

**Public Works Committee Meeting
Chenango County Office Building – Committee Room
Friday, January 24, 2020 – 10:00 am**

Present Were: Chairman Daniel S. Jack, Supervisor Peter C. Flanagan, Supervisor Thomas P. Grace, Supervisor John J. Cammarata, Supervisor Joseph M. Henninge, Supervisor Jennifer B. Boudreau, Supervisor Raymond E. Wakefield, Jr., Chairman Lawrence Wilcox, County Auditor/Clerk of the Board RC Woodford and Public Works Director Shawn Fry.

Absent: Supervisor Stanley D. Foulds.

Chairman Daniel Jack called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

**RC Woodford, County Auditor/Clerk of the Board
Public Transit Services:**

Mr. Woodford stated that First Transit would be submitting a request for grant funds to the NYSDOT under Section 5311 for a project to provide public mass transportation services for the County Public Transit System.

Mr. Woodford explained the mass transportation program to the committee members and stated that program belongs to the County and that the buses purchased are owned by the County but operated by First Transit.

Mr. Woodford stated that he was requesting to move to the full BOS in order to obtain a resolution to apply for the grant funds.

Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Wakefield, to refer to the next meeting of the BOS in order to obtain a resolution to authorize an application for NYSDOT Section 5311 grant funds. Carried.

Resolution to Follow

New York State Bag Waste Reduction Act:

Mr. Woodford presented the Committee with a copy of the NYS Bag Waste Reduction Act.

Mr. Woodford stated that the County could decide to opt in to collect a 5¢ fee on carry out paper bags under this law. Mr. Woodford stated that he is recommending to the Committee not to opt in for the collection of the 5¢. Mr. Woodford stated that the fees would go to the State and the State would return 2¢ back to the County. Mr. Woodford stated that this would be an additional tax that would be placed on the local taxpayer.

Mr. Woodford stated that he understood why this program was enacted and that it was certainly admirable, however he was not in favor of charging an additional tax where the State would collect it and claim to return some back to the County.

Mr. Woodford stated that he polled other counties in the State and only two counties wanted to impose this additional tax.

Committee members agreed with Mr. Woodford and determined that no further action would be taken by the Committee on the matter.

**Shawn Fry, Director, Public Works
Recycling:**

Monthly Report: Mr. Fry handed out the monthly Public Works reports which reflected the 2019 annual totals for the landfill programs.

Mr. Fry stated that recycling revenue for 2019 was \$109,560.14. Mr. Fry stated that they fell short of the \$140,000 revenue goal that was set for the year. Mr. Fry stated as a result of applying for and receiving grant funds, they were able to make up that difference and end up \$4,000 above the projected revenue.

Mr. Fry stated that the market prices were low last year as a result of trade issues with China and other low market prices in general.

Mr. Fry stated that they did better than other Counties due to their single source separation efforts at the landfill.

Landfill:

Monthly report: Mr. Fry stated that the total annual tonnage for 2019 was 44,510, which was higher than previous years.

Mr. Flanagan stated that the price increases kicked in this year. Mr. Fry stated that was correct. The tipping fees for residential customers kicked in earlier in the year and the tipping fees for commercial haulers kicked in this past November.

Mr. Fry explained what leachate was and the collection process of the leachate to the Committee.

Mr. Fry went over the income and expense report for the landfill with the Committee. Mr. Fry stated that they target expenses to be around \$1.7 to \$1.8 million annually.

Mr. Fry stated that the revenue for 2019 was \$2.4 million and the expenses were around \$1.719 million. Mr. Fry reminded the committee that all of the 2019 expenses have not been claimed yet and that a portion of the revenues are set aside to go into future cell development.

Mr. Cammarata asked how much it was to build a cell. Mr. Fry stated that the cost fluctuates depending on the costs associated with the cell construction during the timeframe it is being built. Mr. Fry stated that the last cell, cell 4 was approximately \$4.8 million.

Mr. Cammarata asked if they utilized the waste in any manner to convert it over to energy. Mr. Fry stated that over the years they have looked into various ways to utilize those resources and that they have learned through internal studies and studies conducted by an outside source that it was not economically feasible for the County. Mr. Fry stated that in the scheme of things overall, the County's landfill was small in comparison to those landfills that were able to utilize those resources for energy purposes.

Mr. Wilcox stated that the landfill was built in 1994 with a projected lifespan of 20 years. Mr. Wilcox stated that through the efforts of Mr. Fry and his staff they have been able to exceed those expectations and they have a plan that enabled them to increase the lifespan of the landfill to 40 years.

Cells 5, 6 & 7 and Landfill Expansion Update: Mr. Fry provided the Committee members with the background information surrounding the construction of cells 5, 6 and 7 and the land swap discussion with the NYSDEC.

Mr. Fry stated that they have been working with a company, Forecon, to remove the timber from some of the landfill property. Mr. Fry stated that they have marked off the timber to be harvested and that they will be

working on the RFP for contractors to harvest the timber. Mr. Fry stated that they are hoping to be able to gain enough revenue from the timber to pay for the contractor's services for the removal of marketable timber and the removal of other trees of no value.

Mr. Fry stated that they are still negotiating the idea of the land swap with the NYSDEC. Mr. Fry stated that he was notified that the project was handed off from the local representative to the regional engineers to look over. Mr. Fry stated that he was not expecting to hear anything anytime soon from the DEC. Mr. Fry stated that things have moved forward, but still at a slow pace. Mr. Flanagan offered to contact the DEC to see if he could help make the decision process move along a little.

Mr. Fry stated that they are also still interested in purchasing the land across the road from the landfill. Mr. Flanagan stated that the landowner wasn't sure if he wanted to sell the property and that he was unsure of the timeline for the project so he did not press the issue further. Mr. Fry stated that he would like to know the answer sometime this summer. Mr. Flanagan stated that he would contact the landowner again and see if he had any thoughts of wanting to sell the property to the County.

Refill HMEO Position: Mr. Fry stated that the individual who runs the compactor and manages the cell has indicated that he will be retiring sometime this year and he would like to begin the process of finding someone to replace him. Mr. Fry stated that he did not believe anyone was interested in the position from within the department and that he may need to advertise for the position. Mr. Fry stated that he would like to refer this to the Personnel Committee in order to have time to hire someone and train them for the position.

Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cammarata, to refer to the Personnel Committee in order to refill a HMEO position at the landfill. Carried.

Referral to Personnel Committee

Highway:

Material Bids: Mr. Fry stated that he had several bids to accept for materials for the DPW.

Mr. Fry stated that they received several bids for bank run gravel and he is recommending to accept all bids based upon job location and product availability.

Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Wakefield, to accept all bids received for bank run gravel. Carried.

Mr. Fry stated that they received one bid for ready mix concrete from Hanson's and that they were the same vendor that was used last year.

Mr. Wakefield made a motion, seconded by Ms. Boudreau, to accept the bid for ready mix concrete from Hanson's. Carried.

Mr. Fry stated that they received two bids for welding gases and that Airgas was the lowest bidder. Mr. Fry stated that Airgas has been the lowest bidder for several years.

Mr. Cammarata made a motion, seconded by Mr. Wakefield, to accept the bid received by Airgas for welding gases. Carried.

