

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

DATE: March 19, 2009

LOCATION: MOSA Administrative Complex, Howes Cave

**Committee
Members**

David Parker, Chair
Philip Skowfoe
John Thayer

**Other Board
Members**

Meredith McNeil
Olga Podmajersky
Edward Wesnofske

Others

Gilbert Chichester
Glenn Packard
Steve Rothrock
Dennis Heaton

Chairman Parker called the meeting to order at 11:04 p.m.

Mr. Thayer moved to accept the minutes; Mr. Parker seconded the motion with all in favor.

Chairman Parker reviewed the agenda. Mr. Thayer made a motion to adopt the agenda as presented; Mr. Skowfoe seconded and the agenda was accepted as presented.

1. Review of Projects Memorandum

a) OTS Structural Improvement Options

Mr. Chichester reported that the engineer doing the report has been out sick and should have the OTS report finished soon. Mr. Thayer asked if these are the structural changes needed for the blown out walls. Mr. Chichester advised that they were. Ms. Podmajersky asked if we knew the total cost of the improvements and if all the funds are available for this work. Mr. Chichester advised that a resolution would go before the Board with the total amount needed once that information is determined.

b) Tarping Specs

The tarping specs are being developed and Golder will speak about them at the full Board meeting later today. Mr. Chichester indicated that sketches and drawings for the tarping stations had been distributed and would be incorporated into the bid specs. Mr. Chichester asked if there were any issues with the drawings. Mr. Thayer reviewed the drawings and discussed the options and black topped areas with Mr. Chichester and Mr. Packard. He stated that he didn't want to spend big dollars for a lot of unnecessary black topping and inquired as to the current method of moving around at the site. Mr. Packard and Mr. Chichester explained the current method and advised that it is a safety issue of backing up on the site, which will be eliminated with the creation of the new black topped areas.

Mr. Parker noted that the original cost was \$400,000 for free standing buildings, extensive grading, etc., which has now been pared down to skeletal structures at the sites. This will come in as two separate cost estimates, one for Amsterdam and one for Randall. He recommends proceeding with Amsterdam as it is straight forward and further discussion can occur on the Randall site.

c) Closed Landfill Improvements

Mr. Chichester pointed out that resolution #15 was adopted at the last Board meeting; however, it was incorrectly worded due to a cut and paste error. He pointed out that resolution #16, before the board today, corrects the wording and clarifies what is included in Phase I for the dollar amount proposed, which is a survey for topographical mapping and evaluation of next steps. This resolution replaces Resolution #15.

He indicated that from the work completed in Phase I, we would receive the specifications for Phase II, which would come under a separate agreement. In the discussion that followed, Mr. Thayer asked if there was an in-house list of what needed to be done such as wash outs, flame out and potential access gain. He advised that Mr. Mattas was able to gain access at ATS through an unlocked gate. Mr. Chichester advised that the gates at the transfer stations are kept closed, but not locked; however, the gate around the flame is locked and should be secure at all times. Mr. Parker noted that it has always been locked when he has visited the site.

Mr. Packard reported that he and Dan have done a walk about and noted what needs to be done; he doesn't have a list but will develop and distribute one.

Mr. Thayer thought MOSA staff may be able to take care of some of the repairs but Mr. Parker noted that a GIS contour map serves as a baseline post closure map and must meet DEC regulations and guidelines. While he agrees the estimates are high, Golder is the least expensive with the best quality baseline for the future and the bottom line is that it must meet DEC regulations.

Mr. Chichester indicated that he had reported a number of issues, such as the lack of vegetation indicating a gas leaking, wash outs, leachate, trenching, etc. at a previous meeting and he advised that an engineer needs to evaluate these issues and recommend solutions so as to get at the underlying problems.

Mr. Thayer asked if the \$44,000 for Phase I would cover this. Mr. Chichester stated that the contours on the map will show the drainage patterns that may be causing some of the problems. Mr. Chichester advised that the original drainage swale may not have a liner that may be causing some of the problems with blow outs as well.

