

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

DATE: June 8, 2009
LOCATION: MOSA Administrative Complex, Howes Cave

Members Present:

Philip Skowfoe, Chair
David Parker
John Thayer

Others Present:

John Mattas
Olga Podmajersky
Harold Vroman
Edward Wesnofske

Gilbert Chichester
Jason Cooper
Dennis Heaton
Bob Loske
Robin Loske

1. Opening

Chairman Skowfoe called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

2. Minutes – March 19, 2009

Mr. Parker moved to accept the minutes; Mr. Thayer seconded and Chairman Skowfoe remarked that he abstained because he had not read the minutes. The minutes were accepted by majority vote.

3. Agenda

Chairman Skowfoe did not want to discuss the items in number 6, “Review of Other Outstanding Issues” and wanted them removed from the agenda as he felt he hadn’t been made aware of the items prior to the meeting. Mr. Chichester responded that these items were outstanding operations issues and that he had faxed the agenda to Chairman Skowfoe last week. Mr. Chichester further stated that it was not an issue if the committee did not want to review the issues at this meeting. Chairman Skowfoe remarked that he was concerned about how long it would take to discuss these issues as the Personnel Committee meeting was at 7:00 p.m. After some discussion, Mr. Thayer moved to approve the agenda as written; Mr. Parker seconded and on voice call the agenda was accepted unanimously.

4. Review Resolution No. 30

Chairman Skowfoe read the resolution to the committee and asked for discussion.

Mr. Parker remarked as he stated in the minutes of the last board meeting (these minutes are not yet published) MOSA is already operating at minimal staffing with this position. His primary issue is with the dilution of Mr. Chichester’s duties to include safety and operations from a day-to-day standpoint. He went on to say that things run safely and smoothly as the operation exists right now and that he would not vote to compromise the existing position; especially from a safety position.

Chairman Skowfoe thinks it would be cost effective; to make us more economical. He asked for a motion to take the resolution to the full board; Mr. Thayer made the motion and Chairman Skowfoe seconded. On voice call Mr. Thayer and Mr. Skowfoe voted aye and Mr. Parker voted nay.

5. Gas Flare at Eastern Landfill

Mr. Chichester explained the existing system at the landfill, advising that it is a passive system not an active system that would create a vacuum and as such makes it difficult to accurately measure the flow of gas. At this point in time, the company (Landfill Service Corp.) that went out to replace the flare has indicated the flow is greater than the largest flare they had in stock can accommodate. The company provided a quote for the manufacture of a larger flare, that would be comparable to the existing flare before it discontinued working, and its installation at a total of \$5,559.55, which is about double the amount approved for in the resolution. (Resolution 20 dated March 19, 2009)

Mr. Chichester advised that replacement of the flare cannot proceed without increasing the amount on the resolution and having an accurate measurement of the flow of gas. Golder engineers are questioning the measurement taken by Landfill Service during their visit to the site, as there is quite a wide range from 600 – 1000 CFM, and would like to perform their own flow test before recommending the appropriate flare size.

Mr. Parker brought up Resolution 20, which was adopted on March 19, 2009. It contained two parts:

1. Golder Associates Inc. for a Landfill Gas Collection and Control System Evaluation at the Eastern Landfill for an amount of \$3,954.
2. Landfill Service Corp. for a CF-10 flare and installation for no more than \$3,500.

Mr. Parker suggested going ahead with the first resolve and have Golder perform the system evaluation. Mr. Chichester agreed that was possible without any changes to the resolution.

Mr. Parker also remarked that the quote from Landfill Service Corp. was not double the \$3,500 approved in the resolution but closer to \$2,000 more or even less than \$2,000 if the current guy wire set is in good condition and doesn't need replacement. Mr. Parker recommends proceeding with the items in the resolution and increasing the amount of the resolution by amendment at the next board meeting.

Mr. Mattas asked for clarification as to whether the \$3,954 for Golder was to measure the flow only once or would they take ongoing measurements.

