

Minutes
Rockland County Solid Waste Management Authority
March 22, 2001

Members Present

C. St. Lawrence
L. Dessau
E. Devine
T. R. Dusanenko
S. Hurley
D. Jobson
R. Karben
T. Kleiner
A. Thompson
Dr. Yarmus
K. Zebrowski

Members Absent

S. Corallo
F. Fornario
C. Holbrook
T. Lawless
I. Schoenberger

Others Present

R. Delo, P.E.
T. West
T. Pytlar
B. Beckmann
S. Orfini

The Meeting was called to order at 8:11 p.m.

Item #3

**RESOLUTION NO. 7 OF 2001
ADOPTION OF MINUTES, MEETING OF FEBRUARY 22, 2001**

K. Zebrowski offered the following resolution, which was seconded by D. Jobson and was approved unanimously,
RESOLVED, that the transcribed minutes of the Rockland County Solid Waste Management Authority for the meeting of February 22, 2001 as recorded by the Clerk are hereby adopted.

Item #4

REPORTS-WFC

T. Pytlar summarized the work WFC conducted during the month of March. A MRF job meeting took place where WM introduced its new plant manager, Jeff Rouse. During the meeting, WFC discussed issues of operations and maintenance with the new plant manager. WFC continued to track DEC reviews of grant applications for the Authority. There was an award made for the recyclables preprocessing facility in the amount of \$1,093,000, however we originally applied for the \$2,000,000. We assisted the Authority in planning for school recycling assistance and backyard composting-waste reduction programs. WFC continued its observation with its resident engineer for the improvements to the transfer station with the contractors.

S. Hurley questioned the DEC grant for the consolidation facility?

T. Pytlar answered that after the last meeting it did not seem as though we were going to move forward with building a facility in the Town of Orangetown. WFC did call the DEC to see if the money could be redirected for other usages such as to provide assistance to the schools and small businesses with recycling. The DEC answered that the redirection could not be done and if we were to pursue funding for schools and small businesses we would have to file another application.

C. St. Lawrence questioned if the DEC mentioned any other programs that the Authority could use the money for?

T. Pytlar answered that the DEC's policy is that you have the information in the application about how you plan to spend the money, if you don't mention anything in the application, then the money cannot be used. The preprocessing facility grant application did not have any wording in reference to the school recycling and or small business recycling.

Executive Director

R. Delo stated that in each board member packets are reports from various staff members for their review. The Authority is still having problems with getting amendment for the Cocomposting Facility. Clarkstown's wood waste it is too wet and there is not enough quantity. The Authority's staff is working with Clarkstown to resolve this issue. The Authority has been receiving amendment from various landscapers to help with the shortage. The landscapers want to get paid for the material. The Authority has been meeting with Synagro to discuss the possibility of paying the landscapers for the wood waste.

T. Dusanenko stated that Orange and Rockland has a number of companies that they use to dispose of wood waste year round and the Authority should contact them to discuss options.

R. Delo stated that Orange and Rockland does have plenty of material but wants the Authority to pay them for it and now we do not pay Clarkstown for any material.

T. Dusanenko suggested if we ever looked into setting up covered drop off areas in Rockland County?

R. Delo clarified that Synagro is required to pick up material from Clarkstown and drop it off at the Cocomposting Facility under contract. Synagro has offered the Authority a credit back for not picking up that material since it is not available at a price of \$5.50 a ton.

C. St. Lawrence suggested contacting I. Wicks for wood waste.

R. Delo answered that the Authority has been in touch with I. Wicks, Orange and Rockland, Sterling Carting and Sullivan Tree Service. All of those companies have

material but the Authority needs to create a competitive situation to come close to the price that we can offer as credit.

C. St. Lawrence questioned who pays the Authority \$25.00 a ton for wood waste?

R. Delo answered people that bring unprocessed wood waste pay \$25.00 a ton. The material that we get from Clarkstown is already processed.