Ms. Podmajersky questioned why we didn't go back to the engineering firm that capped the landfill and Mr. Chichester informed her that the firm has gone out of business. Mr. Parker stated that it is absolutely mandatory from a public entity and liability standpoint to do this and that he would be recommending to the Board that we go ahead with the Golder plan.

Mr. Skowfoe advised that he would not support this plan.

d) Landfill Gas

Mr. Chichester advised that he had received several proposals for obtaining data and providing a professional opinion on the possibility of an economic return on using the landfill gas effectively. This includes evaluation of the current system in regard to quantity, quality, collection, water in the system, etc.

- ✓ Clough Harbor proposed \$4500 for scope of services minus evaluation for future use of the gas.
- ✓ SCS was \$6800 and includes scope of services and evaluation
- ✓ Golder Associates was \$3954 and includes scope of services and evaluation

Mr. Parker recommends using Golder because of the sequential logic of having the report completed within a month of receipt of the agreement.

Mr. Thayer noted that if their findings show there is a need to redo the existing piping it may delay the project. Also, the cost of the repair is unknown. There was further discussion about the flare cost and size of the flare needed.

Mr. Chichester advised that the flow determines the size of the flare. A question also arose as to whether DEC was aware of the issue and if MOSA had been sited.

Mr. Chichester advised that DEC was aware and MOSA had not been formally sited. He indicated that DEC was satisfied that the Authority was aware and was moving to remedy the situation. He reviewed Resolution 20, which would allow for the evaluation study and purchase of a new flare.

Mr. Parker suggested modifying the wording in the resolution to put it in a sequential context so as to be considered after the preceding Resolution 19.

Mr. Thayer asked how we were paying for this.

Mr. Chichester advised it would come out of the Building and Grounds Funds.

Mr. Thayer asked if Landfill Services was the only bidder on the flare replacement.

Mr. Chichester and Mr. Packard responded that several other companies have been contacted but had remarked that they were not interested in bidding because they considered the current flare system antiquated.

Mr. Thayer supported sending Resolution 20 to the Board.

e) OTS Recycling Building Repair

Mr. Chichester reported that Otsego County contractors have been using the OTS building for years and it is an ongoing issue as to who is responsible for repairs to the building. He spoke to the increase to the rent at the Otsego County Solid Waste Management Committee meeting last week and reported that the committee balked at this idea. Mr. Chichester indicated that he is currently in negotiations with them regarding who should pay for the damage to the building.

It was decided that for their April meeting the Otsego County Solid Waste Committee will meet at the OTS to view the damage. The committee discussed the current year's rent of \$10,080 and Otsego County's plans for the future of paying down to zero in 2010 and 2011 when they believe they will own the building.

Also discussed was the type of repairs needed, cosmetic or structural and whether or not we have had an estimate made. Mr. Chichester and Mr. Packard advised that the damage has not been thoroughly investigated with regard to the walls in that siding has not been removed. They indicated that some of the trusses have been broken. It was reported that siding needs to be removed to check on whether or not there is structural damage and it was indicated that the doors need to be replaced; no estimate has been made to date.

Mr. Thayer suggested MOSA take on the project itself. Mr. Chichester advised that it is a sizeable project to take on and a decision would need to be made to repair for the original use or modify it for current use and that while we are doing this, other projects will be put on hold.

Mr. Parker recommended an engineer be hired to spec out the work.

Mr. Thayer indicated that MOSA should not be responsible for paying for this; Otsego County should pay for the engineering study. If Otsego County has its own contractor do the work, MOSA should oversee the work to be sure the repairs are acceptable and then negotiate the rent.

Mr. Chichester reported that currently, there is no one from Otsego County overseeing operations at the building when the contractors are using it and the contractors don't care. Mr. Chichester would like some direction on how to proceed with negotiations with Otsego County.

The committee recommended asking Otsego County to cover the cost of an engineer to spec out the repairs and return the specs to the committee for review and determination.

2. Review of Equipment Replacement Fund

Mr. Parker advised that the equipment list was finalized yesterday morning and had Mr. Rothrock comment on each piece of surplus equipment.

Mr. Thayer asked about replacing scales and Mr. Chichester advised the scale deck had been repaired (patched) at Northern and usage is restricted to homeowners only and could be further restricted to bag use only if the scales are determined to be un-usable.

