

To: Mayor Joseph H. Sauer, City of Danbury, Connecticut.

Re: Minutes of the Special Common Council Meeting held December 14, 1988.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 P.M. by Mayor Joseph H. Sauer who led the assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance. Council Member Stephen Flanagan offered the prayer. Roll Call was taken with the members being recorded as follows:

PRESENT - Connell, Gallo, Moran, Renz, Flanagan, Zotos, Cresci, Fazio, Shaw, Cassano, Charles, Bundy, Danise, Eriquez, Regan. Mrs. Butera and Mr. DaSilva arrived at 8:15 P.M. Mrs. Bourne arrived at 8:25 P.M.

ABSENT - Esposito, Godfrey.

19 present - 2 absent

NOTICE OF THE SPECIAL MEETING - To be held on the 13th day of December, 1988 at 8:00 P.M. in the Common Council Chambers in City Hall, for the purpose of acting upon the following:

1. REPORT - Update on City's Garbage Disposal Position.
2. COMMUNICATION - Resignation of Council President James Nimmons.

Mayor Sauer announced that he was withdrawing item 2 as Mr. Nimmons had withdrawn his resignation.

This meeting was adjourned on December 13, 1988 until December 14, 1988 due to inclement weather.

Mr. Charles made a motion to accept the call. Seconded by Mr. Flanagan. Mr. Renz questioned the validity of the call and asked for clarification that this in fact was a Special Common Council Meeting, and not either a public hearing or a committee of the whole meeting. Mayor Sauer clarified that it was a Special Common Council Meeting.

1. REPORT - Update on City's Garbage Disposal Position.

Before submitting the following report, Mr. Bundy asked permission to read the following statement:

"I would like to say a few words about the committee and the task assigned to its members. Each and every member of the committee was well aware at the outset, that the responsibility of examining all feasible alternatives to the problem of disposing of our community's and quite possibly the regions municipal solid waste was a critical assignment. All of us took the time and put forth the effort necessary so as to bring to this Council a responsible, well thought out, reasoned and viable solution to accomplish the objective.

For the past three months we have educated ourselves and listened to various alternative methods of trash disposal. We have examined the pros and cons of each system. I, as the Chairman, have presented each of you progress reports on a timely basis over the past three months so as to keep you informed on our progress. All meetings were posted and open to the public. There were no private meetings held by this committee. Objectivity was crucial and each member of the committee was pledged to keep an open mind. There were no pre-conceived or pre-determined agendas.

This committee also accepted and received reports from the Federal Government, the State Government and the Technical Advisory Team appointed by Mayor Sauer. This input was digested by the committee and was an integral part of our decision making process. No input or information was ever rejected out of hand. All information was used and reviewed. This integrity of this committee is above reproach and we feel that what we present to you represents the results of much hard work and dedication to this community."

Mr. Bundy then submitted the following report:

The Common Council Committee appointed to update the City's garbage disposal position met on Thursday, December 8, 1988 at 7:30 P.M. in the Fourth Floor Lobby in City Hall. In attendance were committee members Bundy, Regan, Godfrey and Flanagan. Also attending were Council Members Moran, Connell, DaSilva and Charles, ex-officio.

The objective of this committee was to research current and available technologies capable of disposing of our City's and/or region's trash working within the parameters of the mandate set by the State of Connecticut that 25% of our trash must be recycled by the year 1991. The committee considered all the proposals and accompanying technologies with the following criteria in mind: track record; feasibility (will it work); commitment; short and long term results; location; cost factors; benefits to the City; risks to the City; environmental impact; safety.

The following companies and their technology were invited to make a presentation to the committee and did so. A synopsis and overview of each presentation was prepared by the Chairman and given to each member of the Common Council in the form of a progress report over the past two months.

1. Reuter Resource Recovery, Inc. - Resource Derived Fuel (RDF) pellets.
2. Newest Technologies - Wet Trash Shredding.
3. Ogden Martin Systems, Inc. - Mass Burn/Incineration.
4. Environmental Recovery System - Recycling/Composting.
5. Phoenix Environmental Technologies, Inc. - Resource Derived Fuel (RDF) Pellets.

This report will not go into any great depth regarding these companies and their respective proposals as this has already been done, but will instead focus on the two most viable alternatives. A review of how each of these alternatives measures up to the established criteria and which presents us with the most environmentally sound, cost effective and safe system that will satisfy the needs of Danbury and if so desired, the needs of the entire region.

It should also be noted that the committee reviewed a report published by the Municipal Solid Waste Task Force, Office of Solid Waste, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington D. C., issued in September, 1988. The committee also thoroughly reviewed the report submitted to Mayor Sauer by the Technical Advisory Team dated December 5, 1988.

The committee determined that the two most viable and realistic alternatives were Mass Burn and Composting. Mass Burn because of its widespread use and track record as a solution and Composting because of its promise, feasibility and potential.

