

**Report to the Town of Hingham Board of Selectmen:
“Evaluation of Waste Disposal and Recycling
System Alternatives for the Town of Hingham”**

**Submitted by
Long Range Waste Disposal Planning and Recycling
Committee**

November 23, 2010



Hingham LRWDP

Report to the Town of Hingham Board of Selectmen:
 “Evaluation of Waste Disposal and Recycling System Alternatives
 for the Town of Hingham”
 11/23/2010

— **CONTENTS** —

Introduction

Report Background	2
Reporting Framework	2
Reporting Approach.....	3
Information to Keep in Mind	4
Terms Used in this report.....	5

Enterprise Funds: (a look at pulling waste management out of the

Town’s general budget).....	6
-----------------------------	---

Alternative Waste Disposal and Recycling Models

Curbside Collection.....	7
Flat Fee.....	9
Pay As You Throw	11
Permitted Access with Itemized Fees	13
Private Hauler	15

Resident Feedback	17
-------------------------	----

Conclusions.....	19
------------------	----

Appendices: A –Enterprise Fund Model for Waste and Recycling Operations.....	21
--	----

B: Resident Comments to the Board of Selectmen	23
--	----

C: Financial Impact of Permitted Access with Itemized Fees	33
--	-----------

D: Financial Impact of Pay As Your Throw.....	34
--	-----------

—INTRODUCTION—

Report Background

In April, 2010, the Hingham Board of Selectmen (the Board) asked the Long Range Waste Disposal Planning and Recycling Committee (the Committee) to do the following:

1. Research and evaluate options for Hingham's waste and recycling operations.
2. Prepare a report on our findings that the Board would use in evaluating potential revenue sources, especially for the FY2012 town budget.

The Committee agreed to the request and began work on the report in May.

In September, the Board clarified their request with a charge to include:

1. a recommendation for which option would work best for Hingham in 2012 or to rank the options, in order of suitability; and
2. residents' feedback on the options included in the report.

The Committee addressed the additional charge in October and November. (See "Approach" for more information on how the Board requests were addressed, in preparing this report.) The Committee submitted its final report to the Board of Selectmen on November 23, 2010.

Reporting Framework

The Committee's mission is stated as follows: "To promote and encourage efficient long-range waste planning, with a focus on recycling, through the use of communication/education, facilitation, and best practices."

As a committee, our advisory function and ability is limited to our mission. However, we are aware that the Board requested this report in order to explore potential revenue sources for Hingham, if needed, as well as to become educated on alternative waste disposal and recycling programs operating in other towns. Therefore, we have included general fiscal information, to create a more useful overview of each option in this report. Further analysis of the options reviewed, or of their real potential for increasing revenue for Hingham, will be something for the Board to pursue with resources they have, beyond this committee.

In preparing this report and our recommendations, the Committee researched and evaluated waste and recycling system options with efficiency and recycling in mind. An underlying premise of our evaluations was that, by increasing recycling, residents would reduce Hingham's solid waste disposal costs. Additionally, we took into consideration the pros and cons of each model and its perceived impact on residents.

Reporting Approach

To prepare this report, the Committee:

1. surveyed the towns on Hingham's benchmark list and developed an initial overview report of the waste and recycling programs being used by these towns;
2. expanded the survey/report to include additional towns that encircle Hingham and that are members of the South Shore Recycling Cooperative, in order to provide additional comparative data for our use;
3. considered data from the MA Dept. of Environmental Protection and the U.S. Dept. of Environmental Protection on what is working across the U.S.;
4. evaluated the programs surveyed and developed a list of viable options to look at in detail, based on what the committee thought could be possible scenarios for the Town;
5. honed the list of towns to include in the final option overviews, based on how analogous these towns are to Hingham, in population size, available infrastructure, or municipal structure;
6. discussed our findings in light of the framework, described above, and eliminated any models that we considered unsuitable for Hingham;
7. developed a rough analysis of the financial impact of the remaining models and discussed our analysis in light of the framework, described above;
8. solicited and summarized resident feedback*; and
9. finalized our findings and rankings, as contained in this report.

*To solicit resident feedback for this report, the Committee:

1. prepared overviews of the options included in this report (Curbside, Flat Fee, Pay as You Throw, Permitted Access with Itemized Fees, and Private Hauler) and posted them on the town website, on the LRWDPR bulletin board at Town Hall, and at the Hingham Library (10/22/10);
2. prepared an on-line survey, available through the town website with assistance from the office of the Manager of Information Systems, through which residents could share feedback on the options included in this report and rank their support of the options (10/25 - 11/4/10);
3. held an educational meeting for town residents at the Hingham Library, where we presented the options included in this report, solicited and recorded resident feedback for each option, and asked attendees to rank their support for each option (11/03/10); and
4. provided education and publicity for this report, the options included in it, the survey, and the public meeting with a Hingham Journal article (10/21/10), as well as calendar listings on the town website and in the Hingham Journal and an email blast to subscribers to the town's email list.

Information to Keep in Mind

As you read through this report and think about Hingham's options, it will be helpful to consider how Hingham compares to the towns studied and to keep the following information in mind:

- Hingham is a small town of fairly low population density, with 22.59 square miles of land and 136 miles of roads, with approximately 6,500 households bringing waste to the Transfer Station.
- Hingham's Transfer Station site is relatively small, roughly 4 acres, but has a well developed infrastructure designed for efficient handling and sorting of materials for disposal and recycling.
- Hingham's landfill was closed Feb. 3, 2000. Costs for waste disposal for Feb.– Dec. 2000 were \$951,000, compared to \$275,000 for all of 1999. Our current (FY2011) budget for waste disposal costs is \$767,000.
- The nature of solid waste disposal and the laws surrounding it have created a very different landscape than what was the reality even 10 years ago. The various costs and mandates associated with solid waste, in the current post-landfill era, virtually guarantee that waste disposal will never be cheap again. Of the 27 towns we researched, 22 (or 81%) currently charge residents fees for some parts of their waste disposal and recycling operations.
- Systems that reduce municipal waste will provide the most savings, over time. It is fiscally imperative for Hingham to find ways to reduce solid waste, both in the short and long term.
- According to MA DEP, Hingham's recycling rate is 52%. When we remove the effects of our very successful yard waste composting operations, the recycling rate for common household recyclables is 29% and leaves much room for improvement. Another way of measuring a town's success at reducing waste is "pounds, per person, per year (lbs/pp/py)." The ideal (goal) amount is 500 lbs/pp/py, or less, and Hingham is currently at 680 lbs/pp/py. Again, this shows a clear opportunity for improvement.
- The focus of the Board's request and the Committee's research was on evaluating alternative options for Hingham's waste and recycling system. However, it should be noted that Hingham's **current system** does allow for reduced costs and some revenue generation, as described below:
 - Hingham recently negotiated a lower tipping fee for transport and disposal of household waste at SEMASS, starting at \$80 per ton, as of 1/1/11 (a savings from our current fee of \$104 per ton through 12/31/10). Transfer Station management consistently strives to find new ways to lower our waste disposal costs and related expenses.
 - Recent changes in the Hingham Transfer Station regulations allow for collection of new fees (beginning 6/10) for the following: commercial vehicle access stickers and permits; residential Transfer Station access stickers beyond one per address; commercial disposal of C&D, yard waste, and other waste ban items; and residential disposal of C&D waste beyond 3 cubic yards per week. As these fees are in their inaugural year, the revenue generated from these changes has yet to be determined. Based on the data from June

through August 2010, revenue from the new stickers is estimated to be approximately \$26,000 per year, with additional revenue from fees for waste disposal brought in by commercial vehicles.

- Hingham currently offers more opportunities for materials to be diverted from the waste disposal stream and properly disposed of or recycled than many towns. If, as a town, we improved our recycling efforts, we would expect to see a related reduction in our expenses, because our waste tonnage would be reduced. As noted previously, Hingham has room for improvement in this area. The Committee continues to educate residents about ways to reduce our municipal waste tonnage each year, through diligent separation and recycling.

