

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

DATE: September 1, 2009
LOCATION: MOSA Administrative Complex, Howes Cave

Members Present:

Martha Clarvoe
Olga Podmajersky
Harold Vroman

Others Present:

John Mattas
John Thayer
Philip Skowfoe
Edward Wesnofske

Others Present:

Barbara Corrigan
Donna Mickel
Jason Cooper
Dennis Heaton

1. Opening

Chairman Podmajersky called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m.

2. Minutes of Prior Meeting

Chairman Podmajersky remarked that she hadn't had a chance to read the minutes from the July 20, 2009 meeting and asked if the committee minded waiting to approve them at the next meeting. On voice call, the committee unanimously agreed to postpone approval of the minutes.

3. Approve Agenda

Chairman Podmajersky asked for a motion to adopt the agenda; Ms. Clarvoe so moved, Mr. Vroman seconded and on voice call the motion carried unanimously.

4. 2010 Budget

Chairman Podmajersky reviewed the document hand outs from the finance department:

- ✓ 2010 draft budget summary
- ✓ (details by department)
- ✓ 2010 Personnel & Benefits Summary
- ✓ (details by department)

Chairman Podmajersky turned the meeting over to Ms. Corrigan.

Ms. Corrigan advised that the draft budget was based on the assumptions handed out a couple of meetings ago and stated that she had asked Ms. Mickel to attend the meeting to explain the changes made and cost savings obtained by them.

Ms. Mickel reported the following:

- ✓ Last year Manager Plus software was implemented in the Maintenance Department. This software has created a more efficient system for inventory and purchase orders. Both work orders and purchase orders are run through the system, making them easier to track.
- ✓ A full inventory of the maintenance department was performed in June and again in December, utilizing the new system.
- ✓ Only the necessary items on purchase orders are being purchased; nothing extra is being kept on the shelf, resulting in substantial savings.
- ✓ The main office is being used for housing of inventory supplies. These include office supplies, safety equipment and general supplies (toilet paper, paper towels, and cleaning supplies). These items are purchased through the main office and then requisitioned by the sites as needed. Items are requested by sites on a form, entered into a database and a monthly report is generated in order to provide tracking of supplies by site.
- ✓ Supplies are kept to bare bones minimums; ordering only what is needed at the time. The only exception to that are general supplies that if ordered in bulk are less expensive.
- ✓ Office supplies are not ordered until we meet the threshold for free shipping bi-weekly or monthly.

Montgomery-Otsego-Schoharie Solid Waste Management Authority
Finance Committee Meeting
September 1, 2009

- ✓ Regular comparison of prices with other vendors is performed to be sure we are receiving the lowest prices.

Chairman Podmajersky asked if this is the same system Steve uses. Ms. Mickel responded that Steve uses Manager Plus and the main office uses Access and then correlates the two systems through journal entries in MAS 90.

Ms. Mickel continued:

- ✓ In 2009, we are down \$2,500 in office supply expenses from 2008.
- ✓ Everyone is being very conscientious and cooperative about tightening their belts on supplies.
- ✓ Last year the Pitney Bowes machine was downsized to a smaller machine possible with a cost savings of \$2,700 per year.
- ✓ She worked with Crystal Rock, the bottled water and coffee vendor, to reduce cost by putting in a coin operated coffee machine and implementing uniform bottled water pricing at all the sites.
- ✓ Computer consultant expenses are reduced because Jason Cooper performs a lot of our in-house computer needs. A consultant is only called in when something comes up that Jason cannot take care of.
- ✓ Puncture resistant/steel toed boots are required for some employees; MOSA provides 1 pair of boots per year for the staff that require them. The only supplier of this type of boot is Redwing. After checking with 4 vendors in the area, we found that the Shoe Factory in Amsterdam has the lowest price, saving MOSA \$128 per pair.
- ✓ All vendors have been contacted and a valiant effort made to get the lowest prices possible; this practice will continue in 2010.

