of Options “B and “D” into one. There was a question about the alignment of the compactor building shown in Option “D”. MM explained that the proposed layout and alignment took advantage of the change in topography needed for the compactor placement.

Following the review of capital and operational costs, the consultants agreed to correct an error in the operational cost spreadsheet, add in another “base” option and include current program costs. This will be presented to the Committee at the next meeting.

### **Survey & Outreach**

Tracy Floyd, who is a member of the Recycling Committee, was scheduled to be at the meeting to present a draft of his survey talking points. Tracy was not at the meeting so the item was tabled to the next meeting of the Committee.

### **Discussion of Format for the Public Input Session**

JS handed out a list of topics for the public input session which is scheduled for Thursday, April 9th at the Town Hall. She had proposed that each member would facilitate a discussion at individual tables. There was an extended discussion about the role of the facilitators, who would take notes and how the information would be presented back to the attendees. Modifications to the format were suggested by the members and JS will revise the outline for discussion at the next meeting. JS will also reach out to the Recycling Committee to see if they could help out that evening. It was agreed that it could be a challenge for Committee members to facilitate a discussion and take notes at the same time.

### **Review of Committee Progress to Date**

JS feels the Committee is on track, but that there were other programs/issues related to the Committee's charge that still needed to be discussed. These included the operation of the Swap Shop, the Bottle Redemption Bldg., the Silver Bullets program (including the ones located at Town Hall), Pay-per-Bag, Curbside Collection and Composting. After some discussion, JS developed a list of topics to be discussed at future meetings and detailed them on the conference room dry erase board. They are as follows:

April 8<sup>th</sup>

- Revised site plans with value factors.
- Preparations for Public Input Session on April 9<sup>th</sup>.
- Discuss survey format.

April 22<sup>nd</sup>

- Debrief of Public Input Session
- Swap Shop
- Bottle Shed
- Large Item/HHW Collection
- Silver Bullets
- Construction/Demo Debris

May 6<sup>th</sup>

- Curbside Collection
- Pay-per-Bag
- Composting
- Commercial Haulers
- Survey?
- Donation Boxes – Goodwill & Salvation Army
- Vacuum Cleaner

May 20<sup>th</sup>

- Open

June 10<sup>th</sup>

- 1<sup>st</sup> Draft of Committee Report

June 20<sup>th</sup>

- Final Draft of Committee Report

June 24<sup>th</sup>

- Open

JS asked the members if they were still committed to compiling the Committee's final report with some assistance from the consultant on any related appendices. Everyone replied in the affirmative, which will save the expense of having that done by the consultant.

ASK stated that the Committee will have to start taking votes soon and that the majority vote should rule rather than trying to develop a consensus within the entire Committee.

RM stated he will be out of the country from April 25<sup>th</sup> through May 3<sup>rd</sup>.

### **Citizen Opportunity for Public Comment**

Bill Schmitz addressed the committee again. He said that the temporary disposal costs need to be included in the cost information being compiled by the consultants. He has observed debris between the jersey barriers and the roll-off containers for demolition and metal. He said the Swap Shop and the Bottle Bldg. should be separated to reduce the traffic congestion in that area. He likes the concept of compacting the single-stream recyclables and that the Committee needs to add food-waste composting to any proposed program. He does not prefer Option "D" and would like to see both Pay-per-Bag and curbside collection offered as an option to the residents.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert C. Malley  
Director of Public Works