Terms Used in This Report

Bulky Waste: large furniture, rugs, mattresses and appliances

C&D: Construction and Demolition materials; e.g. molding; drywall, linoleum, tiles, 2x4s, etc.

Household Recyclables: “common recyclables;” e.g., paper, cardboard, plastic, metal, glass

MA DEP: Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection

Municipal Solid Waste: Waste collected from residences, town buildings, parks, fields, and street waste containers. In Hingham, waste from schools is not part of municipal solid waste.

SEMASS: A waste-to-energy plant in Rochester, MA that burns trash to make electricity. Hingham contracts with SEMASS for its solid municipal waste disposal.

Tipping Fee: The fee paid to dispose of municipal solid waste.

Waste Ban Items: Materials the MA DEP has made illegal to dispose of in municipal solid waste. These items require special treatment and often involve a fee to a specialized vendor to properly handle these materials. The following materials and items are currently prohibited from disposal with municipal solid waste in Massachusetts:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asphalt pavement, brick and concrete • Cathode ray tubes (monitors, TV’s) • Electronics waste (computers, printers, other electronics; a.k.a. “e-waste”) • Ferrous & non-ferrous metals • Glass & metal containers • Household Hazardous Waste • Lead acid batteries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaves and yard waste • Recyclable paper, cardboard, paperboard • Single resin narrow-necked plastics • Wood and wood waste (all wood, treated and untreated) • White goods (large appliances) • Whole tires (banned from landfills only; shredded tires acceptable)
--	---

—ENTERPRISE FUNDS—

A range of towns use enterprise funds for their waste and recycling operations, which are treated as financially independent operations. Revenue to support operations is raised through user fees. In some towns, waste management enterprise funds are self supporting, while in others they receive significant support from the towns general budget. Most towns with enterprise funds use a Pay As You Throw system (see page 11 for information on the Pay as You Throw model). Some towns' enterprise funds have managed to build up surplus funds to pay for capping landfills and making infrastructure improvements.

Many towns seem to have established their enterprise funds around the time their landfills closed. This may have been done to raise resident awareness of the costs of waste disposal and to guarantee that any funds raised for waste disposal and recycling were used exclusively to pay for these operations; one of the hallmarks of an enterprise fund is that it makes the real costs of municipal waste disposal and recycling operations transparent for residents. There are many attractive aspects of this model for Hingham, including the transparent costs and the ease with which adjustments can be made to fees, in response to changing costs or recycling revenues. However, timing plays an important role in the success of an enterprise fund.

Towns with well established enterprise funds and very successful waste diversion and recycling rates have used this model for many years and were able to build up money reserves during better economic times. During the last few years, as costs have risen but resident incomes have not, several of these towns have used their reserves to reduce user charges or to hold them flat. If Hingham started an enterprise fund at this time, it would need to charge higher user fees than any of the other models included in this report, except the Private Hauler model, in order to begin building reserves to pay for maintenance and capital improvements and offset fluctuations in vendor charges and recycling commodities markets.

With our current municipal solid waste contract, Hingham has been paying over \$100/ton for waste disposal, higher than that of any of the towns researched with enterprise funds. Our new contract with SEMASS sets our rate at \$80/ton, starting 1/1/11, with slow increases over the next 10 years. This makes Hingham's waste disposal costs less of a roadblock to successfully starting an enterprise fund that could become self-supporting. However, in discussing this option, the Committee decided that, in these challenging economic times, it would not be prudent for Hingham to ask its residents to pay extra fees nor for the town to incur the administrative and legal expenses required to establish an enterprise fund for the town's waste management system. Therefore, the enterprise fund model was not included in our public information presentation or survey.

For future consideration of this model for funding waste and recycling operations, we offer the data we gathered from comparable towns in Appendix A.

— ALTERNATIVE MODELS FOR WASTE DISPOSAL AND RECYCLING —

Curbside Collection (Town-Sponsored) Model

Description: Curbside pick-up of residential trash and recycling. The Transfer Station is closed to regular resident access. Pick-up service could be provided through the town contracting with a commercial waste disposal company or using town employees, or a hybrid of both. In most towns using this model, trash pick-up occurs once a week, while recycling pick up occurs every two weeks (either single stream where the following are mixed together: paper/cardboard/plastics/glass/metal bottles and cans OR dual stream where paper and cardboard are collected separately from mixed plastic/glass/metal bottles and cans).

Peer Towns Using this Option

Town	Population	Tons of MSW/Person	2009 Mass DEP Recycling Rate	Fees	Comments
Concord	17,000	0.23	47%	\$262/yr + fee per barrel	Town employees run the curbside service Still have a \$1.3 million transfer station budget
Weymouth	54,000	0.45	32%	\$100/yr	Outsource to Capitol Waste as part of tri-town system Includes yard waste Fee-based bulky/white goods collection
Hingham	20,500	0.34	52%	NA	

If Hingham Employed the Curbside Model

Startup Costs:

If town-run, would require purchasing/leasing of trash collection vehicles, collection containers for residents, and training for staff and residents. If outsourced, it would require collection containers for residents, and costs to select and enter into a contract with a commercial hauler.

Range of Fees for this Service in Local Towns: \$100 - \$275 per year. Note: These fees do not cover the full cost of the curbside service, additional revenue from taxes or other source are used (e.g. in Weymouth and Braintree remainder of cost covered through taxes and in Marshfield and Concord remainder is raised from Pay As You Throw programs – see PAYT model below).

Benefits:

*Would reduce cost of operating the transfer station – could be open only part time and only for Waste Ban items (see description above).

*More convenient for some residents (less sorting, no traveling to dispose of weekly household waste)

Disadvantages:

*Loss of service to residents (many items not accepted/separate fees charged)

*Visual impact of trash at curbside, especially in historic areas/Main St.

*Traffic congestion and noise impact of trash vehicles in neighborhoods.

*A new financial burden for residents

*No revenue to the town of Hingham for the sale of recycling commodities

*Not easy to enforce recycling- reduced recycling leads to increase costs for waste disposal

Challenges to Implementation for Hingham: Residents would likely be unhappy with the loss of access to the Transfer Station and the full range of materials that are accepted there. They are also likely to be unhappy with the traffic and noise impact of trash collection vehicles in neighborhoods.

Ability to Raise Revenue for Hingham: Low: This model will cost significantly more to run compared to resident drop-off at Transfer Station, so fees charged will only cover part of the costs.

Anticipated Impact on Recycling Rates: Negative: Compared to towns using other models, towns with curbside collection have lower recycling rates. Reduced recycling results in increased waste disposal costs.

Flat Fee Model

Description: The Flat Fee model refers to a single annual fee charged to every residential household for use of the Transfer Station, usually a vehicle sticker fee for towns with drop off Transfer Stations. There may be additional fees for Waste Ban items (see description above) or the town may prohibit the disposal of such items at the facility and require residents to hire a commercial hauler to handle these items.

Peer Towns Using this Option				
MSW- Municipal Solid Waste H-Household TF-Tipping Fee WB- Waste Ban Items				
Town	Pop.	Tons of MSW / person	2009 DEP recycling rate	Fees/ Comments
Weston	10,660	.37 T	28%	<u>Annual Permit:</u> \$215, Seniors-\$35, Yard waste free for residents, No WB items accepted (no white goods, CRT, lead batteries, paint, rechargeable batteries) <u>Commercial Users:</u> \$147/ton+\$15.mo fees <u>Recycling permit:</u> \$25/yr
Winchester	22,275	.55 T	29%	<u>Annual Permit:</u> \$175/yr, 2 nd permit \$30, Low Income - \$30, 1 day pass-\$25 <u>Waste Ban Items:</u> Freon units-\$15, Metal-\$10, Propane tanks-\$5, CRT-\$10, Tires-\$5 Household Hazardous waste days available
Barnstable (partial PAYT)	50,000	.48T	16%	<u>Annual Permit:</u> \$130, 2 nd permit-\$15, Low income-\$55, <u>Partial PAYT:</u> Limit 8 bags/week, \$1 /bag, \$100/ton for exceeding limits. <u>C&D:</u> \$15 min/passenger vehicle, \$160/ton-sm. Utility trailer, truck/van (\$30/min), \$300/ton-mixed loads, Use of scale for non-solid waste - \$10/use <u>Bulky items:</u> Mattress-\$15, crib-\$5, furniture-\$20, metal doors/windows\$5 <u>Waste Ban Items:</u> Freon units-\$15,Tires-\$2-12, Metal-\$5,Propane-\$5-10, CRT-\$5-30, mowers-\$5
Scituate (PAYT)	18,233	.32T	46%	<u>Annual Permit:</u> \$80/yr, 2 nd permit-\$25, Senior-\$55, PAYT - \$2/lg bag, \$1/sm bag <u>C&D:</u> \$120/ton <u>Bulky items:</u> Mattress-\$20, Furniture-\$10, \$2- 30/gal or \$120/ton <u>Waste Ban Items:</u> Freon unites-\$10, Tires-\$2-8, Propane-\$8-20, CRT-\$10 <u>Swap:</u> \$2 for 30 gal or \$120/ton to drop off a reusable item, free to pick up
Hingham	20,500	.34T	52%	No fees currently for residential users. Commercial users : C&D \$120/T or \$15 min.

