

**Minutes**  
**Rockland County Solid Waste Management Authority**  
**June 28, 2001**

**Members Present**

C. St. Lawrence  
S. Corallo  
L. Dessau  
T. Dusanenko  
F. Fornario  
C. Holbrook  
S. Hurley  
R. Karben  
K. Zebrowski

**Members Absent**

E. Devine  
D. Jobson  
T. Kleiner  
T. Lawless  
I.Schoenberger  
A. Thompson  
Dr. Yarmus

**Others Present**

R. Delo  
T. West  
T. Pytlar  
A. Etelson

The meeting was called to order at 8:20 p.m.

Item #3

**RESOLUTION NO. 21 OF 2001**  
**ADOPTION OF MINUTES, MEETING OF MAY 3, 2001**

K. Zebrowski offered the following resolution, which was seconded by S. Hurley and was approved unanimously,

**RESOLVED**, that the transcribed Minutes of the Rockland County Solid Waste Management Authority for the meeting of May 3, 2001 as recorded by the Clerk are hereby adopted.

**Item #4-Reports**  
**WFC**

T. Pytlar stated that WFC assistance to the Authority this month has been an additional grant application for 50% reimbursement for up to three recycling staff salaries in the Authority and other publicly and education program. There has been an escalating dispute with WM regarding the operations of the materials at the MRF. The dispute involves processing of Out-of-County recyclables at the MRF, the overall fee structure for the services, contaminants in the materials, maintenance of the equipment, rejection of deliveries at the MRF, and WM is withholding payments to the Authority. WFC has been assisting the Authority in resolving these issues with WM. WFC has taken samples of the incoming materials to see the actual contents of the material. We have prepared some correspondence to WM regarding the maintenance of the equipment. The improvements to the transfer station are moving along on schedule.

S. Hurley questioned the grant application?

T. Pytlar answered that the grant is for waste reduction/recycling education. The State law was changed last year to reimburse municipalities for moneys that were spent on recycling education and waste reduction. The Authority has already submitted a pre-application and now the State asked for the full application.

S. Hurley questioned if it is a yearly contract?

T. Pytlar answered that we can ask for the money for up to three years.

F. Fornario questioned if the three positions already exist?

R. Delo answered yes.

### **Executive Director**

R. Delo stated that the Authority had a very successful one-day SWANA conference at the Authority's new conference center and greenhouse. There were 50 SWANA members that came out from all over NYS and NJ. Demonstrations were done on new equipment out in the market for commingled materials. At the transfer station there was a rattlesnake under some construction debris. The police and DEC were phone, and the park ranger came out to relocate the snake.

C. Holbrook questioned the snake's size?

R. Delo answered 6-10 feet and was tagged. Procures were put into place for this situation and the process was followed and everything worked out right.

R. Delo continued to say that there is a problem with the amount of rejects in the commingled containers being brought to the MRF from In County and Out-of-County. The implementation of a very aggressive education program though out the County to try to get the residents to rinse out the containers more. Residents are putting certain items into the recycling bins that are not allowed. There are plenty of loads that are coming into our facility from Rockland County municipalities that can be rejected.

S. Corallo questioned the items that residents are putting into the recycling bin that are not recyclable?

R. Delo answered plastic bags, non-recyclable type materials, hoses, and laundry baskets just to name a few. A lot of people think that because things are plastic that they can be recycled. With this program we would hand out brochures with pictures of items that should be recycled and material that should not be. Mayors and Supervisors should pass this information along to their residents.

L. Dessau suggested a mass mailing to the residents.

R. Delo stated that the mailing and the brochures together would get the point across.

St. Lawrence stated that in the month of May there were over 1,000 participants at the HHW Facility. St. Lawrence also commented on the new cocomposting brochure and stated that the Authority members' names should be on the front of the brochure.

R. Delo noted his comment.

### **Recycling Coordinator**

S. Abate stated that K. Scales has been accepted into Leadership Rockland Program and the staff is very pleased for her. Out of the 40 applicants K. Scales placed 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> on the list. The Village of Grandview and New Square has signed the intermunicipal recycling agreement. The Village of Upper Nyack has not yet.