Mr. Chichester read from an e-mail he received from Golder and interprets it as ongoing measurements from a device (an installed flow meter). Mr. Mattas thought it best in dealing with DEC on post-closure to have the ability to take ongoing measurements; Mr. Parker agreed.

Mr. Thayer questioned the limiting factor to flow regarding flare size and asked how this was determined; by chamber size, restrictions on the flame, etc.

Mr. Chichester responded that he did not know if he could answer that question and went on to say that the measurement of 60% methane should be accurate; however, he is not sure exactly what determines flare size. He indicated that is why we have hired professionals to deal with this situation.

Mr. Skowfoe stated that they must have checked it before they came to install the flare; Mr. Chichester responded that they had visited the site prior to the scheduled installation and he believed they were trying to use a flare they already had on the shelf. He further went on to explain that Landfill Services tested the flow at the end of the pipe and it measured 600 – 1000 CFM and then came to the conclusion that the flare they had was too small as it was rated for 0- 140 CFM.

Mr. Skowfoe asked why they didn't test the first time they were at the site before bringing the flare. Mr. Chichester responded that we are dealing with two different entities that have two different purposes; the manufacturer that makes and installs flares and the engineers who use more scientific methods of testing and evaluation.

Mr. Parker remarked that it was his understanding that we were looking for the most expedient way to deal with a problem; the flare had been out for a month and a half and installing a flare that was already available would be the quickest solution. At the time, Golder thought that the #10 flare would work. He went on to

explain that the flare could not be replaced with the same model that was previously installed as it is obsolete and no longer available.

Mr. Thayer read from the 3/19/09 Operations Committee minutes, in which a discussion took place about this issue; however, he concluded from the minutes that the issue was not really resolved. He stated that we could move forward with the resolution in place (Resolution 20) and do the flow test. He asked Mr. Chichester how long the test would take; an hour, a day, a week. Mr. Chichester responded that they hadn't gotten that far yet and that Golder was investigating flow meters and would be in touch with him to discuss the matter when they had more information.

Mr. Thayer suggested installing the flow meter, get the necessary readings, which will be skewed, but will at least give them something to work with, and then see if Landfill Services can provide a flare for \$3,500. After some discussion, it was decided to proceed as stated in Resolution 20 and if necessary, bring the resolution back before the full board if the cost will exceed \$3,500.

6. Review of other outstanding issues

a. Landfill repairs

Mr. Chichester asked about how to proceed with landfill repairs now that DEC has spoken to the board.

Mr. Thayer stated that in the past MOSA employees did the repairs up to the point where there was a breach in the liner. Mr. Chichester responded that with engineering guidelines, MOSA staff had done some repairs in the past. Mr. Thayer asked if with the current caps there was an opportunity they could do it again and stated that Golder is asking for \$44,900 for mapping and identifying problem areas; Mr. Chichester added that it also included laying out a plan.

Mr. Parker remarked that after Golder reviews the situation at the landfills and prepares a plan it should then come to the full board and the Executive Director to review and determine if MOSA staff are capable of performing any or all of the necessary repairs.

Mr. Thayer wanted to know if staff were reporting pooling areas and washouts and were trying to repair them before it becomes critical maintenance.

Mr. Chichester responded that at the Central Landfill, the discussion has been to have work done to ensure that the water can find its way from top to bottom so as to prevent erosion. The suggestion has been made that down spouts or lined ditches could be used to go from swales, one to the other, in order to control the flow of water on the face of the landfill. He questioned whether staff should be left to figure this out on their own without an engineering study and instruction on where the down spouts or ditches should be placed, how to line them, and so on.

Mr. Thayer asked if the \$44,900 could be pared down. He remarked that he thought \$44,900 was an excessive amount and that the mapping, which he believed was the highest cost in the proposal, should be left out. Mr. Parker responded that the mapping was \$19,700 and the plan was \$25,100. He remarked that this plan is a permanent plan that we can live from for years to come.