Mr. Fry stated that the next set of bids was for motor oil and lubricants and that he recommended awarding the bid to the lowest bidder, BWE Brenntag.

Mr. Wakefield made a motion, seconded by Ms. Boudreau, to accept the bid from BWE Brenntag for motor oil and lubricants. Carried.

Refill Mechanic: Mr. Fry stated that there was a vacant mechanic position as a result of the individual being promoted to one of the Deputy Director positions.

Mr. Fry stated that the position was necessary due to the amount of vehicles and equipment owned by the DPW.

Mr. Cammarata made a motion, seconded by Mr. Henninge, to refer to the Personnel Committee in order to refill Mechanic position #DM5130.11. Carried.

Referral to Personnel Committee

Refill Deputy Director: Mr. Fry stated that he was notified by Mr. Randy Rakes that he would be retiring on April 11, 2020. Mr. Fry stated that Mr. Rakes was their engineering and surveying expert. Mr. Fry stated that he would like to find someone with similar qualifications to fill the position.

At 11:07 a.m. Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cammarata, to go into executive session. Carried.

At 11:24 a.m. Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Wakefield, to adjourn the executive session. Carried.

Mr. Fry stated that he is requesting to refer to the Personnel Committee in order to refill the Deputy Director position. Mr. Fry stated that he would need time to advertise for the position.

Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Wakefield, to refer to the Personnel Committee in order to refill the Deputy Director Position. Carried.

Referral to Personnel Committee

Funding Request by Barton & Loguidice: Mr. Fry stated that as a result of unexpected costs, Barton & Loguidice has requested an additional \$15,068 for the bridge projects on County Road 32 in the Town of Norwich. Mr. Fry stated that they overran the Construction Manager and Inspection Manager lines because of having to work additional hours on the weekends that the contractor required them to be there for.

Mr. Fry stated that Barton & Loguidice put in a lot of extra effort to get the bid to come in \$70,000 under the bid specs. Mr. Fry stated that this overage was not expected and that Barton & Loguidice does a good job for the County and he believes they should be paid the amount they have requested.

Mr. Fry stated that Barton & Loguidice fought with DOT regarding the bridge inspections, and to reduce costs associated with the job.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he understood their plight, however Barton & Loguidice made a lot of money off of the County over the years and is making more money off of the County with the COB renovation project.

Mr. Fry stated that the issue was that their Inspection Manager and Construction Manager were required to work a lot more weekends than expected due to the contractor working weekends.

Mr. Flanagan asked if this was a legitimate bill or just a request. Mr. Fry stated that he thought it was a legitimate request and he would like to move this to the Finance Committee for approval.

Mr. Flanagan stated that there was a bidding process involved and that sometimes they were accurate and sometimes they weren't.

Mr. Jack asked if they did a good job for the County in other areas. Mr. Fry stated yes, there was no question as to their performance.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he has been told that it has been working both ways over the years. They do well by us and we do well by them in the amount of work the County gives to them.

Ms. Boudreau asked if Barton & Loguidice bid on the job and it was awarded to them. Mr. Fry stated yes.

Mr. Flanagan stated that a lot of bids are based on the cost of the job. Mr. Fry stated that was correct but sometimes the job ends up costing more. Mr. Fry stated that they typically bid based off of a percentage of the overall costs of the job.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he would like to see more detail regarding the additional expenses they are requesting. Mr. Fry stated that Barton & Loguidice asked if I wanted them to come to today's meeting and I did not think it was necessary and asked if the Committee wanted someone from their company to attend next month's meeting. Mr. Flanagan stated yes.

Mr. Jack stated that they would table this matter and ask Barton & Loguidice to attend next month's meeting.

Weights & Measures: Mr. Fry stated that he would place the December and annual report for 2019 in Committee members county mailboxes.

Other: Mr. Fry stated that there was a fire at the recycling facility located in Apalachin, NY that was a total loss to the company. Mr. Fry stated that the facility is closed and it is unknown for how long. Mr. Fry stated that hopefully the closure of this facility would not affect the recycling operation at the county landfill.

Adjournment:

Mr. Jack adjourned the meeting at 11:42 a.m.

slh

Public Works Committee Meeting
Chenango County Office Building – Committee Room
Thursday, February 20, 2020 – 10:00 am

Present Were: Chairman Daniel S. Jack, Supervisor Thomas P. Grace, Supervisor John J. Cammarata, Supervisor Joseph M. Henninge, Supervisor Stanley D. Foulds, Supervisor Raymond E. Wakefield, Jr., Director of Public Works Shawn Fry, Barton & Loguidice Engineers Matthew Schooley & Gregory Miller, and Chairman Lawrence Wilcox.

Absent: Supervisor Peter C. Flanagan and Supervisor Jennifer B. Boudreau.

Chairman Daniel S. Jack called the meeting to order at 10:00 am.

Barton & Loguidice Engineers Matthew Schooley & Gregory Miller
Request for Additional Funding:

Mr. Fry stated that during last month's meeting they spoke about the County Road 32 bridge projects that were completed last summer. Mr. Fry stated that two bridges were rehabilitated with the assistance of Barton & Loguidice.

Mr. Fry stated that Barton & Loguidice did a fabulous job with having construction engineers on site on a daily basis. Mr. Fry stated that Barton & Loguidice ran over on the number of hours and have requested additional funding. Mr. Fry stated that he has reviewed their records and he believed wholeheartedly that their request was justified. Mr. Fry stated that Barton & Loguidice saved the County a lot of money on this project.

Mr. Fry stated that the Committee requested more information and wanted to speak with the Barton & Loguidice representatives. Mr. Fry stated that he could not express enough that Barton & Loguidice was justified in asking for this additional funding.

Mr. Schooley stated that they worked on the preliminary design for this project several years ago and at that time the funding was denied. Mr. Schooley stated that a couple of years ago Bridge NY funds became available and they pulled out the old project proposal and worked with Mr. Fry on the application and submitted it for approval.

Mr. Schooley stated that the State wanted two engineers on site daily, however they were able to get the State to agree to have only one engineer on site. Mr. Schooley stated as a result of this they were able to cut \$100,000 from the project.

Mr. Schooley stated that the contractors stated that they would be able to complete the project in 18 weeks and even though they did not agree with that timeframe, they adjusted the project for 18 weeks. Mr. Schooley stated that they felt that 18 weeks was not an adequate amount of time and in the end, the project ended up taking 21 weeks, which led to the overages.

Mr. Schooley stated that they cut \$70,000 from the construction budget during the project and that he hoped that the committee would value the \$170,000 savings in making their decision.

Mr. Miller stated that they went over the agreement by \$15,100 for additional construction oversight efforts and explained to the committee that they budgeted 116 hours for construction management and the actual time was 160 hours. Mr. Miller stated that they budgeted 800 hours for construction inspection and the actual number of hours was 950. Mr. Schooley stated that there was an additional 45 hours of overtime due to the contractors work schedule for painting and paving. Mr. Miller stated that they budgeted 68 hours for construction support and the actual hours came to 100.

Mr. Miller stated that the scope and fee for construction oversight was based on 18 weeks with an estimate of 45 hours per week. Mr. Miller stated that due to the contractors schedule they ended up taking 21 weeks to complete the project. Mr. Miller stated that the additional three weeks to complete the project was where the additional \$15,100 came from.