F. Fornario questioned how many municipalities have signed the agreement?

S. Abate answered all but the Village of Upper Nyack.

C. Holbrook stated that Village of Upper Nyack is apart of Clarkstown.

S. Abate continued with the status of the municipal private contract is the following:

- Mahwah-Counsel authorized to sign
- Park Ridge- Counsel authorized to sign
- Closter- Counsel authorized to sign
- Demoto Paper-Signed the agreement
- American Resource-Signed the agreement

For the period of April 2-June 9, Demoto currently brought in 571 tons of commingled containers and American Resource has brought in 159.3 tons, for a total of 1131 tons of commingled which translate to a 34% increase if this continues for the year 2001.

Another company based out of Closter, NJ, named, Zozzarro is interested in signing a contract with the Authority and has estimated 700-1000 tons. Bergen County Utilities Authority's contract is having changes made to it.

The wheel kit program has had a great turn out; the due date for the response forms has been extended since there are so many participations. There are 35 seniors who have participated in the program. As of now all of the survey forms that have been returned have favored the four-wheel kit instead of the two-wheel kit.

K. Zebrowski questioned S. Abates report, Item #7?

St. Lawrence answered that item #7 in S. Abate's report is being pulled.

S. Abate stated that this item was pulled because the staff will be working with him to increase recycling in Rockland County using the sticker program. This item will be revisited at another time.

T. Dusanenko questioned the status of the composting bins bid and if the Authority contacted manufactures to get free bins?

R. Delo answered that the bid specification are being reviewed.

T. Dusanenko stated that the Authority should request from the vendors free samples before we do the bid to evaluate the kind of bin that we want.

R. Delo answered that the bid is written in a generic way that the Authority would not have to buy the bins from the lowest bidder. In the bid we have asked for samples from all the vendors, along with brochures and videos for teaching the residents. All the composting bins do work but it depends of how the resident wants to use the product.

St. Lawrence questioned if the Authority is going to test all the bins that the Authority wants.

R. Delo answered that the Authority will find out what the lowest bidder is by the bid and then have a pilot program to see how effective they are. The Authority will not buy 20,000 bins without going through the process.

#### **Item #5**

**Resolution No. 22 of 2001**  
**AUTHORIZING AMENDMENT NO. 13 TO WILLIAM F. COSULICH**  
**ASSOCIATES CONTRACT WITH THE AUTHORITY TO EXPEND**  
**ADDITIONAL ENGINEERING FEES REQUIRED FOR CONSULTING**  
**SERVICES FOR THE AUTHORITY'S OPERATIONS**

**WHEREAS**, The Rockland County Solid Waste Management 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**, in order to serve the public need as set forth in its enabling legislation, the Authority has constructed a Materials Recovery Facility and Sludge Composting Facility at its site at Torne Valley Road in Hillburn, New York, and

**WHEREAS**, said facilities have been in operation since June, 1998, and

**WHEREAS**, the firm of William F. Cosulich Associates (the "Engineers") are the engineering consultants to the Authority under the contract, and

**WHEREAS**, the services of William F. Cosulich Associates are required to assist in the continued operations and programs of the Authority, and

**WHEREAS**, William F. Cosulich Associates has submitted to the Executive Director its June 19, 2001 letter enclosing revised budgets for Operations Related Services, Operations Plan and Procurement of an Operations Contractor for the Recyclables Preprocessing Facility, Engineering Services in Support of Grants Programs and a Wood Drying System Feasibility Study together with Schedule 1 consisting of five pages, a one page attachment 1 and a three page attachment 2 describing the work, estimated time to be spent and a breakdown of the budgets and sub-budgets within each category of services, and

**WHEREAS**, the additional budget requested is in the sum of \$373,300, and

**WHEREAS**, the Executive Director has reviewed the proposed Amendment No. 13 and recommends it approval, therefore be it

**RESOLVED**, that the contract for services with William F. Cosulich Associates be enlarged by Amendment No. 13 to include the additional services required by the Executive Director for the purposes set forth in the above letter and estimated budget attached thereto, and it is further

**RESOLVED**, that the Executive Director is authorized to execute all documents necessary to facilitate the same.

Motion to Approve  
Hurley/Zebrowski

### **Discussion**

R. Karben questioned the current amount of the contract? Cosulich is asking for an additional \$400,000. What was authorized for this calendar year?