Mr. Thayer responded that he recalled one of the DEC representatives (he could not recall his name) saying he thought the proposal was "overkill". Mr. Parker responded that DEC said that the 1 foot

contour mapping was “unusual”. He went on to explain that while the 1 foot map is not mandatory, it gives the user of the data an early warning system of imminent changes, etc. and that Mr. Chichester had gotten three quotes and that Golder’s was the lowest. Mr. Parker would like to stick with the proposal as written and recommend it to the full board.

Mr. Thayer asked how you would know when there is change without doing another 1 foot map every 3-5 years; he thinks the proposal is “overkill”.

Mr. Parker responded that once the map is done, a base line is shot and we decide how and when we want additional mapping; 3, 5 or 10 years. He asked if anyone had experience with GPS mapping.

Mr. Mattas remarked that he had looked into it on the Internet and suggested renting equipment to be mounted to the lawn mowers so that mowing and GPS mapping could be done at the same time. He thinks it would be practical and cost saving. Oneida and Fulton Counties were using this equipment on their landfills.

Mr. Skowfoe asked if he had a cost on the equipment; Mr. Mattas responded that he did not.

Mr. Chichester remarked that he was not sure mowing with GPS equipment attached would give the same result as GPS mapping. It would have to be looked into.

Mr. Parker stated that he trusts Golder and on a previous proposal, the post closure estimate, they came in under bid. He made a motion to recommend the proposal to the full board; as there was no second, the motion died in committee.

b. Tarping Stations

Mr. Chichester stated that all work has been stopped on the tarping stations.

Mr. Parker remarked that he thinks we should be proceeding on these stations; and confirmed with Mr. Chichester that bid specs were being developed and the rough estimate for per station costs was \$45,000. He went on to say that at the last Operations Committee meeting, it was his recollection, that it was decided to recommend to the full board that Montgomery County stations be done first; however, this was stopped because of a letter from Terry Bliss asking MOSA to stop all capital expenditure projects.

Ms. Podmajersky said that Ms. Wesnofske gave a directive to Mr. Chichester to stop all work due to Mr. Bliss’ request. Mr. Parker remarked that he does not agree with this directive.

Mr. Thayer thought there had been an issue with black topping at Randall, but that there had not been an issue at Amsterdam, Oneonta or Schoharie. Mr. Chichester replied that they were only pursuing tarping stations at Amsterdam and Randall and that no blacktopping was necessary at the Amsterdam station as the tarping station was to be constructed in the middle of the existing blacktop parking lot. Mr. Thayer read a section from the 3/19/09 minutes in which Mr. Parker recommended proceeding with the Amsterdam station first as it is straightforward and further discussion can occur on the Randall site. However, Mr. Parker remarked, it was never recommended to the full board, probably for this reason.

Mr. Thayer read another section of the minutes in which Mr. Parker described the size and scope of the original project (free standing buildings, extensive grading, etc. at a cost of \$400,000) and the current pared down skeletal structure version and then asked what the cost estimate was on just the scaffolding type of station. Mr. Chichester advised it was in the \$40,000 range for the scaffolding plus the cost of the concrete pad and jersey barriers. This was later determined to be in the \$30,000 range. There is no cover, no electrical; it is basically a pad, scaffolding and jersey barriers to protect the scaffolding. Mr. Parker remarked that engineering specs were needed and that he believes it will come in well under that number.

Mr. Thayer suggested a rolling stairs tarping station concept that he believed would probably come in at a great cost savings and asked if anyone knew if they were being used in the area. He went on to say that he wasn't sure if snow and ice in the winter would pose a problem with this type of system and remarked that it may be a problem for the scaffold system. Mr. Chichester asked him to explain the concept of the rolling stairs system and if it was automatic. Mr. Thayer advised it is a completely manual system that starts at the front and moves towards the back; you set it, roll it and set it, etc. He further explained that it takes time to do so and would take two people to tarp a trailer. Mr. Chichester responded that no matter what system you use, it will require time and two people to operate. Because of the limited staff at these sites, the station would have to be shut down while tarping and customers would have to wait. The current method of tarping is one person tarps a trailer by walking on top of the load. Mr. Skowfoe remarked that he didn't think the rolling station would take much longer than working on the scaffold station.