Mr. Jack stated that the \$70,000 was off of the total bid and asked if that was a 95% State share and 5% local share. Mr. Fry stated that anything over a certain amount was local dollars and that the total cost was \$933,000. Mr. Fry stated that in 2017 the County made the decision to fund the overage amount of an additional \$20,000 and that the \$170,000 was actually a savings to the County.

Mr. Grace asked when Mr. Fry became aware of the project overrun. Mr. Fry stated that he became aware of this in November, however due to the committee's meeting schedule, the committee did not meet again until January.

Mr. Fry stated that the contractors schedule made it tough on Barton & Loguidice as well.

Mr. Jack asked how often they asked for additional funding for projects. Mr. Schooley stated that on the engineering side, almost never but on the construction side it could get to that point from time to time. Mr. Schooley stated that they really had no control over the construction.

Mr. Jack stated that the costs were based on 2017 costs. Mr. Schooley stated that was correct.

Mr. Grace made a motion, seconded by Mr. Foulds to refer to the Finance Committee for the additional request made by Barton & Loguidice in the amount of \$15,100. Carried.

Referral to Finance

Waste Management Monthly Reports:

Recycling: Mr. Fry stated that they marketed \$18,386.39 worth of recyclables in January.

Landfill: Mr. Fry stated that 3,082 tons of solid waste came in last month. Mr. Fry stated that leachate for the month of January was 550,000 gallons.

Refill HMEO Position:

Mr. Fry stated that an individual resigned in order to accept a position elsewhere and that this position was one of only three positions at the landfill. Mr. Fry stated that he is requesting to move to the Personnel Committee in order to refill the position.

Mr. Grace made a motion, seconded by Mr. Wakefield, to refer to the Personnel Committee in order to refill HMEO position #A8092.11. Carried.

Referral to Personnel

Landfill Equipment List Modification:

Mr. Fry stated that during the 2020 budget sessions it was discussed that there may not be enough funding to cover the costs of new equipment.

Mr. Fry stated that they budgeted for an excavator and semi-tractor truck.

Mr. Fry stated that he was asking to modify the \$375,000 equipment budget.

Mr. Fry stated that the tractor truck was \$130,000 and that it would be delivered sometime in March.

Mr. Fry stated that the remaining \$245,000 would not be enough to cover the cost of a new excavator. Mr. Fry stated that they are currently looking for a used excavator and that the cost of a used one was around \$100,000. Mr. Fry stated that the excavator was not used a lot, but they needed one for certain things.

Mr. Fry stated that they need a backhoe because he was afraid that they might not be able to repair the current one due to its age and not being able to find parts for it anymore. Mr. Fry stated that they were looking for a used one around \$60,000.

Mr. Fry stated that they have three leachate tanks and that one of them was shot and needed to be replaced. Mr. Fry stated that with the remaining funds he would like to replace it.

Mr. Fry stated that he was asking for the committee's approval to modify the equipment list and purchase those additional items.

Mr. Wakefield made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cammarata, to approve the purchase of a used backhoe and leachate tank. Carried.

Logging Project:

Mr. Fry stated that he along with Mr. Rakes and Mr. Trammel met with the DEC and walked through the wooded area at the landfill. Mr. Fry stated that the DEC did not have a problem with 95% of the area and that the County could go to bid on that. Mr. Fry stated that the DEC wanted to come back in the spring to look at the remaining area with an updated map that showed the wetland areas and where the new road was going to be in relation to one another.

Mr. Fry stated that the bid advertisement would be going out and that they have to advertise it for three to four weeks and that they were still a ways away from opening bids.

Mr. Fry stated that the price of lumber was very low right now, so they may elect to wait six months from now for the prices to increase.

Land Swap:

Mr. Jack stated that Mr. Flanagan met with the land owner recently and that the land owner was more receptive to the idea of selling the property to the County. Mr. Jack stated that the land owner was not agreeable to the purchase price offer, but was willing to talk about it. Mr. Jack stated that they were also continuing to work on the land swap with the State.

Construction Debris Tipping Fee:

Mr. Fry handed the committee a report that indicated the tipping fees for construction debris for Chenango County and surrounding landfills.

Mr. Fry stated that they took in a lot of construction debris last year and that the age of the landfill was dependent upon how fast it filled up. Mr. Fry stated that the longer that took, the better.

Mr. Fry stated that last year they were just under the permitted limit for what they could take in and that when they looked at what they took in, construction debris stood out the most. Mr. Fry stated that construction debris did not degenerate as fast as other household waste and that it did not compact as well either.

Mr. Fry stated that besides Broome County, Chenango County's tipping fees were very inexpensive as compared to other landfills. Mr. Fry stated that if they were to raise the tipping fees it might reduce the chances of people from outside of the county from bringing it in to us.

Mr. Jack asked if there was a way to raise the tipping fee in a way that would keep the price down to help homeowners. Committee members discussed the fee amounts that were presented.

Mr. Fry stated that he was not asking for a decision to be made today and that they would take a look at the report and continue to assess the situation and come back to committee with further suggestions.

Highway Report:

Material Bids: Mr. Fry stated that he had a few material bids for committee approval.

Snow Plow Blades & Shoes: Mr. Fry stated that he recommended to award to the low price bidder per item as indicated on the bid sheet to Chemung Supply and Steel Sales.

Mr. Wakefield made a motion, seconded by Mr. Foulds to award the bids to the low price bidder per item to Chemung Supply and Steel Sales for snow plow blades & shoes. Carried.

Special Hardened Grader Blades: Mr. Fry stated that he recommended to accept the bid provided by Chemung Supply as the sole bidder.

Mr. Cammarata made a motion, seconded by Mr. Henninge, to accept the bid received by Chemung Supply for special hardened grader blades. Carried.

Carbide Insert Snow Plow Blades: Mr. Fry stated that he is recommending to accept the low bid to Chemung Supply.

Mr. Foulds made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cammarata, to accept the low bid received by Chemung Supply for carbide insert snow plow blades. Carried.

Refill MEO Position and Subsequent Backfill Requests:

Mr. Fry stated that he was incorrect in saying that no one from within the department was interested in the HMEO position at the landfill and that this individual accepted the position and he is requesting to refill this MEO position and any subsequent backfill requests.

Mr. Grace made a motion, seconded by Mr. Foulds, to refer to the Personnel Committee in order to refill the vacant MEO position and any subsequent backfill requests. Carried.

Referral to Personnel

Modify 2020 Equipment List:

Mr. Fry stated that the approved equipment list was for the purchase of a dirt loader and two one ton carry all pickup trucks.

Mr. Fry stated that the dirt loader was purchased and would hopefully be delivered in April and that he was waiting for the final State bid package pricing for the trucks.

Mr. Fry stated that he was asking for approval to make an addition to the equipment list in order to purchase a compactor for the John Deere excavator in the amount of \$13,375, a welder for the service truck in the amount of \$2,500 and a new air compressor for the paint shop in the amount of \$4,500. Mr. Fry stated that the purchases would be funded from account #H5130.20 – County Road Machinery Fund.