R. Delo suggested a sub committee to look at a possible education campaign for the Authority. Several years ago the Authority had a very bad experience with our last PR firm and had to terminate them. When the Authority did presentations for PR firms several years ago, at that time there was a second company that was very good and produced excellent material. The problem was that they were very expensive. There is a grant that the Authority is receiving from the DEC that has allocated money to be paid for this expense. R. Delo stated that the DEC would be paying 50% of this expense and would like volunteers to hear a presentation from the firm. They are located out of Fort Lee, NJ.

C. St. Lawrence recommended Karben, Zebrowski and himself to be on that committee.

T. Dusanenko questioned where the first PR firm was located?

R. Delo answered Pomona, NY.

T. Kleiner questioned the name of the potential PR firm?

R. Delo answered Kalmar.

T. Dusanenko stated that this company is not local.

R. Delo answered that they are building a new office in Orangetown.

C. St. Lawrence requested material to be sent to all the Authority members in reference to Kalmar.

R. Delo mentioned that the Authority did have a meeting with PIP. It was not very productive and more meetings are to follow. PIP is not interested in paying for anything from the prior years and they have taken the attitude of comparing prices for each service.

C. St. Lawrence stated he was present at the meeting with PIP and they keep making the note that they want to be good neighbors but they do not understand the Authority's services and want to see results of the Authority's service now. Their parks are cleaner because of the Solid Waste Authority. In the Governor's veto message he said that they should be paying a tax but not what the Authority has said.

R. Delo stated that PIP is not recycling in any of their office buildings or parks.

C. St. Lawrence stated that after notifying PIP that they are violating Article 17 of the Source Separation Code, their answer was that they are a State Agency and they can do what they want.

Dr. Yarmus questioned Denis O'Donnell's Report item #9-what septic tank?

R. Delo answered that there is a septic tank at the transfer station and the scalehouse. The Authority is required to put in septic tanks to remove solids from the discharges since dischargers will go through the Ramapo leachate pump station which cannot pump solids. When the new wastewater treatment plant is built in Western Ramapo they will be eliminated.

Item #5

**Resolution No. 8 of 2001
AUTHORIZING THE TRANSFER OF INTEREST EARNING FROM THE 1996A
AND THE 1996B BOND ISSUE TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR
THE TRANSFER STATION/RECYCLABLES PRE-PROCESSING PROJECT**

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

WHEREAS, the SWMP/GEIS sets forth a strategy that relies upon multiple waste management methods and facilities, including recycling, 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 "Act"), 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 issued its Series 1996A General Obligations Bond in the amount of \$22,936,600 through the New York State Environmental Facilities Corporation ("NYSEFC") to finance the design and construction of a sewerage sludge composting facility (the "Cocomposting Facility"), and,

WHEREAS, the Authority issued its 1996B General Obligation Bonds in the amount of \$11,620,000 to finance the Cocomposting Facility related costs that were ineligible for financing through the NYSEFC and to finance the design and construction of a materials recovery facility (the "MRF"), and,

WHEREAS, the Authority issued its 1999A General Obligations Bonds in the amount of \$4,000,000 to pay certain costs incurred in connection with the acquisition, rehabilitation and equipping of a municipal solid waste transfer station and the design and

construction of a recyclables pre-processing facility (the “Transfer Station/RPF Project”), and,

WHEREAS, the Authority has interest earnings from the 1996A and 1996B bond issuances, which were used to finance the design and construction of the Cocomposting Facility, to finance the Composting Facility related costs that were ineligible for financing through the NYSEFC and to finance the design and construction of the MRF, and,

WHEREAS, the Cocomposting Facility, the MRF and the Transfer Station/RPF Project, along with the household hazardous waste facility and yard waste composting facility, comprise the principal components of the solid waste management system developed and operated on behalf of the Authority, and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Authority hereby authorizes the Executive Director to apply interest earnings from the 1996A and 1996B bond issuances set forth herein to provide additional funding for the Transfer Station/RPF Project, which along with the Cocomposting Facility, the MRF, the household hazardous waste facility and yard waste composting facility, comprised principal components of the solid waste management system of the Authority, in accordance with the requirements of the NYSEFC and the recommendation of the Authority’s bond counsel and financial advisor.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Authority hereby authorizes the Chairman, Treasurer or Executive Director to execute any and all documents as may be necessary to effectuate the intent of this resolution.