If Hingham Employed the Flat Fee Model

Start-up Costs: No changes to Transfer Station operations. A system for collecting annual fees and fees for Waste Ban items would be needed.

Range of Fees for this Service: \$130-\$215 per year per household. **Note:** in towns with lower fees, the fees cover only part of the costs of the waste and recycling operations and/or the towns also use a Pay As You Throw (PAYT) program (see next model) to further cover costs.

Benefits:

- *Covers some of the Town's costs for waste disposal
- *Simple to administer
- *Can be used with PAYT (see description of that model below)
- *Raises awareness about the costs of waste disposal

Disadvantages:

- *Regressive fees – places same cost burden on all households regardless of number of residents and the amount of waste generated
- *Likely negative impact on recycling – residents feel they have paid a fee to dispose of waste, so may not be inclined to sort out recycling
- *A new financial burden for residents
- *Decreased recycling yields increased waste disposal costs
- *Not likely to cover all of town costs for waste disposal (to do so the fee would be unacceptably high)
- *Very few towns have this model without a PAYT system in place

Challenges to Implementation for Hingham: Relatively easy to implement. Need to develop a method of charging yearly fee per household.

Ability to Raise Revenue for Hingham: Medium-High: This model can raise some or all costs of operating the Transfer Station but fees would need to be high to do so. See note below on Financial impact of this model on Hingham.

Anticipated Impact on Recycling Rates: Negative: Compared to towns using other models, towns with the flat fee model see less motivation for recycling which increases waste disposal costs.

Pay As You Throw Model (PAYT)

Description: PAYT communities charge residents a disposal fee per unit of regular household waste (for example, \$2 for each 30 gallon trash bag, or \$1 for each 15 gallon trash bag). There is no fee for separated recyclables. There are fees for Waste Ban materials (see description of Waste Ban items above). Most PAYT communities with residential drop-off facilities use a system of PAYT bags and some also charge a yearly access or sticker fee per vehicle. Most communities have a two-tiered fee structure for residents with lower bag and sticker fees for seniors and low-income residents. A resident's costs rise or fall in direct relation to the amount of waste they dispose of and the amount of materials that they divert from the waste stream by recycling.

Peer Towns Using this Option (Towns w/ Residential Drop-Off and PAYT)								
Town	Population	Tons of MSW per person	2009 DEP Recycling Rate	User Fees				Comments
				1 st /2 nd Sticker	Lg/Sm bag	C & D	Waste Ban	
Cohasset	7,617	.30T	38%	\$50/\$50	\$1.50/0.75	\$120/ton	Varies, \$3-\$20	Senior Discounts
Duxbury	15,330	.28T	55%	\$25/\$25	\$1.50/! .00	\$200/ton	\$5 or \$10	1 free barrel c & d /day
Needham	31,097	.25T	67%	\$75/\$37.50	\$1.60/0.85	\$135/ton	Varies, \$2-\$20	Senior Discounts
Scituate	18,223	.32T	46%	\$80/\$25	\$2.00/1.00	\$120/ton	varies	-
Hingham	20,500	.34T	52%	\$0/\$25	N/ A	\$120/ton	No Charges	\$15 min C & D charge

If Hingham Employed the Pay As You Throw Model

Start-up Costs: Many steps involved in starting a PAYT program including arranging for bags and stores to sell bags, collecting bag revenues, and considerable education of residents about the program. No changes to Transfer Station staffing or lay-out would be needed. (Note: there is an option to contract with Waste Zero to start PAYT with no initial cost to the town – see Challenges section below)

Range of Fees for this Service: \$25-\$80/yearly access (sticker) fee, 1.50-\$2.00 per 30 gallon bag, 0.75-\$1.00 per 15 gallon bag, \$120-\$200 per ton for construction materials and bulky furniture, \$3-\$20 for other Waste Ban items (see description of Waste Ban items above).

Benefits:

*Would raise revenue through bag sales

*Shown to help raise recycling rates and reduce waste disposal costs

*Equitable way to charge for waste disposal (pay only for what you throw away)

*Residents can control their costs with choices (recycling, purchasing)

Disadvantages:

*Can lead to increased illegal dumping

*New financial burden for residents

*Residents can feel “nickel and dimed” by municipality

Challenges to Implementation: Typically there are multiple challenges to starting a PAYT program. However, Waste Zero (a company now working in MA) will do all the initial start-up work for a new PAYT program at no initial cost to the town. Their fee is paid from a portion of the bag sales revenue as it comes in. Possible initial increased roadside dumping may occur (it has in other towns) as residents attempt to avoid paying bag fees. Other towns have addressed this problem with video/police monitoring, additional pick-up of roadside trash by DPW, and fining of residents caught dumping illegally.

Ability to Raise Revenue for Hingham: Medium-High: medium if only PAYT is implemented (from bag sales) and high if a yearly access (sticker) fee is added.

Anticipated Impact on Recycling Rates: Positive: Recycling increases in towns using PAYT programs because there is a financial incentive to sort all recyclables (which are taken for free at the Transfer Station) from household waste that can only be disposed of in bags that cost \$1-2 each)

Permitted Access with Itemized Fees

Description: Residents receive one free access permit (sticker) per household and pay a fee for additional vehicle stickers. Specific fees are charged to cover some of the Transfer Station expenses for specialized vendors to take Waste Ban items for processing. Most commonly, fees are charged for construction & demolition waste, bulky waste and Waste Ban items (which, by law, are required to be removed from household waste and processed separately), such as appliances, TV's and CRTs, other electronics and tires.

Peer Towns Using this Option

Town	Population	Tons of MSW/person	2009 MA DEP recycling rate	Fees	Comments
Norwell	10,377	.37 T	28%	Waste Ban items with fees: CRT/TV, CFL bulbs, Propane tanks \$10 each.	C&D and yard waste not disposable through town curbside trash and recycling system
Hanover	14,000	.33 T	40%	Waste Ban items with fees: All C&D/bulky waste \$120/T CRT/TV \$10, White goods \$10, Microwaves \$10, Tires \$3	
Hingham	20,500	.34 T	52%	No fees currently for residential users Commercial users : C&D \$120/T or \$15 minimum	

If Hingham Employed the Permitted Access with Itemized Fees Model

Start-up Costs:

Developing a system for paying for items with fees (Online/Credit card/Check)

Range of Fees charged for this Service:

C & D charged by volume or weight- \$120-\$200 per ton

Large furniture: Fridge, sofa, rugs, mattress- \$10-20 per item

CRT's/TV's/Microwaves- \$10-15 each Propane tanks- \$10-\$20

Benefits:

- *Incremental addition of charges for waste disposal and recycling. No major overhaul
- *Starts educating residents that waste disposal in the post landfill era is costly
- *Charges only for those items that carry specific costs to dispose of or recycle
- *Some ability to raise revenues for Hingham depending on how many items or materials have fees associated with their disposal

Disadvantages:

- *Continues to hide total costs of waste disposal and recycling operations
- *Does nothing to increase recycling and likely to have only a small impact on consumer choices re: waste generation
- *Could lead to some off road dumping
- *Negative impact on recycling possible due to residents combining waste and recycling/waste ban items into household trash to avoid fees
- *New financial burden for residents

Challenges to Implementation for Hingham:

Developing a system of "tickets" to show that fees have been paid before materials are deposited at the Transfer Station. A fine system would need to be in place for those attempting to dispose of mandatory recyclables or Waste Ban items in the household trash area.