T. Pytlar answered that the current amount authorized for this year was \$145,000.

R. Karben questioned the year prior?

T. Pytlar answered that an estimate would be the same amount. This amendment is divided into four of the following sections:

Part A- Operation of related services is work that is ongoing. This work was authorized for a one-year period from last May and the work has been carried out. This year's budget amount for this part is \$60,800 that is similar to the scope of services that we have been carrying out in the amount of \$135,000.

Part B - Is for the operation of the recycling preprocessing facility that is being installed at the transfer station as part of the upgrade. This facility is for bulky and commercial material that is not suitable for the MRF. This work is for helping the Authority find an operator for the new facility.

Part C- Relates to work that would be covered under the budget for various grant applications that have been applied for by the Authority. There are 8 grants in total and 6 are still pending.

Part D- is allocated for dry amendment at the composting facility.

R. Delo stated that Part A is a reduction from the past year.

S. Hurley questioned if some of Cosulich services would be reimbursed under a grant?

R. Delo answered that under Part C the Authority would receive 50% grant funding.

R. Karben questioned Part C, which list recycling promotion and education?

T. Pytlar answered that Cosulich was asked to support that program by helping with any work that is related to providing analysis on how to increase recycling and help coordination and preparation of public education information.

R. Karben stated that the Authority is spending a great deal of money on recycling promotion and education between the Authority's staff and Cosulich. R. Karben is concerned that the Authority might be duplicating spending money on the same projects. Is this amendment changing the total time estimated for the project?

T. Pytlar answered that these estimates are based on the total amount of time already spent on each project. T. Pytlar understood R. Karben's question about duplicating money and explained WFC background in helping communities in NY and other areas to initiate recycling programs.

R. Karben questioned why the Authority is paying WFC \$100 a month to review invoices for the Authority?

T. Pytlar answered that WFC reviews monthly invoices from the MRF and Coco.

R. Karben questioned R. Delo who else reviews those invoices?

R. Delo answered that D. O'Donnell and himself and other people for different reasons.

R. Karben questioned that there are four people reviewing the same invoice?

R. Delo answered that there are four people reviewing the invoice for different reasons. The scalehouse records and the contractor records need to match for inbound and

outbound material. The Authority needs to insure that the MRF invoices are correct because of the recyclables revenue rebates that are paid the municipalities and that the revenue that we receive from the operator is correct with the national and regional standards of the markets for each material.

R. Karben questioned T. Pytlar on the amount of time is estimated for the grant programs?

T. Pytlar answered that \$241,000 would be about 400 hours total.

R. Karben questioned who from WFC handles that work?

T. Pytlar answered that himself and support by the other office.

R. Karben asked what happens if he does not vote in favor of this amendment?

K. Zebrowski stated that he also reviews the invoices paid being the Treasurer of the Authority. K. Zebrowski relies on S. Simon, Accountant for the Authority and is pleased with the handle that S. Simon has on the accounting department. K. Zebrowski stated that he feels that it would be a mistake of R. Karben to underestimate the value of the professional partners on who we have relied on to make this a solid Authority. The concept that the Authority can start to do business as a mom and pop operation is misplaced. K. Zebrowski gave his consent for this amendment and stated that if ever any information was needed from WFC's office the reaction was always immediate.

St. Lawrence stated that K. Zebrowski made a valid point for the direction that the Authority needs to go and he feels that some questions and concerns that R. Karben has can be brought up at budget time.

R. Karben questioned how much money is left in the budget for this year? R. Karben stated that he is concerned with so rapidly expanding the scope of work into too many areas.

R. Delo stated that the Authority did anticipate budgeting extra money for this line item in the budget. When the budget is done next year the Authority would have to incorporate the amount of money that is fit. Many of the grant applications have been discussed for almost a year. R. Delo stated that he strongly urges everyone to support this amendment. The Authority relies very heavily on having the outside consultant come in and review certain items and it is a sanity check for the Authority. For the year 2000 the recyclables revenue was \$1.8 million dollars and WFC picks up on certain things that the Authority would not be aware of because WFC has experience in MRF's all over the Country.