Motion to Approve
Zebrowski/Thompson Unan.

Item #6

Resolution No. 9 of 2001
AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EXCESS 1996A BOND PROCEEDS FOR THE
AUTHORITY’S SHARE OF THE COSTS OF A NEW TUB GRINDER AND THE
DEVELOPMENT OF AN OUTDOOR COMPOST EXHIBIT AREA

WHEREAS, in 1992, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (“NYSDEC”) approved Rockland County’s (the “County”) Final Integrated Solid Waste Management plan and Generic Environmental 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 “Act”), 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 issued its series 1996A General Obligation Bond in the amount of \$22,936,600 through the New York State Environmental Facilities Corporation (“NYSEFC”) to finance the design and construction of a sewage sludge composting facility (the “Cocomposting Facility”), and

WHEREAS, the Authority has excess bond proceeds from the 1996A General Obligation Bond issuance used to finance the design and construction of the Cocomposting Facility of which the tub grinder and the outdoor compost exhibit area will be part of such Facility, and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Authority hereby authorizes the Executive Director to apply the excess 1996A proceeds set forth herein to pay the Authority’s share of the cost related to acquiring a new tub grinder and the development of an outdoor compost exhibit area at the Cocomposting Facility, in accordance with the requirements of the NYSEFC and the recommendation of the Authority’s bond counsel and financial advisor.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Authority hereby authorizes the Chairman, Treasurer, or Executive Director to execute any and all documents as may be necessary to effectuate the intent of this Resolution.

Motion to Approve
Zebrowski/Thompson Unan.

Item #7

**Resolution No. 10 of 2001
AUTHORIZING THE FILING OF SUIT AGAINST
SCHETTINO SERVICE CORP.**

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 contracted with a hauler, Schettino Service Corp., to allow Schettino Service Corp. to utilize the services of the Authority’s transfer station in consideration for the payment by Schettino Service Corp. to the Authority of tipping fees, and

WHEREAS, Schettino Service Corp. has become significantly in arrears in paying its outstanding balance despite numerous demands for payment by the Authority, and

WHEREAS, the Authority has attempted unsuccessfully to come to an agreement with Schettino Service Corp. on paying its debt in installments, and

WHEREAS, the Authority's best interest would be served by passing this resolution authorizing suit against Schettino Service Corp. to collect the debt owed to the Authority plus interest if and when in the opinion of the Executive Director and Counsel such suit would best serve the Authority's interest, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Authority hereby authorizes suit against Schettino Service Corp. to collect its debt plus interest if and when in the discretion of the Executive Director and Counsel it is in the Authority's best interest.

Discussion

T. Dusanenko questioned if the update of the outstanding balance is in the packets?

R. Delo answered that it was handed out tonight.

T. Dusanenko stated that \$1.2 million is still outstanding.

A. Etelson clarified that suit was filed against Sonny Zito in the amount of \$72,000. Suit was filed against Marangi Disposal in the amount of \$209,000. Marangi Disposal is disputing it. Judgment was collected against TTI. Schettino is the biggest one and if the board passes this resolution then he will file it first thing tomorrow.

T. Dusanenko stated that we do need to make some progress in these outstanding balances.

K. Zebrowski questioned if T. Dusanenko has any suggestions on what more the Authority can do to collect these funds?

T. Dusanenko stated that after the next meeting we should invite these people in and find out what their problem is.

C. St. Lawrence stated that T. Dusanenko is making a good point because many of these carters are picking up garbage from the Towns and Villages and getting paid taxpayer dollars.