Education of residents re: how much waste disposal costs and the costs involved to process Waste Ban materials.

Ability to Raise Revenue for Hingham: Low to medium: Revenues will depend on how many items have specific fees charged for their disposal. See table 1 "Comparison of Financial Impact..." below.

Private Hauler Model

Description: Residents would be required to contract with a private hauling company to pick up their trash and recyclables. Typically trash pick-up is weekly and recyclables are collected every other week. Typically, bulky waste (furniture, rugs), appliances, TV's, computers, yard waste, and other Waste Ban items are not included in your service contract, and/or would have additional costs.

Towns Using a Variation of this Model: Hull

Private Hauling Service Companies that Service Hingham: Waste Management, Inc.; Dumpster Depot; Gilbert Trash & Recycling

Company	Fees	Comments
Waste Management, Inc.	\$41 per month; \$123 / qtr.; additional fuel and environmental fee of \$20-21 /qtr and recycling offset charge, which ranges from \$0.65 to \$1.95 / qtr.; \$2.50 per bag charge for each additional bag that does not fit in the 64-gallon MSW bin provided by WM.	Weekly pick-up for MSW and every other week pick-up for single stream recycling; Recycling is unlimited (i.e. if WM bin is full, customer may use any bin marked "recycling" (up to 32-gallons) to hold recyclable items).
Dumpster Depot	\$125 /qtr for weekly service; \$86 / qtr for every other week service. Recycling service costs \$46 per qtr and is picked up every other week.	Recycling is an additional charge (\$46/qtr).
Gilbert Trash and Recycling	\$10 per week, includes recycling (trash picked up once per week; recycling picked up every other week)	Recycling is dual stream (i.e. bottles, cans, glass in one bin; paper and cardboard in another bin).

If Hingham Employed the Private Hauler Model

Startup Costs: None for Town of Hingham

Range of Fees for this Service: \$344 - \$704 per year for trash and recycling by the 3 companies surveyed. Waste Ban items have additional fees.

Benefits:

- *Possible lower taxes, if Transfer Station taken out of DPW's operating budget.
- *Town is relieved of residential solid municipal waste and recycling management responsibilities.
- *Decreased residential and commercial traffic to and from current Transfer Station

Disadvantages:

- *Loss of service at the Transfer Station.
- *A new financial burden for residents: cost per household for trash and recycling will be more than current per household cost for Transfer Station.
- *Additional costs for yard waste and other Waste Ban items
- *Lower recycling rates (customers pay additional fees for recycling).
- *Possible increase in DPW costs due to illegal dumping and litter.
- *Increased truck traffic throughout Hingham.
- *Waste of current infrastructure at the Transfer Station.
- *No revenue from recycling commodities for the town of Hingham
- *Waste ban items might be mixed with solid waste and Hingham would lose the ability to enforce this ban.

Challenges to Implementation for Hingham: Some residents may be unhappy with the loss of local "self-service" and choice of days for trash and recycling and some residents may also be displeased by the visual, noise and traffic impacts of trash and recycling collection vehicles in neighborhoods.

Ability to Raise Revenue for Hingham: High: This model does not raise revenue but could remove full costs of Transfer Station from town budget.

Anticipated Impact on Recycling Rates: Negative: Compared to towns using other models, towns with curbside collection have lower recycling rates. Unless town changes its regulations for commercial waste disposal companies who operate in town, there is no way to insure that recycling is offered and that Waste Ban items are being removed from household waste.

Anticipated Impact on Recycling Rates: Neutral: A possible backlash from residents about having to pay new fees could lead to attempts to hide some items in with household trash. A fine system would need to be in place from the start.

— RESIDENT FEEDBACK —

The Committee was asked to research and gather input from residents about alternatives to our current system that would have potential to raise revenue or decrease costs for waste and recycling operations, should the town opt to do this to balance the town budget, in the future.

The Committee would like to sincerely thank the residents who responded to our online survey (190 responded) or attended our public meeting (9 attended) about potential alternative models for waste disposal and recycling for Hingham. We appreciate all the opinions that were offered about potential benefits, disadvantages, and challenges to implementation. These opinions have expanded the Committee's understanding of the potential impact of each alternative model on the residents of our town.

We summarized the input we received regarding each model by tallying the Benefits, Disadvantages and Challenges to Implementation that were noted most frequently. That data are provided in the table on the next page.

We also compiled the full list of comments that residents wrote to the Board of Selectmen and are presenting them to the BOS in this report. See Appendix B.

After considering the models, 97 individuals responded to the following survey question (online or by completing a questionnaire at the public meeting): "If Hingham needs to begin to charge some fees for waste disposal and recycling operations in order to balance the Town Budget for FY12, how would you rank the models? Please rank the five models in order of your support (#1 you most strongly support to #5 you support the least):"

Respondents gave their highest rank to the alternative models as noted below:

- Pay As You Throw: 38%
- Permitted Access with Itemized Fees: 30%
- Flat Fee: 19%
- Town Sponsored Curbside: 14%
- Private Hauler: 1%

The table below presents the complete ranking of support for the alternative models. (Total of 97 respondents. Survey period 10/25/10- 11/4/10)

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Strongest Support				Least Support
	1	2	3	4	5
Curbside Collection (contracted by the Town)	13	4	11	46	23
	14%	4%	11%	48%	23%
Flat fee	18	33	31	10	5
	19%	34%	32%	10%	5%
Pay As You Throw	36	19	23	9	10
	38%	20%	23%	9%	10%
Permitted Access with Itemized Fees	29	34	29	4	1
	30%	35%	30%	4%	1%
Private Hauler (contracted by the individual household)	1	7	3	28	58
	1%	7%	3%	29%	60%

Summary of Resident Input about the Alternative Models

Model	Most Frequently noted Benefits	Most Frequently noted Disadvantages	Most Frequently noted Challenges to Implementation
Curbside	a)Transportation convenience, reduced traffic b)Convenience for elderly	a)Negative visual impact b)Cost c)Loss of recycling d)Loss of SWAP shop.	a)Possible loss of Transfer Station
Flat Fee	a) Simple to administer b) Simple to understand c) Least change from current system d) Cheaper e) Keeps transfer station open	a) Belongs as tax;Fees can't be deducted b) Decreases recycling c) Regressive Fee/Unfair	a)Difficult/Expensive to Administer b)Arriving at Fair Fee c)Cost - resident resistance d) Easy to pay bill e)Enforcement
Pay As You Throw	a)Forces recycling b)Fair c)Reward people for reducing trash/increasing recycling	a)Illegal dumping b)Having to buy "special bags" c)Cost of bags d)Nickel & dimes to death e)Difficult to enforce using correct bags	a)Off-road dumping b)costs c)Policing/surveillance/locking school and restaurant dumpsters d)Administration
Permitted Access with Itemized Fees	a)Similar to what we have now b)Like that people only get charged for unusual things that they dispose of c)Reasonable/Fair system d)Would work	a) Does not provide incentive to recycle or reduce waste b) Does not raise much revenue c) Illegal dumping d) Ticket/charges would be an administrative nightmare	a) Enforcement – employees will need to monitor everything b) Model adds complexity and paperwork- might increase costs c) Education will be needed d) Fine system will have to be set up
Private Hauler	a)Good service b)Convenience c)Lower taxes (but responders believe tax dollars would go to another department) d)Town relieved of waste removal responsibility	a)Cost b)Visual impact c)Loss of local control for waste disposal and recycling d)Increased truck traffic e)Loss of yard waste disposal at transfer station	a)Enforcement of residents to hire waste disposal services (so as to minimize illegal dumping) b)Enforcement of bringing containers to curb and removing barrels in a timely manner c)High cost of private service d)Additional truck traffic throughout neighborhoods and main streets e)Adjustment to visual impact of trash and recycling containers