S. Hurley questioned the line item amount?

R. Delo answered \$700,000 was budgeted.

K. Zebrowski stated that there is a tremendous benefit in having a professional. If there are items that the Authority's staff can do sole then they would but K. Zebrowski does not feel that it is the case. The regulations for the State are only getting more and more complicated. The Authority has to rely on competent professional services to help the Authority though its changes and they should get paid fair amount. The Authority should set a budget for WFC at budget time next year.

L. Dessau stated that he is in favor of this amendment.

Roll Call Was Taken  
9 ayes and 1 nay (Karben)  
Motion passes 9/1

**Item #6**

**Discussion-Refinancing of SRF 20 Year Bonds to 30 Year Bonds**

R. Delo stated that the Authority could save some money by spreading out the bonds from 20 to 30 years. The Authority would reduce its cost now and pay more over the later part of the years. R. Delo stated that it does make sense for the Authority to do this.

F. Fornario questioned if there is arbitrage factor?

R. Delo stated no, and that this item would be brought back to table after EFC finalizes their regulations.

**Item #7**

**Resolution No. 23 of 2001  
AUTHORIZING THE FILING OF APPLICATION FOR STATE  
GRANT-IN-AID FOR MUNICIPAL REDUCTION AND/OR RECYCLING  
PROJECT AND SIGNING OF THE ASSOCIATED STATE CONTRACT UNDER  
THE APPROPRIATE LAWS OF NEW YORK STATE FOR THE FOLLOWING  
PROJECT:**

**A) RECYCLING COORDINATOR AND RECYCLING  
EDUCATION, PROMOTION AND OUTREACH**

**WHEREAS**, the Rockland County Legislature, pursuant to Resolution No. 301 of 1994 and Section 2053 (c) et seq. of the Public Authorities Law, created the Rockland County Solid Waste Management Authority (the "Authority"), to plan, design, finance, procure and operate the municipal solid waste reduction and recycling projects as set forth in the Rockland County Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan, (the "Plan"), and

**WHEREAS**, the PLAN provides for several facilities and programs each to reduce and recycle a specific portion of the solid waste stream, and,

**WHEREAS**, the State of New York (the “STATE”) provides financial aid for such municipal waste reduction and recycling projects, and

**WHEREAS**, the AUTHORITY, has examined and considered the applicable laws of the State of New York and the AUTHORITY deems it in the public interest and benefit to file application under these laws to obtain such financial aid for a) **RECYCLING COORDINATOR AND RECYCLING EDUCATION/PROMOTION AND OUTREACH**, under the PLAN, and

**WHEREAS**, it is necessary that the STATE and the AUTHORITY execute contracts for such financial aid, now, therefore, be it

**RESOLVED** by the ROCKLAND COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY, the following:

1. The AUTHORITY is hereby authorized to file applications for the below listed project in such form as may be required by the STATE and by the applicable laws of the state of New York including all understanding and assurances as may be contained in such applications: a) **RECYCLING COORDINATOR AND RECYCLING EDUCATION/PROMOTION AND OUTREACH**.
2. Ronald C. Delo, P.E., Executive Director of the Authority is directed and authorized as the official representative of the AUTHORITY to act in connection with the applications and to provide such additional information as may be required to execute any resulting contracts, should such applications be approved.
3. The AUTHORITY agrees it will fund its portion of the cost of said Municipal Solid Waste Reduction and/or Recycling Project.
4. Five (5) Certified Copies of this resolution be sent to the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Albany, NY 12233-7253, together with a completed application.
5. This resolution shall take effect immediately.

Motion to Approve  
Hurley/Dusanenko

Unan.

