

**Salisbury/Sharon Resource Recovery Authority (SSRRA)
&
Transfer Station Building Committee (TSBC)
Special Meeting**

Wednesday, November 16, 2016

Salisbury Town Hall

NOTE: Minutes are considered DRAFT ONLY until reviewed and acted upon at the next regular meeting

Present:

TSBC Members (Charlie Kelley, Dale Jones, Bob Loucks, Ed Reagan , Tom Bartram, Curtis Rand, Charlie Ouelette, John Perotti, Malcolm Brown, Bob Palmer, Brent Colley)

Also Present (Kevin Grindle of Anchor Engineering, Patrick Sullivan, Brian Bartram, Ann Saunders, Chris Williams)

Meeting was called to order by C. Rand at 5:30 p.m.

Approved Agenda – J. Perotti moved to approve the agenda, C. Kelley seconded this motion and all others were in favor.

Discussion with SSRRA and TSBC members regarding possible action on proposal from Anchor Engineering regarding plans, scheduling, and possible next steps for the new Transfer Station:

Current plans are a result of discussions and DEEP requirements. K. Grindle took previous plans that TSBC really liked prior to DEEP adjustments and gave them a fresh eye.

Page 1

- Parking configuration has 3 drive isles, with main access drive passing main office. Similar to initial plan.
- Manuvering Area is the new feature and K. Grindle asks for feedback on this area tonight. It is designed to separate commercial hauler waste stream.
- Revisited the existing screening and decided to expand by incorporating a new line of evergreen vegetative screening

Page 2

- Slight parking configuration and 3rd drive isle changes to segregate commercial haulers
- All other structures still very similar – parking spaces are approximately the same in number and minimize backing into drive isles
- Oversized areas provide storm water mitigation or snow storage or landscaping within the parking areas
- J. Perotti asked if the new footprint is infringing upon the town's property. C. Rand mentioned that the town could be asked for a land swap. Other option would be to put the transfer station in a field, which the town does not want so we do not foresee a problem. B. Palmer commented

that it is not a significant change and the first priority of this land was to accommodate the transfer station.

Page 3

- Rudimentary sketches that roughly illustrate the appearance to residential users as they enter the site. Hopper on left, MSW. Hopper on right, recyclables. Commercial haulers enter on the right hand side of this drawing through the gates. Segregated access on 2 sides of the hoppers and commercial haulers on the third side.

Page 4

- This rendering illustrates the grade - The compactors are below grade within their own bunker, so the only visibility from the top for residential users would be the hoppers. This changes the configuration of the canopies and is more cost effective to build and allows visual and wind/weather protection on the westerly side. Smaller area, more economical building based on discussions that 2 hoppers, rather than 3, will be sufficient.

The first plan and similar sketches have been provided to the transfer station employees, including Brian Bartram. The snow storage area and third drive isle have not yet been discussed.

D. Jones asked about water shed. K. Grindle said on the high size it would mitigate velocity with catch basins. The grading would be away from the walls and compactor areas. Slight pitch

E. Reagan asked about ease of cleaning out the swap shop. K. Grindle: outside of business hours vehicle access would be viable, the floor supports are sufficient.

M. Brown asked about the roof lines and if any face south to take advantage of solar energy. K. Grindle said that several of the buildings would be optimal for solar generation roof mounts. The roofs are strong enough to support these panels.

D. Jones asked about the reduction to 1 MSW hopper after discussing the need for 2. B. Palmer reports that the committee reviewed historic transfer station data and learned that although overall tonnage is up at the station, MSW has been static over several years – and slightly decreased. The assumption was that MSW had also increased, but it has actually not changed for quite some time. Talking with the carting companies, they do not foresee an increase in volume/capacity of MSW due to recycling and single stream methods – trucks are larger but because they need to accommodate recyclables. Eliminating the third hopper from this design allowed us to separate commercial and residential users in the design again. We also have excellent staff management and never have a problem with the station being at a standstill due to hoppers needing to be changed out. The hopper height has been brought down to accommodate a greater volume.

B. Bartram said the operational efficiency of the additional hopper is definitely more desirable. If we lose the ability to cart to Torrington and are forced to go further it will be even more challenging. The current system is working but we are trading operational efficiency for the expense of an additional hopper.

K. Grindle says that within the bulky area containers there could be an emergency plan for needed hopper space or change out. B. Bartram says this is fine for a safety net, but not ideal for an ongoing process.

K. Grindle says that the budget presented previously is still sufficient for the plans presented tonight.

C. Rand asked if the opportunity for a future third hopper is lost with this design. K. Grindle says that we will have additional wall space that with some adjusting a third hopper could be worked into.

B. Palmer asked about using this hopper configuration to the other side of the facility. K. Grindle says that it is absolutely feasible and he is working on it now. The canopy and roof could cover the westerly wall on all of the open-top hoppers for additional protection. He will continue to work on this design. Once the sketch is generated he will send it along to the group.

B. Bartram asked about making the lean-to structure a full vehicle bay. K. Grindle says the current configuration has brought us down to 1-bay. He will revisit the option to add an additional bay – within budget – and adding an additional drive-through bay, as we previously had in the original drawings. B. Bartram asked if adding this bay would then allow the outcropped office area of the building to become flush with the building. K. Grindle believes that this could be attained while still maintaining enough visibility to oversee most of the building with the exception of the bulky area. There are some operational efficiency with reducing the square footage.

B. Bartram asked for a cost for a sixth open top container and design to accommodate. K. Grindle will provide tomorrow and email the group. B. Palmer suggests that we incorporate this sixth hopper option into the plan that will be presented to planning and zoning so that we have the option, whether or not it is exercised. K. Grindle asked – along these lines- if he should incorporate a scale location in the plans that will be presented to Planning & Zoning. He could add a drive lane and have the scale encroach upon the vegetative area. B. Palmer asked that the plan clearly state future potential in these features.

J. Perotti asked about how the guard shack has now been omitted. B. Palmer explained that the decision to switch to a transponder system has eliminated the need for a guard shack – and helped the flow of and separation of residential and commercial traffic patterns. It is now mechanical.

C. Kelley moved to Authorize that Anchor engineering can pursue adding details and working with this plan, E. Reagan seconded this motion and all others were in favor.

Set meeting dates for both committees for 2017:

B. Braislin said that next year quarterly meetings would be sufficient next year. Dates would be: January 18, 2017 (Salisbury), April 19, 2017 (Sharon), July 19, 2017 (Salisbury), and October 18, 2017 (Sharon). Special Meetings will be held as needed.

D. Jones moved to approve dates as outline and submitted by B. Braislin, E. Reagan seconded this motion, all others were in favor.

B. Loucks moved that we should not meet in December 2016, J. Perotti seconded this motion, all others were in favor.

Citizen Comments:

C. Kelley moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:35 p.m, E. Reagan seconded, all others were in favor.

Holly Leibrock

Salisbury Recording Secretary

RECEIVED