



TOWN OF NEW LONDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

375 MAIN STREET • NEW LONDON, NH 03257 • WWW.NL-NH.COM

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING MINUTES December 7, 2009

PRESENT:

Larry Ballin, Chair
Mark Kaplan, Selectman
Tina Helm, Selectman
Jessie Levine, Town Administrator

ALSO PRESENT:

Russell Aney, Energy Committee
Liz Bedard, Solid Waste/Recycling consultant
Richard Lee, Public Works Director
Bob & DJ Lavoie, New London residents
Debbie Cross, *the Villager* newspaper

Chair Ballin called the meeting to order at 8:00 AM.

Meeting Minutes: Ms. Helm made minor grammatical changes to the minutes of November 30, 2009. Mr. Kaplan moved to accept as amended, seconded by Ms. Helm and approved 3-0.

Police Vehicles: Ms. Levine said that the 2006 cruiser, which had been scheduled for replacement in 2009 but pushed back to 2010 due to the budget reductions in 2009, needed a new transmission. The vehicle had over 100,000 miles on it but is needed for the rotation of vehicles because the 2007 vehicle replacement was postponed as well. The Board of Selectmen agreed that the vehicle maintenance should be kept up until the vehicle is replaced in the summer of 2010, and asked Ms. Levine to ask Chief Seastrand for an estimate for the necessary repairs.

Crockett's Corner: Ms. Levine said that she had written to the State Department of Transportation at the Selectmen's request to ask for a temporary blinking light to be installed at the Crockett's Corner intersection. She had received a phone call from project manager Shaun Flynn, who stated that the light had been removed from the intersection design at a joint meeting of the state and town, with the support from the selectman present and the Town's public safety leaders. Ms. Levine agreed that the Town had been in agreement with the removal of the light because they did not think it added a safety factor to the intersection. She said that as a result of that decision during the design process, the State removed the electric conduit from the intersection, and if the Town continued to request the light, it would have to be installed at the Town's expense. Ms. Levine said that she did ask for a name at a higher level if the Selectmen decided that they wanted to appeal the decision.

Ms. Levine said that she also talked to Mr. Flynn about the narrow shoulder on the south side of Route 11 between exit 11 and the intersection. The State will review the shoulder width when the median curb is set in the spring and it's possible that another foot could be gained along the shoulder.

Chair Ballin said that with respect to the light, he is inclined to leave it alone. Mr. Kaplan stated that he heard from one individual that thought the light should be returned. Mr. Kaplan said that he is not a traffic expert and understands that some people want it and some people say that it does not make any difference. Ms. Helm said that she was in favor of seeing if the State will put the light in, but if they are not, she is not in favor of putting it in at the town's expense.

Chair Ballin said that if our public safety people think that there is an ongoing problem there, we can address it at a later time. Mr. Kaplan said that if the changes to the intersection accomplish what we set out to do, then the light might not be necessary.

Energy Grants: The Selectmen welcomed Russ Aney of the Energy Committee to the meeting to clarify some confusion that arose at the Joint KRSD Board of Selectmen's meeting on Thursday night. Chair Ballin asked who would be responsible for the cost of hiring Mr. Aney to prepare a grant application for the school buildings: the separate towns or the school district itself? Secondary to that, Chair Ballin said, there was some question as to Mr. Aney's background and track record in procuring these grants. Chair Ballin asked if Mr. Aney could provide a curriculum vitae that the New London Selectmen could forward to the other towns.

With respect to the first question, Mr. Aney said that question came up at the School Board meeting Thursday night as well, and they resolved that they thought it would be appropriate for the School Board to pay for it and asked Mr. Aney to return in a few weeks with a specific proposal to pay for it. Since the School Board would be the primary beneficiaries, they felt it would be appropriate for them to try to fund it. Mr. Aney said that the School Board is rewriting their warrant article #1 to account for the possibility of grants. He is not sure who the best customer is either and asked the Selectmen for their opinion. Chair Ballin said that he thought the reason Mr. Aney brought this question to the joint boards of selectmen was to expedite the process. Mr. Aney agreed.