T. Dusanenko stated that C. St. Lawrence's suggestion is a good one; let them make their payments though the Towns and Villages directly to the Authority because maybe they are not really mature enough to handle the cash flow.

C. St. Lawrence stated that at the next Authority meeting the board members should have a report on each outstanding balance and note that the Counsel did implement a credit policy.

A.Etelson questioned how does the Authority want to act on this?

T. Dusanenko stated that what good is broken promises for payment?

A.Etelson stated that we don't want to shut down these companies.

T. Dusanenko referred A.Etelson to look at the amounts on the report and the number of days late, it keeps adding up.

S. Hurley suggested what about revising the Towns licensing laws to reflect this problem?

R. Karben suggested that the Counsel circulate language that would enable municipalities to do what Hurley suggested.

T. Dusanenko called the questions and that some good suggestions were made.

Motion to Approve Suit Against Schettino Service Corp.
Zebrowski/Hurley Unan.

After further discussion the Authority Board directed Counsel to research the following items:

1. To have present at its next meeting a full detailed report on the status of any and all outstanding revenue accounts due to the Authority.
2. Research the ability to garnish funds from carters who have contracts with municipalities for garbage removal that have outstanding balances with the Authority.
3. Research the various ordinances and licensing laws for each municipality in which the carters operate and draft standard language by which municipalities could modify or amend legislation.

Motion to Direct Counsel
Dusanenko/Hurley Unan.

A.Etelson stated that the Authority could garnish any funds after a judgment is issued but before a judgment is issued he would have to research if the Authority can legally do that.

Item #8

Discussion-NYSDEC Environmental Protection Fund Grants

a) Consolidation Facilities

R. Delo stated that a discussion was already made on the grant for the consolidation facility in Orangetown and Orangetown does not want the site their Town if it is going to service other areas. The Authority did approach Haverstraw and Stony Point and at this time they had no site which was acceptable. R. Delo feels that the Authority should let this grant go at this time. NYSDEC grants this money on a first come first serve basis. The Authority can get on the DEC list again on a later date.

T. Dusanenko questioned if Miele's transfer station could be used?

R. Delo stated that Miele's transfer station is on private property and the Authority did met with Clarkstown about the landfill and there is no room for the facility there.

b) Fiber Presort System

T. Pytlar stated that the DEC has requested that the Authority submit a final application. The fiber presort system is a piece of equipment that would automate the sorting of the newspaper, junk mail, and corrugated cardboard. At no cost for the Authority, that system has been installed at the MRF by WM and it is currently being tested. If the results are favorable, based on a report by WM, then the Authority could choose to buy that system. The system is still under going testing and right now the results are mixed. The Authority filed a pre-application for the system knowing that it takes time. The DEC has agreed to extend the deadline for the final application to June 1, 2001. The final application requires a certified resolution from the Authority.

c) Food Waste Composting Project

T. Pytlar stated that the DEC has also asked for the final application on the food waste composting project and the Authority's certified resolution. The food waste project would consist of doing first a feasibility study on the potential to bring food waste from commercial establishments, not residents, to the coco to be composted. If the feasibility study tested positive the grant would also include funds for the modifications to the Cocomposting Facility to handle foodwaste. The estimated budget on the foodwaste project is \$1.6 million and the DEC share would be \$800,000. A final application was submitted a long time ago and Mr. Reisman did not wish to proceed with it and therefore the DEC was informed that the Authority would not be moving ahead with the foodwaste project. If the Authority chooses to move ahead with this project now, the DEC would only need a certified resolution.

T. Pytlar stated that the consolidation facility grant is off the list and the Authority would need to resubmit an application if interested again. The procedure of the fiber presort system grant would be to submit to the DEC the certified resolution and the final application. There is no obligation to the Authority on the foodwaste composting project even if the contracts were received.

