

Minutes
Rockland County Solid Waste Management Authority
November 16, 2000
Town of Clarkstown, Room 311

Members Present

C. St. Lawrence
E. Devine
T. Dusanenko
F. Fornario
C. Holbrook
S. Hurley
D. Jobson
R. Karben
T. Kleiner
Dr. Yarmus

Members Absent

G. Darden
L. Dessau
T. Lawless
H. Phillips
H. Reisman
A.Thompson
K. Zebrowski

Others Present

R. Delo
A.Etelson
T. West
T. Pytlar
D. Tracy
C. Frankel
S. Simon
D. O'Donnell
Leg. S. Corallo
S. Orfini
M. Reilly

Item #3

RESOLUTION NO. 55 OF 2000
ADOPTION OF MINUTES, MEETING OF OCTOBER 26, 2000

Dr. Yarmus offered the following resolution, which was seconded by F. Fornario and was approved unanimously,

RESOLVED, that the transcribed minutes of the Rockland County Solid Waste Management Authority for the meeting of October 26, 2000 as recorded by the Clerk are hereby adopted.

Item #4-Reports

William F. Cosulich Associates

T. Pytlar stated that the primary activity this month related to assisting the Authority in obtaining manufactures of the wheel kits for the recycling bins for the handicapped and elderly people for test purposes. We assisted the Authority in the review of the bids for the set out containers though the state grant. We observed Waste Management in the installation of a new paper screen on the paper line. This new equipment will reduce labor and enhance the quality of the paper being shipped out. We also reviewed the proposal for the transfer station operation, disposal and transportation agreement. We investigated the economics of establishing a fueling station for the Authority at its transfer station.

C. St. Lawrence questioned if the committee met to discuss the fueling station?

T. Pytlar answered that there was no committee meeting because Miele Sanitation stated at a follow up meeting that they were not in favor of the fuel station because they utilize their waste transport trailers from their transfer station in Clarkstown and in New Jersey. Miele Sanitation could not guarantee that the fuel from out transfer station was going to be used for the Authority's transportation of its waste. If the Authority inquired its own fleet at some time then maybe a fueling station would be a good idea.

Executive Director

R. Delo updated that the kick off event for the electronics-recycling program was held today. Residents and school district attended the event. We will need to do a separate collection to the schools because they have so many computers to dispose of. The event went very smoothly and Senator Morahan attended the event and dropped off a computer. We are getting close with the Orange County Agreement. T. West has been in touch with their attorney to resolve the one outstanding item. I sent a formal proposal to the Town of Hempstead for their recyclables. Town of Hempstead estimates 14,000 tons of containers a year.

C. St. Lawrence questioned the dollar amount of revenue the Authority would receive?

R. Delo answered that it all depends on the value of the containers but it would net over \$150,000.

R. Delo stated that the Authority received a call from Senator Morahan's office that the revision to the Act has finally been sent to the Governor.

A. Etelson clarified that the Governor has 10 days to sign the document.

C. St. Lawrence welcome Sal Corallo to the meeting and stated that on Tuesday he will become a member of the Solid Waste Authority Board to replace H. Phillips. All of the Authority's prayers go out to the former Chairman of the Authority, Herb Reisman, he is in the hospital.

**Item #5
Public Hearing**

Motion to Open Public Hearing
Jobson/Hurley Unan.

Motion to Close Public Hearing
Jobson/Hurley Unan.

Item #6

RESOLUTION NO. 56 OF 2000
ADOPTION OF THE 2001
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY BUDGET

WHEREAS, by Resolution No. 301 the County of Rockland did authorize and form the Rockland County Solid Waste Management Authority under Title 13-M of the Public Authority Law of the State of New York, and

WHEREAS, the Authority is authorized and empowered to fix and collect rates, rental fees, and other charges for the use of availability of the facilities or services, and commodities provided by the Authority, and

WHEREAS, the Authority is authorized and empowered to plan, study and develop solid waste management facilities, as set forth in the Rockland County Solid Waste Management Plan, and

WHEREAS, the Authority, after due deliberation and public hearing, did review and discuss a budget for the fiscal year 2001 setting forth the various expenditures of the Authority, now therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Rockland County Solid Waste Management Authority does hereby adopt the budget of the Authority for the year 2001, a copy of which is attached to this resolution and marked as Schedule "A", be it further,

RESOLVED, that the Executive Director is hereby authorized and directed to take such steps as are necessary to implement the intent of this resolution.