Mr. Kaplan asked Ms. Levine if it was the same. Ms. Levine said there are three options: 1) the towns engage Mr. Aney and share the cost of his contract, and the towns act as the client; 2) the towns engage Mr. Aney but he report to the School Board; or 3) the School Board engages and manages Mr. Aney's work. She thinks the third option is the best, since we are talking about school buildings.

Mr. Aney said there was a wrinkle that came up on Friday regarding the fact that Springfield is in Sullivan County and the remaining towns are in Merrimack County (the grant is funded by region). Mr. Aney was told by Eric Steltzer of OEP that only one town could apply for the mutual project, even though there are seven towns involved. So, he said, it looks like one town would have to apply on behalf of all seven towns and that town may not be able to apply for grants for the town itself because it would have used up its capacity within the grant. Mr. Aney will follow-up with Joanne Morin, Director of OEP, to address this inequity in the grant process.

Mr. Kaplan asked if all seven towns could apply for the same funds, and Mr. Aney said that it could force that to happen, but OEP's response to that idea was not favorable. Chair Ballin suggested talking to our representatives in Concord if we need more assistance. Chair Ballin said that he is meeting with Dari Sassan tomorrow morning and could advocate on this subject if Mr. Aney needs him to.

With respect to Mr. Aney's qualifications, he said that he is not a grant writer; his background is more as a strategy and management consultant and more recently as an entrepreneur. He has been attracted to energy efficiency and urban renewal and is getting to know that market area better. He also recently intervened in the NH CORE programs that run through the utilities as a private marketing consumer advocate. He summarized that he has a fairly deep and broad understanding of the energy market here in NH. Earlier this year when an RFP came out of the PUC for energy efficiency projects and the greenhouse gas reduction fund was being used, he applied for one for a start-up and did not get approved. More recently, he received a technical assistance grant for the energy efficiency block grant. This has been his year to write grants and he's getting better at it. Mr. Aney has reached out to Shelley Hadley, former executive director of the UVLSRPC, and she would be willing to do the reporting associated with the federal labor requirements. He noted that Shelley is an expert and widely regarded.

Mr. Aney will report back on his conversations with Joanne Morin and otherwise suggests that there be grant applications from the seven towns. Mr. Kaplan asked if New London was to reply and receive

\$400,000 for the school system, what that would represent of the total cost. Mr. Aney said Honeywell priced the energy savings measures for the entire district at \$741,000 (with a 5.5-6 year payback) out of the \$2.9 million of work contained in the District's Warrant Article #1, and OEP has been clear that they would prefer projects that have some degree of matching funds. The grant would be \$400,000 and the remaining funds would be the District's match.

Bob Lavoie asked what the \$2 million was for. Mr. Aney said that Honeywell proposed a \$2.9 million project to do some renovations to the school, many of which were based on an opportunity to reduce energy savings (where the energy savings paid for a significant portion of the project over 15 years). In addition to energy savings, there were code compliance costs as well, so it is difficult to figure out what portion relates to energy savings measures specifically and what relates to other costs. The proposal is broken down by school, not by measures, so they are waiting for some clarity from Honeywell.

Debbie Cross asked if all schools were included, and Mr. Aney said that they were not because there were not energy-saving measures in every school (the new middle school, for instance).

The Selectmen thanked Mr. Aney and will wait to hear back on the School Board's consideration of his proposal.

Scenic Byway Update: Ms. Levine updated the Selectmen on the Scenic Byways Committee meeting on Thursday, December 3, and said that a large part of the meeting was spent drafting the mission statement of the committee and then discussing Byways resources that should be protected. It was a difficult discussion with not a lot of direction, so Ms. Levine recommended that each town meet with its constituent groups to gauge the important resources.

Bob Lavoie asked if this group could become obstructionist. Ms. Levine said that the idea was that the Byways Committee itself would not be activist but would lend its support when a critical resource was threatened.