R. Delo stated that in the past the Authority was hesitant on moving ahead with the foodwaste-composting project because the Authority did not have the experience that it has now. The composting facility has been running for a few years now and has been very successful with no complications.

R. Karben questioned if the fiber presort system was installed at the Authority's request?

R. Delo answered that WM was exploring ways of trying to reduce their operation costs. A company approached WM with the presort system and was looking for a location to try it out on. The Company chose the Authority's since the MRF is new. The company stated that if the system works they would install it in MRFs all over the country. There is no obligation to the Authority to pay for the system, but if it works the Company would like the Authority to consider buying it.

R. Karben questioned who owns the equipment now?

R. Delo answered the he assumed that WM owns it and he was unsure on the arrangement WM made with the manufacture.

R. Karben questioned what arrangement does the manufacture have with the Authority?

R. Delo answered that the arrangement the Authority has is no liability and there was not a signed agreement.

R. Karben questioned who approved this arrangement?

R. Delo answered that he approved it.

R. Karben stated that the Authority Board is very hands on and for him to discover that a \$700,000 piece of equipment that the Authority does not own is attached to equipment that the Authority does own is crazy. Somebody made the determination that it was a benefit for the Authority to have this equipment without an agreement. A deal should have been made with the manufacture that the Authority could purchase this equipment at a reduced price since the equipment is being used for the manufactures own reasons. Given the history of WM there should have been some approval from the Board or even the Executive Committee.

C. St. Lawrence stated that WM does operate the facility and they have certain latitude in their contract that they can do certain things. WM did not need the Authority's blessing in installing the equipment as long as it did not interrupt the operations of the MRF. WM did speak to the Executive Director about installing the equipment at no cost to the Authority.

R. Delo stated that \$700,000 is an estimated cost for the grant so if the Authority did decide to buy this equipment there would be enough money to do so. The Authority has

not started to negotiate a price for the equipment and right now it is a demonstration test to see if it works.

C. St. Lawrence questioned how much this equipment would save the Authority?

R. Delo answered that the test results are not complete. The equipment does reduce the manpower requirements for the paper sorting line. The paper sorting system at the MRF is all manual setting, 20 to 30 people manually pick paper out. This system eliminates some of that manpower requirements by automatic presorting of paper that produces a high quality of paper. Some more time is needed to evaluate the system. R. Delo stated that the DEC is requesting a final application now, and a committee should be set up to help with the negotiations of the equipment.

R. Karben suggested that the Authority prioritize these grant applications.

R. Delo clarified that the (a) consolidation facility project the Authority was reviewing, the Authority requested DEC to pull us off the list because we are not interested right now, if we look at this project at a later time we will need to submit another application. (b) The fiber presort system has a deadline of June 1, 2001 to act on; the Authority has been pressing WM to submit to the Authority a written report of the equipments efficiency. The Authority's staff is evaluating the equipment also. If the members are interested in pursuing this grant then the Authority needs to submit more paperwork to the DEC, if not we can be removed from the list. (c) The foodwaste program was dropped a few years ago because the Authority did not have a track record with the Cocomposting Facility. The Authority has a good track record for some time now and the Authority will pursue this grant also with the member's acceptance.

K. Zebrowski stated that the ultimate decision of these grants to move forward or to be pulled off the list is in the board members hands and he feels comfortable with this situation.

T. Dusanenko questioned what are the advantages and or downside to the foodwaste composting grant?

C. St. Lawrence stated that the concern has always been the odor.

T. Dusanenko questioned the contract with WM; they are getting paid per ton or an operation fee?

C. St. Lawrence answered yes to both.

T. Dusanenko stated that if WM can reduce their cost on manpower with the fiber system, isn't it an advantage to WM? Why would the Authority buy the equipment?

R. Delo answered that if the equipment works the way they say it does, it would be an enhancement to the Facility that would be there forever after WM is long gone.