Motion to Approve
Kleiner/Fornario

Discussion

T. Dusanenko questioned what rates are going up?

R. Delo answered that the only rates that are increasing are the transfer station fee. The award for the new contract for the operation, transportation and disposal is on the agenda tonight. The new contract will be awarded to Miele Sanitation at a price of \$60.00 per ton, versus the current \$57.50 per ton. The price of \$60.00 is for the next three years. The Authority's charge of \$3.00 brings the price to \$63.00 per ton. The Authority's user fees are dropping from \$24.20 to \$21.10 per single family house. In the 2001 budget the recyclables rebates is increasing from \$26.00 per ton to \$31.00 per ton.

F. Fornario questioned the difference in the equalization used in the 2001 budget opposed to the rates used in the 2000 budget.

R. Delo answered that in the packet is a letter from the State Comptrollers Office dictating the rates for the year. We are raising the same amount of money from 2000 to 2001.

F. Fornario questioned how often does the rates change?

R. Delo answered every year.

R. Karben stated that he has taken the position with respect to the County Budget not to approve any department head salary increases. I believe for consistency sake it would be hypocritical of me to approve these raises at the same urging the County not to. I have concerns about increase for employees that have been employed by the Authority for less than one year. I know that every vote here is needed to pass the budget. I do not want to hold up the passing of this budget, but I can not agree to this salary schedule.

C. St. Lawrence questioned if we could have future discussions on the salaries and pass the budget and set the salaries at the January 2001 meeting?

R. Karben questioned what would happen to the money already in the budget for the salaries?

C. St. Lawrence answered that the money becomes a salary saving.

R. Karben stated that the salary schedule in it current form is not acceptable and I hope changes can be made by January.

C. St. Lawrence suggested that we put these aside for now and move on to the other business on the agenda and maybe another member will come in?

R. Karben stated if another member comes in then we will get into the business of negotiating. Maybe you should adopt the budget with out the salary schedule?

C. St. Lawrence agreed, and consulted the A. Etelson on the proper procedure.

A. Etelson stated that nine members are need for the adoption of the budget.

C. Holbrook stated that we need to have the budget move forward and have the salaries discussed at a later time and that he would accept R. Karben's amendment to pass the budget with out the salary schedule with the interest of getting the budget passed.

C. St. Lawrence stated that the salaries for the Authority are going down due to the fact that three of the positions of the Authority are going to be reimbursed by the State.

Motion to Approve the 2001 Budget without the Salary Schedule
Karben/Holbrook Unan.

Item #7

**RESOLUTION NO. 57 OF 2000
ADOPTION OF RATE, RENTAL FEE
OR CHARGE FOR USE OR AVAILABILITY
OF THE FACILITIES AND SERVICES OF
THE AUTHORITY FOR THE YEAR 2001**

WHEREAS, the Rockland County Solid Waste Management Authority (the “Authority”), is a Public Authority Corporation, duly organized and existing under Title 13-M of the Public Authority Law of the State of New York, and

WHEREAS, it is necessary for the Authority to set its fees, rates and charges for the usage of the Authority’s facilities for the year 2001 and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to Title 13-M of the Public Authority Law of the State of New York, the Authority is required to hold a public hearing on the above, and,

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held on November 16, 2000, for the purposes of determining the setting of fees, rates and charges, and

RESOLVED, that the fees and charges for the usage of the Authority's facilities annexed hereto and made a part of this Resolution as Exhibit “A” are hereby adopted for the year 2001.

Motion to Approve
Holbrook/Jobson

Discussion

R. Delo stated that the only rate that is being increased is the transfer station tip fee and the rest of the rates have decreased.

C. St. Lawrence stated that he has received a call from Arnie Frumkin, from the Village of Airmont who is opposed to the Transfer Station increase because it will add to his carting costs for the Village. I did mention to him that we are reducing all of our others charges across the County.

R. Karben questioned how the Authority raising its tip fee would have a direct increase to the Village’s budget?

C. St. Lawrence stated that the carters hauling for the Village of Airmont will pay an extra \$2.00 per ton and then they will in return pass that cost to the Village.

R. Delo stated that the Authority is absorbing \$.50 of the increase. We are currently paying \$57.50 and the increase is to \$60.00. Clarkstown rate is also \$63.00 per ton. We are increasing the recyclables rate from \$26.00 to \$31.00 to the municipalities. Our unit charges are going down from \$24.20 to \$21.10. The municipalities are also saving in this area.