Chairman Podmajersky asked if there was a total dollar figure associated with the amount of savings. Ms. Mickel said that she could do so and let her know.

Ms. Corrigan advised that a lot of these things were started last year and the practice will continue this year. She went on to say that the 2010 draft budget shows where we are at the moment and that we are still looking at other options such as breaking some costly contracts.

Ms. Corrigan asked if there were any questions on the details of the draft.

Mr. Thayer asked why there was such a large difference between the budgeted and actual amounts on fuel at the Oneonta Transfer Station. Ms. Corrigan replied that the amount budgeted at the time had been based on the equipment on site and that the price of fuel has dropped drastically since that time.

Chairman Podmajersky remarked that the T&D is based on total number of tons and asked what number of tons is being used. Ms. Corrigan remarked that the GAT was the second subject on the agenda but replied that 97,583 tons was the number used.

Chairman Podmajersky asked if the committee wanted to review the summary or the details.

Ms. Corrigan remarked that what was before them was the first round and that on some items, details were still being reviewed, i.e. health insurance. She went on to say that we need an executive director to know what choices need to be made and what direction to go in. She advised that if an RFP was done to replace

GASBOY, the cost of fuel system repairs could be eliminated, reducing the expenses by \$4,000.00. There are other items that could be cut; amounting to \$10,200. Cleaning costs at the sites were cut in half by having them only cleaned once a year.

Ms. Mickel remarked that insurance costs were analyzed and reduced because some items were incorrectly listed as insured when they had been disposed of earlier in the year.

Mr. Skowfoe asked what the cost per kilowatt was. Ms. Corrigan advised it was 10-12 cents and that the contract is with Integrys. Mr. Skowfoe asked when the contract expires; Ms. Mickel advised the date was 2011. Mr. Skowfoe remarked that the cost should be about 7 cents per kilowatt. Ms. Corrigan advised that she was trying to get out of the contract early and had another company looking it over to see what the cost would be to get out of the contract.

Ms. Corrigan reported that Saturday hours are all overtime hours for the full time staff. This could be cut; however, she doesn't feel that she is in a position to do so. Mr. Thayer asked if part timers could work during the week so that the full time staff would not require overtime for Saturdays. Ms. Corrigan advised that there was not enough part time staff available to do so and that she was going to bring this up at the Personnel Committee meeting.

Chairman Podmajersky asked how many Household Hazardous Waste events are in the budget. Ms. Corrigan advised that there was no change from the current year and the net cost is \$30,000 per county.

Chairman Podmajersky remarked that Environmental Protection is about the same, Landfill, Maintenance, Administration and Transfer Stations are a little less.

Ms. Corrigan asked how much detail they would like to get into at today's meeting. Mr. Skowfoe remarked that he would like to look at the details. Ms. Corrigan handed out the budget worksheets that show the detail.

Chairman Podmajersky suggested that everyone look the information over.

Ms. Clarvoe asked why we are using the word "disposal" of recycling because it sounds like we are trashing them rather than recycling them. Ms. Corrigan responded that they are not being trashed and said she would come up with another word.

Chairman Podmajersky asked Ms. Corrigan to go over the budget worksheets with the committee.

Ms. Corrigan reviewed the budget worksheet on Environmental Protection advising that:

- ✓ some of the costs for handling recyclables are offset by revenues
- ✓ not shown is the revenue from metal scrap
- ✓ HHW shows a budgeted amount of \$150,000; however, there is a revenue side to that as well based on a 50% reimbursement from DEC. If that is not received in 2010, the budgeted amount will drop by \$60,000 and we will only schedule one event for each county.
- ✓ Freon – based on history and projections for 2010
- ✓ Volunteer groups – consistent with 2009 proposed budget
- ✓ Tires – based on current costs with new vendor and is offset by revenues as well

Montgomery-Otsego-Schoharie Solid Waste Management Authority
Finance Committee Meeting
September 1, 2009

- ✓ Insurance – details are in the attached summary

Mr. Skowfoe asked the cost of health insurance for union employees. Ms. Corrigan replied that she was waiting for the insurance company, CDPHP, to get back to her about new rates for 2010.