Mr. Wakefield made a motion, seconded by Mr. Foulds, to approve the additional equipment purchases. Carried.

Upcoming 2020 Projects to be Bid on in March:

Mr. Fry stated that following projects were slated for this year dependent on State funding.

Town of Preston: McDonough Road total bridge replacement with the road closure for 6 to 8 weeks.

Town of Greene: County Road 9, twin culvert replacement with a road closure for 3 to 5 days.

Town of Guilford: County Road 36, bridge replacement with road closure for 6 weeks.

Oil and stone County Roads 8, 17, 29, and 38.

Hot mix overlay surface treatment on part of County Road 10A, part of County Road 33 and part of County Road 35.

In place cold recycling and hot mix asphalt overlay: County Road 32 in the Town of Norwich between State Highways 23 and 320. Mr. Fry stated that this project was totally dependent on the extreme winter weather recovery funds.

Mr. Fry stated that the Governor's executive budget had Pave NY and Bridge NY funding put back into it for the next two years. Mr. Fry stated that the federal government was supposed to enact a new federal highway bill, but it would take two years for that funding to come out, so the Governor only wanted to have the state funding for two years in order to wait and see what happened with the federal funding.

Mr. Fry stated that CHIPS funding did not increase this year and that they wouldn't know if they would be receiving extreme winter weather recovery funding until March or April.

Mr. Wilcox stated that they may need to supplement some of the projects with local dollars.

Weight & Measures:

Mr. Fry provided the committee with the January report of activities for the Sealer of Weight & Measures.

Adjournment:

Mr. Wakefield made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cammarata, to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Jack adjourned the meeting at 11:10 a.m.

slh

**Public Works Committee Meeting
Chenango County Office Building – Committee Room
Thursday, April 23, 2020 – 10:00 am**

Present Were: Chairman Lawrence Wilcox, Director of Public Works Shawn Fry and Clerk of the Board/County Auditor RC Woodford.

Present Via Teleconference Were: Chairman Daniel S. Jack, Supervisor Peter C. Flanagan, Supervisor Thomas P. Grace, Supervisor Jennifer B. Boudreau, Supervisor John J. Cammarata and Supervisor Joseph M. Henninge and Supervisor Raymond E. Wakefield, Jr.

Absent: Supervisor Stanley D. Foulds.

Chairman Daniel S. Jack called the meeting to order at 10:00 am.

**Shawn Fry, Director, Public Works
Monthly Reports:**

Mr. Fry stated that he emailed the monthly reports for recycling, landfill and highway to committee members and asked if anyone had any questions. No members had any questions or comments regarding the monthly reports.

Landfill – City of Norwich Request for Tipping Fee Reduction or Waiver:

Mr. Fry stated that in March he received a letter from the City of Norwich Code Enforcement Office regarding a building on the corner of Mitchell Street and State Street that began to collapse in May of 2019. Mr. Fry stated that at the time the building was a privately owned rental property and that the City was hoping that the owner would do the right thing and pay for the disposal of the building. Mr. Fry stated that the owner of the building has failed to take care of it and now the City of Norwich has to dispose of it.

Mr. Fry stated that the City of Norwich is asking for a tipping fee waiver at the County landfill for the demolition debris for that building. Mr. Fry stated that he also had a conversation with the Code Enforcement Office for the City of Norwich regarding the bricks and whether or not they could be used as a possible source for road base or some other form of reuse of the bricks to help reduce the cost of disposal. Mr. Fry stated that he spoke to a DEC representative and that he was told that they could use the bricks for the purpose of a road base, however the County would have to apply for a Beneficial Use Determination, which was possible, but the City of Norwich would be tasked with separating the bricks from the rest of the materials in the building. Mr. Fry stated that may or may not drive the cost of the demolition up drastically because whoever the City of Norwich contracted with for the removal of the building would have to somehow separate all of the bricks out of the debris.

Mr. Fry stated that the City of Norwich has not made any decisions because they were trying to figure out if the County was willing to negotiate the tipping fees reduction or waiver. Mr. Fry stated that this was why he was presenting it to the committee. Mr. Fry stated that in the past they have not allowed for a reduction in tipping fees and that very rarely have they allowed for a tipping fee reduction for a municipality or individual that has come before this committee during his tenure.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he had been on this committee for a long time and he did not remember a time where they have granted a tipping fee reduction for a municipality.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he thought they were covering the landfill with construction and debris. Mr. Fry stated that was correct, however the construction and debris had to go through a bunch of testing and that the materials they were using had to be ground down and chopped down to a less than six inch material in order to qualify for the alternate daily cover for the landfill.

Mr. Grace asked Mr. Fry if there was an actual use for the bricks by the County. Mr. Fry stated that they may be able to use the bricks as a base for the new ring road around the landfill after the expansion project was completed. Mr. Fry stated that he had mixed feelings about this and that it was just an idea that was thrown out there.

Mr. Fry stated that at the rate the landfill was filling up with their increased tonnage he was not real excited about getting this building debris in and throwing it into the landfill and throwing bricks in there that would not degrade at all. Mr. Fry stated that he was trying to think of alternative uses for the bricks. Mr. Fry stated that he would like to see the bricks recycled, but he understood the City of Norwich not wanting to have to pay a fortune in having to separate the bricks out either.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he had a suggestion to consider giving the City of Norwich the commercial haulers rate and then asking the City to credit the County for the cost of leachate disposal towards the City's cost for the tipping fees. Mr. Flanagan stated that it would be a significant discount for the City. Mr. Fry stated that it might be.

Mr. Flanagan stated that once again he did not recall ever reducing tipping fees for anyone in the past. Mr. Flanagan stated that in the past when they had to demolish a building it cost the City around \$30,000 and that was back in the day when the tipping fees were cheaper and that building was smaller than this one. Mr. Flanagan stated that this building might be a \$50,000 or \$60,000 item at the normal rate. Mr. Fry stated that was hard to say and that the City currently has a disposal rate of \$50 per ton and the commercial haulers rate was \$45 per ton. Mr. Fry stated that the normal rate for the average person off the street was \$60 per ton.

Mr. Jack stated that this offer might be an issue for the City in regards to their internal billing because the sewage and water treatment facility was separate from their code enforcement office. Mr. Flanagan stated that it could be a problem and that was for the City of Norwich to determine.

Mr. Flanagan stated that while no money would actually exchange hands, what could be a savings of \$60,000 to \$70,000 to the City of Norwich by not having to write a check for the amount would allow for the debris disposal and not set a precedence for other municipalities that struggle with buildings that end up having to be demolished at their expense. Mr. Flanagan stated that it would be nice for the County to be able to help them out but this would open the door for giving discounts to other entities. Mr. Flanagan stated that in this manner it would provide a benefit for both the County and the City by deferring expenses. Mr. Flanagan stated that maybe it wouldn't work for the County either, but it was something to consider.

Mr. Jack stated that he was comfortable offering them the commercial haulers rate and that he would not want to go any lower than that.

Mr. Henninge asked if Mr. Fry would use the bricks. Mr. Fry stated that he was hoping that the bricks could be used somewhere else in the terms of being recycled or reused. Mr. Fry stated that when he spoke with the Code Enforcement Officer from the City, they were brainstorming back and forth as to how the bricks could be used and that the Code Enforcement Officer used that example in their letter to the County.