Single Stream/Pay-As-You-Throw: Chair Ballin welcomed Liz Bedard and Richard Lee to the meeting. Ms. Bedard introduced herself having been involved with recycling in NH for 30 years, with 15 years with Governor's Recycling Council and 5 years as Executive Director of the Northeast Resource Recovery Association, from which she stepped down two years ago and is now doing part-time consulting work. One of her clients is the Concord Coop, and since she's been involved with recycling for 30 years she has also become very involved with the Pay-As-You-Throw (PAYT) concept. Ms. Bedard said that she could not be here when Jim Presher presented the single stream program to the Selectmen and is available to answer questions on that front as well.

Chair Ballin said that the New London Board of Selectmen has often discussed the Town's waste stream and now has this proposal from the Coop for single stream, and the Selectmen have questioned whether it makes sense to do everything at one time. Chair Ballin noted that the single stream is attractive in some ways and unattractive from a revenue stream aspect. PAYT appears to be a great idea to reduce volume but there could be some management difficulty.

Ms. Bedard showed the Selectmen sample pay-as-you-throw bags from other programs (Peterborough, Barrington, Sanbornton). Traditionally, she explained, and in the case in New London, solid waste costs are part of the property taxes and are unrelated to the actions of individuals. As society moves forward and we find that we are unable to build landfills and waste disposal facilities, trash removal is getting more and more expensive. Similar to what communities are doing with water and sewerage, PAYT is a program whereby users pay for waste disposal based on what they throw away, so it takes away the perception that waste disposal is free, which is what people often think when it's paid for by their taxes. When disposal is paid by taxes, there is a disconnect between cost and action. PAYT has received an amazing amount of popularity; 30 years ago there were 200 PAYT programs in the US, and now there are well over 10,000. Every year, more and more communities of every size (Portland, Maine, Worcester,

Concord) adopt the program. The results follow what they predict, but it does involve a change that is often met with resistance. Ms. Bedard said that rubbish can be an emotional issue, despite the fact that it's being thrown away. Communities do not take implementation lightly, but there has not been a town yet that has implemented the program that has rescinded it because they have found that PAYT makes so much sense from both the government management perspective and the individual resident perspective. She told the story of Sanbornton, NH, which implemented the program several years ago, and there was a resident who kicked and screamed over the change and made a motion at Town Meeting to rescind the program and could not even get a second. She said it's not unusual for a PAYT program to pass by a few votes, and after people have it for a year, they cannot even get a second to rescind it.

Why is it so popular? Ms. Bedard explained that the first reason is fairness -- not just fairness for recyclers who are already trying to reduce their costs and paying for the people who are not, but also fairness because people who did not recycle did not have to feel guilty about not recycling anymore (that person will pay for whatever they want to put in the bag). Another example of fairness is with the property tax -- a retired single person in a large family home who pays a fair amount of property taxes and only generates one bag of trash every two weeks is subsidizing other peoples' disposal costs.

Another reason PAYT is expanding is municipal government finances. What Ms. Bedard sees over and over again with PAYT is costs going down and revenue going up. Revenue goes up because the bags are sold (Concord sells its purple bags for \$2 apiece) and the majority of the cost of trash disposal is taken off the tax rolls. At the same time, costs are decreased because there is less waste disposal. Concord decreased its trash disposal by half. Mr. Kaplan asked what happen to the other half and Ms. Bedard said that some people react strongly and get a small backyard dumpster for \$25-50 per month and put their bags in it every week. She said that during the first year there will be dumpsters, and then people will realize that they're paying more for the dumpster than using PAYT and the amount of trash will go back up. Another immediate response is that people start bringing their trash to a family member's house, to their office or put their trash in front of a house in another town, but during the course of a year that gets old as well. So there is usually a big drop in the first year and then a slight increase the following year. Some of the decrease also goes to an increase in recycling, although for Concord the trash decrease does not equal the recycling increase, so it's a combination of migration, recycling, changing habits (many people start using compost bins; organics are 20% of our waste), and people who are no longer illegally leaving waste in Concord.

