

**MONTGOMERY-OTSEGO-SCHOHARIE SOLID WASTE
MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY**

OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

DATE: June 8, 2006

LOCATION: MOSA Administrative Complex, Howes Cave

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rudolph Laguna
Ray Halgas
Olga Podmajersky
Joan Bent

MEMBERS ABSENT:

OTHERS PRESENT:

Gilbert Chichester

1. Opening

Chairman Laguna opened the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

2. Minutes of Prior Meeting

Ray Halgas motioned to accept the minutes of the prior meeting of March 22, 2006. Olga Podmajersky seconded the motion and on voice call the minutes were unanimously approved.

3. Oneonta Transfer Station Retrofit

Mr. Chichester reviewed with the committee the material that had been distributed in the past relative to the retrofit of the Oneonta Transfer Station. Joan Bent was provided all the background information. Color-coded copies of the last drawing, labeled "6B" was distributed to everyone. The differences between "6A" and "6B" were discussed and then it was suggested that the committee review each drawing and evaluate it as to its functionality so as to narrow down the choices.

The problem with Option A (Drawing # 2) was that it did not rectify the congestion issue that was one of the major concerns to be addressed. It also maintained the existing tip floor as the focus of the operation.

It was pointed out that the Oneonta Transfer Station was designed to handle the waste stream from the City of Oneonta only. Practically speaking, this station is handling all the waste generated in Otsego County along with some waste from outside the Service Area. It was observed that there is no redundancy to provide for a backup tip wall. Option A did not rectify this situation given that the pillars along the outside wall of the lean-to addition would prevent its use by commercial vehicles. Option B established an area for homeowners and hand unloaders to deposit waste into a

separate trailer and still had all the commercial activity on the existing tip floor. The area designated for homeowner and hand unloaders will require a railing or wall to meet OSHA standards, which could prevent the use of the wall for commercial traffic if needed.

It would seem that it would be most advantageous to use the existing building for less intense/ demanding deliveries and provide a location more suitable for the heavy commercial activity. By regulation, if homeowners are allowed access to a transfer station, a separate area is to be designated.

Option C, again, channels all the traffic through the same corridor. The pushing of waste through the side of the building is seen to be unacceptable. The flow of residential and self-unloading customers remains questionable.

Option D, continues to put the commercial activity at the only tip wall that is currently in need of major repairs.

Mr. Chichester shared the letter of review that he had prepared for Golder Associates wherein, he had asked the engineers to put forth a fifth proposal that took off from and added to the accomplishments of Option D and drawing 5. This resulted in drawing number 6 and ultimately an additional drawing labeled 6B.

Given the inefficiencies of the existing situation, an attempt has been made to incorporate recycling into the retrofit. After the overall review, Olga Podmajersky expressed her feelings relative to any accommodation for recycling. Ms. Podmajersky felt that nothing should be done relative to recycling. She felt the site should simply be made usable. She felt the recycling is not to be considered solid waste and the recycling is not part of the mission of the organization.

Mr. Chichester indicated that perhaps the Planning Committee should take up the review of the mission statement and that the Governing Board should make a decision as to whether the mission of the organization included recycling activities.

Ms. Podmajersky indicated that the Oneonta Transfer Station is in horrible condition.

Ray Halgas thought that the latest plan is the closest. Ms. Podmajersky indicated that she liked option D with drawing number 5 in that it solved the problems. She expressed that she was totally against any accommodation for recycling for Otsego County in that it was a waste of money.

Mr. Halgas felt that it was important to have a direct dump design for the MSW and that we needed a backup tip wall. He felt that a new tip wall would provide for direct dump and the old, existing tip floor, could be rented to Otsego for recycling.

Ms. Podmajersky indicated that if a new transfer station was to be built that it should be

located somewhere else that would better accommodate the direct dump tip wall. She indicated that she understood that a new permit would be required along with siting studies and an environmental impact study. She indicated that a couple of million dollars could be put into the existing site and questioned if it was appropriate to put that amount of money in that location.

Rudolph Laguna recognized the difficulties that could be encountered with permitting a new site.

Olga Podmajersky felt a new site could be permitted between Oneonta and Cooperstown. Raymond Halgas, Joan Bent and Rudolph Laguna all felt that trying to develop a new site would create major issues and take a lot of time.

Mr. Laguna expressed his feelings that recycling should be made part of the picture. He felt rather than refining the last version any more, a price estimate should be obtained. The construction cost could then be a consideration in finalizing a plan.

Mr. Halgas indicated that he was against having any scale in the pit. He also felt that the third tip wall should be priced as an option and that a crane should be also be added for consideration.