Mr. Fry stated that people reclaim bricks all the time from these buildings and do all kinds of stuff with them. Mr. Fry stated that the hardest part about this was that the contractors would come in with an excavator and take all of that debris mixed together and dump it into the dumpster and that they would not want to take the time to separate out the bricks.

Mr. Flanagan stated that by the time the City had to pay a contractor prevailing wage to come in and separate out all of those bricks, they would end up paying the cost of that tipping fee six times over.

Mr. Fry stated that he could talk to the City about the offer that Mr. Flanagan had suggested and see if it was something they were interested in and come back next month with an answer.

Mr. Fry stated that he was not sure if the City of Norwich was in the process of doing anything with this matter at this time due to the pandemic because he was unable to get in touch with anyone from the City recently to talk about the letter. Mr. Fry stated that they may have tabled this matter as well and not be investigating the cost of the debris removal right now.

Mr. Jack stated that they would table this matter for the time being and wait to hear back from the City of Norwich. Mr. Flanagan asked if they should present them with an offer. Mr. Jack stated that if they weren't in their offices conducting business at this time, they were not in any hurry to do anything. Mr. Jack stated that if we were going to make them an offer he would not offer them the reduced rate either and just trade them for the leachate fees. Mr. Flanagan stated that the perception has been that the City has always treated the County fairly well with the leachate contract. Mr. Flanagan stated that Mr. Iverson told him that the County got a heck of a deal. Mr. Jack stated that he understood that and that they could table it and discuss it at a later date. Mr. Fry stated that tabling it would also give him some time to work out some of the bugs also.

Highway – Refill Requests:

Mr. Fry stated he had refill requests and asked Mr. Woodford if he wanted to explain the Board referral regarding refilling positions in further detail with the Committee.

Mr. Woodford stated that there was a referral from the Board meeting to all committees and departments to evaluate all positions and backfills in accordance to FEMA and essential staffing classifications and requirements. Mr. Woodford stated that he spoke with Mr. Flanagan following the Board meeting to make sure he understood the intent of the referral. Mr. Woodford stated that the intent was twofold with looking at any refills or backfills or other positions. One is that if there was any FEMA reimbursement potential regarding those positions down the road and two, relative to the Governor's order regarding non-essential government employees. Mr. Woodford stated that the order was that a minimum of 50% of non-essential employees were required to either be working from home or be more at home on paid leave without using accruals of their paid time off. Mr. Woodford stated that he and Mr. Fry spoke about the referral requests that he had for his department and hoped that he explained it properly for Mr. Flanagan. Mr. Flanagan stated that was the gist of it and that the FEMA situation may not apply here. Mr. Flanagan stated that the FEMA positions was one thing and the other concern was that if they were paying 50% of the people to stay home he had trouble with adding positions because they were hiring people one day only to turn around and send them home the next day. Mr. Flanagan stated that at this rate they would have to hire two people to get one worker. Mr. Flanagan stated that it was not fiscally prudent to do that.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he understood that there were different positions at the highway department but if they had half of their people at home he was reluctant to refill any of those positions that were not considered to be essential.

Mr. Cammarata stated that he thought they could not hire anyone new at this time because he ran into a situation with FEMA regarding hiring someone with excavation experience. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was unsure of that because they could hire anyone they wanted to, but FEMA may not pay for the position was how he understood it.

Mr. Flanagan stated that this was why he wanted the County to hire someone for the FEMA projects so that there was someone who understood those FEMA requirements. Mr. Flanagan explained to the committee what his interpretation of the FEMA requirements were.

Mr. Flanagan stated that this could be a different situation and asked Mr. Fry if this was due to retirements or some other circumstance. Mr. Fry stated that in reference to the LMEO and the two laborer position refill requests he understood the Board referral and that those positions were not necessary at this point, but that they would become necessary to refill at some point after this crisis was over with.

Mr. Flanagan made a motion to table those refill requests until Mr. Fry deemed them to be necessary. The motion was seconded by Mr. Grace. Carried.

Mr. Fry stated that the refill request position was for the Sr. Account Clerk/Typist for the Highway. Mr. Fry stated that this was for a proposed retirement that was going to occur sometime in June. Mr. Fry stated that position was very important to the department and that she handled all of the financial transactions for the highway division.

Mr. Fry stated that he was requesting approval from this committee to go before the Personnel Committee with a referral to create a temporary Sr. Account Clerk/Typist position for training purposes until the existing individual retired. Mr. Fry stated that he would leave the salary for the temporary position up to the Personnel Committee to determine. Mr. Fry

stated that he could not stress enough how much work went into paying the bills for that department and learning how all of the accounts work. Mr. Fry stated that a lot of people think that they can just throw anyone into this position and they can do it. Mr. Fry stated that he disagreed with that statement entirely. Mr. Fry stated that there was a lot of knowledge that went into that position and he would like someone to get as much seat time into that position with Ms. Neubauer before she retired.

Mr. Jack asked what the current salary for the position was. Mr. Fry stated that the salary was currently \$38,647. Mr. Jack asked what he wanted the new person to start at. Mr. Fry stated that the pay schedule was determined by the union contract and that it would be whatever the base rate for the Sr. Account Clerk/Typist was.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he thought his motion was for all of the refills but he could see the difference here.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he still questioned what the status of the staff was and asked if they were working in the office or from home. Mr. Fry stated that Ms. Neubauer was working in the office quite a bit. Mr. Fry stated that the office staff has been on a rotational basis like the highway workers have been, however Ms. Neubauer has been coming in to work in the office a majority of the time partly because she did not want any of this to affect her retirement.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he understood that and wanted to know if someone was going to be hired from within his department. Mr. Fry stated that he did not have another Sr. Account Clerk/Typist from his department, but it could be someone from a different county department that would fill the position. Mr. Fry stated that they still needed to go through the interview and hiring process but he could not do that without this referral.

Mr. Flanagan stated that it made things difficult at this point in time but he still had a problem with wanting to hire somebody to stay home. Mr. Flanagan stated that he did not know how much seat time this person was going to get because of social distancing and did not know how they were going to be able to accomplish any training. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was personally reluctant to hire anyone at his point.

Mr. Jack asked Mr. Fry if this individual would be right there in the office working with Ms. Neubauer. Mr. Fry stated yes and that the desks would be set up six feet apart with the computers linked to one another so that they would be looking at the same screen and working together.

Mr. Jack stated that the refill on this was something that they wanted to take advantage of between now and June in order to train someone. Mr. Flanagan stated that it was no arguable approach but once again we were at different times and he did not know what the normal evolution of this would be and asked Mr. Fry if he expected to get someone in from a different department. Mr. Fry stated that when they refilled the Sr. Account Clerk/Typist from within the waste management department they had interest from other county employees, so they might see someone from another department apply.

Mr. Flanagan stated that if there was an opportunity to promote from another department they were already paying someone to stay home that maybe that department could lend that person to the highway department.

Mr. Flanagan asked if this was a civil service process. Mr. Fry stated that it did fall under civil service requirements but that they needed it to get through Personnel and get the position advertised and to hire off of the list.