—CONCLUSIONS—

Based upon the research conducted and presented in the preceding pages, the Committee has developed a recommendation to address the specific request from the Board of Selectmen. The committee's charge was to identify and rank options for Hingham's waste management system that would raise revenues or otherwise reduce the costs to the town for its waste disposal and recycling operations. As described in the introductory section on Research Approach, a number of towns and models were considered. For each model, the potential benefits, costs and challenges to implementation were considered. In order to facilitate the ranking of the options, the Committee considered each model for its ability to:

- Maintain or increase recycling
- Have a positive fiscal impact
- Be implemented easily by Hingham

The alternative models are compared by these criteria below:

Model	Impact on Recycling	Revenue Potential	Ease of Implementation in Hingham
Curbside	Negative	Low: Would cost more than current waste system	Difficult
Flat Fee	Negative	Medium to High: Depending on level of fees charged	Easy
Pay As You Throw	Positive	Medium to High: Depending on whether access sticker fee also charged	Moderate: by using Waste Zero, a company which provides the start up help for PAYT programs at no initial costs to the town.
Permitted Access With Itemized Fees	Neutral	Low to Medium: Depending on number of materials that have fees for disposal	Relatively easy
Private Hauler	Negative	Low But could have significant cost avoidance benefit for town (removing all residential waste costs from town budget)	Easy for town, Difficult and costly for residents

In Committee discussions, the Curbside and Private Hauler models were ruled out because of their negative impact on recycling and prohibitively high costs, to the town in the Curbside model and to residents in the Private Hauler model. The Flat Fee model was ruled out because of its negative impact on recycling and the resulting increased disposal expense from added waste tonnage.

The Committee voted to rank the remaining models in the following order:

1. Permitted Access with Itemized Fees
2. Pay As You Throw

Although the Permitted Access with Itemized Fees model does not directly increase recycling, it does educate residents about the costs associated with modern day waste disposal. The Committee saw this model as an incremental change most appropriate to the current economic times, with residents being required to pay only small additional fees and only when they bring unusually large or difficult to dispose of items to the Transfer Station. For these reasons, this model was ranked first by the Committee.

The Pay As You Throw model was seen as likely to significantly reduce residential waste by its financial incentive to increase recycling. Also, his model educates residents about the costs of waste disposal and will likely impact their purchasing choices and thus total waste disposal costs. However, it is a more dramatic change, requiring considerable initial implementation work. Thus it was ranked second by the Committee.

Please note that town residents who completed the on-line survey regarding the above models also ranked PAYT (38%) and Permitted Access with Itemized Fees (30%) as their most supported options **should** the town need to change its waste management system in order to raise revenue.

To help the Board of Selectmen assess the two models, the Committee developed a rough estimate of the financial impact of implementing these two models in Hingham (see Appendices C and D). These estimates are based on the waste and recycling tonnage from the Transfer Station's 2009 statistics and the estimated costs and revenues associated with each model.

In conclusion, should the Selectmen wish to explore changing Hingham's current waste management system to increase revenues for the Town, the Committee recommends that a more thorough analysis be done to assess the financial impact and implementation requirements of the two options stated above, in the order in which they are ranked.

Respectfully submitted by the Long Range Waste Disposal Planning and Recycling Committee,
November 23, 2010:

Brenda Black
Cheryl Bierwirth
Andrea Dewire
Marianne MacDonald
Leon Merian
Peter Stathopoulos
Karen Thompson
David White

Appendix A : Enterprise Fund for Solid Waste and Recycling Operations

Description: Waste disposal and recycling operations are removed from the Town Budget (over time) and become self-supporting through user charges. This model allows for complete transparency to residents of the actual costs of solid waste disposal and recycling operations. Most municipal waste and recycling enterprise funds use PAYT systems to generate some of the revenue to support the operations and to help reduce waste disposal costs as residents alter their waste generation behaviors.

Peer Towns using this option						
MSW- Municipal Solid Waste H- Household TF-Tipping Fee						
Town	Population	Enterprise	Tons of MSW/person	2009 DEP Recycling rate	Fees	Comments
Marshfield	25,000	Y	.33 T	46%	\$265/H/yr, includes one 39 gal. barrel/week. Add'l. bags \$2 each	Curbside & PAYT TF = \$66/T Charges for Waste Ban items
Scituate	18,233	Y	.18 T	46%	\$80/yr 1 st car, \$25 add. car PAYT bags \$2 for 30 gal \$1 for 15 gal	Drop off and PAYT TF = \$71.50/T Charges for Waste Ban items (C&D, bulky, CRT/TV, Freon, Pay to leave items in Swap area
Concord	17,000	Y	.23 T	47%	\$184/H/yr plus \$78 for one 39 gal. barrel/wk or bags \$1.50 each	Curbside and PAYT - Mature program TF = \$82/T Charges for Waste Ban items Charges for twice annual swap More urban, less yard waste DEP rate w/o YW 56%
Hingham	20,500	N	.34 T	52%	No fees currently for residential users Commercial users : C&D \$120/T or \$15 minimum	TF = \$104/T (currently) TF = \$80/T in 2011 DEP recycling rate w/o yard waste: 29%

If Hingham Employed an Enterprise Fund Model

Startup Costs:

Legal expenses of creating the enterprise fund. Initially it will require Town Budget support. It is unlikely to succeed at eventually being self-supporting without a PAYT system.

Going Rates for Service:

\$180-\$275 per year user fee (for the higher user fees, this includes 1 "free" bag/barrel/wk)
 Additional bags \$1.50-\$2
 Charges for some Waste Ban items

Benefits:

- *Total transparency regarding exact costs of waste and recycling operations
- *Responsive system, user charges can be adjusted quickly as market rates change and MSW tons go down or up
- *Enterprise funds usually use PAYT systems to reduce waste and raise revenues through bag/barrel charges

Disadvantages:

- *Will take a few years to get fully established and self-supporting
- *Hingham's user fees likely higher than most local towns due to our TF and to needing to begin building a positive balance to cover regular capital upgrades will require significant user fees and/or significant support from Town Budget for some years.
- *Requires some additional accounting and auditing costs to operate an Enter. Fund.
- * Will not cover the costs of capping 2nd half of old landfill in time for that bill

Challenges to Implementation for Hingham: Starting PAYT will be new and challenging for Hingham. Charges for some Waste Ban items also new. No new staff likely needed and no physical changes to Transfer Station.

Ability to raise revenues for Hingham: Low: Will not raise revenues for the General Town Budget, but will reduce expenses for the budget significantly once established as all costs for Waste Disposal and Recycling will covered by the Enterprise Fund.

Anticipated Impact on Recycling Rates: Positive: Likely significant increase in recycling and reduction in household waste for disposal (and thus reduced costs for waste disposal).

Appendix B: Resident Comments to Board of Selectmen (from Talking Trash Survey 10-25/10-11/4/10)

Why charge for a second sticker when many active families must use several cars for tasks. Use of dump is not increased, so other than a small actual cost for the sticker itself, there is no basis for this fee, other than to prevent fraud, which should be dealt with directly.

Yes, the environment. Recycling saves the town money...but it's not the #1 priority in recycling. We must make people take responsibility for what they throw away (and thus, what they buy).

You guys are frustrating. Its simple in my eyes - permitted access with itemized fees. The folks that go once a week to dispose of 1-2 bags of household trash should not pay for those that drop off bulky waste, and the like. Let them be charged for it. Revenue increases for the town = increased tax on constituents. Its enough. Close the transfer station on Thursday and Friday. Reduce hours on sat and sun. Layoff a worker or two. In the private sector we have done that to preserve the business in the absence of revenues. So do the same - its not a welfare town. Why make this so much more complicated than it needs to be. Frankly, people will find it easier to take trash to weymouth and leave on the sidewalks their trash day, or to take it to their office dumpster than pay for curbside, the flat fee where i am subsidizing those that dump a ton of trash, the pay as i throw model, and the private hauler.