T. Dusanenko stated if the Authority buys the system because it is an enhancement to the Facility and can reduce their manpower, WM should then in return pay the Authority a lease fee.

R. Delo stated that T. Dusanenko comment is correct and that would be a part of the negotiation process for this equipment which has not taken place yet.

C. St. Lawrence stated that the results should have been available before the grant was submitted.

R. Karben stated that there has to be some way to project what the equipment is capable of doing.

R. Delo stated that he did not want to negotiate with out knowing the Authority boards interest with this grant. If this grant is something that the board wants to pursue then the Executive Director with members of the board can negotiate.

S. Hurley stated that the Authority should determine the feelings of the Town of Ramapo Board before we move ahead with the foodwaste composting project because the Town has always been concerned about the odor and this project will be adding more odors to the Torne Valley.

K. Zebrowski questioned if the foodwaste composting project is a study?

R. Delo answered that the first phase is a feasibility study and at the end of the study you make a decision as to whether you want to move ahead with the project.

K. Zebrowski stated that he does agree with S. Hurley and if any municipality has issues with the study, it would get put on hold, if not then the Authority should go ahead with the study.

S. Hurley questioned if the DEC gave a deadline on the foodwaste composting program application?

T. Pytlar answered that they did not and he believes that the DEC is trying to set their budget for the next year and they probably would extend it until June 1, 2001.

C. St. Lawrence requested that the discussions on the foodwaste composting program should end until the Authority gets more guidance from the Town of Ramapo.

C. St. Lawrence requested T. Pytlar to give more information on the consolidation facility grant.

T. Pytlar stated that the DEC requested the Authority to submit the final application last fall. The Authority received an extension until April 1, 2001 so that the Authority has time to site a facility.

C. St. Lawrence questioned the amount of money the Authority would receive if we found a site?

T. Pytlar answered \$1.6 million for two facilities.

C. St. Lawrence stated that the Monsey/Spring Valley area is a good location and he would hate for the Authority to lose out on this money.

S. Hurley stated that the money is there and the Authority has to resubmit before April 1 just to keep the money. We can find a site later on.

C. St. Lawrence stated that he agreed.

R. Delo stated that siting any solid waste site would not be done in a month. The Authority has already had requests on Host Fees for the facilities. The facilities do bring more truck traffic to the site even though it reduces traffic overall. R. Delo feels that a month time frame is not enough to site a solid waste facility. R. Delo has had meetings with every Town trying to find a municipal site to avoid the purchase price of private land and have been told none available.

T. Dusanenko questioned what about state/federal surplus land?

R. Delo answered that the planning department could supply us with a list.

C. St. Lawrence questioned the size of the property?

R. Delo answered about 3 acres for Orangetown, which is a big site, but it can be smaller.

T. Pytlar stated that WFC could call the DEC to extend our deadline to possibly June 1.

C. St. Lawrence suggested a sub-committee to review sites for two Consolidation Facilities.

The Consolidation Committee consists of: Karben, Thompson, St. Lawrence, Hurley, and Devine.

S. Hurley requested Dr. Yarmus to supply the Authority with a list of state owned lands.

Item #9

Discussion-Finalization of Ethics Policy

T. West stated that the draft policy is a policy that was created from the County's policy and other solid waste authorities.

R. Karben stated one concern with the draft ethics policy being the situation with spouses. R. Karben referred to K. Zebrowski to recite his recollection of a legislature meeting that addresses this issue.

K. Zebrowski stated that the Authority has the power to implement and authorize any policy we wish at any level of stringency, but we have a responsibility to have the policy in place before we hold someone accountable to a hypothetical policy.

R. Karben continued to express his displeasure with the draft policy and the power to who would investigate if a situation arises and that a great deal of thought needs to be given to this policy for every kind of situation.