Mr. Cammarata stated that they might not be able to refill the position until sometime during the end of May. Mr. Fry stated at the earliest the position could be refilled in the middle of May. Mr. Cammarata stated then the training needed to be done and agreed that the process should be started now because otherwise he would be stuck without having someone in that position processing the bills. Mr. Fry stated that was correct and that they were coming up on their busy season for road work. Mr. Cammarata stated that he would move to get this process started.

Mr. Grace made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cammarata, to refer to the Personnel Committee in order to create a temporary Sr. Account Clerk/Typist position for the Highway Department. Carried with Mr. Flanagan opposed.

Referral to Personnel Committee

Discussion: Mr. Flanagan stated that due to the 50% reduction of staffing he did not think this was going to work. Mr. Flanagan stated that he did not think the social distancing requirement was going to be over with anytime soon and that by the time they were going to be able to get this done they would not be able to have time to train anyone. Mr. Flanagan

stated that if they could find somebody to be loaned to them from within the County that would be his preference. Mr. Flanagan stated that he knew this probably was not practical but he did not think this was going to work due to the timing of it.

RC Woodford, Clerk of the Board/County Auditor

Extension of Agreement with First Transit:

Mr. Woodford stated that they have extended this contract multiple times over recent years and that essentially this was for a one year agreement for the extension of the contract with First Transit for the public transportation system. Mr. Woodford stated that a similar resolution will be going through for the Health and Human Services Committee for the AAOA as well as Mental Health on April 27, 2020. Mr. Woodford stated that as stated this was a one year contract that will expire on April 30, 2021 and he is asking for a referral for a Board resolution to approve the contract.

Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Henninge, to refer to the next BOS meeting in order to adopt a resolution to authorize a one year extension to an agreement with First Transit, Inc. for Public Transportation Services. Carried.
Resolution to Follow

Other:

Chairman Wilcox stated that he had a request from the Planning Department to remind Supervisors to return the Hazard Mitigation commitment paperwork to Ms. Doing in the Planning Department so that they can complete the County's plan.

Adjournment:

Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cammarata, to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Jack adjourned the meeting at 10:43 a.m.

slh

Public Works Committee Meeting
Chenango County Office Building – Committee Room
Thursday June 18, 2020 – 10:00 am

Present Were: Supervisor Raymond Wakefield, Jr., Supervisor Joseph M. Henninge, Director of Public Works Shawn Fry, Clerk of the Board/County Auditor RC Woodford and Chairman Lawrence Wilcox.

Present Via Teleconference Were: Chairman Daniel S. Jack, Supervisor Peter C. Flanagan, Supervisor Thomas P. Grace, Supervisor John J. Cammarata and Supervisor Joseph M. Henninge and Supervisor Raymond E. Wakefield, Jr.

Absent: Supervisor Jennifer B. Boudreau and Supervisor Stanley D. Foulds.

Chairman Daniel S. Jack called the meeting to order at 10:03 am.

RC Woodford, County Auditor/Clerk of the Board
Stimulus Funding:

Mr. Woodford stated that in April they received a notice from NYSDOT regarding \$1.6 million that was awarded under the federal stimulus package as part of the CARES Act for the public transit system. Mr. Woodford stated that NYSDOT has determined that the funding will be provided in the form of operating assistance. Mr. Woodford stated that not a lot of detail was provided at this point in time however he is suggesting that the County should begin the process of accepting this award and authorizing the appropriations by either Board Resolution and/or a referral to the Finance Committee for the Mass Transportation System. Mr. Woodford stated that the reason he stated Board Resolution and/or referral to the Finance Committee was because at the moment he was not entirely sure how funding will affect Chenango County as far as the public transportation system because it was running throughout the shutdown period for the pandemic.

Mr. Woodford stated that a good part of the operating assistance that the public transportation system received was state aid and if he had to guess the state aid will essentially slow or cease and the federal aid will take its place. Mr. Woodford stated that he was not entirely sure what the implications were today, but he would like to ask for a referral to the Finance Committee and or the Board to one authorize the contract with NYSDOT and two to make the appropriations if appropriate or if necessary.

Mr. Wakefield made a motion, seconded by Mr. Henninge to refer to the next BOS meeting and/or the Finance Committee in order to authorize the contract with NYSDOT and make the appropriations if appropriate.
Carried.

Referral to Finance Committee and Resolution to Follow

Discussion: Mr. Flanagan joined the meeting and asked for an explanation on the motion. Mr. Jack and Mr. Woodford explained what was being discussed prior to the motion.

Shawn Fry, Director, Public Works
Recycling:

Monthly Report: Mr. Fry stated that the recycling stations were opened back up in mid-May for three days per week for about three weeks and as of the 1st of June they resumed normal operations. Mr. Fry stated that the landfill remained open during the COVID crisis.

Mr. Fry stated that for the recycling report for May 2020 they were able to market some scrap metal and news printed materials. Mr. Fry stated that made around \$6,000 for the month of May and were up to about \$30,000 so far this year. Mr. Fry stated that was 21% of the projected annual revenue and that usually this time of the year they have made around 42% of the projected annual revenue. Mr. Fry stated that being shut down for a couple of months put them behind and hopefully they can catch back up.

Landfill:

Monthly Report: Mr. Fry stated that May brought in about 3,700 tons and had about 500,000 gallons of leachate. Mr. Flanagan stated that they were down 1,000 tons from this time last year and although that might have been an anomaly and asked Mr. Fry what he saw there or was there anything in particular that caused that. Mr. Fry stated Mr. Flanagan was correct and that they were down about 1,000 tons from last year and that it was hard to say what the difference was. Mr. Fry stated that they have been busy, but it could be from the virus issue. Mr. Flanagan stated he wondered why because last year's was 4,700 ton and maybe there was a reason that it was unusually high last year. Mr. Fry stated that he was unsure, May was a particularly busy month last year for some reason, but numbers for this year were more reflective of what the typical years for May have been. Mr. Flanagan stated okay, he just wondered.

Construction Debris & Other Materials Tipping Fees: Mr. Fry stated that the next couple of items for discussion were based on the amount of garbage they received last year and their permitted amount. Mr. Fry stated that they were annually permitted for about 45,000 tons per year and last year they took in 44,510 tons.

Mr. Fry stated that one of the biggest factors for how fast the landfill fills up is compaction and density. Mr. Fry stated that one of the biggest contributing things that came in last year was construction and debris. Mr. Fry stated that caused the landfill to fill up quickly. Mr. Fry stated that cell four is filled up above the road now and starting to go up the hill. Mr. Fry stated that it was quite shocking how fast the hole filled up. Mr. Fry stated that the faster the cell filled up the sooner they needed to look at building the next cell, cell five. Mr. Fry stated that last November they projected that cell 5 would begin to be opened up in 2024 and again felt the same way when they conducted their annual volume calculations in January. Mr. Fry stated that as they have been looking at it and as fast as it seemed to be filling up this year and if they kept getting in the annual tonnage like they did last year he was unsure and he was getting very nervous.