The scale has been certified by Pro-Tech, who checks it every 6 months, and if it cannot be certified, a new diamond plate deck could be laid on top of the old deck at an estimated cost of \$15,000.

Mr. Chichester reminded the committee that the scale in question is the Schoharie scale. Mr. Packard reported that Pro-Tech had recommended replacing this scale before any of the others as it is badly rusted, our repairs are only temporary and it may not be able to be certified if not replaced soon.

Mr. Rothrock suggested replacing the current Toledo scale with a different manufacturer's scale as Toledo's information is proprietary. This causes problems because if the operator receives an error code it can take hours for our scale company to rectify the issue.

Mr. Chichester advised that we would go to bid for a new scale.

Mr. Thayer asked what the scale replacement costs were at other sites.

Mr. Packard advised approximately \$100,000 but that included pier work.

Mr. Skowfoe asked how long the changeover would take.

Mr. Chichester indicated that if no pier work was required, it would take less time and perhaps could be done after regular hours. This would depend on the scale company.

Mr. Parker asked Mr. Rothrock to continue with his comments on the list of surplus equipment.

Mr. Rothrock indicated that the pickup is 9 years old with high miles and that the dump truck is very rusted and has had lots of engine repairs. The extended warranty only covers basic engine/turbo but not rest of the vehicle.

Mr. Thayer advised getting rid of it now while it is up and running.

Mr. Rothrock indicated that he would like to bid a new dump truck with a hydraulic sander rather than an electronic or gas operated sander.

Mr. Skowfoe suggested a flow and dump system.

Mr. Packard will check the state contract before going to bid.

Mr. Thayer asked about the main office computer equipment on Resolution 19.

Barbara Corrigan reported on the recommendation of MOSA's IT technician. She reported that he recommended that the server will need to be replaced by years' end.

Mr. Chichester advised that a new server is not needed at the moment; however, this was to be a pre-authorization of money for a new server and connection box for later in the year. Mr. Chichester reviewed the purchasing policy for the committee advising that a resolution was necessary in order to spend money out of the Equipment Fund.

Mr. Skowfoe, Ms. Podmajersky and Mr. Thayer questioned the need for having these items on the resolution. Ms. Corrigan further advised the need for the new server and connection box and that the printer used for accounts payable may also need replacing later in the year.

Mr. Chichester indicated that this computer equipment would be handled like the leachate pumps on the equipment replacement schedule. This would allow the purchase when necessary.

Ms. Corrigan reported that the IT technician advised that individually, these items would all be below \$5,000. Ms. Corrigan further advised that quotes would need to be sought and that she would want the IT tech's input as he has to work with the equipment.

Mr. Thayer and Mr. Parker do not have a problem with recommending this schedule to the Board.

Mr. Chichester inquired as to whether the Operations Committee recommends that the equipment / materials described on Resolution 18 be declared surplus and disposed of according to the Disposition Policy. After, some discussion, it was the consensus of the committee to do so.

3. Extended Hours Request

Mr. Chichester reported that he received an e-mail from Terry Bliss regarding longer hours at OTS, until 5:00 p.m. 1 night per week. This request came from a single individual to Mr. Bliss.

Mr. Chichester is looking for guidance on giving a response to Mr. Bliss and the individual. Ms. Podmajersky's opinion is that any number of private haulers would probably be happy to pick up his waste.

Mr. Thayer reported that he had heard a complaint in Montgomery County by County Waste that at lunchtime in Randall there is a cable across the entrance and they are closed for lunch.

Mr. Chichester and Mr. Packard were unaware of this and remarked that it may be personnel issue. He and Mr. Packard indicated they would look into this situation and report their findings to the committee.

Mr. Thayer asked if any of the other transfer stations were closed for lunch; Mr. Chichester and Mr. Packard advised that they were not.

4. Other Business

None was brought forth.

5. Closing

Mr. Thayer made a motion to adjourn the meeting; Mr. Parker seconded and all present approved. The meeting adjourned at 12:22 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Judith Beeler,
Confidential Secretary