Mr. Kaplan asked how many bags would be sold if New London had 3500 tons of trash. Ms. Bedard said to anticipate about 20 pounds per bag on average. They will be heavier in the beginning as people try to put as much as possible into a bag, but after a while it will average out. Ms. Bedard said that she was a skeptic at first when the bags were \$1 apiece and she did not realize how conscientious we are. Ms. Bedard said that people will not pay to get rid of something that they can dispose of for free. Concord, for example, now every house has recyclables in front of it because people do not want to pay to get rid of something they can get rid of for free.

Ms. Bedard said that she would recommend two different bag sizes, such as 15-pound and 35-pound bags, at varying prices. Mr. Kaplan asked what a family would expect to spend per year. Ms. Bedard said that it depends on how much someone threw away a year, so in her case it would be about \$24 per year, but she recycles, composts, and does everything she can. For someone who doesn't recycle at all, it may be \$4-6 per week, but they can control what they spend and their actions impact not only their own budget but the Town's budget as well. The residents have a choice to positively impact the Town's budget, and if they choose not to, they can do so without burdening the other taxpayers.

Chair Ballin noted that in Concord, for example, the dumpsters would not go to a town facility. Mr. Lee said that is one of the questions we would have to answer here, because other towns do not accept commercial trash like we do, so we would have to figure out how to handle those dumpsters and commercial accounts. Ms. Levine said she would think that PAYT would be across the board for both

residential and business property – some would use bags and some would use dumpsters. Ms. Helm noted it would have to be the commercial business's responsibility to make sure that others aren't dumping in their dumpsters.

Ms. Helm asked about towns that have adopted single stream and PAYT. Ms. Bedard said that PAYT has been around a lot longer than single stream. The only community that has both currently is Exeter, and it works fine. For a community like New London that's considering both, there's a benefit, because what we're saying is that PAYT make sense for fairness, financial reasons, and to improve recycling (reduce, reuse, recycle), but it will cost people money to get rid of rubbish or they can get rid of recyclables for free, and single stream makes it as easy as possible to get rid of recyclables, so handling recyclables should be on the same ease level for getting rid of trash. Single stream would make it easy to recycle, so she can see the two programs going together hand-in-hand, though they do not have to.

Ms. Helm asked about implementing them at the same time. Ms. Levine said that Exeter is the only town that currently has both so there is no opportunity for comparison in New Hampshire. Mr. Lee said he would rather do it in sequence from an education standpoint so as not to try to introduce two new concepts at the same time, but he agreed that it might work out to do both at the same time.

Mr. Doheny asked to clarify the definition of single stream, which means that all recyclables – not all trash and recyclables -- go into the same bin. He noted that the Town of Duxbury, Massachusetts, did both PAYT and single stream at the same time. Mr. Doheny said that he is on the fence as a family of five, and he does not know what the reduction in cost would be. He noted that it did not take a long time to retrain residents on what went into the bag and what went into single stream; he recommended doing it all at once rather than at two times.

Ms. Cross said that she has been recycling for years; she sees it as easier for people who automatically recycle, and people who have not started yet will have an easier time rather than trying to figure out how to do it. Mr. Lee said that his concern is that the two types of bags go to the same place at the Transfer Station. Ms. Bedard said that recyclables are best coming loose into the Transfer Station and that the trash bags are specific colors and therefore it's easy to see if it's a New London PAYT bag or not.

Mr. Kaplan said that he is not in favor of either program, although he can live with PAYT. With respect to single stream, he ran some numbers based on 2008: we paid \$176,000 to dispose of trash and had revenue of \$43,000. If we had single stream and increased recyclables by 50% (and, he said, no one has generated that much in recycling), we would lose the \$46,000 in revenue. Ms. Bedard stated that Dover has hit 50% recycling with PAYT. Ms. Bedard also said that revenue would come through Coop anyway, so if the single stream facility had been constructed and functional in 2008, we would have received \$50 per ton in revenue.