Leave it like it is!

I'm pleased with the present system- just look around to other Mass. towns-- Almost all have varying degrees of disposal-

The dump is one of the few things that lets those who don't have children feel they get something for their taxes. One way or another it looks like what seemed "free" now costs - smeels like a way to circumvent prop 2.5 ?

I would hire a private hauler before participating in a pay-as-you-throw system. The town would have to staff and enforce the system, plus deal with all the cleanup. I live on a main road and guarantee I will have to call DPW weekly to complain of dumping!!

Leave current transfer system alone. Much money has been spent already to the present system. Fees are just another form of taxation. If funds needed then add to the tax bill. I am in a community that has its own trash collection, however, there are times when I use the transfer station. Monitoring for residents from abutting towns from using Hingham's facility. This is still going on since no one at the transfer station is looking for the stickered vehicles.

I do not believe that any of these models are good. I would like to know how much it cost the town now for each household. How much are we talking here and have we considered other ways to balance the budget. The tax rate in Hingham is high enough and I do not believe that we need more fees. What's next? Consider cutting the school budget or closing the library one day per week. Do you think that most people would vote for that? I say no leave thing as they are because I don't see much advantage in any model

I think the residents of Hingham understand the costs of running the landfill. Most people will pay an increased amount of money based upon family size to keep the current policy. As a resident of Hingham since 1952 I like the way the landfill is run. I allows me to ensure my waste is properly recycled.

The current system can serve us well with a little fine tuning. We should consider a senior discount or a 6 month sticker for seniors who are gone for a season. We should not have trash haulers going through the streets. They are noisy and ugly and oftentimes spill trash onto the street. The streets will not be aesthetically pleasing if there are trash bags all over the place, some opened by animals. It is fair that people who throw away big items or building materials should pay for the privilege. We should also make sure that the trash is from Hingham. I know of people who move from here and still get a sticker to dump trash. Also, builders who have permits should have to say where the materials are coming from. They could be hauling from a neighboring town.

Can't we come up with some system for rewarding people who recycle? Administration of this might be tough, but I am sure someone, somewhere has come up with something that works. Also, trying to get people to "care" about the transfer station and what they do is seriously hampered by the attitude and work ethic of the people who work there. If people seem like they care about what they are doing, and are nice to people using the service, it goes a long way to making towns people more invested in why this is even an important issue. I think that you should start with the employees of the transfer station. The act as if they are as oblivious to people as the employees of the DMV...and we all know what charmers DMV employees can be. Just some thoughts. Thanks for doing this!

How about a positive reinforcement exercise: a contest with reward to household generating least amount of non-recyclable trash in a certain time period.

I know all you want to do is look for revenue sources, but lets look at not plowing snow as well as we do before making us pay more at the landfill. We do TOO good a job plowing snow. Cut it in half..plow the main streets and leave the side streets till there is more snow on them to reduce the hours worked. I'd like you to repeal the second vehicle fee. That is onerous. Get on people hard who don't recycle. I see it almost every week with cardboard and bottles etc in the trash. Get on them.

I think that trash disposal is a BASIC town service that should be funded by taxes. I do think some revenue could be raised by fining those who fail to recycle significant amounts of stuff at the dump. FInally, thanks to those of you who are volunteering your time to serve on this Committee to make things better for all of us.

PAYT needs to have a proper cost per bag. My son in Vermont pays \$5.00 per large bag and recycling is much improved. I strongly favor this model. Thanks for all the hard work.

I took the survey a few minutes ago and just realized that you have no way to monitor who takes the survey. So non-residents and waste haulers could take it if they wanted to.

Stop implementing hidden taxes on the residents and get spending on all Town Departments (including the Schools) under control. The Landfill's budget has not increased to the extent some departments have and it is a well run operation. Recycling is at about 60% and growing. Stop trying to screw up a good thing.

thanks very much for your considerable and thoughtful efforts on this problem

The transfer station could be open only two days each week. Saturday, as the most popular day, and Thursday for those who work weekends or for whom Saturday is the Sabbath. Charging for each car's transfer station pass would be easily accepted. Those with serious economic hardship could be exempted. Perhaps increase the cost of dumping trash at the transfer station (raising sticker cost) and offer a small redemption on recyclables brought by the bag. Even though it doesn't make economic sense to be given 10 cents (or other nominal amount) per bag of recyclables, especially in a financially-comfortable town like Hingham, people still go for it. We are a town of frugal millionaires.

Presentation was not complete. You did not provide financial information such as total costs, revenue from the new scale, revenue from recyclables, fees collected, etc. You forgot or purposefully left out existing process - which is basically flat fee of \$0. Town Deficit is not solely attributable to waste disposal. Recommend Selectmen consider leaving Transfer Station as-is and explore other avenues of balancing the budget.

IT IS WORKING FINE AS IS! LEAVE THE SYSTEM ALONE!

Each house should get a breakdown of the entire costs associated with the transfer station. Why don't they have a covered swap area for people to use for a couple of days. Is there any report on how often the swap area is used? versus closed?

as I said above, people will complain whatever you do - might as well just go for what makes sense - charge people for how much they throw out, encouraging less waste, recycling, etc. It's a fair and, likely, a progressive tax. Fabulous idea.

I do not support any of these models as they all involve modest to substantial additional financial burdens on tax-payers who are already over-burdened. Most of the models are regressive as well, and would inevitably be complicated by special waivers for favored groups. Given our relatively good recycling rate in town, even the PAYT model might not have a significant environmental benefit. In general, I think that increasing our reliance on fees for various public services creates a slippery slope that could tend to pit one interest group against another in town. The Town's financial situation would be better served by encouraging responsible growth that leads to higher tax revenues, and continuing to look carefully at all of our costs to keep them under control. Seeking new revenues from existing sources to pay for existing services may be an easier way out, but it does not address the fundamental challenge of managing our expenses better.

Yes, I would like the Selectmen to present a case for higher waste disposal fees relative to other line items in the town budget. In addition, I would like to see how our waste disposal costs compare to neighboring towns and how commercial usage impacts the overall cost estimates. This exercise is presumptuous; the case for higher fees needs to be made before asking residents to choose which fee increase model they prefer. A one paragraph case can be made: Hingham spends \$x/resident on waste disposal fees. Relative to neighboring towns, we are x% higher/lower with our spending. Commercial activity increases waste disposal fees by \$x/resident but property taxes are reduced by \$x/resident due to higher commercial tax rates. In the end, if we (Hingham) are outspending our neighbors for waste disposal, we should adjust our model. If we aren't, we need to look to other areas of the budget for cuts.

In the past I have known many non-residents who have used the Hingham dump well past when they lived here with old stickers. It does not appear that the DPM monitors the stickers. Perhaps that would be a good place to start. Many people from Cohasset and Hull are getting a free ride.

I think Duxbury has a pay as you throw and a sticker system. I think you should pay something to use the dump even if it's a small fee. The PAYT systems forces people to recycle who are not currently participating, which is good.

The key is education re recycling. All these proposals are deeply flawed if you care about roadside trash, the beauty of the community and adding burdens to tax payers. I ONLY RANKED THE ABOVE BECAUSE YOU WILL NOT ACCEPT THE SURVEY IF I DO. I FIND ALL BUT FLAT FEE OFFENSIVE AND I DON'T PARTICULARLY LIKE FLAT FEE EITHER.

As a residential contractor I am not allowed to dump *recyclable* materials at the transfer station without paying a fee. My business produces an overwhelming amount of recyclable materials (steel, copper, aluminum, cardboard and plastics) that would provide revenue for the town but since I am charged I throw it into the jobsite dumpster. There is an opportunity for the town to increase revenue and contractors to reduce landfill waste.