C. St. Lawrence questioned if the transfer station increase negatively impacts any other contract?

R. Delo stated that it impacts every carter that dumps at our transfer station.

C. St. Lawrence questioned if it effects any of the host fees for the Town of Ramapo?

R. Delo answered that there are no host fees for the transfer station.

T. Kleiner questioned what are the consequences by not adopting this new rate?

R. Delo answered that if we do not change the rate there will be a shortfall of \$200,000 a year. Clarkstown charges \$63.00 per ton and Orange County is \$65.00 per ton and the private transfer stations are in the same range.

Unan.

Item #8

**RESOLUTION NO. 58 OF 2000
SETTING THE RATE FOR MUNICIPALITY
RECYCLABLES REVENUE PAYMENTS
FOR THE YEAR 2001**

WHEREAS, the Rockland County Solid Waste Management Authority (the "Authority"), is a Public Authority Corporation, duly organized and existing under Title 13-M of the Public Authority Law of the State of New York, and,

WHEREAS, the Authority owns and operates a Materials Recovery Facility, (MRF) for processing the commingled recyclables collected from throughout Rockland County, and,

WHEREAS, the Authority receives revenue from the sale of the recyclables processed at the MRF, and,

WHEREAS, in order to encourage municipalities to maximize their recycling rates and to defray their collection and transportation costs for these recyclables, the Authority would like to share the revenue it receives from the sale of the recyclables, and in accordance with the formula included in the Intermunicipal Recyclables Management Agreement, and,

WHEREAS, based on recyclables revenue received and expenses incurred for operation and maintenance of the MRF for the year 2000, the recyclables revenue payment for 2001 has been calculated to be \$31 per ton, and, therefore be it,

RESOLVED, that the Authority pay over to each municipality which has entered into the Intermunicipal Recyclables Management Agreement with it, the sum of \$31 per ton for each ton of recyclable materials that such municipality has delivered to the Authority during the Year 2001.

Motion to Approve
Holbrook/Kleiner

Discussion

R. Delo clarified that the new recyclables revenue rebate will be \$31.00 per ton. According to the formula in the agreements.

C. St. Lawrence questioned what tonnage number can the five dollar saving be multiplied by?

R. Delo answered that we budgeted \$775,000 to the rebates in 2001.

C. St. Lawrence stated it would be 26,000 tons at an extra \$140,000 of revenue sharing to the municipalities. Last year the Authority had a budget for a PR Firm. I would propose that the staff get a press release out stating that the Authority is not only decreasing the taxes, it is giving \$150,000 in municipal aid, free leaf bags and recycling bins.

T. Kleiner stated that it is very important to pass this resolution.

C. Holbrook stated that being a member of the Authority you see the benefits of the Authority. Over the years it has been a struggle to get the villages signed on with the Authority, but it does show the benefits.

T. Kleiner stated that at the Town level we try to educate the people that it is not just for the environment that the Town gets money back to reduce your taxes.

Unan.

Item #9

**RESOLUTION NO. 59 OF 2000
ESTABLISHING THE POSITION OF SENIOR PROGRAM ASSISTANT IN
ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROCEDURES OF THE ROCKLAND COUNTY
PERSONNEL OFFICE**

WHEREAS, the Rockland County Solid Waste Management Authority, the “Authority”), is a Public Authority Corporation, duly organized and existing under Title 13-M of the public Authorities Law of the State of New York, and

WHEREAS, the Authority has established the position of Senior Program Assistant, and

WHEREAS, the position must comply with the classification and description of services to be rendered in conformity with the procedures established by the Rockland County Personnel office, and

WHEREAS, the job title and description is set forth in the PO 27, attached hereto, now therefore be it,

RESOLVED, that the position of Senior Program Assistant be and it is hereby established retroactive to the date of appointment of the first Senior Program Assistant or position of similar name.