Ms. Levine disagreed with Mr. Kaplan's cost analysis because she said they are based on 2008 revenues, and the current recycling market is not generating revenue. Ms. Levine presented a spreadsheet that she and Richard Lee had developed on single stream:

	2009 Budget	2009 Estimates	25% recycling increase	Projected cost with 25% increase	50% increase	Projected cost with 50% increase	75% increa se	Projected cost with 75% increase
Tipping Fees (\$48/ton)	\$ 135,000	2812.50 tons	2,674	\$ 128,352	2,535.50	\$ 121,704	2,397	\$115,056
Hauling to Berlin	\$ 68,705	141 trips/year @\$412/trip + gas over \$3.00	133.70	\$ 55,084	126.78	\$ 52,231	126.78	\$ 52,231
Hauling to Meredith	\$ 21,573	141 trips/year@153/trip	133.70	\$ 20,456	126.78	\$ 19,397	126.78	\$ 15,912
Recycling fees	\$ 8,000	554 tons in 2008 (w/o glass or light metal)	692.50	\$ 6,925	831	\$ 8,310	969.50	\$ 9,695
Hauling to Penacook	\$ -	Annual cost of hauling recycling (15 tons per trip)	46 trips @ \$153	\$ 7,038	55 trips @ \$153	\$ 8,415	65 trips	\$ 9,945
	<u>\$ 233,278</u>			<u>\$ 217,856</u>		<u>\$210,057</u>		<u>\$202,839</u>

Chair Ballin asked about whether new towns could come into the Coop for trash disposal if other towns left (such as Hopkinton and Webster). Ms. Levine read aloud Jim Presher’s response to her e-mail asking that question: “We had not planned on either town participating in the recycling project from the beginning. As for the possibility of taking on new communities and their solid waste, I have to look at the contract with Wheelabrator. You are the second one to ask that question and I have not had a chance to review the options. I hope to do that tomorrow and will let you know.”

Ms. Bedard said that the Concord Coop is a good organization and she does not doubt that people will try to get in at this time. She said that people are lining up to get into the Coop or into the single stream project. Waterville Valley has joined, as have Hampton, Milford, Goffstown, Hooksett, Sandwich, and Holderness— there are about 25 communities that have joined for 15 years. There is 23,000 in tonnage at this point and the Coop has decided that they want 25,000 tons signed up for 15 years before they put a shovel in the ground, even though once they build it there will be a floodgate of material coming in (she said that one private hauler in Concord, in anticipation of this facility, has already switched his customers over and is hauling the material to facilities in Massachusetts or Maine). People are already going single stream thinking it’s coming, and in that private hauler’s case, one dumpster is for trash at a higher expense, and the other dumpster is for single stream at a lower expense. He pays a tipping fee in both cases, but the fee is lower at the single stream and even has the potential for revenue.

Ms. Bedard said that the Concord facility is the only one being proposed in NH and she believes it will be the only one in NH because there is such a high capital cost that one needs a lot of volume to justify that and this facility will use that volume. If New London is thinking that eventually it might want to go single stream, it would be better economically to come in as a partner before as opposed to coming in as spot market later. The partners will make out the best financially.

Ms. Helm asked Richard Lee where his thinking is related to the recycling of glass. Mr. Lee said that we could either separate it or allow it to go into the mixed recyclables. It is a product that we have but we do not have to have it. Chair Ballin said that we’ve got an inventory built up that would last us for a while. Mr. Lee noted that part of the reason we started crushing glass is that the State of NH said that they would use it in their projects, and as it turned out they refused it in both local projects (the Park & Ride and the Andover/Route 4 project). That was frustrating because there was an opportunity missed to promote the recycling of product. We have tested it a lot ourselves, but trying to get someone to use it after the State of NH says that it doesn’t meet gravel specification will be tough. A lot of these cooperative crushing areas were started on the pretext that the glass would be reused, and now other towns are not using it because it does not pass State spec. If we remove the glass, we would not have to pay to haul it but would

have to pay to crush it. Mr. Kaplan pointed out that the figures do not reflect the savings of mixing it with crushed gravel.