Ms. Clarvoe asked for an explanation of the HHW numbers as it looked as if Montgomery and Schoharie Counties had been budgeted for two events and Otsego County only one event. Ms. Corrigan explained that Otsego County applies for their own matching grant and MOSA applies for Montgomery and Schoharie Counties; therefore, the difference in the amounts budgeted.

Ms. Corrigan advised that insurance costs are down by \$5,000 from last year. The Authority has a broker who finds the best insurance costs for our various insurance needs. The insurance contracts go from June to June. Mr. Mattas suggested shopping around next year after the audit.

Mr. Skowfoe asked if the broker was from Cobleskill. Ms. Corrigan advised that the company, Capital Bauer, was located in Albany and the broker's name is John Decatur.

Chairman Podmajersky asked how many vehicles the Authority has and if all of them are necessary. Ms. Corrigan advised there is a van, 2 service trucks and a pickup truck at this site. She went on to explain that insurance costs are budgeted to the sites at which they are located; however, some vehicles are used at several sites so costs may be shown in several areas for the same vehicle.

Mr. Skowfoe suggested going out to bid for insurance on a RFP.

Ms. Corrigan reviewed the budget worksheet on the Landfills advising that:

- ✓ the largest expense associated with the landfills is leachate
- ✓ a wet year can change the numbers
- ✓ Canajoharie Waste Water Treatment Plant has DEC restrictions regarding outside deliveries
- ✓ leachate line/tank cleaning bids were received and opened yesterday
- ✓ a mowing bid needs to be issued; mowing occurs twice per year – spoke with Dan Herrick about mowing only once per year to cut costs but Dan believes that the cutting would be too difficult

Mr. Mattas asked who owns the mowing equipment, the Authority or the person who does the mowing. Ms. Mickel advised him that the person who does the mowing owns the equipment and that mowing typically occurs in early June and then again in October, depending on weather conditions.

Ms. Corrigan reviewed the budget worksheet on the Maintenance Department:

- ✓ cell phone expense – reviewed breakdown

Mr. Skowfoe asked why the maintenance department needed cell phones. Ms. Corrigan advised that both Dan and Steve are on the road to the sites and it is advantageous to be able to get in touch with them if issues arise while they are in transit.

Ms. Corrigan advised that there is usually not a charge per call as we don't go over the plans limits but taking away the two cell phones from maintenance would save about \$62.00 per month. Ms. Clarvoe

remarked that would probably cause lost efficiency and suggested asking Steve about the problems not having cell phones might cause. She went on to suggest addressing fuel consumption instead.

Ms. Corrigan stated that Steve's use of Manager Plus has helped to save on fuel consumption by better planning and handling maintenance issues at the sites, saving on the need for multiple trips.

Chairman Podmajersky asked why so much fuel for equipment was allotted to the Maintenance Department. Ms. Corrigan advised that there are 2 service trucks, a dump truck, roll off movement, and pulling of gas for the other sites. Gas is only on site at the Western and Schoharie Transfer stations.

Mr. Skowfoe asked what the cost per gallon she used was. Ms. Corrigan indicated it was 10% of 2009 average and this cost will be revisited.

Mr. Mattas stated that it seemed a waste to spend \$5,000 for propane when there is so much methane gas from the landfill so close by. Mr. Thayer advised that it is cost prohibitive to install a system to convert the raw methane gas for use in heating. Mr. Wesnofske stated that the methane gas has to be cleaned and processed in a particular way to make it usable. Ms. Clarvoe stated that a report was done on landfill gas that explained all this and that perhaps, Mr. Mattas would be interested in reading it. Mr. Mattas asked when the report had been done; Ms. Clarvoe responded that she believed it was done prior to her tenure on the board.