**RESOLUTION NO. 60 OF 2000
ESTABLISHING THE POSITION OF RECYCLING COORDINATOR IN
ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROCEDURES OF THE ROCKLAND COUNTY
PERSONNEL OFFICE**

WHEREAS, the Rockland County Solid Waste Management Authority, the “Authority”), is a Public Authority Corporation, duly organized and existing under Title 13-M of the public Authorities Law of the State of New York, and

WHEREAS, the Authority has established the position of Recycling Coordinator, and

WHEREAS, the position must comply with the classification and description of services to be rendered in conformity with the procedures established by the Rockland County Personnel office, and

WHEREAS, the job title and description is set forth in the PO 27, attached hereto, now therefore be it,

RESOLVED, that the position of Recycling Coordinator be and it is hereby established retroactive to the date of appointment of the first Recycling Coordinator.

Motion to Approve
Holbrook/Jobson

Discussion

R. Delo stated that the Authority already created these positions, but did not do it correctly. The County sent back the final classifications for these two positions and the Authority needs to formally adopt these classifications.

C. St. Lawrence stated that these two positions under the new classifications are being refunded by the State because of a new grant.

R. Karben questioned why does this item need to be done by a second resolution?

R. Delo answered that the County Personnel did not classify the position into this title.

R. Karben questioned if this resolution is not adopted then the positions would not exist?

R. Delo answered that if this resolution is not passed then those employees would be illegal.

F. Fornario questioned what the positions were?

R. Delo answered, Recycling Coordinator and Senior Program Assistant. When the Authority submitted the paper work we named it Administration Assistant and then after the County's review they renamed the position Senior Program Assistant.

R. Karben questioned if there are current employees in these positions?

C. St. Lawrence answered, yes, Sam Abate and Janet Burnet.

F. Fornario questioned what are the consequences if we do not approve these resolutions?

R. Delo answered that the Personnel Department could slap us on the wrist.

R. Karben clarified that these resolutions need to be adopted because the taxpayers would pay more because the State would not refund these positions otherwise.

C. St. Lawrence stated that R. Karben's statement is correct.

Unan.

Item #10

RESOLUTION NO. 61 OF 2000 CONTRACT OF PURCHASING OF RECYCLING BINS

WHEREAS, the Rockland County Solid Waste Management Authority (the "Authority"), is a Public Authority Corporation, duly organized and existing under Title 13-M of the Public Authorities Law of the State of New York, and,

WHEREAS, the Authority has received a grant from the New York State Environmental Protection Fund for purchasing recycling bins for all the households in Rockland County, and,

WHEREAS, the Authority has distributed invitations to bid for the purchase of up to 90,000 blue and 90,000 green recycling bins for the collection of commingled containers and commingled paper products, and,

WHEREAS, the Authority received bids from the following vendors:

Tulip Corporation
Rehrig Pacific Company
SCL A-1 Plastics Ltd.

and the lowest bidder was SCL A-1 Plastic Ltd. in the sum of \$5.39 per bin with lid, now therefore be it,

RESOLVED, that the Executive Director is authorized on behalf of the Authority to purchase the recycling bins from SCL A-1 Plastics Ltd. the said for the sum of \$5.39 per bin with lid according to the specifications set forth in the invitation to bid and Addendums thereto.

Motion to Approve
Jobson/ Dusanenko

Discussion

R. Delo stated that these bins are for the Towns and Villages in Rockland County.

C. St. Lawrence questioned if they have lids and wheels?

R. Delo answered that the bins have lids and the Authority is still looking into the wheel attachments. There are so many different kinds of wheel attachment we want to be sure of the correct one. Every Municipality has agreed to the writing on the bins. One side has the list of acceptable materials and other side is the recycling symbol.

C. St. Lawrence questioned if the Authority is offering the bins to the Villages that have not signed the Intermunicipal Recyclables Agreement?

Everyone answered no.

R. Karben stated that each Town and Village should notify each resident that the bin was given to you by the Rockland County Solid Waste Management Authority.

Unan.

Item #11

Appointment of Nominating Committee for the 2001 Officers

C. St. Lawrence selected the following members to be part of the committee:

Kleiner, Karben, Jobson, Yarmus, Devine, Holbrook, Corallo, Lawless and the Chairman of the committee will be Zebrowski.