Ms. Helm said that it sounds like we don't have a market for the glass, and Ms. Levine agreed but said that we had not tried hard to sell it either. She thinks that with some marketing this could be done. Ms. Helm said it sounded like Mr. Lee might be inclined to still isolate the glass. Mr. Lee said that he would because it makes handling easier on the single stream end as well. Ms. Levine said that the beauty is that if people do not separate it, it could still go single stream, and if they separate it then we get the benefit.

With respect to PAYT, Mr. Lee pointed out that the bags might cost something different in New London – a local analysis would have to be done. Ms. Bedard said the average price in NH is \$1.50 or \$1.75 and the highest price that she has seen is \$2.25. Concord chose \$2. Ms. Bedard said there is no PAYT around here, and she recommends having the communities pay the same amount so that people are not buying bags and dumping in a neighboring communities.

Ms. Levine asked if we would be concerned about people from out-of-town dumping at our Transfer Station as long as they've paid for the bag. Mr. Lee said we would still want to monitor it, but it's not as much of an issue if they've paid for their own bag. Ms. Bedard said that financially it is not an issue, and Littleton even charges more for the bags than they pay for disposal, so they make money on every bag and encourage people to use their facility. Chair Ballin asked how the Littleton business community reacted to PAYT, and Ms. Bedard said that they already pay for disposal so it leveled the playing field. Mr. Kaplan asked if our businesses pay for the dumpster and hauling, and Mr. Lee said that they do but they do not pay for the disposal (tipping fee). Mr. Lee added, though, that they would be able to have a single dumpster for recycling as well, so they have the opportunity to recycle for a lot less than what they are going to pay to dispose of trash.

Mr. Lee explained the cardboard disposal process – Naughton picks up dumpsters of cardboard and brings the cardboard to the Transfer Station and the College brings tin cans and paper, so there is some commercial recycling but not a lot. He knows that most towns do not take commercial trash in their Transfer Station, so a lot of communities that went to PAYT did not take commercial trash to start with, so there was not a big issue of dealing with commercial people. In theory, if we went to PAYT their tax rate would drop so they would have that money to turn around and dispose of their own trash. So he cautioned the Selectmen to be ready with an argument from the commercial people who felt like they didn't have to pay for it before. However, this makes them more responsible because they will see their trash bill up front and encourage them to recycle more of their own trash just like the average resident.

Ms. Bedard asked to speak to the education piece and said that she cannot over-emphasize the importance of work on the front end. She has worked with a lot of communities and if homework is done it definitely pays off. She said to talk to everyone and every opportunity to talk to people because it is a change, something new and different. One community did a great job and there was one question at Town Meeting regarding where the bags could be purchased; all of the answers had been given before town Meeting. Ms. Bedard said that some communities just sell the bags retail, while some do at the Town Office. She said that Hannaford worked with the City of Concord; her recommendation is to only do retail because the Town Hall and Transfer Station are already too busy and would have to handle cash. Towns can contract with a distributor and the retail store can order the bags directly from the distributors. Typically the towns would agree to give the stores that sell them a few cents per bag, although some towns don't and the stores sell them as a community service. One thing that would need to be decided is whether the retailers could use the bags as a loss-leader or whether the businesses would have to charge the bag cost.

Mr. Lavoie said that on the single stream idea, it would make sense to have plastic bins available so people can use them for that purpose. Chair Ballin said that we currently have bins and we should consider going to a bigger size. We currently charge \$10 for bins.

Mr. Lavoie asked if the facility would have to change to go to single stream. Ms. Levine explained that PAYT would require more facility changes given our current handling of recycling and the different drop-off sites. If go to single stream, all recycling would go to the same place so it would be a more efficient process and would require fewer facilities changes. Mr. Lee said that the separating of recycling takes time and clogs up the traffic, and also there would be more difficulty storing the various items separately, and single stream would improve traffic flow and make it easier to handle recycling.

Chair Ballin said that if we go to single stream and PAYT, traffic would be even more improved. Mr. Lee agreed that there would just be two stops for the user.

