

**MONTGOMERY-OTSEGO-SCHOHARIE SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT  
AUTHORITY  
PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING**

**DATE:** October 5, 2006

**LOCATION:** MOSA Administrative Complex, Howes Cave

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

William Strevy  
Ed Wesnofske  
Martha Clarvoe

**ABSENT:**

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Joan Bent  
Olga Podmajersky  
Rudolph Laguna  
Gilbert L. Chichester  
Terry Bliss

**1. Opening**

Chairperson Strevy opened the meeting at 10:20 a.m.

**2. Minutes of Prior Meeting**

The minutes of the prior meeting of May 18, 2006 were approved as written.

**3. Mission Statement**

Mr. Strevy asked if there was any discussion relative to the mission statement as it existed.

Martha Clarvoe indicated that she would like to see more language relative to recycling and composting.

Ms Podmajersky indicated that it was implicit in the word "integrated".

Mr. Wesnofske spoke to possibly including language referencing national and state recycling policy.

Mr. Strevy indicated that MOSA did play an important part in recycling in Montgomery County. He did not recall all the details of why the change was made.

Mr. Wesnofske indicated that the Service Agreement was the underpinning for the issuance of the bonds. The Authority had to reduce the tipping fee to be competitive after the Carbone Decision of the U.S. Supreme Court and prior to the closure of the Eastern Landfill. The responsibility for facilitating recycling under Section 120AA of the General Municipal Law was the responsibility of the Counties. The Authority offered to continue to handle the collection of recyclables, but requested that the counties pay the Authority for this service as opposed to covering the cost by way of the tipping fee. The Counties felt that the estimated costs were too high and chose to go their own way.

Joan Bent indicated that mission statements were usually general in wording and followed by the establishment of objectives and goals.

Mr. Chichester indicated that perhaps some modification needed to be put in place so that there is no question as to the Authority's position on recycling, i.e. some language is incorporated in the mission to make this point clear.

Ms. Clarvoe raised the question as to the benefits of the three counties working together in the name of better marketing. Perhaps with greater volumes there would be more markets available.

Terry Bliss indicated that bringing the recycling function together would be a big change for Otsego County. He indicated that Otsego County was in the process of going out to bid since they are in the last three months of their contract with Vet's Disposal for the transfer and marketing of recyclables.

They are seeking prices for the handling of approximately 3500 tons of recyclables under the current system. The county has regional drop locations from which recyclable materials are hauled to the Oneonta Transfer Station for reloading. Haulers also bring recyclables to the Oneonta Transfer Station. Vet's compacts the recyclables and sends them to a MRF of their choice. Their system maintains the materials in two streams – commingled containers and mixed fiber.

Mr. Bliss indicated that for the near future, he anticipated that the County would maintain the same system and handle it on their own. He felt it too late to consider any other options at this time.

He felt that the discussion was meaningful and that it might lead to benefits for consolidation in the future.

Mr. Strevy indicated that he interpreted the situation in Montgomery County to be such that if the City of Amsterdam sent its recyclables to the Western Transfer Station that most of Montgomery County's material might well go in that direction. He felt that this would open the door for greater cooperation.

Mr. Wesnofske indicated that the Authority must look to the system to market and dispose of materials on a regional basis so as to maximize efficiencies. Transportation is a major factor requiring an economy of scale.

Ms. Clarvoe wanted to include some mention of the NYS recycling goals.

Ms. Bent proposed to insert language speaking to meeting Federal and State objectives, namely the three R's, Reduce, Reuse and Recycle.

Mr. Strevy and Ms. Podmajersky asked if the wording could be left the same.

Ms. Clarvoe indicated that the Mission Statement then seems to focus on trash. She made the

motion to recommend to the full Governing Board that additions be made to the Mission Statement so that it would read as follows: ( changed language in bold).

”To plan, initiate and maintain comprehensive, integrated and cost effective solid waste **and recycling** management services and facilities for the MOSA community that meet the objective of receiving, moving, processing and disposal of waste in a safe and environmentally sound manner to create a clean and healthy environment **so as to work toward the goals established at the State and Federal level to reduce, reuse and recycle.**”

Mr. Wesnofske seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

#### 4. MOSA Board Management Objectives

Mr. Wesnofske indicated that he had prepared the objectives to give the public and staff a sense of direction and provide, over the longer term, things to work toward. He presented the document for review and change based upon the thoughts of others.

He thought something like this could be put on the web site to give the public a sense of the direction of the Authority. Instead of an outdated Solid Waste Management Plan, there would be a short description of direction and priorities. He felt that such a document would need an annual or other periodic review to consider the dynamics both within and outside the organization.

In talking of planning, this puts objectives on the table. It will reflect what the Board has adopted. The County constituencies can see direction for the short, intermediate and long term and it provides for accountability both at the Board and staff levels.

The Committee discussed each point in the document and ultimately Mr. Wesnofske indicated that he would rework the document to reflect the discussions.

It was felt that such a policy statement would need to be implemented by a resolution, which would facilitate the flow of information to the Counties.

Ms. Podmajersky indicated that she was against having someone from the outside write a plan.

The Committee felt that the RFP/RFQ should be written as was put forth at the November 15, 2005 Planning Committee meeting. This would give needed information for setting future direction.

The Committee discussed the ongoing subsidization by the Counties along with flow control and the related recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court to hear the Oneida/Herkimer appeal.

It was decided that more information should be gathered for discussion at the next meeting of the Planning Committee, which was scheduled for November 2, 2006 at 10 a.m.

**5. Closing**

Edward Wesnofske motioned to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Martha Clarvoe and unanimously approved on voice call.

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gilbert L. Chichester  
Executive Director

### **MOSA Board Management Objectives**

#### **Immediate Management Objectives (ongoing and within the year)**

Sustain quality efforts in administration of financial conditions and operations

Recruit and train new financial management personnel

Execute on Oneonta Transfer Station modernization for waste and recycling processing

Develop integrated team management approach in new staff

Propose an alternative for the City of Amsterdam for recycling activities

Implement requirements of Public Authorities Accountability Act of 2005 in cooperation with Governing Board.

Develop greater clarity of views and work toward consensus in MOSA Community on post 2014 MOSA and County responsibilities for waste, waste reduction, recycling and materials recovery planning, management and operational responsibilities.

Develop in cooperation with the Counties a written, DEC approved long term plan for waste management and recycling for a period until 2034 (thereabouts or beyond) encompassing the handling of construction and demolition waste, electronics waste, municipal solid waste, metals, plastic and energy recovery technologies.

Advocate on Flow Control Program and Authority Licensing/Registration of haulers and clarify with Counties issue of enforcement agency and standards.

Study alternative conditions for subsequent T&D contract structures and negotiations.

#### **Intermediate Management Objectives**

Develop or integrate multiple Montgomery County municipal recycling activities into an improved economic recycling environment.

Undertake a permanent public outreach and educational activity for understanding waste management and recycling economics and technologies and to implement public policy on reduction, recycling and recovery with respect to waste generation.