There was discussion around the timing of any construction, i.e. how long it might take and when it could be started. It was pointed out that there was not a lot of work being undertaken currently and that there could be contractors available any time. This could result in reduced costs.

Additionally, the committee recognized that the pigeon problem still existed. It was felt that the resolution to this issue must be incorporated into any building project. A tarping station was also recognized as a need.

Rudolph Laguna made the motion for the Executive Director to direct Golder Associates to prepare a cost estimate to include consideration for the contingencies discussed. Raymond Halgas seconded the motion. Mr. Laguna, Mr. Halgas and Ms. Bent voted in favor. Olga Podmajersky voted against the motion.

There was also discussion relative to the staffing needs for any retrofit of the Oneonta Transfer Station. It was pointed out that one of the initial goals for the project was to save staff if possible. Several factors were discussed, i.e. the automation of the scale house, the need for two to tarp trailers, the operation of a crane, monitoring homeowners activities. It was generally felt that keeping staffing the same would be an accomplishment.

The committee next took up outstanding issues at the Oneonta Transfer Station. This included paving the area currently used for parking the transfer trailers and the area

where the county recycling boxes are located. Both areas have holes that fill with water and are rough to navigate and/or present issues for people having to walk in the area.

The committee directed the Executive Director to develop specifications for paving the trailer staging area and mitigating the surface in the area around the recycling boxes to alleviate the current problems and make the area appropriate for winter maintenance as well. It was recognized that some drains might need to be put in the trailer parking lot. The possible use of reserve funds needs to be investigated also.

4. Tarping Stations

Mr. Chichester reviewed some options for the construction of tarping stations at the transfer sites to facilitate the tarping of trailers without staff having to walk on top of the waste. Quotes had been received from Safe-Rack and Carbis Inc. Additionally, Mr. Chichester had acquired pictures of the tarping station located at the Ontario Landfill site. The cost of the stations, excluding site work, from Safe-Rack and Carbis Inc. was in the \$60,000 to \$70,000 range. These designs provided for moving the scaffolding closer to the trailer once it was in place. The design at the Ontario Landfill used pressure treated lumber. This can present problems reaching the tarp if the scaffolds are placed far enough apart to accommodate the tractor without pulling in the mirrors.

The Executive Director is to check with a fabricator who lives in the St. Johnsville area as to what it would cost to have them made locally.

5. Fire Risks – Alarm and Security Systems

Mr. Chichester reviewed proposals submitted by Nelson Kenny from International Systems in Albany and Hart Alarm Systems Inc. in Watervliet. Mr. Kenny provided a price for a complete job while Mr. Hart provided pricing on equipment that could be used.

Mr. Chichester indicated that he had another vendor that he was working with relative to phone systems that also installed security systems. He indicated that he would gather more information for the next committee meeting.

6. Scrap Metal Collection

Mr. Chichester indicated that some special collection events had been scheduled for the Northern Transfer Station for June 5th, 12th & 19th. Items with Freon were being accepted for a fee equal to the rate for its removal.

Mr. Chichester indicated that he would recommend that the rate schedule be changed at the next meeting of the Governing Board to provide for the removal of Freon at cost.

Operations Committee Meeting

June 8, 2006

Page 5 of 5

7. It was also reported that a vendor had offered to place boxes at the transfer stations for the collection of scrap metal, pull the boxes plus pay a good price for the material. Another name was provided by Mr. Halgas as a competitor. Mr. Chichester indicated that he would proceed to work with the vendor that would provide the best service for the greatest return.

Tires were also taken at the collection events at the NTS. Mr. Halgas indicated that BCD from Hagaman was taking tires from the city to be chipped and used as fuel. Mr. Chichester will contact the firm to ascertain if it is a better alternative for tire disposal.

8. Buildings and Grounds "To Do" List

Last year, Mr. Chichester had provided the committee with a list of projects to be worked on by the Buildings and Grounds Supervisor along with a site employee as needed. A new list for 2006 was provided to the committee.

9. Northern Transfer Station

Mr. Chichester indicated that he had sought pricing for compactor boxes at the Northern Transfer Station. He had been referred to an engineer from Troy with whom he had visited the site. He was awaiting more information that will be reported at a subsequent committee meeting.

10. City of Amsterdam Recycling Needs

It was noted that the City of Amsterdam was looking for alternatives for processing the recyclables collected in the city. Mr. Halgas indicated that he and the City Engineer would be reporting to the City Council on the matter in two weeks. He saw MOSA as a possible alternative but would have to assess it against other options.

11. Site Tour

Given that there are a number of new board members, it was suggested that a tour be set up to go to all the sites. The dates of June 29th and 30th were established as target dates for this. Mr. Chichester is to coordinate.

12. Closing

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gilbert L. Chichester,
Executive Director