Ms. Cross asked if we would have to go to Town Meeting. Ms. Levine said that Town Meeting would have to approve a 15-year contract (Ms. Bedard disagreed and said some towns have made the commitment without going to Town Meeting), but she does not think that Town Meeting would have to approve going to PAYT. Ms. Bedard agreed that the Selectmen have the authority to go to PAYT, but politically, to gain community buy-in and involvement it might make sense to go to Town Meeting. Ms. Levine will check with town counsel regarding going to Town Meeting for the single stream contract.

Mr. Lee said that the first time we heard about single stream from the Coop, there was no opportunity for revenue from recyclables, whereas now if we get in as an affiliate, there might be revenue if the market for recycling goes up. Mr. Lee said that we took in \$46,000 for revenue in 2008, but as of the end of November 2009 we took in only \$16,000 in revenue and paid \$8,000 to remove recyclables, so our net revenue is \$8,000 this year. Ms. Bedard said that we would have received \$50 per ton for recyclables in 2008, so there would have been some revenue.

Mr. Kaplan said that even if the market for recyclables goes up and the cost of the cooperative also goes up, we may still get nothing. Ms. Levine said that the revenue certainly has to be part of the decision, but that one must also consider reducing the amount of trash disposed of in a landfill and hauled to Berlin at a cost to the environment. Chair Ballin said that it is also an education for people to buy items with less packaging.

Chair Ballin said that this is good information and they are still on a learning curve. Ms. Bedard offered to come back if needed. Ms. Levine asked the Selectmen what else is needed to make a decision. Chair Ballin asked the timeline for the single stream facility. Ms. Bedard said they will not start building until they have 25,000 tons, and it will take about a year after construction starts. She said that Newmarket, Stratham and Newfields are currently evaluating and they represent 1800 tons.

Ms. Helm suggested continuing to talk about it at the Selectmen's December 21 meeting. Ms. Levine will work on cost analysis for PAYT. Ms. Levine asked the Selectmen to let her and Richard Lee know if they need more information for that meeting.

Chair Ballin asked Ms. Bedard for more information about the transparency of the cost of the facility. Ms. Bedard said that the Coop has been successfully operating for 25 years, and the partners of this project are Concord, Laconia, Goffstown, Bow, so a very wide base of management. If the Town of New London is thinking of eventually going to single stream, then becoming an RFAM is a better approach economically than waiting and having to dispose of recycling on the spot market. There will be only one facility built in NH, at least at this point, so if we went single stream later we would be bringing it to Concord or Burlington, VT or Portland, ME or Avon, Mass, so if we went to single stream we would be using the NH facility and the best economics would be to come in now.

As far as developing a budget for this facility, every fall the municipal partners in the project would come together and develop a budget with expected costs and revenues and what we want to charge ourselves or give ourselves for revenue based on recyclables that come in. Right now, there's market revenue of \$10

per ton. Every quarter, the facility will assess its actual costs and actual revenue, so if markets have gotten better and the members should have received \$15 or \$20 per ton, the towns will receive that surplus revenue at the quarter, and the only difference between the Coop members and RFAM members is that there will be 55/45 split of that revenue. The coop listened to towns that were worried about what happens when the markets get worse, and if the markets do get worse that will be absorbed into the budget in the coming year. Ms. Bedard said that she was a selectman for six years, so she knows the needs of towns and the importance of deliberating.

She said there are two ways to terminate the 15-year contract: one is that if the tipping fee for recycling is 90% or more of the tipping fee for the Coop; and second is that if a community is getting paid for recyclables and the markets drop off, then a community can withdraw with six-months notice. That has been enough to make the other communities feel comfortable. Ms. Bedard said that the proposed contract has improved over time and through review by many communities and their lawyers.

Chair Ballin asked for confirmation that RFAM members have a seat at the table, and Ms. Bedard said that it is one vote per 500 in population. Chair Ballin asked if it was weighted for Coop members, and Ms. Bedard said not for the single stream facility, although the budget does have to get approved by the full Coop.

The Selectmen thanked Ms. Bedard and she left at 10:15 AM.