Mr. Chichester advised that at the Randall location the lay of the land and black topping needs to be considered when deciding what type of tarping station will work. He voiced concern about the rolling station's operation at this site and questioned the size of the wheels; especially during the winter months. He asked if they were used in this area.

Mr. Thayer advised that he saw them being operated outside in the winter at warehouses while working in New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Mr. Skowfoe remarked that they are used in the Price Chopper warehouse.

Mr. Thayer remarked that his concern is the time it will take to tarp a load. Montgomery County has just gotten a municipal waste hauler back into the system, but waiting is a big issue for this hauler and they don't want to lose him again.

Mr. Wesnofske asked in using this system, how many times would staff have to go up and down the stairs to tarp a load. Mr. Thayer advised on a 45' trailer it would probably be at least 5 times; whereas with the scaffolding station, they just walk up once, tarp the load and walk down. He went on to say that if it can be done for \$40,000 per site, he would support it.

Mr. Skowfoe stated that the Riccelli contract is coming up and he would rather see automatic tarps put into the bid specs for the new T&D Contract and eliminate the whole thing. Mr. Thayer remarked that Riccelli is willing to open his contract up and we could talk to him about that. Mr. Skowfoe further remarked that he doesn't understand why we should spend the money for tarping stations when it could be part of the bid specs and the contractors that bid for the trucking contract can take care of it.

Mr. Chichester pointed out that you need to consider there are different circumstances at each transfer station. He talked about the visit to the Oneida County burn plant and advised that these loads were processed waste not regular MSW. It had been shredded and was easy to level off in the trailer before tarping. He reminded the committee that Rich did express concern in regard to the automatic tarping systems.

Mr. Skowfoe remarked that maybe he won't be the only contractor to bid on the T&D contract and if it is in the bid spec they will have to deal with it.

Mr. Wesnofske stated that another issue Rich raised was that one or more of the transfer stations do not have wide enough bays for the arms on the side.

Mr. Chichester clarified that Rich was talking about room for the side arm wings like those on roll off trucks. He further advised that Rich had tried this system but found that wind direction was an issue when using this type of tarping system; he has since discarded this model.

Mr. Chichester stated that our sites are set up so that the probability of the side of the trailer hitting the wall is remote to none. Both the WTS and ATS have curbs on both sides so when the trailer drives through; it will not hit the wall on either side. The OTS had a curb installed on the side of the tip wall to keep the trailer from hitting the side there as well. Mr. Chichester pointed out that Mr. Riccelli would have to dedicate trailers to MOSA sites and have them return to MOSA sites. Mr. Chichester advised that Rich is willing to come back and talk about options with the board.

Mr. Skowfoe remarked that he would like to talk to him and to other contractors about options and thinks others will bid on the T&D contract.

Mr. Chichester remarked that at this time we are in a mode of not knowing whether we will rebid.

Mr. Skowfoe asked why we wouldn't rebid.

Mr. Chichester responded that some people want to defease, some people want to have a new Service Agreement.

Mr. Skowfoe stated that defeasance of the bonds and changes in the Service Agreement are meant to reduce the tip fee and the GAT subsidy; but that doesn't mean we won't be in the transportation and disposal business any longer.

Mr. Parker stated that \$40,000, in the context of the T&D Contract, is pitifully insignificant and shouldn't prohibit us from proceeding. He understands the scheduling and leveling issues. He added that he doesn't lose sleep over it but he does see the possibility of people falling off trailers and hopes there won't be a lawsuit. Mr. Parker went on to say that he thought it would show good faith to OSHA who had not officially sited us yet, but had mentioned that this was not a good method. Mr. Chichester confirmed his statement that OSHA had, in fact, mentioned the issue in the past.