Ms. Corrigan stated that if there were any questions on equipment repairs she would be more comfortable having Steve Rothrock answer them. She went on to say that expenses are down from last year. Chairman Podmajersky remarked that they should be because we have new equipment.

Ms. Corrigan reviewed the Buildings & Grounds budget worksheet:

- ✓ general property repairs

Mr. Skowfoe asked what the \$40,620 was for that was listed under "general property repairs". Ms. Corrigan replied that there is about \$18,000 in current work orders in the system and advised that she would prepare a detailed list. There is \$2000 budgeted for unforeseen issues at each site, ELF stairs, ATS salt storage building repairs and WTS bollards and siding.

- ✓ Door maintenance – the goal is to do regular maintenance and to be more careful with accidents. If outsiders do damage to the doors we need to go after their insurance companies to pay for the damage.

Mr. Thayer remarked that with the numbers of doors we have at each site, \$2500 is very reasonable.

Mr. Wesnofske asked about the calibration/repairs budgeted for the scale at NTS and stated that he thought we were getting rid of that scale. Ms. Corrigan replied that she thought so as well and stated that a decision on this will affect the budget.

Ms. Corrigan reviewed the Administration budget worksheet:

- ✓ A cell phone was budgeted for the executive director; however, it is currently shut off.
- ✓ Maintenance agreements were reviewed and discussed.

Chairman Podmajersky suggested getting rid of the color copier because we have to pay for each copy and the monthly cost is higher than the black and white copier. Ms. Corrigan stated that we have a lease on the color copier but not on the black and white copier (the Konica), which is used for most of the copying; however, you need to have another copier on site.

Chairman Podmajersky asked about breaking the lease; Ms. Corrigan advised that Brett was looking into the cost of breaking the lease; however, she believed it would be very expensive to do so. Ms. Mickel advised that included in the lease is all maintenance and supplies and that the copier is also currently being used as our fax machine.

Mr. Wesnofske noted that vendors want long term agreements and that the manufacturers are then responsible for repairs and maintenance. He suggested evaluating when the lease is up.

Mr. Skowfoe asked what the number of copies per year is and suggested buying a copier at Office Max or Staples with an extended warranty and throwing it away when it no longer worked and purchase a new one. He believes that would be much cheaper than leasing a machine.

Mr. Wesnofske asked if these types of copiers are capable of being networked. Mr. Skowfoe was not sure. Ms. Corrigan advised that both the OCE and the Konica copiers are networked.

Ms. Clarvoe asked about paper costs. Ms. Mickel advised her that the price per case is \$33. Mr. Skowfoe remarked that he gets paper for \$24 per case. Mr. Thayer remarked that perhaps Mr. Skowfoe's case only has 8 reams in it instead of 10 reams. Mr. Wesnofske stated that is the cost of being green and using recycled paper.

- ✓ Maintenance agreement on the boiler could be eliminated
- ✓ Telephone costs – Crysti is currently looking into cost savings on the current telephone system
- ✓ Light & power – contract with Integrys through 1/2011

Mr. Skowfoe questioned why we are getting bottled water when we have a well. Ms. Clarvoe remarked that the water tastes terrible. Mr. Skowfoe remarked that it did not have to taste good, just be potable.

- ✓ Rebate calculation – this will probably not be used because we are not making much money in interest on the bonds.
- ✓ Financial Advisors and HR Consultants – may be able to remove this amount from the budget
- ✓ Conferences & seminars - \$4,000

Ms. Podmajersky stated that with the state of the economy she thought conference costs were too high; however, she did not suggest removing it at this time. Ms. Mickel advised this number was down from last year. Ms. Corrigan replied that the only conference budgeted for is SWANA for four people. Mr. Skowfoe asked what four people were going. Ms. Corrigan advised that she did not know who would attend next year. Mr. Wesnofske stated that typically the executive director, some staff and some board members attend. Mr. Thayer remarked that the amount budgeted was down \$1,800 from 2009.