I appreciate the town and the committee reaching out to the residents. It is obvious that the committee members spent a lot of work investigating different solutions. Is it possible for the committee to include a cost benefit analysis along with more factual pros and cons? The waste management industry has made many advances. These companies have helped transfer heavy manufacturers like Subaru into zero waste contributors. They work with municipalities to better manage their waste management systems with goals of impacting efficiency, costs, and waste. They also work with municipalities to convert waste to energy visit: <http://www.wte.org/about>. I do some work with waste management companies helping them obtain local, state, and federal permits. I know that there is a model that helps our town produce significant revenue, reduce environmental impacts, and improves our service choices.

Thank you for doing this survey!

NOt sure I have enough information to really give the preference, 1-5.

thanks for the opportunity to input.

I believe the Transfer Station is a great advantage to Hingham in terms of recycling and disposing of yard waste, and we should not let it go unused. I like the flexibility of the number of days it's open but perhaps for a cost savings, we could lessen the number of days a little.

if the staff at the Transfer Station actually enforced the recycling laws, we'd be much better off. i've been told by more than one employee that they have been instructed to not enforce recycling laws due to multiple complaints by residents to Town Hall. this seems ludicrous. i would not want them to open each bag, but hardly a trip to the Transfer Station occurs when i see residents trhowing away recyclable material. before we change the system, why don't we enforce the laws that we have and see if this has a positive affect on the situation?

Thanks for your hard work in putting this together. It is quite thorough!

As mentioned, the case has not been made for the need to increase revenue. Clearly, waste disposal is a challenge everywhere, but are we now charging for anticipated new costs, for current costs, or to raise town revenue which is what the preamble infers. Until the case is made, and options of cost reduction are examined, it remains a little confusing as to exactly what is being addressed. Is the issue to look at new options in garbage disposal in the post-landfill era, or to raise fees on gargage to increase revenue? Can recycling/enforcement be stepped up? Lots of cardboard and plastic are dumped? Can garbage be reduced through better household and Depot sorting? Is the Depot era also over? Are there new transport/disposal costs to be considered? So my suggestion is to give us more information on the background to the issue, current costs and anticipated changes, cost coverage from taxes, alternative cost reducing options, the opt

Any solution involving curbside pickup (either town or private) would be an eyesore an create unnnecessary saftey/traffic issues. I'd much rather pay a modest fee than see our town look horrible on "trash day."

This is not a way to control cost.

please give it lots of thought and consideration. Once/if we choose to be rid of the TS, and its employees, then we are stuck with that solution. I really love "the dump" and how beautifully it is set up. It has lots of potential. If we have to pay more, then so be it, but the staff there needs to be more visible, and helpful. Hingham has always been unique in its ways to solve problems and to get things done. Just because Norwell, Scituate or Cohasset do it, does not mean it is right for Hingham.

WHAT ARE WE PAYING TAXES FOR?

while we had to rank the 5 choices in order, I just want to clarify that I do not like curbside collection or private hauler at all because I really do not believe that in the end my taxes will be permanently decreased; and pay as you throw is a system that will be too costly for residents, create resentment and treats the user in a juvenile manner, or nickel and diming like the model says. Sticking with permits, or a flat fee I see as the best choice. In my opinion, if we are truly looking to find relief for taxpayers then we need to bring new revenues into town, look for and eliminate waste across the board, etc.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I think the town needs to join the rest of the country in providing free curbside pick up of recycling products and trash. It should be paid for out of taxes - which should be raised if necessary. I for one always vote for an increase in taxes because I appreciate government services - like trash pick-up. It is also incredibly irresponsible for the town to continue running a waste disposal system that not only does not incentivize recycling but actually provides a disincentive. Separating items into 50 different bins - I mean this is what people did 50 years ago - I know the technology has evolved since then!!! thank you for listening.

I am glad they are considering input from residents.

waste management in hingham has puzzled me since moving here in the last decade. it is alien to me. i pay weirdly high taxes - mostly to benefit the spawn of others - yet BASIC municipal services such as water, sewer, and trash are someplace between limited and non-existent. amazing. the last time i had to put sacks of smelly goo in the boot of my automobile and drive them to the dump (pardon, transfer station) was when i lived in rural vermont several miles outside a town of 2000. given what i pay in property taxes and how very little value i get therefrom" i would expect a liveried civil servant to ring the bell at my home and inquire whether i had any discardables that day. alas, in hingham, not having to drive one's own trash-truck to the dump (sorry, transfer station) is perceived as a NEGATIVE! do fellow residents not work, or have families, or want to do things with their time other than haul rubbish in the family car? geez!

I like the pay as you throw model best with a supplementary fee for disposing things like computers and metal goods. I'd like to think that the educated and caring residents of the town would not dump trash in remote locations just to save on PAYT fees. I like the fact that PAYT increases recycling. Our town recycling rate is high but can and should go higher. Keep those good articles in the newspaper coming, blast the townspeople with info. Set up an info station at the Library, put this announcement out to school newsletters, senior center email lists, church bulletins, etc.

What about curbside collection by a private hauler? The town could negotiate and select say two haulers (competition) then provide citizens the ability to pick which of the two preferred haulers they want to use. Citizens could still have the ability to a private hauler not selected by the town as preferred. Hopefully the town could obtain very competitive rate from the preferred haulers - volume. Contracts should be as short as possible so competition is always introduced into the process.

It appears that the town is trying to balance future budgets by diverting expenses to each property owner. Rather than creating one more expense, one more bill, why not just ask for an increase in the property taxes that we currently pay. The current models will not get the same amount of discussion, debate or visibility vs. putting it in the tax bill.

How does the discussion relative to these additional costs mesh with the property taxes that we now pay? No matter the method we adopt, we must increase the professionalism of the landfill and DPW operations. There is little attention paid to the recycling adherence. Black plastic bags hide construction waste and cardboard is regularly thrown into the trash compactors.

Wait for the reorganization committee report for input on this issue. Already paying taxes for labor and equipment. Adding taxes to residents at this time does not seem prudent. Create a Hybrid model from all of your current options. Cut cost in town government -waste, fraud and abuse. Get more efficiency from current operations. Good Luck !!

Would there still be an area available for disposal of yard waste such as grass clippings, brush, logs, leaves and rubble? I've lived in other towns that had curbside pickup and never liked seeing trash blowing around in the wind or seeing barrels all over the road. When I moved to Hingham, not seeing this was something that really struck me. I think the current waste disposal system is something that a lot of people may not appreciate until it's gone. I understand that the current model may not be sustainable much longer but I would strongly encourage the town to hold onto it as long as possible.

Would prefer transfer station remain open for those who like to do it yourself, stronger enforcement of recycling, keep the swap area open - it is an effective way of recycling usable items.

Didn't see any options of reducing headcount and restricting hours the Transfer Station is open. I also didn't see any mention of ticketing those who continue to throw recyclable material in the trash. It would be an easy revenue source. Fact is that handling waste is a Town function and may operate at a net loss. That's the nature of a Town service. Running the Town is not running a business. Save the money by shrinking the Fire Dept and privatizing the ambulance service. Eliminate traffic details. Eliminate overtime for Police and Fire. Reduce the SPED budget by being more judicious with IEP's that require aides for behavior related to permissive parenting. There are plenty of ways to save money in the overall budget without making citizens pay twice for handling trash.

This WEBFORM DOES NOT ACCURATELY COLLECT PUBLIC OPINION. I cannot accurately rank the 5 models in order of my support (#1 you most strongly support to #5 you support the least). I want to select '5' "strongly do not support none of the above" models. You will receive inaccurate data for this survey.

I would like to say that I think the swap area is terribly underutilized. Many, many times I have driven to the dump with items for the swap area, only to find it closed. I understand that it is closed if rain is expected, or it is the end of the day, but I have found it closed at 11:00 in the morning on a beautiful sunny day. I am talking about perfectly good pieces of furniture and large baby items (like a swing). I do not have time to drive these items back and forth to the dump, so I just threw them in the compactor when I realized I could not leave it at the swap area. I also think the swap area is difficult to access. I realize that the task of managing the town's waste is very complicated, and I do not mean to suggest that improving the hours and the accessibility of the swap area will solve the problems you are faced with, but I think it really could cut down on the amount of trash being disposed of. Thank you for all of your work on this.