Mr. Skowfoe asked for further comments.

Mr. Thayer asked if he would object to getting one site, ATS, up and running with scaffolding for a trial and evaluate. Mr. Skowfoe responded that he would rather bid it out with automatic tarps on the trailers in the T&D contract; so he would not support it.

Mr. Thayer asked if the bid specs were prepared. Mr. Chichester responded that the engineers had been working on them. Mr. Thayer asked about the cost to prepare the bid specs. Mr. Chichester responded that he would have to look up the cost.

Mr. Parker moved to proceed as written in the minutes of the 3/19/2009 Operations Committee meeting, recommending to the full board that a scaffolding tarping station be constructed at the ATS as a trial. Mr. Thayer seconded the motion to recommend to the full board for discussion there by all the board members. On voice vote, Mr. Parker and Mr. Thayer voted aye and Mr. Skowfoe voted nay.

c. OTS structural repairs

Mr. Chichester reported that tomorrow he should have the final specs and drawings to go to bid for the structural repairs to the Oneonta Transfer Station. The high side of the estimate given to us by the engineer was about \$125,000 for the work and the low end was about \$90,000.

d. Equipment Replacement

Mr. Chichester advised the committee had authorized the replacement of six items; we have only proceeded on #4, replacing the scale at the Schoharie Transfer Station. We have developed a spec and the bid is out there. Bids are due on June 23rd so we should have bids back for the next board meeting on June 24th.

e. Surplus Equipment

Mr. Chichester reported that the surplus equipment that the committee had authorized selling would be sold at auction on Saturday, June 13th. The equipment is being moved to the site on Tuesday, June 9th.

f. Leachate processing

Mr. Chichester reported that in discussions with DEC and Golder it does appear that there is some viability of dealing with leachate processing in a less expensive manner. This remains an open item; nothing has been done other than identify it as a possibility.

Mr. Thayer asked if this was leachate from both landfills. Mr. Chichester responded that it was; one may be more viable than the other.

Mr. Parker remarked that the test results from both landfills are comparable.

Mr. Chichester advised that the Central Landfill is a lot closer to the Mohawk River than the Eastern Landfill. Basically, we would be looking for more engineering work.

Mr. Parker proposed that the board speak with Dick Forgea to see if DEC would entertain a proposal based on historical, current and local data to reclassify the leachate from the analytical data obtained over the last five years. At least this would be a start.

Mr. Skowfoe asked him if he was making a motion; Mr. Parker responded that he was.

Mr. Chichester asked Mr. Parker what the classification is based on.

Mr. Parker advised that the classification could be changed based on the analytical data, relative to the classification of the disposal site. He advised that the Mohawk River is a different classification.

Mr. Chichester stated that we are not changing anything; at the moment we are just looking to identify the viability of the discharge. Mr. Parker agreed and said we could be rejected; however, we could ask for guidance at the same time.

Mr. Thayer questioned if this could be done in conjunction with defeasance or if we should wait. His concern is that the process of defeasance may be slowed down if we are waiting for a DEC decision on the leachate reclassification. He prefers to wait until after the bonds are defeased and everything is settled.

Mr. Skowfoe asked for a second; and discussion. Mr. Parker looked to Mr. Thayer to second the motion; he did not do so. Mr. Parker asked for discussion. Mr. Skowfoe advised with no second there could be no discussion and the motion dies. He stated it could be brought up again at another time.

g. Other

Mr. Skowfoe asked if there was anything else; no one came forth. Mr. Skowfoe then said he had something else and stated, "this is the Operations Committee and the Director of Operations is not here and he should have been". He then asked for a motion to adjourn.

7. Closing

Mr. Thayer made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Mr. Parker. The meeting adjourned at 6:03 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Judith Beeler,
Confidential Secretary