Mr. Fry stated with that being said, he wanted to talk about construction debris and materials. Mr. Fry referred to the document in the Committee's packet regarding material that require special attention. Mr. Fry stated that it showed the materials for the surrounding counties with the tipping fees that they charge in comparison to Chenango County. Mr. Fry stated that construction and debris as well as other materials like mattresses, box springs, bulk furniture and items like that was one of the leading causes that contributed to the cell filling up as quickly as it was because those items did not degrade as quickly as normal household garbage did. Mr. Fry stated that it was very obvious, those materials were not organic and does not break down as quickly and it was very difficult and very time consuming to try to compact those materials.

Mr. Fry stated that he believed that they needed to implement an increase in tipping fees for those items as soon as possible to try to slow down or at least if not slow down, try to capitalize on capturing more money for those items that are causing the concerns that they are facing for the future.

Mr. Fry stated that later on with the agenda they were going to discuss the demolition of the big brick building that the City of Norwich wants to bring to the landfill. Mr. Fry stated that they also have three other buildings that he has been notified about over the last couple of weeks. Mr. Fry stated that meant more construction and debris was coming in. Mr. Fry stated that this problem was not going to go away anytime soon, the economy was good and people were able to do those types of demolitions and build. Mr. Fry stated that this was something that was going to affect all of them.

Mr. Fry stated that with construction and debris and the other items that he mentioned, he believed that it was time to increase the tipping fees on those items as soon as possible to try to get ahead of that problem.

Mr. Fry stated that he would like the Committee to make a motion to approve an increase in tipping fees for construction and debris, mattresses, box springs, bulk furniture, and asbestos to the following rates. Before Mr. Fry could state the requested rates, Mr. Flanagan asked what the current rates were for those items. Mr. Fry stated that rates were as follows: construction and debris was \$60.00 a ton, mattresses and box springs were \$4.00 a piece or \$60.00 a ton, bulk furniture was \$4.00 or \$6.00 a piece or \$60.00 a ton and asbestos was \$2.00 a bag or \$60.00 a ton.

Mr. Fry stated that he was proposing the following increases: construction & debris go to \$85.00 a ton, mattresses go to \$15.00 each, box springs go to \$15.00 each, bulk furniture go to \$10.00 per item and asbestos go to \$4.00 a bag or \$85.00 per ton. Mr. Flanagan asked if they have ever gotten in a ton of bulk furniture all at once. Mr. Fry stated no, but there were times when people came in insisting on weighing their load of furniture being brought in.

Mr. Grace made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cammarata, to increase the tipping fees as requested by Mr. Fry, construction & debris go to \$85.00 a ton, mattresses go to \$15.00 each, box springs go to \$15.00 each, bulk furniture go to \$10.00 per item and asbestos go to \$4.00 a bag or \$85.00 per ton. Failed.

Discussion: Mr. Jack stated that he has an issue with mattresses and box springs because they would end up being thrown out onto state land or along the side roads. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was going to vote against this motion because Mr. Jack was exactly right. Mr. Flanagan stated that places like the Town of Preston, which was particularly close to the landfill, people were not going to pay \$15 to get rid of a mattress, they would throw it off on the side of the road. Mr. Flanagan stated that they have household hazardous waste day every year, which the County spends \$40,000 on every two years so that people from Norwich could get rid of the stuff in their garages. Mr. Flanagan stated that he would rather keep the stuff off of the sides of the roads in the towns that were most impacted which were the towns that surround the dump, not Pharsalia because it was about 500 yards into Pharsalia. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was in favor of raising the construction and debris tonnage but the per item things, he just knew where most of those items would end up.

Mr. Jack stated that he would like to see the construction and debris higher than \$85.00 because they were getting a lot more of that in, which was filling up the landfill. Mr. Jack stated that he was looking at the comparisons for tipping fees for some of the other counties and \$85.00 was close to the surrounding counties and if they wanted to discourage a lot of that coming in to keep the cell from filling up so fast maybe the fee should be just a hair bit higher than the others. Mr. Flanagan stated that we have a law that prevents people from bringing it in from other counties. Mr. Fry stated that the construction and debris that was coming in, was not coming in from out of the county. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was in favor of the increase for construction and debris, but if they were talking about \$10 for an old chair he was not in favor of it. Mr. Flanagan stated that he did not want to see that stuff getting dumped off on the side of their roads because they were already seeing more than enough tires and televisions along the side of the roads. Mr. Fry stated that he agreed, but the problem was at the current rate they have been, they are getting in huge volumes of those items. Mr. Fry stated that they took in 100 to 150 mattresses and box springs last week. Mr. Fry stated that outlet stores and a lot of people are cleaning out their places and it was amazing the number of items they were getting in. Mr. Fry stated that mattress and box springs bounce back and did not compact at all. Mr. Flanagan stated that his nightmare was that those items would end up along the side of the roads. Mr. Fry stated that he understood that frustration.

Mr. Cammarata asked if they had ever considered purchasing a shredder to put those items through. Pulverize it and get rid of it that way. Mr. Fry stated that there was that option but those machines start out at around \$350,000 per year up to very expensive ones for over \$1 million. Mr. Fry stated that they were a lot of money and manpower to run it. Mr. Fry stated that there was liability risk involved. Mr. Fry stated that it would be a great idea, but the trouble with those was they try to run more through them than they should. Mr. Fry stated

that items get wet and nasty and it degrades the quality of them. Mr. Fry stated that they freeze up over the winter and the maintenance on them was high. Mr. Fry stated that he spoke to other areas that have used them and they stopped using them for those reasons. Mr. Fry stated that he was told flat out by the other people that used them that the county would be further ahead by putting the money into buying another larger compactor and putting another person in the cell full time to run that other compactor. Mr. Cammarata stated that getting a larger compactor would probably be better because when you got in a large dresser or bulk furniture item, you could break it down into more manageable pieces more before putting it into the cell for the bulldozer to move around. Mr. Cammarata asked if they had a compactor. Mr. Fry stated that they do have one that is located in the cell. Mr. Fry stated that with another compactor they would have two of them in the cell to help break those items down more.

Mr. Flanagan stated that they were just making them pay a penalty for a higher price. Mr. Flanagan stated that he doubted they were going to balance the landfill budget by raising the prices for mattresses. Mr. Flanagan stated that the idea of a larger compactor makes sense, he did not want to spend \$1 million on a shredder. Mr. Flanagan stated that this was a financial question of when they would need to go into the next cell. Mr. Flanagan asked how much was expected to be made by those increases. Mr. Fry stated that the increases were more for hopefully slowing down those waste streams. Mr. Flanagan stated where those items would go, would they not tear down a building because it cost too much. Mr. Fry stated that they may take them somewhere else or they may still bring the items to us. Mr. Fry stated that it would help in the long run due to the acceleration of the volume.

Mr. Fry stated that the next thing they were going to talk about was looking at increasing the normal bag rate and tipping fees. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was all for that too, but wanted to continue with the construction and debris discussion. Mr. Flanagan asked how much construction and debris they took in annually. Mr. Fry stated that increasing the construction and debris rate from \$60.00 to \$85.00 per ton would bring them in \$51,385 per year. Mr. Flanagan asked if Mr. Fry had any idea on the other items. Mr. Fry stated that asbestos would bring them an additional \$7,000. He did not have an amount for the other items.