Item #12

**RESOLUTION NO. 62 OF 2000
AUTHORIZING THE CHAIRMAN OF THE AUTHORITY
TO EXECUTE A TRANSFER STATION SERVICE
AGREEMENT WITH MIELE SANITATION COMPANY**

WHEREAS, in 1992, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation approved Rockland County's (the "County") Final Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan and Generic Environment Impact Statement (the "SWMP/GEIS"); and

WHEREAS, the SWMP/GEIS sets forth a strategy that relies upon multiple waste management methods and facilities, including the recycling of select solid waste materials; and

WHEREAS, the Rockland County Solid Waste Management Authority (the "Authority") was formed in accordance with section 2053(c) *et seq.* of the Public Authority Law of the State of New York (the "State"), and resolution no. 301 of 1994 of the County Legislature to implement certain provisions of the SWMP/GEIS and to construct solid waste management facilities; and

WHEREAS, the Authority acquired the transfer station located in Hillburn, New York from the Town of Ramapo on August 12, 1998 (the "Transfer Station"); and

WHEREAS, the Authority is undertaking certain improvements to the Transfer Station; and

WHEREAS, the Authority determined under the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA") that the acquisition of the Transfer Station and improvements thereto, including the recyclables preprocessing facility (the "RPF"), will have no significant impact on the environment; and

WHEREAS, on May 28, 1998 a SEQRA Negative Declaration was issued by the Authority; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Authority's procurement policies, on September 15, 2000, the Authority issued a request for proposals to enter into a contract to operate and maintain the Transfer Station (the "RFP"); and

WHEREAS, prior to October 23, 2000 receipt deadline the Authority received three proposals in response to the RFP; and

WHEREAS, the proposals represented offers to enter into the Transfer Station Service Agreement at the fees attached hereto as Exhibit A.

WHEREAS, two proposals were deemed responsive to the RFP; and

WHEREAS, after undertaking an evaluation of the proposals, the Executive Director determined that it is in the best interest of the Authority to enter into a Transfer Station Service Agreement with Miele Sanitation Company; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT:

RESOLVED, by the Authority that it is the finding of the Authority that the Chairman of the Authority is hereby authorized to execute the Transfer Station Service Agreement with Miele Sanitation, Inc., substantially in the form presented at this meeting and attached hereto as Exhibit B, with such negotiated terms and any such amendments, modifications, changes and omissions thereto as the Chairman may approve as in the best interest of the Authority and not inconsistent with the terms of this resolution. The execution of the Transfer Station Service Agreement shall constitute conclusive evidence of the valid authorization hereunder of any such negotiated terms, amendment, modification, change or omission.

RESOLVED, that the Chairman and Executive Director of the Authority, is hereby authorized to execute and deliver any and all other papers, instruments, opinions, certificates, affidavits and other documents, and to do and cause to be done any and all acts necessary or proper in connection with or for carrying out this resolution and the execution and delivery of the Transfer Station Service Agreement.

PROPOSALS FOR TRANSFER STATION OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, HAULING AND DISPOSAL SERVICES

Proposed Fees*

Criteria	J.P. Mascaro & Sons					Miele Sanitation					GEM Enterprises				
	Year					Year					Year				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
A. Service Fee	78.45	78.45	80.80	83.21	85.70	60.00	60.00	60.00	62.00	62.00	63.75	66.80	70.00	73.40	77.50
B. Unacceptable Waste Fee	74.78	74.78	74.78	74.78	74.78	62.00	62.00	62.00	65.00	65.00	65.74	68.80	72.00	75.40	79.50
C. Bulky Scrap Metal Fee	72.60	72.60	72.60	72.60	72.60	12.40	12.50	12.50	12.60	12.60	12.50	13.50	14.50	15.50	16.50
D. Tire Fee	118.75	123.50	128.44	133.57	138.92	100.00	125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00	160.00	168.00	175.00	183.00	190.00
E. Supplemental Staffing															
Supervisor	25.00	26.00	27.04	28.12	29.24	30.00	30.90	31.83	32.78	33.76	56.20	59.00	62.00	65.10	68.30
Equipment Operator	23.00	23.92	24.87	25.87	26.90	25.00	25.75	26.52	27.31	28.12	33.50	35.20	37.00	38.80	41.00
Maintenance Mechanic	23.00	23.92	24.87	25.87	26.90	20.00	20.60	21.21	21.84	22.49	56.20	59.00	62.00	65.10	68.30
Driver	20.00	20.80	21.63	22.49	23.39	20.00	20.60	21.21	21.84	22.49	32.00	33.60	35.30	37.00	39.00
Sorter	15.00	15.60	16.22	16.87	17.54	15.00	15.45	15.51	16.38	16.87	21.40	22.45	23.60	24.75	26.00
Laborer	15.00	15.60	16.22	16.87	17.54	15.00	15.45	15.51	16.38	16.87	21.40	22.45	23.60	24.75	26.00
						The hourly rates for Supervisor, Equipment Operator, Maintenance Mechanic and Driver do not include the hourly rate for health benefits which are currently paid according to the following schedule based on a 40 hour week: Family: 6.10 per hour Husband and Wife: 4.35 per hour Single: 2.10 per hour Parent and child: 3.75 per hour									
F. Merchant Acceptable Waste Tonnage-Based Fee	not provided					not provided					4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00