**Item #8**

This item was pulled

**RESOLUTION NO. \_\_ OF 2001**

**AUTHORIZING APPROVAL OF CHANGE ORDER  
NO. 3, TO CONTRACT NO. 1G, HUDSON CANYON  
CONSTRUCTION**

**WHEREAS**, on March 24, 2000 the Rockland County Solid Waste Management Authority (the "Authority") and Hudson Canyon Construction (the "Contractor") executed Contract No. 1G; and

**WHEREAS**, it would be in the best interest of the Authority to have additional work performed by the Contractor for Contract No. 1G as delineated in the attached letter from WFC; and,

**WHEREAS**, due to such a change in the scope of work required under Contract No. 1G; a change order, to be known as Change Order No. 3, has to be issued to the Contractor; and

**WHEREAS**, a copy of Change Order No. 3 is also attached hereto; and

**WHEREAS**, the value of such services shall be an amount equal to \$156,486; and

**WHEREAS**, the Executive Director and the Authority's consulting engineer have reviewed Change Order No. 3 and recommend its approval; and

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT:**

**RESOLVED**, the Authority does hereby approve Change Order No. 3 to Contract No. 1G at a cost of \$156,486 for the additional work described in William F. Cosulich Associates letter dated June 22, 2001.

**RESOLVED**, that the Chairman and the Executive Director of the Authority, are 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.

This Item was pulled

**Item #9**

**RESOLUTION NO. 24 of 2001  
AUTHORIZING THE FILING OF SUIT  
AGAINST ACTION CARTING ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.**

**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 law of the State of New York, and

**WHEREAS**, the Authority has contracted with a hauler, Action Carting Environmental Inc., to allow Action Carting Environmental, Inc. to utilize the services of the Authority's transfer station in consideration for the payment by Action Carting Environmental, Inc. to the Authority of tipping fees, and

**WHEREAS**, Action Carting Environmental, Inc. has become in arrears in paying its outstanding balance despite numerous demands for payment by the Authority, and

**WHEREAS**, the Authority has terminated the right of action carting Environmental, Inc. to utilize its transfer station facility during such delinquency period under its new policy permitting haulers to continue on a C.O.D. basis if they pay down their balances on May 16, 2001 by 1/12 payments per month, and

**WHEREAS**, Action Carting Environmental Inc. has not accepted the Authority's offer to remain on a C.O.D. basis by paying 1/12 of the May 16, 2001 balances per month, and

**WHEREAS**, the Authority's best interest would be served by immediate suit against Action Carting Environmental, Inc. or the corporate entity under which it operates to endeavor to obtain a judgment against Action Carting Environmental, Inc. to collect the debt owed to the Authority, therefore be it

**RESOLVED**, that the Authority hereby authorizes that suit be filed against Action Carting Environmental, Inc. or the corporate entity under which it operates for its balances due to the Authority, plus interest.

Motion to Approve  
Holbrook/Hurley          Unan.

**Item #10**  
**Discussion of Delinquent Accounts**

St. Lawrence stated that at last months meeting that Authority implemented a new credit policy which states that any carter that is in arrears has to pay 1/12 of the total balance due. There was one carter that owes that Authority \$209,000 and has paid the first 1/12 payment and are now paying COD. Prior to establishing this new credit policy the Authority already had an agreement with Sonny Zito and it is not the 1/12 but the Authority agreed to it. The Authority also agreed to accept less then 1/12 per month from Schettino.

S. Simon stated the following updates:

Action Carting	Passed Resolution tonight for Judgment
Capasso/Interstate	Resolution in front of the Board tonight
C. Capasso	Arnie will send a letter
Donato	Working with them to update both sets of records

Marangi Disposal	Working with them to update both sets of records make 1/12 payment
Marangi Services/TTI Schettino	Made 2 1/12 payments and are on COD Basis Agreement in place

St. Lawrence questioned Miele Sanitations outstanding balance of \$129,000. It is unacceptable for this carter. Don't we pay him on a bi-weekly basis?

S. Simon answered yes, his balance is for one month period of time.

St. Lawrence requested that the Authority should not pay him for the transfer station.

S. Simon stated that he is holding a check for Miele until he delivers a check to the Authority for half of the amount owed to date.

R. Delo stated that moneys have been deducted from his last payment to make up for any old balance (over 60 days) that he owed the Authority.

St. Lawrence stated that the Authority gave permission to Miele to bill the Authority every two weeks and the Authority pays Miele every two weeks and the Authority should not change its new credit policy because Miele does not pay us within the appropriate time frame that everyone else has to. The Authority should go back to paying him on a monthly basis.

R. Delo stated that in the contract it spells out payment terms. R. Delo is putting pressure on Miele to pay sooner and will not release any checks to him until he pays the Authority.

