

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

DATE: November 2, 2006

LOCATION: MOSA Administrative Complex, Howes Cave

MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Strevy
Ed Wesnofske
Martha Clarvoe

ABSENT:

Raymond Halgas

OTHERS PRESENT:

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

1. Opening

Chairperson Strevy opened the meeting at 10:15 a.m.

2. Minutes of Prior Meeting

Martha Clarvoe moved the acceptance of the minutes of the October 5, 2006 meeting. Mr. Strevy seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

3. Recycling

Single Stream--

The agenda was modified so as to take up the subject of recycling first. Martha Clarvoe raised the issue of glass being mixed with the paper when recyclables are processed in a single stream. Mr. Chichester indicated that the pulp mills have raised this issue in the past and he did not know if steps had been taken at the mills or the MRFs to address the issue or if it was an ongoing concern. In any event, it appears that single stream recycling is a method to stay with us in that both Casella and Waste Management have invested heavily in the technology.

Mr. Chichester indicated that it seemed to be more expensive to process through a single stream facility than one accepting dual streams. Mr. Wesnofske indicated that the single stream concept had developed to streamline recycling at the homeowner level in that less attention had to be given to separation into multiple containers. Additionally, it made the process easier for the collector in that multiple compartments were not necessary and compaction was possible. Both these factors made the collection process more economical.

Mr. Chichester indicated that it appeared that municipalities were continuing to subsidize the recycling process by covering the costs for collection and transportation to the MRF. Often times there is no cost sharing resulting from the marketing of the materials.

Ulster County--

Mr. Chichester discussed the arrangements the Authority has with Ulster County and that there may be changes that will impact the costs incurred for handling the material. He suggested that more options needed to be explored relative to the efficient movement of recyclable materials.

City of Amsterdam Recycling Options--

Mr. Chichester reviewed the outcome of the bids solicited by the City for the collection and handling of recyclables for City residents. Spohn Disposal of Mohawk bid \$538,500 on a three –year contract (\$179,500 per year) and \$400,000 on a two-year contract (\$200,000 per year). County Waste bid \$384,000 for a three-year contract (\$128,000 per year) with no offer for a two-year agreement. Michael Parillo of Haganan offered the City two options; pick up the material and deliver to Schoharie for \$177,000 per year or pick up the material and deliver to Randall for \$172,000.

Mr. Chichester pointed out that the City was paying for the collection and transportation of the material to County Waste’s MRF and County Waste was not sharing any of the revenue from marketing the materials. This appeared to be another instance where it was advantageous to own the processing facility and do the collection. All others have to add on a tipping fee or other additional cost at the MRF.

Mr. Chichester spoke to the issue of the City locking in for three years. This was an opportunity to develop a scenario where all of Montgomery County could benefit from greater efficiency in handling recyclables. The question remains as to how the Authority can help streamline the process for the counties.

Mr. Wesnofske indicated that he feels that the Authority needs to develop features that will make it viable for the municipalities to pull together. He saw the Authority to be the big broker with regard to transportation. He expressed the need to make investments so that when municipalities go out for bids in the future, the infrastructure is in place to streamline the process. This may not be cost effective up front. The payback will come over time. He thought the Authority could buy transportation in bulk or enhance market efficiencies by being able to deliver greater quantities. This would mean that the cost for development in this area could not be seen as an operational cost, but should be looked at as a capital cost to be spread over time. The Authority should look to improve efficiencies in the future and flow control could help in developing this concept.

The Authority is looking for assistance in planning and it was felt that recycling systems for the region should be included in the planning process so as to get the thrust toward good business practices and not political agendas.

The tip fee may need to subsidize recycling. The Authority must develop a strong niche. The transfer stations are not highly efficient due to low volumes. Flow control may provide the incentive for further development. Disincentives need to be in place. Constituents should pay based upon quantities of waste generated. Those who generate the most should pay the most. The current method of County subsidization of the tip fee favors the high generators and penalizes those who recycle and reduce the amount of waste needing disposal. Subsidization by using tax dollars penalizes the small generators in that they are paying the way for those generating the higher quantities. The concept of Pay As You Throw may need to be developed.

It was generally felt that a re-education of the public was needed.

4. Flow Control

A copy of the last draft of a flow control law developed by the Authority in conjunction with Michael Cahill was distributed to all members of the Governing Board.

Mr. Strevy felt that Mr. Cahill should review the draft to be sure that all aspects of it are still legal and also to try to make the law more complete.

It was recognized that subsidization of the tip fee was easier in the past than it is now with a much higher tipping fee.

Mr. Strevy felt that the elderly should not be subsidizing generators of large quantities of waste through their tax bills. He felt that those generating the least should be rewarded.

It was felt that the Authority should carry the ball. In the draft, there were a number of areas left to be developed in conjunction with the counties. At this point it was felt that the law should be made as complete as possible with the Authority assuming responsibility for its implementation and enforcement. All ambiguous areas should be made clear.

5. County Subsidization

The Committee discussed if and to what level the Counties would continue to subsidize the tipping fee. It was felt that this was up for further discussion at the County level.

6. Competitiveness of Tipping Fees

It was suggested that the tipping fees for surrounding disposal facilities be reviewed.

7. Next Meeting

It was agreed that the next meeting of the Planning Committee would be on December 7, 2006 at 10 a.m.

8. OCRRA Mission Statement

Martha Clarvoe pointed out that she had distributed a copy of the mission statement from the Onondaga County Resource Recovery Agency for everyone's review. She indicated that she felt that it had multiple dimensions and spoke more broadly than that currently adopted by the MOSA.

9. 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 12:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gilbert L. Chichester
Executive Director