Ms. Corrigan reviewed the Transfer Stations budget worksheet:

- ✓ Safety supplies
- ✓ Miscellaneous items

Mr. Thayer asked how comfortable Ms. Corrigan is with the T&D costs budgeted. Ms. Corrigan advised it is based on the contracted price, which is going up \$1.73 this year.

Chairman Podmajersky asked if there were other comments and suggested the information be reviewed.

Ms. Corrigan asked if anyone needed Steve to answer any questions. She went on to say there are areas that can be cut once an executive director is in place and can give direction such as overtime, changing personnel, etc.

5. 2010 GAT

Chairman Podmajersky remarked that at a quick glance the numbers were scary. Ms. Corrigan advised that Jason Cooper would be joining the meeting as he had prepared the calculations.

Mr. Cooper reported that he had used different scenarios to come up with the calculations and began with Montgomery County:

- ✓ Averaged out 2004 – 2008 deliveries
- ✓ Backed out 2006 flood waste
- ✓ March – July 2009 deliveries were annualized to estimate 2008 lost tonnage numbers
- ✓ Backed out 2004 – 2008 large delivery numbers

Chairman Podmajersky asked what the 2008 lost tonnage numbers represent. Mr. Cooper explained that they are the actual numbers from March – July 2009 annualized and compared to 2008 numbers to figure out the lost tonnage number. This number helps to true up the numbers for 2008 as waste was being diverted from the Authority during the year. He went on to say that there were seven municipalities with fairly significant differences in these years.

Ms. Corrigan advised that we couldn't use unadjusted 2008 deliveries as the information for that year was incomplete. That is why these calculations had to be done in order to give somewhat accurate delivery estimates for 2008. Mr. Cooper continued explaining how he arrived at the estimated number by taking the annualized number, minus flood waste, minus lost tonnage and minus large deliveries.

Mr. Mattas asked if only the 2008 numbers had been adjusted not the 2007 and 2008 numbers. Mr. Cooper responded that only the 2008 numbers had been adjusted.

Chairman Podmajersky remarked that we are back to the lost waste from Keymark and that it had been discussed at every meeting for some time now. Ms. Corrigan advised that she had taken out the lost waste from BFI but wouldn't take out the Keymark waste until instructed by the board.

Chairman Podmajersky stated that she thinks 44,274 ton generation is high for Montgomery County right now.

Montgomery-Otsego-Schoharie Solid Waste Management Authority
Finance Committee Meeting
September 1, 2009

Chairman Podmajersky asked Mr. Cooper to continue and report on Otsego County. She asked if the estimate had been arrived at in the same manner; Mr. Cooper advised that it had.

Mr. Cooper reported that the lost tonnage was figured on a per capita basis where we feel there has been lost waste historically.

Chairman Podmajersky asked what the total of the three counties GAT was; Mr. Cooper responded that the total is 102,719. Ms. Corrigan advised that she had reduced that total by 5% to 97,583 for the budget calculation.

Chairman Podmajersky asked what the tip fee would be at this amount; Ms. Corrigan responded that it would be about \$111.

Mr. Wesnofske asked how the Unadilla lost tonnage amount of 964 was arrived at. Mr. Cooper advised that he had based this on a generated per capita rate for the town of Westford, which is .38, and the population of town and village of Unadilla, which is 4548. Population of 4548 x .38 equals 1728 annual tons. Mr. Wesnofske asked how this compared to previous GAT numbers and said that Unadilla is a place where you get variable amounts due to a change in haulers who only provide crude information about where the waste is coming from. Chairman Podmajersky remarked that Unadilla brings its waste to the Sidney transfer station, not MOSA.

Chairman Podmajersky remarked that in 2005 there were a lot of special events in Montgomery County and the number was less than 40,000; she stated that she thinks the number for 2010 is too high. Mr. Cooper listed the special projects in 2005: Target Distribution Center project, an apartment building in Amsterdam, a house in Amsterdam, and the Windsor Hotel in Amsterdam.