*Due to GEM Enterprises submitting a proposal reflecting experience in operating fewer than three (3) Transfer Stations or less than five (5) years of Transfer Stations operation experience, GEM Enterprises was not considered by the Authority pursuant to Section 3.1.1(c) of the RFP. Proposed fees are presented here for reference.

Motion to Approve
Dusanenko/Holbrook

Discussion

R. Delo stated that there is a revision to the staffing schedule. The revisions are based on a letter from D. Tracy.

T. West stated the revisions to the staffing plan are changes for the health insurance for the employees.

R. Delo stated that this is a three- (3) year contract with the option to renew for a additional two (2) years. For the first three (3) years the price per ton is \$60.00 per ton. There are other rates that are the contract for unacceptable waste, tires etc.

R. Karben questioned the other bidder name?

R. Delo answered JP Mascaro and GEM. There were only 3 bidders and there were 15 people that picked up the bid packet.

R. Karben questioned the evaluation process.

R. Delo answered that a request for proposals was sent out and three proposals came in. The Authority reviewed the proposals for completeness, accuracy and requested additional information from Miele because he was the lowest bidder. We reviewed their experience, qualifications and the cost. Since Miele has done a great job for the Authority this past year and in Clarkstown.

R. Karben questioned if there was a rating system used?

R. Delo answered that there was no rating system applied to the determination of the transfer station operator. The price per ton was black and white, as far as experience we have minimum qualifications that they had to meet to be responsive to the bid. So many years of operation of a transfer stations, certain types of equipment, and certain types of personnel on staff.

R. Karben questioned if all the bidders met those qualifications?

R. Delo answered that no, the second lowest bidder, GEM, did not have the experience as a company although they had individuals in there firm that had enough experience. Mascaro did have experience but they were the higher price per ton.

R. Karben questioned what records are on the process?

R. Delo answered that there are written reports on the process.

R. Karben questioned who was involved with the review?

R. Delo answered T. Pytlar, T. West and himself.

T. West stated that he has a draft report that he can finalize. His report has not been made available to the public yet.

R. Karben questioned when was that report going to be made available to the members of the Authority who are ratifying your judgment?

T. West stated that the Authority needed to make revisions to the report, when the proposals were finalized and then the report would be final.

R. Karben stated that he was disappointed with the flow of the paper work and that the draft report should have been finalized before the recommendation was made tonight.

C. St. Lawrence stated that last year at this time we were in the situation that we did not have an operator to operate the transfer station. At that time we took the faith of the Executive Director to establish a state of emergency and pick an operator for a year. I think that we can take the judgement of the Executive Director and the Authority's Consultants to pick an operator for the transfer station. I do agree that the report should have been circulated prior to the meeting.

R. Karben stated that he believes that it is not very wise to put all of the Authority's bait in one individual in the decision making. The more information is always better.

R. Delo clarified that the report that T. West is referring to be a record of proceeding in accordance with the law and with the procurement procedure. The record of proceeding is then available to the public (other bidders) to show the step by step process.

C. St. Lawrence stated that the record of proceeding should have been available to the members tonight.

Unan.

Item #13

RESOLUTION NO. 61 OF 2000 CANCELLATION OF THE DECEMBER 2000 MEETING

WHEREAS, the Rockland County Solid Waste Management Authority (the "Authority") is a Public Authority Corporation, duly organized and existing under Title 13-M of the Public Authority Law of the State of New York, and

WHEREAS, by Resolution No. 39 of 1995 the Authority did ratify an amendment to section 4.2 to the by-laws, whereas the Chairman may elect to cancel any

single regular monthly meeting for lack of any business to be transacted or anticipated lack of a quorum, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the regular monthly meeting, originally scheduled for Thursday, December 28, 2000, shall be cancelled.

Motion to Approve
Dusanenko/Fornario Unan.

Motion to Adjourn
Jobson/Yarmus Unan.

Respectfully Submitted,

Camille Guido