

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

**DATE:** June 16, 2008

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

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Martha Clarvoe  
Ed Wesnofske  
Olga Podmajersky  
David Parker

**ABSENT:**

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Gilbert L. Chichester  
Barbara Corrigan

**1. Opening**

Chairperson Clarvoe opened the meeting at 1p.m.

**2. Minutes of Prior Meeting**

Mr. Wesnofske moved to approve the April 30, 2008 minutes.

Mr. Parker seconded this motion, which was unanimously approved.

**3. Old Business**

**a. Flow Control**

Ms. Clarvoe asked if the flow control letters had been sent out to the counties. Mr. Wesnofske indicated that he was drafting the letter with a Q&A section to provide additional information and he would follow through on completion and distribution of the letter. Ms. Clarvoe believed additional information and education would be helpful.

Mr. Parker asked Ms. Podmajersky if there was further discussion in Montgomery County regarding loss of GAT Waste. Ms. Podmajersky indicated she was unaware of any change.

Discussion continued regarding the drop in GAT numbers for the month of May.

**b. GB&B**

Ms. Clarvoe indicated that she believed we should be pursuing GBB for future plans so MOSA would be able to continue to do the job of planning and handling the disposal of waste and at the least turn over something of value to others.

Mr. Wesnofske and Mr. Chichester indicated that Montgomery County and the Helmer report should be produced in the near future. Ms. Podmajersky noted she would not wait for the report. Mr. Parker indicated that Otsego County was going out

with an RFP based upon a letter published by Terry Bliss updating Long Range Planning Services. It is the county's job to handle their fiduciary responsibilities, but MOSA should be focusing on a broad perspective – what is best for the Service Area as a whole and what other options exist to work with other counties.

Ms. Clarvoe the committee if they felt any of the counties would continue to be a part of MOSA. Mr. Chichester reiterated that Montgomery County would stay if there was a competitive tip fee, “that is not going to happen” so Montgomery County pulls out. Mr. Powers indicated to Mr. Chichester that he is no longer interested in continuing the fight.

Mr. Chichester suggested looking at things through waste sheds – waste is driven not by county lines but by available highways and other factors. This should be reviewed and studied. Montgomery County thinks Fulton County is their salvation, maybe they are but someone needs to calculate the bottom line and determine what Montgomery County needs to proceed in that direction. There is no indication that this has been done.

Mr. Chichester agrees with Hans Arnold's letter, don't spend money or make commitments until the Counties make their decisions. Mr. Parker believed the letter from Mr. Arnold was referring to post 2014, Mr. Wesnofske believes it refers to the T&D contract.

Ms. Podmajersky expressed the need to begin work on the next T&D contract. MOSA cannot wait for a decision we need to be prepared to provide these services until 2014. Mr. Chichester stated that we did not necessarily need something until 2014 if the Counties want out now.

It was agreed the way to begin the T&D contract process was to go out with an RFP. This would indicate to the Counties that MOSA is going forward with to fulfill our obligation through 2014.

Questions arose if the counties could get out before 2014; Mr. Chichester noted if the bonds were defeased the agreements could be made to end MOSA.

Discussion continued around the points of the T&D contract. All indications are that the goal is lowest cost. There were disagreements regarding the current contract and information that was calculated and distributed. Ms. Clarvoe refocused on the future contract.

During the discussion - summarized below – questions regarding the service fee for other Riccelli services (hauling recycling materials, residual waste) came up. Ms. Corrigan will look into the charges for these other services.

Transportation and Disposal RFP

- Break into two contracts one with landfill(s) one with transport

- Landfill
  - Use one or several?
  - Min Max amounts in the contract?
  - No guaranteed amount of waste from MOSA!!
- Transportation
  - Contract for this after space is assured
  - Reputable hauler
  - Assure enough trucks and trailers
  - Reasonable age so R&M is not an issue
  - Rail/Barge options

Mr. Parker made a motion that Mr. Chichester be charged with beginning to make contacts with landfills or alternative disposal solutions that he and/or the board can think of to begin the process toward a feasible Disposal RFP/Contract

Ms. Clarvoe seconded the motion

All in favor

Ms. Clarvoe directed that C&D specific landfill options be considered. Mr. Parker felt the Board would not want to deal with that independently. Mr. Chichester suggested that the possibility to divert C&D be included in a contract.

Mr. Parker indicated that the contract negotiation was a parallel objective to GBB Phase II activity. Discussion ensued regarding landfill options and issues including Albany County, Chenango County, Warren Washington, and Coeyman's application for the opening of a new cell.

Mr. Parker suggested contacting Counties/areas in a 75 mile radius around Howe Cave to discuss a burn plant (waste to energy plant). Mr. Wesnofske indicated such an endeavor was not possible without flow control.