Mr. Skowfoe remarked that Montgomery County's GAT is less than 2009 but Otsego and Schoharie County's GAT are both more than in 2009. He asked how that could be in a declining economy. Ms. Corrigan advised that consistent logic must be used across the service area when doing calculations. She went on to say that 2007 – 2008 numbers were used at first but there had been so much diverted waste during that time that they went back and used 2004 – 2005 numbers as an option. Still not happy with the numbers, she cut them by 5%. Mr. Skowfoe stated that 5% would not cut it.

Mr. Wesnofske stated that you can only get a good guess because the database of information is not good and there has been significant waste diversion going on throughout the three counties.

Ms. Corrigan stated that the three county talks directly affect the entire process. These are the numbers we have to work with; haulers come and go throughout the system and we have to decide on a 2010 GAT.

Mr. Wesnofske asked Mr. Cooper if he was correct when saying for every 10,000 tons taken off the GAT the tip fee is increased by \$4.00 per ton; and added that 60% of costs are T&D and 40% are fixed costs for debt and operating the Authority.

Ms. Clarvoe asked if anyone had last month's GAT totals. Chairman Podmajersky gave her a copy.

Chairman Podmajersky suggested everyone review the information and she would call another meeting soon to discuss it.

Ms. Corrigan remarked that in looking at the numbers and the tip fee, we do not budget for outside waste. She believes there are opportunities out there for outside waste deliveries. She went on to say that Otsego County has an outside hauler interested in delivering waste on Saturdays. Mr. Wesnofske advised that will not be allowed as this is a downstate construction hauler who wants a subsidy in order to bring their waste to MOSA.

Chairman Podmajersky hopes that at the next meeting both the GAT and the new budget are able to be settled.

6. Other Business

Chairman Podmajersky asked if there was any other business.

Ms. Corrigan advised that a RFP is supposed to go out for a replacement for the GASBOY system; however, she would like some assurance if we prepare a RFP that MOSA will move forward with replacing the system. She went on to advise the committee that the current system has had issues, will be obsolete soon, and there will no longer be parts available to fix it.

Chairman Podmajersky asked the cost of replacing the system; Ms. Corrigan advised that the estimated amount last year was \$40,000, but she has no idea if that number is still correct. She went on to say that something needs to happen before the system is unable to be repaired and suggested getting a credit card in order to purchase gas off site. Ms. Corrigan noted that if a mother board goes bad at one of the transfer stations it will cost \$1,000 to replace it.

Mr. Skowfoe stated that he is running the GASBOY system that came from the Northern Transfer Station and that he has not had any problems with the system or getting parts or maintenance done. He went on to say that \$1,000 is better than \$40,000. Ms. Corrigan replied that she just needed to know whether or not to go ahead with the RFP.

Ms. Corrigan reported that a resolution had been adopted earlier in the year, authorizing the purchase of computer equipment. She went on to advise the committee that there were issues with both the server and the current backup system that needed to be addresses. Ms. Corrigan consulted with Brett and he has come up with two options for a backup system. One option includes backup and disaster recovery, called a Barracuda System. This system has an ongoing annual maintenance fee of \$1100.00. The second option is to purchase discs (7 – 10) at \$80.00 a piece and replace them periodically; this system does not include disaster recovery or a maintenance fee. Ms. Corrigan prefers the Barracuda system because of the disaster recovery portion of the system. Mr. Wesnofske stated that with the amount and type of information created on the system every day, he agrees and would prefer an offsite storage system in case of a catastrophic event such as a fire.

Ms. Corrigan also advised that the server needs replacement and that \$21,000 had been set aside in the budget to replace it; however, Brett thinks he can replace it for less than that amount and is working on getting a quote.