Discussion concerning mass burn was covered quite well in the report submitted by the Technical Advisory Team. Mass Burn technology is the most visible in that it is what is operating now and suffices as a short term solution. However, it is not an answer for the long term. The Federal Government, specifically, the Environmental Protection Agency has declared that recycling including composting must be considered as the technology of the future. Since the beginning of 1987 almost \$80,000,000,000 worth of proposed mass burn projects have been cancelled. Regarding feasibility, it is quite evident that construction of mass burn facilities is well documented. However, the need for refitting and alterations present a constant maintenance problem. The location of an incinerator has always been a problem and in Danbury's case is no different.

In the case scenario painted by the Housatonic Resource Recovery Authority (HRRRA) a proposed mass burn facility would be located on White Turkey Road. Reports submitted by two separate consulting firms, R. W. Beck for HRRRA and Camp, Dresser and McKee for Danbury, designated Danbury's White Turkey Road site as number one and tied for number one respectively. The environmental impact of smoke and ash are to say the least not good. The risks are great and should be avoided if possible. Mass burn facilities are constantly refitting and altering their systems to cope with dangerous smoke produced by these facilities 24 hours a day. The ash produced by a proposed incinerator for our region would amount to 150 tons per day which would have to be trucked to a specially lined land fill somewhere in the region. The ash is a toxic substance and demands special consideration. As regards cost, a mass burn facility approved today may, after all appeals are exhausted and construction completed, be operational by 1994 (5 years). Our own Technical Advisory Team tells us that Danbury's landfill has no more than 3-4 years of life left in it. An incinerator just contracted for in Preston, Connecticut was bonded at a cost of \$198,000,000. Five years from now this cost could easily escalate to \$400 - \$500 million. The tipping fee at the Bristol, Connecticut facility began at \$37.50 per ton and have escalated regularly. Five years from now the tipping fee required may be well over \$150 per ton to absorb the enormous cost of construction. To reiterate, it is simply not prudent for a facility to be considered safe when it emits smoke fumes and toxic ash. Benefits to our community are minimal. The proposal calls for a host community benefit of 25 cents per ton for trash accepted but not produced by Danbury.

Discussion concerning a composting operation began with the feasibility question. The committee examined the proposal thoroughly and came to the following conclusions:

Composting can indeed work. This system will accept all of a community's municipal solid waste with the exception of hazardous waste, automobile scrap, steel reinforced concrete, white goods, flammables and tires (in bulk). It should be noted that these items were deemed to be excluded by each and every company that made a proposal. These items would be transported to a facility designed to accomodate them, such as a bulky waste and demolition landfill, as they are disposed of now. The balance of the waste stream (90-95%) would be sent through a state-of-the-art composting process after front end recycling to extract recyclables such as corrugated cardboard, aluminum cans, and bottles. The system was a magnetic conveyor to remove ferrous metals. The balance of the waste stream is put through the system under a constant monitoring process eventually being converted to an extremely high quality, marketable compost.

The track record for composting facilities is severely limited due to the fact that there are very few operations up and running as yet. There are, however, several small operations and doing quite well, (100 tons per day). Due to this fact the committee was very critical in assessing Environmental Recovery Systems commitment to their process. The company proposes a \$40,000,000 facility financed completely by their own lenders, located on a 38 acre parcel of property they have an option on and will purchase a complete insurance package provided by Marsh and McClennan Insurance Brokers (including business interruption insurance, liability and standard insurance coverage), willingness to guarantee a tipping fee of \$78 per ton (reduced by \$58 per ton for Danbury as part of our host community benefits package) with the only increase being the rise in the consumer price index over a period of 20-25 years and their willingness to accomodate Danbury and HRRRA's needs. The company at their presentation was represented by their Chairman as well as fourteen other individuals who were experts on each facet of the operation from machinery to insurance. The committee was especially critical of the end product (compost) and its marketability. A study and review procedure as regards the compost to be produced revealed that there are markets that will take all the compost that can be produced and examples and illustrations of its uses were outlined to the committee.

Regarding short and long term results it was determined that the system could be up and operating in two years. However, the company is willing to begin accepting our trash sooner if we so desire (in order to preserve our remaining landfill) at a cost of \$78 per ton. The company would also assume the responsibility of disposing of it until their facility is operational. The long term benefit of this system is multi-faceted. Firstly, it enables Danbury and the region to dispose of our municipal solid waste and fulfill our recycling mandate. Secondly, after front end separation, a useful product is produced which can be sold and used for many purposes including the reclamation of heretofore non-productive land. Thirdly, we are not contributing to the pollution problem because there is no smoke, ash or effluent stream produced in this process. Fourthly, we are cooperating with our government request to move away incinerators by being in the vanguard of this approved technology. The location of this facility is quite acceptable to the committee as it is to be based on a 38 acre parcel of property accessible to major arteries and zoned for such use. As there is no smoke, ash or effluent stream problem the environment is not threatened.