K. Zebrowski questioned if Miele Sanitation is doing a good job operating the transfer station?

R. Delo answered yes.

K. Zebrowski stated that a phone conversation with Miele will speed up payment responses to the Authority if it is explained that the Authority has a contract with Miele and that the payment terms should be followed and if they are not then the Authority would revisit the terms of the contract.

St. Lawrence stated that he is not happy with Miele Sanitation in the Town of Ramapo.

K. Zebrowski requested that a meeting should be set up immediately.

St. Lawrence stated that he is unhappy with Miele because of the commingling of recyclables that is occurring in the Town of Ramapo. St. Lawrence agreed with K. Zebrowski and a meeting will be set up as soon as possible.

**New Business**

**RESOLUTION NO. 25 of 2001  
AUTHORIZING THE FILING OF SUIT AGAINST  
CAPASSO CARTING (INTERSTATE)**

**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,

**WHEREAS**, the Authority has contracted with a hauler, Capasso Carting (Interstate) to allow Capasso Carting (Interstate) to utilize the services of the Authority’s transfer station in consideration for the payment by Capasso Carting (Interstate) to the Authority of tipping fees, and

**WHEREAS**, Capasso Carting (Interstate) has become in arrears in paying outstanding balance despite numerous demands for payment by the Authority, and

**WHEREAS**, the Authority has terminated the right of Capasso Carting (Interstate) to utilize its transfer station facility during said delinquency period under its new policy permitting haulers to continue on a C.O.D. basis if they pay down their balance on May 16, 2001 by 1/12 payments per month, and

**WHEREAS**, Capasso Carting (Interstate) has not accepted the Authority’s offer to remain on a C.O.D. basis by paying 1/12 of the May 16, 2001 balance per month, and

**WHEREAS**, the Authority’s best interest would be served by imitating suit against Capasso Carting (Interstate) or corporate entity under which operates to endeavor to obtain a judgment against Capasso Carting (Interstate) to collect the debt owed to the Authority. and therefore be it

**RESOLVED**, that the Authority hereby recognizes that suit be filed against Capasso Carting (Interstate) or the corporate entity under which it operates for its balance due to the Authority, plus interest.

Motion to Approve  
Hurley/St. Lawrence                      Unan.

**RESOLUTION NO. 26 of 2001  
AUTHORIZING THE FILING OF SUIT AGAINST  
STERLING CARTING**

**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, Sterling Carting to allow Sterling Carting to utilize the services of the Authority's transfer station in consideration for the payment by Sterling Carting of tipping fees to the Authority, and

**WHEREAS**, Sterling Carting has become in arrears in paying its outstanding balance despite numerous demands for payment by the Authority, and,

**WHEREAS**, the Authority has terminated the right of Sterling Carting to utilize its transfer station facility during said delinquency period under its new policy permitting haulers to continue on a C.O.D. basis if they pay down their balance on May 17, 2001 by ½ payments per month, and

**WHEREAS**, Sterling Carting has not accepted the Authority's offer to remain on a C.O.D. basis by paying 1/12 of the May 16, 2001 balance per month, and

**WHEREAS**, the Authority's best interest would be served by immediate suit against Sterling Carting or the corporate entity under which it operates to endeavor to obtain a judgment against Sterling Carting to collect the debt owed to the Authority, therefore be it

**RESOLVED**, that the Authority hereby authorizes that suit be filed against Sterling Carting or the corporate entity under which it operates for the balance due to the Authority, plus interest.

Motion to Approve  
Hurley/Corallo

Unan.

**Item #13**

**RESOLUTION NO. 28 OF 2001  
IMPLANTATION OF PROVISIONS OF THE CODE OF ETHICS  
FOR THE ROCKLAND COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT  
AUTHORITY**

**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 of the Public Authority Law of the State of New York (the "Act") and resolution no. 301 of the 1994 of the County

Legislature to implement certain provisions of the SWMP/GEIS and to construct solid waste management facilities; and

**WHEREAS**, the Authority recognizes there are rules of ethical conduct for officers and employees of the Authority which must be observed if a high degree of moral conduct is to be obtained and if public confidence is to be maintained in the Authority; and