Mr. Skowfoe asked why a new server was needed as he believed it had been replaced just a few years ago. Ms. Corrigan advised that it had not been replaced. Mr. Skowfoe asked why the information couldn't be backed up by disc every night. Ms. Corrigan advised that the current system of disc back-up is no longer working properly. She went on to say that all our records on MAS 90, all historical data, Manager Plus – everything we create and use every day is stored on the computer.

Mr. Mattas asked if there was a third option. Ms. Corrigan stated that Brett had already investigated the options and the two she presented were the best.

Mr. Thayer asked the current monthly cost of having Brett come in to back up the system. Ms. Corrigan advised that we are not doing it as the system doesn't work.

Mr. Skowfoe suggested contacting Schoharie County and see if we can piggy back on their backup system. He will get the contact information to Ms. Corrigan and she will have Brett and Jason speak to them.

Mr. Thayer suggested that Chairman Podmajersky send this to the full board for action through her committee.

Chairman Podmajersky asked about the RFP for a GASBOY replacement. Mr. Skowfoe said he would not support it. Ms. Clarvoe asked if there were other options. Ms. Corrigan advised that there were other types of systems and would speak to Ms. Chale as whether a bid or RFP was best.

Mr. Wesnofske asked if there were other vendors out there with other systems and if the systems would be the same at the sites. Ms. Corrigan advised that there were other systems available and the goal was to feed into the Manager Plus system and have all the same equipment at the sites. She went on to say the Dan had advised that the tanks are ok but the pumps are old and the pedestals are rotting and need replacement.

Ms. Clarvoe asked if we could get verification of the facts about maintenance and parts availability from another source. Ms. Corrigan advised that Steve had already done that and had reported back that once the parts in inventory are gone, no more will be manufactured, the system is obsolete and the company will no longer support it once the inventory is depleted. Ms. Clarvoe remarked that we don't know how large of a parts inventory the company has and that there may be parts available for 10 years.

Chairman Podmajersky made a motion to go ahead with the RFP; Mr. Vroman asked if it would go before the full board for approval. Chairman Podmajersky advised that it would. Mr. Vroman then seconded the motion.

Mr. Mattas asked who Mr. Skowfoe used for maintaining his system; Mr. Skowfoe remarked that he had the information at home and would provide it.

Chairman Podmajersky asked if there was any other business. Mr. Mattas stated that he would like to propose a resolution and read it into the minutes as follows:

Resolution Clarifying Practice of Reimbursement of Directors for Travel Expenses

Resolution by John Mattas

Seconded by

Whereas, having past practiced the reimbursement of members of the MOSA Board of Directors for travel expenses to and from: regular meetings, special meetings, committee meetings, educational seminars and/or tours, and specific MOSA related business meetings, and

Whereas, it is the intent of this practice to reimburse members for legitimate travel expense only,

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Authority shall approve mileage reimbursement only from the members primary residential address to the “event”, and,

Be it further Resolved that this practice shall be made retroactive to January 1, 2009.

Ms. Clarvoe asked if this meant if an individual were somewhere other than home they would have to return there before attending the meeting; what if you were closer than your home to the meeting. Mr. Mattas replied then the closer distance would apply.

Mr. Wesnofske stated that this may be contrary to law as unpaid individuals; board members are entitled to be paid for actual expenses incurred.

Mr. Mattas gave an example of being on vacation in Paris and getting paid to go to a meeting as being ludicrous.

Chairman Podmajersky asked if the committee supported the resolution. Mr. Mattas stated that the committee could support it or he would present it to the full board. Mr. Vroman made a motion to bring the resolution to the full board, Ms. Clarvoe seconded; the motion carried.

7. Closing

Chairman Podmajersky asked for a motion to adjourn; Ms. Clarvoe so moved and Mr. Vroman seconded. The meeting adjourned at 9:47 a.m.

8. Next meeting

The next Finance Committee meeting is scheduled for September at 1:00 p.m. to continue discussions on the GAT and Budget for 2010.

Respectfully Submitted,

Judith Beeler,
Confidential Secretary