The cost factors are to be borne by the provider of the services. The committee was satisfied with the company's plan which does not require the City or region to invest anything but their trash. The benefits provided to Danbury as the host community are quite good. They include \$400,000 per year payment in lieu of property taxes, a 50/50 net revenue split of Danbury end product sales and a \$351,000 annual host community fee. The estimated first year dollar commitment to Danbury is \$1,290,827. This is a significant income generator for our City and must be considered a very big plus for a host community.

A thorough discussion was held regarding possible risks to the City if we entered into this type of system. If the system works as planned and is fully insured as outlined against acts of nature, i.e., tornado, hurricanes that destroy the facility we are risking little. However, if the system fails then we must find another way of disposing our trash.

The committee postulated the following: If we accept the system and it is up and operating in two years we will know within a short period of time (6 mos. - 1 yr.). At that time if the system is failing the companies insurance policy would kick in to insure that our trash is taken care of. We still have a life to our landfill and the incinerator, if proposed, is still four (4) years down the road (time enough for us to re-examine its feasibility). There is no monetary risk for Danbury nor is there any chance for a loss of real estate. It is the committee's feeling that the risks are quite minimal while the potential benefits are quite substantial both environmentally and economically.

A discussion regarding safety disclosed that the composting operation was extremely safe in that the system has built in sensors throughout to detect any foreign materials entering the waste stream. A complete chemical laboratory on the site provides an additional safeguard. The system is also capable of tracing a load of waste to the hauler and particular vehicle that brought it to the facility. There is no toxic ash or smoke and the system is completely enclosed. The committee was particularly impressed with the attention given to the safety aspect of this proposal.

The committee would also express the fact that the other communities belonging to HRRRA can participate in this technology as a partner with Danbury just as they could with a mass burn facility. Whereas this facility can be on-line in two years and an incinerator would take upwards of five years to become operational the Council may wish to direct the Mayor to engage HRRRA officials in dialog regarding the possibility of a partnership.

This committee's challenge was to examine the alternate technologies available to handle our City's municipal solid waste. Our group approached this task with total objectivity and no preconceived notions. All proposals were thoroughly examined and discussed at length. We realize that this decision will impact our City for the next 20-25 years and it was our responsibility to chose a system which came nearest to meeting or exceeding our accepted criteria listed in the beginning of this report. It is the committee's conclusion that the composting operation proposed provides Danbury with the safest system at the least risk, minimum costs, maximum benefits, and the most environmentally sound alternative for processing municipal solid waste.

Mr. Steven Flanagan proposed the following motion:

To recommend to the Danbury Common Council that the Council reject the findings of the Technical Advisory Team. Reject the Housatonic Resourse Recovery Authority's (HRRRA) decision that a mass burn facility be located on White Turkey Road, Danbury, CT, and support the alternative technology solution that employs the recycling and composting system as embodied in this report.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Robert Godfrey, and passed unanimously.

Mr. Flanagan made a motion to accept the report. Seconded by Mr. Connell. Mr. Flanagan then offered the offering amandment:

"The committee strongly supports genuine regional cooperation in finding a safe and economically sound solution for our common problem of garbage disposal." Seconded by Mr. Bundy. Motion to amend carried unanimously.

Mrs. Danise made a motion to suspend the rules to allow members of the Technical Advisory Team to answer questions. Seconded by Mrs. Butera. Motion carried with the members voting as follows:

Yes - Bourne, Flanagan, Zotos, Nimmons, Fazio, Shaw, Cassano, Charles, Bundy, Butera, Danise, DaSilva, Eriquez, Regan.

No - Connell, Gallo, Moran, Cresci.

14 Yes - 4 No.

There followed a 2 hour discussion between members of the Technical Advisory Team and Members of the Common Council. This discussion is on tape and on file in the Office of the City Clerk for public inspection.

Motion to accept the report, as amended, carried with the members voting as follows:

Yes - Connell, Gallo, Moran, Flanagan, Zotos, Cresci, Cassano, Charles, Bundy, Butera, DaSilva, Regan.

No - Bourne, Renz, Nimmons, Fazio, Shaw, Danise, Eriquez.

12 Yes - 7 No

PUBLIC SPEAKING SESSION -

Ronald Blonski, 18 Griffing Avenue - spoke against the technical advisory team recommendation. Stated that if an incinerator comes to Danbury he would move his family out of Danbury.

Maria Ciposa, 21 Woodbury Drive - spoke in favor of composting.

Gabrielle Dunn, 100 Garfield Avenue -spoke in favor of recycling.

There being no further business to come before the Common Council Mr. Moran made a motion to adjourn at 10:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Jimmitta L. Samaha
JIMMETTA L. SAMAHA
Assistant City Clerk

ATTEST: *Elizabeth Crudginton*
Elizabeth Crudginton
City Clerk