Committee Meetings & Reports

Joint Selectmen's Meeting: Chair Ballin asked Mr. Lee if the road agents from the school district towns have met. Richard Lee said that they have met twice, although only four people came to the second meeting, and one person said that the only potential savings was for calcium and salt. He thinks that there might need to be pressure from the top town. Chair Ballin asked Mr. Lee if he sees a benefit for the Town of New London, and Mr. Lee said he does not know. He does not see us being able to buy specialized pieces of equipment because everyone wants them at the same time, but he thinks that if we were to put our fuel and propane together whether that would be beneficial.

Chair Ballin said that the next Joint Board of Selectmen's meeting is Thursday, January 21, 2010 at 6:00 PM in Warner, and the Selectmen discussed inviting the road agents to come to that meeting to talk to the Selectmen. Chair Ballin said that he has a lot of faith that Richard Lee is doing the best job he can to get us the best price that he can.

Chair Ballin said that the other issue was the energy proposal from Russ Aney, and the School District budget presented by Jerry Frew, which is still being hashed out.

Citizen's Advisory Committee: Chair Ballin reported that the CAC met with Rep. Foose, Rep. Kidder, and Senator Odell, and they heard the opinions of a number of citizens at the meeting, and he thinks they understand where our taxpayers are on the issues of fairness. Mr. Kaplan said that the representatives heard us, and he thinks that of the three people the one who responded the most positively is Bob Odell, who said what Mr. Kaplan was hoping he would say that after talking with the Governor, he felt strongly that donor towns ought not to exist, but he recognized that he could not get the constitutional amendment through that would have done away with them. He wants to see a committee formed with the Governor in an effort to resolve the donor town contribution so that budgets could be done before June. Chair Ballin said that Bob Odell is very much on board with that, and he is sure that Dave Kidder is.

Chair Ballin said that going forward, we need to stay in touch with our reps and show up in Concord when the discussion is going on. Mr. Kaplan asked if he should offer to sit in on the meetings with the governor. After some discussion, it was agreed that MR. Kaplan would ask bob Odell if there should be a representative of the Coalition Communities in that meeting, and then go to the coalition meeting on January 15 to seek a representative, if needed.

Upcoming Meetings:

GACIT, December 9, DOT: All three Selectmen will attend the meeting to ensure that Main Street remains in the 10-year plan.

Wilmot Selectmen, December 9: Ms. Levine will attend to ask the Wilmot Selectmen to consider constructing a sidewalk from the Elkins line to the Park N' Go store.

Sunapee Sewer Commission, December 10: Mr. Kaplan expressed concern about Charles Smith's motion at the November 19 meeting that undermined the joint decision reached on October 29. Even though the other commissioners did not go along with the motion, Mr. Kaplan was concerned that the relationship we have developed over the years is in jeopardy. The Selectmen discussed this and ultimately decided to wait to see how the December 10 Joint Meeting went.

Chair Ballin moved to go into non-public session pursuant to RSA 91:A-3 II (a) compensation of personnel. Ballin – yes; Kaplan – yes; Helm – yes.

Upon returning from non-public session, the Selectmen were unanimous to stick to their decision of 1.5% across the board merit raises to offset the health insurance changes and to not make further adjustments to salaries.

Application for Building Permits:

- Amendment/Extension – Michael & Gatia McChesney - 344 Elkins Road (Map & Lot 077-036-000) adjust garage proportions – Permit #08-022 Approved.
- Thomas & Mary Miller – 359 Wilmot Center Road (Map & Lot 052-001-000) 12 x 24 shelter – Permit #09-135 – Approved.

Application for use of Whipple Hall:

- The New London Garden Club business meeting & educational program – Tuesday, July 13, 2010, 10 AM – 3:30pm – Approved.

Application for use of Town Common:

- Chamber of Commerce – 12/10 & 11/2009 – set up Christmas tree & tree lighting & Santa Claus – Approved.

Application for Sign Permit:

- Temporary sign – LS Region Chamber of Commerce – Christmas in New London – Approved.

Other:

- Disbursement voucher week of December 7, 2009 - Approved.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:00 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessie Levine, Town Administrator