"adding new fees, for services that were formerly(CORRECTION:CURRENTLY) paid entirely through tax revenue..need to increase revenue to balance the town budget?(WHY!)" We are in a recession! PLEASE KEEP THE STATUS QUO, AND LET THE "SCHOOLIES" INITIATE THEIR OWN SCHOOL BUDGET OPERATIONAL OVERRIDE! This is a shameful Selectmen Burns & school advocacy initiative to raise revenue for a bloated school budget, and avoid their share of town cuts. The transfer station continues to be fully funded by the taxpayers, and there are NO operational nor fiscal issues. PLEASE leave our valued transfer station operation and the desired funding of such alone! I find it QUITE DISTURBING that the survey DID NOT allow for a sixth option (likely the most desired of the community) of keeping the status quo - VERY TELLING. Recommend after the survey and comment period, that the top two options AND another of keeping the status quo of continued funding via our taxes be included in an updated survey.

The outcome of the recent elections will without a doubt result in hire taxes for everyone in the state. State and Municipal governments have to start cutting expenses/costs (we know there is plenty of waste and fat that needs to be cut from the town budget). Citizens of this town and state have had enough of the additional fees because governments cannot live within their budgets. It is very clear and shameful that the selectmen, especially Ms. Burns are placating to the special interests and needs of an over bloated school system. Enough is enough! It is time for this town's electorate to be educated and made aware of the deceitful and mismanaged financial responsibilities of our elected officials. IF THE REVOLUTION FOR CHANGE IS TO START, LET IT START HERE, LET IT START NOW!

"adding new fees, for services that were formerly(CORRECTION:CURRENTLY) paid entirely through tax revenue..need to increase revenue to balance the town budget?(WHY!)" We are in a recession! PLEASE KEEP THE STATUS QUO, AND LET THE "SCHOOLIES" INITIATE THEIR OWN SCHOOL BUDGET OPERATIONAL OVERRIDE! This is a shameful Selectmen Burns & school advocacy initiative to raise revenue for a bloated school budget, and avoid their share of town cuts. The transfer station continues to be fully funded by the taxpayers, and there are NO operational nor fiscal issues. PLEASE leave our valued transfer station operation and the desired funding of such alone! I find it QUITE DISTURBING that the survey DID NOT allow for a sixth option (likely the most desired of the community) of keeping the status quo - VERY TELLING. Recommend after the survey and comment period, that the top two options AND another of keeping the status quo of continued funding via our taxes be included in an updated survey.

The outcome of the recent elections will without a doubt result in hire taxes for everyone in the state. State and Municipal governments have to start cutting expenses/costs (we know there is plenty of waste and fat that needs to be cut from the town budget). Citizens of this town and state have had enough of the additional fees because governments cannot live within their budgets. It is very clear and shameful that the selectmen, especially Ms. Burns are placating to the special interests and needs of an over bloated school system. Enough is enough! It is time for this town's electorate to be educated and made aware of the deceitful and mismanaged financial responsibilities of our elected officials. IF THE REVOLUTION FOR CHANGE IS TO START, LET IT START HERE, LET IT START NOW!"

The Transfer Station seems to be working very well as it is. Many residents love their outings to the "dump" and look forward to seeing friends and acquaintances. Somehow though the swap area needs to be more strictly enforced. Too many people hang out there for too long on a regular basis.

System should remain as is. Any sort of effort to increase revenue by imposing fees for use of the transfer station or other means of trash disposal essentially is an additional tax. The only justification for charging taxpayers more (regardless of the system used) would be if there was a 100% offset in expenses charged through real estate taxes. I am strongly opposed to any fees that are not offset with expense reductions. Leave the current system as it is. Shift your focus to having the schools create a sustainable budget.

We need better management. Management now doesn't care.

Curbside pick-up from either Town or Private Hauler is not, and should not be a viable option. Eventually this will distract from the beauty of the town and can will pose street hazzards.

I have a lot of yard waste - (leaves- not even mine-) What would I do with the waste - I take about 75-100 bags to the Transfer Station.

I think the tax payer pays enough taxes. The Government needs to curb its spending and wasteful ways. The whole town needs an audit. Time and Motion audit - every department needs an audit.

Appendix C. Financial Impact if Hingham were to employ Permitted Access with Itemized Fees model

Hingham Transfer Station (2009 Data)	Permitted Access with Itemized Fees (Specific Fees Residents Would Pay)	Estimated Revenues (based on 2009 data)
No Residential Sticker fee charges (new charge for 2 nd sticker per household started in June 2010)	Charges for 2nd Stickers: \$25.00 Charges for commercial users: \$50.00 (based on 431 stickers sold in June-Oct. 2010)	\$26,000 /year
Tons Construction & Demo/ Bulky: 813.3 Tons Cost: \$65,500 Charges to Residents: 0	Charges for all C&D and Bulky waste at the rate of \$120/Ton or minimum charge of \$15 for 250 lbs	\$ 97,500 / year
Loads of CRT/TV's: 100 TV's or 75 CRT's = 25 loads/yr Cost: \$600-650 each load = \$16,000/yr Charges to Residents: 0	Charges for each CRT/TV \$10 per item	\$22,000 /year (13 loads TV= \$13,000) (12 loads CRT= \$9,000)
Loads of Microwaves, Refrigerators, Air Conditioners and other White goods 1000 White goods = 21 loads/yr Cost: \$6,300 Charges to Residents: 0	Charges for all Microwaves, Refrigerators, A/C units and other White goods. \$10 per item	\$ 10,000 /year
Tires disposed of: 2000 tires/yr = 1 large & 2 small trailers (17T) Cost: \$3000 Charges to residents: 0	Charges for Tires \$3 per tire	\$6,000 /year.
Total Costs for these Operations: \$90,800 Total Revenue (Current System): \$0		Total Revenue for these Operations with Permitted Access and Itemized Fees: Approx. \$161,000/yr **

**As with the other model, for FY 12 there will be additional savings due to new tipping fee of \$80/T for all MSW disposed. As this model does not impact total tonnage of MSW disposed, additional savings will be approx. \$133,500/yr (6673 tons @\$20 savings/ton).

Appendix D: Financial impact if Hingham were to employ a PAYT (Pay As You Throw) model

If Hingham were to go with a PAYT program, we would recommend considering Waste Zero or similar company, a company that helps towns get PAYT programs going and has a program that does not require any initial expenditure on the town's part to start the program.

Waste Zero's Trash Metering Program provides the services listed below. Their payment is taken as a percentage of the revenues from PAYT bag sales.

Waste Zero will:

- Produce the bags with whatever design the town chooses
- Locate local stores to sell the bags and contract with them
- Deliver bags to the stores and collect revenues
- Provide monthly accounting to the town and quarterly payments
- Guarantee a revenue stream detailed in the bag revenue contract with town
- Support start up with media announcements, public forums, initial legwork

Janine Delaney (formerly with MA DEP's PAYT program) now works for Waste Zero and was asked to provide a preliminary estimate of the revenues from bag sales and predicted savings in waste disposal costs (her calculations are based on Hingham's Transfer Station statistics for 2009, current town demographics and their experience in local towns).

Projected Revenues approx. \$603,800

from bag sales (30 gal bags- \$2, 15 gal bags- \$1.25, 8 gal bags - \$1) :

Note: With the Trash metering program, Waste Zero guarantees \$441,600 in bag sales revenue)

Savings in waste disposal costs approx. \$229,500

(2869 tons diverted @ \$80/T new tipping fee)

Projected PAYT Savings and Bag Revenue approx. \$833,300 **

No changes to the Transfer Station layout or to Transfer Station staffing would be needed to employ a PAYT system.

Note: Hingham would have the option of

- 1) adding the PAYT program to current Transfer Station operations and generating the above savings and revenues **OR**
- 2) adding a user/sticker fee for all households and also implementing PAYT thereby generating enough revenue to cover the full cost of Transfer Station operations (annual user fee would likely be approx. \$60-65 per household).

**As with the other model, there will be additional savings in FY 12 due to new tipping fee for disposing of municipal solid waste (approx. 3,804 T disposed @ \$20/T, additional savings approx. \$76,000).