T. West stated that in drafting the policy he reviewed the county's policy and other solid waste authority's policies. The language used in this policy was taken from another solid waste authority's policy. T. West understood R. Karben's concern and a meeting should be scheduled to address those issues.

K. Zebrowski stated that he did not share the apprehension that R. Karben does on over designating of counsel as the ethics officer.

C. St. Lawrence stated that he thinks that R. Karben makes a good point and the policy is cleaner if you have an independent party reviewing it and having the power to investigate makes the policy stronger.

R. Karben stated that the ethics officer has to determine if a complaint has substance.

R. Karben stated that an amendment was just passed to the County's ethics policy and recited his concerns with the draft:

1. spouses
2. civil service rules
3. respect to confidentially
4. compare to County ethics policy
5. amendment-due process
6. determination of the ethics officer
7. penalties

R. Karben questioned if the Authority is subject to the Rockland County Ethics Law?

T. West stated not unless the Authority adopted the policy early on.

K. Zebrowski suggested since the County Legislature appoints members to the Authority Board it should appoint the ethics officer.

T. West stated that the Town Supervisors are appointed to the Board as per Title 13-M of the State Law.

K. Zebrowski stated that at the least the Authority could moralize though the County legislature.

S. Hurley questioned what the Sewer Commissioners do?

R. Delo answered that the Sewer Commissioners are under the County ethics code; they fill out forms of disclosure.

S. Hurley questioned T. West on what a Supervisor, Commissioner, and an Authority Members which ethics code would he follow?

T. West answered all ethics codes he should follow.

K. Zebrowski stated that the Authority should adopt the County ethics code.

C. St. Lawrence stated that the committee already consists of: Fornario, St, Lawrence and welcomed any more members.

T. Kleiner questioned the \$75.00 fee?

T. West stated that the fee came out of the State Law.

T. Kleiner stated that the Town fee is \$25.00.

Item #10

Discussion of Host Fee for Preprocessing Facility

This discussion item was pulled

Item #11

Resolution No. 11 Of 2001 INCREASE SALARY FOR SENIOR ACCOUNT CLERK TYPIST

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 Account Clerk-Typist at a salary of \$13.87 per hour and sent out canvas letters to qualifying applicants appearing on the civil service list of the County of Rockland, and,

WHEREAS, there have been no affirmative responses for the position because of the unacceptability of the salary and location, and,

WHEREAS, the County of Rockland salary rate for said position is \$15.07 per hour, and,

WHEREAS, it would be appropriate for the Authority to pay the same salary schedule as the County of Rockland, therefore be it,

RESOLVED, that the Authority hereby establishes the position of Senior Account Clerk-Typist at a salary of \$15.07 per hour, and it is further,

RESOLVED, that the Executive Director send out canvas letters to qualified applicants appearing on the civil service list of the County of Rockland for said position.

Motion to Approve
Hurley/Jobson

R. Delo stated this position is vacant and the Authority is trying to recruit someone. Canvas letters went out and the Authority received back 6 responses, 5 declined due to salary and 1 declined due to location.

C. St. Lawrence stated that the Authority did use the Hiring Policy.

Unan.

Item #12
Discussion-Date of April Meeting

R. Delo mentioned that he would be unavailable for the April meeting.

C. St. Lawrence stated that the meeting should still take place.

T. Kleiner suggested May 3, 2001 and have a combined April/May meeting.

Motion to Approve
Kleiner/St. Lawrence Unan.

New Business

T. Kleiner questioned the year 2000 recyclables report for waste paper that was submitted by D. O'Donnell and S. Abate.

C. St. Lawrence stated that the Thruway Paper reopened.

R. Delo stated that waste paper tonnages in general are down, due to weather.

T. Kleiner questioned if the Authority recycled less from 1999 to 2000?

R. Delo answered that the numbers are still being analyzed.

T. Kleiner requested this discussion to be put on the agenda next month.

Motion to Adjourn

Jobson/Zebrowski Unan.

Respectfully Submitted,

Camille Guido