Ms. Podmajersky asked what we would do when fuel costs his \$10 per gallon. Ms. Clarvoe noted alternatives to Transporting waste would look better. Ms. Podmajersky asked what we would do in a year. Ms Clarvoe indicated for the short term the best thing to do is education.

Ms. Clarvoe redirected discussion to the GBB resolution that was tabled. She indicated it was not killed but postponed so the committee could make their case regarding the need for Phase II. Mr. Chichester pointed out that economy of scale is the name of the game. Mr. Parker suggested that the 75 mile radius discussed could provide us with the required 250,000 tons to be competitive.

Discussion continued regarding the project be defined as both the landfill and the waste to energy plant so all areas could be considered. A way to start slowly may be for the development of a C&D landfill. Discussion regarding C&D recycling continued.

The committee was in agreement that waste to energy was the way to proceed. Problems with this approach include the failure of the burn plant in the capital district. Mr. Wesnofske also pointed out that the emissions from a waste to energy plant are less than a coal burning facility. It was determined that the waste to energy idea needs to be reviewed from an economic standpoint, environmental standpoint and the NIMBY standpoint.

Discussion continued regarding the focus of the GBB activity. Mr. Parker wanted them to only look at waste to energy. Mr. Wesnofske indicated that the landfill had to be included to answer questions people may have about that option.

Ms. Clarvoe was looking for agreement regarding moving forward with Phase II part B task 1 and 2. Ms. Podmajersky indicated that having Gil get started on the contract was more important. Mr. Wesnofske noted that the concepts regarding the RFP for landfills need to go before the Board.

Further discussion regarding the specs for the Phase II study by GBB continued, a desire to look at best alternatives for each county was expressed. Mr. Chichester indicated that cost would increase dramatically if this option was pursued. Ms. Clarvoe indicated a need to educate herself and the other MOSA Board Members on Waste to Energy. Mr. Wesnofske said he would pull something together and suggested that we take Chris Chale up on her offer to visit the Dutchess County Resource Recovery Plant. Ms. Podmajersky expressed concern regarding the cost to build the facility and the need to have GBB provide a model for progressive tonnages. Ms. Clarvoe questioned if GBB would recommend a technology to use. Mr. Parker indicated that should be part of the Phase II process.

The committee felt the best way to move forward with this resolution was for Mr. Wesnofske to provide education at the July meeting and table the resolution until after the education. Ms. Podmajersky noted that MOSA spends a lot of money on these studies but never does anything with them. She felt it is a waste of money but that MOSA owes it to the counties to move forward with the study. Mr. Parker suggested that it provides value when Mr. Chichester takes the to other Counties the cost and uses the study information to create partners.

Mr. Parker indicated it was not too soon to share the benefits to host communities, possibility of GAT being eliminated. Probably reduction in energy rates, and PILOT payments

There was discussion regarding the law that established MOSA and any limits this may present regarding taking in of outside waste. The belief was that the legislature of two counties must agree to take in outside waste. Concern if waste to energy is referred to in the law "best available technology" it was determined a closer review of the law is required

**4. Mission Statement**

Ms. Clarvoe revisited a 2006 committee discussion that was to bring to the Board additional language to include in MOSA's Mission. She believes that the Board talks around conservation and the three R's (reduce, reuse, recycle) so they should be included in the mission statement.

Ms. Podmajersky felt this would be redundant. Mr. Wesnofske believed the mission should be reorganized rather than just adding phrases. Ms. Clarvoe agreed the statement was too lengthy. After further discussion it was decided that Ms. Clarvoe would rewrite the statement in bullet fashion and email it out for review and comments.

**5. Diversion of New Items to reduce our transportation fees**

Due to time constraints Ms. Clarvoe suggested not getting into all the new business but wanted the committee to consider ways to reduce what we ship.

Mr. Wesnofske noted that Rockland County Resource Recovery Agency did a lot to recover glass and was unsure of their success.

Ms. Clarvoe mentioned Andela located a Richfield Springs and the fact that they are doing more and more in the area of recycling.

Mr. Chichester mentioned that option existed for organizations to place a box at locations as Green Fiber is currently doing. He also indicated that MOSA has worked with E-lots at the last HHW day. Unfortunately it became apparent they were not disposing of electronics properly due to their directing our driver to unload the electronic material delivered at their shredder. MOSA has changed providers back to Waste Management which will charge for certain items that E Lots was disposing of at no cost to MOSA. Mr. Chichester indicated that we are unable to electronics all the time because of the lack of storage space for these items on site.

**6. Other Business**

The Auction results were just in and it was shared that we made \$76,600 which is before commission and bond proceed money is replaced.

Mr. Wesnofske motioned that the meeting be adjourned

Mr. Parker seconded the motion

The meeting was adjourned at 3:33

Respectfully Submitted

Barbara Corrigan,  
Director of Finance and Administration