**WHEREAS**, Chapter 66 of the Laws of Rockland County (the “Rockland County Code of Ethics”) codifies rules to serve as a guide for official conduct of the members and employees of the County of Rockland; and

**WHEREAS**, the Authority, by Resolution No. 20 of 2001, adopted the Rockland County Code of Ethics applicable to members and employees of the Authority; and

**WHEREAS**, ten of the seventeen members of the Authority Board are subject to the Rockland County Code of Ethics by virtue of their being elected members of the County Legislature of County employees; and

**WHEREAS**, the Rockland County Code of Ethics provides for certain financial disclosure requirements that should be applicable to certain Authority members and employees, not just such members and employees which are elected County officials or County employees; and

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT:**

**RESOLVED**, that the Authority shall cause a copy of the Rockland County Code of Ethics to be distributed to every affected person as designated on the attached list.

**RESOLVED**, that, the financial disclosure provisions contained in Article II of the Rockland County Code of Ethics shall apply to all members of the Authority Board and to employees of the Authority as designated at this meeting.

**RESOLVED**, that, consistent with subsection 66-10B. of the Rockland County Code of Ethics, a person who is subject to the filing requirements of the Rockland Code of another public position may satisfy the requirements of the Rockland County Code of Ethics as adopted by the Authority by filing one annual financial disclosure statement with the Rockland County Board of Ethics.

**DESIGNATED EMPLOYEES**

1. Executive Director
2. Attorney
3. Accountant II

4. Solid Waste Inspector

Motion to Approve  
Zebrowski/Fornario

**Discussion**

R. Delo stated that a list of employees is attached for certain Authority employees that have to file a disclosure statement.

S. Hurley questioned if the members are going to file the same as the County with the same guidelines?

St. Lawrence answered yes. Packets will be delivered to all the necessary employees and the board by May 15, 2001 deadline.

K. Zebrowski amended the motion to extend the deadline for this year only to September 15, 2001.

R. Karben questioned if all the members of the Authority have to file?

St. Lawrence answered no.

R. Karben stated that in the County members of Boards and Commissions salary or not have to file. R. Karben requested that the resolution should reflect this amendment, anyone that is a member of the Authority and that has not already filed a policy with the County then they should do so.

S. Hurley questioned what that meant?

St. Lawrence explained that if you already file with your Town and/or Village then you do not have to file again.

St. Lawrence stated that Town and Villages do not have an ethics policy boards.

K. Zebrowski accepted R. Karben's Amendment but should be added that the Authority's ethics policy will be accepted provided where a member of the Authority files with another municipality or similar entity that the Authority will accept a copy in that form.

R. Delo stated that there is no change necessary the resolution states R. Karben's and K. Zebrowski concern and that the only amendment needed is to extend the filing date to September 15, 2001.

Motion to Approve the amendment the Ethic Policy resolution to extend the filing date to September 15, 2001

Unan.

**Other New Business**

R. Delo stated that a representative from WM was present to discuss the current situation with WM. Rich Geisser has been working with the Authority to resolve the issues at the MRF.

R. Geisser stated he has been an employee of WM since February. His Position is District Manager for Rockland, Orange, and Westchester Counties. The Corporation has been set up that any recycling corporation operates under Recycling America. Some of the contractual requirements that are in disagreements are being worked on with the County. WM wants to work with the Authority to help resolve all of the issues.

St. Lawrence stated that the Authority built these facility with the regional aspect in mind and the Authority is utilizing the Cocomposting facility on that basis by taking Orange County's sludge at that facility. The Authority feels that the MRF is nowhere near the capacity that it was designed for and the operator can process. The rejects that are being shipped out are of good quality and that the processing of the material needs to be revisited. The Chairman feels that WM needs to do and process the material better and the Chairman is firm with his decision. The Authority has not reached the capacity at the MRF and appreciates the open conversations with WM and hopes that they continue.

R. Geisser stated that he is still reviewing the contract but feels that the facility is at capacity. R. Geisser agrees that the rejects need to be processed better and stresses that WM wants to work with the Authority to resolve these issues.

St. Lawrence stated that the Authority will also increase its efforts to get more fiber into the facility.

Motion to Adjourn

Fornario/Corallo            Unan.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Camille Guido