Mr. Jack stated that there was a motion on the table for across the board increases and asked if it could be amended. Mr. Flanagan stated that the motion could be amended. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was opposed to increasing the mattresses, box springs and bulk furniture, but he was not opposed to increasing the tipping fees for construction and debris and asbestos. Mr. Flanagan asked if most of the mattresses were coming in from commercial places. Mr. Fry stated that they get a few from the public, but the was bulk amount from mattresses outlet stores and places like that.

Mr. Woodford stated that at this point there was a motion and discussion had occurred and unless the motion was proposed to be amended by a motion and a second, the next order of business was a roll call vote on the matter. Mr. Woodford stated for clarification, when this would take effect. Mr. Fry stated following the July 13, 2020 BOS meeting. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was not opposed to that date, but they seldom changed the rates in the middle of the year. Mr. Flanagan stated that this was still under discussion and he was not opposed to raising the mattresses to \$10 since most of them came in from commercial businesses and he thought that they would not throw them out along the side of the road. Mr. Flanagan stated the furniture items to change that to a lesser amount.

Mr. Jack stated that if Mr. Grace was not going to amend his motion, it was time to vote on the matter.

Following the failed motion, Mr. Grace made a motion, seconded by Mr. Flanagan, to raise the tipping fees as follows: mattresses \$10 per item/\$85.00 per ton, box springs \$10 per item/\$85.00 per ton, bulk furniture \$8 per item/\$85.00 per ton, construction and debris \$85.00 and asbestos \$4 per bag/\$85 per ton effective August 1, 2020. Carried.

Resolution to Follow

Municipal Solid Waste – Bag Rate & Tonnage Rate Tipping Fees:

Mr. Fry stated that this discussion was also in reference to his statement about the rate that the landfill was filling up. Mr. Fry stated that there will be degradation of the garbage and settlement and compaction. Mr. Fry stated that unfortunately they won't know how well that will go until they conduct their annual garbage survey at the end of December. Mr. Fry stated that hopefully it will degrade quicker than they think it will. Mr. Fry stated that every time he goes up there he looks at the elevation of the cell and cringes.

Mr. Fry stated that he spoke with the landfill supervisor and recycling coordinator and they discussed different rates and when they should increase them. Mr. Fry stated that one of the things they thought about was the fact that they just increased the rates last May. Mr. Fry stated that for the public they went from \$1.50 per bag to \$2.00 per bag and last November they increased the tonnage rate from \$55 per ton to \$60 per ton for commercial haulers. Mr. Fry stated that there were some special break downs for certain amounts of volume.

Mr. Fry stated that just like with the increased amount of construction and debris there was no question that they had to try the best they could to be ready for cell construction sooner. They need to be able to capitalize and put money in the bank and be ready for it. Mr. Fry stated that raising the tipping fees was very warranted

Mr. Fry stated that he looked at the budget numbers and different expenses throughout the year for annual closure costs, savings for cell constructions and savings for other projects. Mr. Fry stated that currently at their rate of \$60 per ton, they were not putting much of that away for new cell construction. Mr. Fry stated that in order to do what they needed to do they needed to be at right around \$70 per ton to help out the best they could. Much like they did for the construction of cells 3 and 4. Mr. Fry stated that what he meant by that was the department has had roughly around \$2 million out of the \$4 million needed for cell construction.

Mr. Fry stated that when he spoke to B&L they were looking at roughly \$5 million for the construction of cell 5. Mr. Fry stated that did not include the cost of moving the overburden pile that was still in the way. Mr. Fry stated that the cost would dramatically increase if they did not move that overburden pile off of the area where cell 5 was located. Mr. Fry stated that was another expense that they have been thinking about and they needed to get it taken care of before the construction of cell 5 takes place. Mr. Fry stated that if they had the contractor move the pile, the construction cost will increase even more. Mr. Flanagan asked what it would cost if the DPW moved the overburden pile. Mr. Fry stated that last year when they figured it out it would cost around \$350,000 per year for the movement of the materials, if they were successful with purchasing the land across the road, for three to four years. Mr. Fry stated that was just an estimate of what they thought it would cost to move the 750,000 cubic yards of material that was sitting on top of cells 5, 6 and 7. Mr. Fry stated that there was a lot of material that needed to be taken away before they could build cells 5, 6 and 7.

Mr. Flanagan stated that as the Committee recalled, prior to the COVID pandemic, we made an offer to the property owner and he came back with another offer. Mr. Flanagan stated that he spoke to the property owner prior to this meeting and the owner has indicated that he is waiting for an answer or a counter offer from the County. Mr. Flanagan stated that for a little bit more money than what the County initially offered, he believed that they would be able to close the deal. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was not the person to authorize this kind of spending. Mr. Flanagan stated that they offered a quarter of a million dollars and the property owner would like a little bit more than that. Mr. Flanagan stated that he wanted to hear a response from the County within the next week or two. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was asking Mr. Jack to talk to the County Treasurer or Board Chairman to find out if they wanted to take it and leave it or sweeten the pot. Mr. Flanagan stated that there was also another parcel with 84 acres for sale located a couple of miles down the road from the landfill. Mr. Cammarata asked how many acres they were talking about that was right across the street from the landfill. Mr. Flanagan stated 144 acres. Mr. Cammarata asked if they would be able to build more cells on that land in the future. Mr. Flanagan stated that there would not be another landfill built in the State. Mr. Fry stated that they were beginning to see lateral expansions occurring at existing landfills in the State. Mr. Fry stated that permitting would begin for cells 8, 9 and 10 to the east side of the landfill. Mr. Fry stated that it was not that

after cell 7 Chenango County was completely out of the landfill, but as Mr. Flanagan did allude to there was a lot of truth in what he said. There was a lot of truth to the statement that New York State would not allow a permit for a new landfill at a different location within the state.

Mr. Woodford stated to get back to the issue at hand, he and the Chairman would have a discussion following the meeting with the County Attorney and County Treasurer regarding the purchase of the property across the road.

Mr. Grace asked how \$70 per ton compared to surrounding area landfills. Mr. Fry stated that the base rate was reflective of what they charged currently which was lower than surrounding areas, with the exception of Broome County whose landfill was subsidized with a tax on its residents.

Mr. Fry stated that one of the other things he wanted to talk about was when to implement this change. Mr. Fry stated that he recommended implementing the change on November 1, 2020 because November 1st allowed them enough time to raise the rates before the impact happened and the weather was still decent.

Mr. Jack stated that if they eventually wanted to get to \$80.00 they could raise the rates to \$70 on November 1st and then maybe on May 1, 2021 increase the rate to \$80 per ton. Mr. Jack stated that \$80.00 per ton was still cheaper but it would relatively be in line with surrounding counties. Mr. Fry stated that was a possibility.

Mr. Fry stated that he was also trying to get this out there because they were working on agreements with commercial haulers. Mr. Fry stated that the sooner they could get this figured out the sooner they could get the word out to them in order to work on their business plans.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he has been on the committee since the landfill opened and when the landfill opened in 1994 they opened with a tonnage fee of \$70. Mr. Flanagan stated that they did 18,000 tons for the first few years and they dropped the fee to \$40 and seldom raised the tipping from there despite the suggestion from some of the committee members. Mr. Flanagan stated that some of the committee members felt that the fees needed to crawl up rather than jump up. Mr. Flanagan stated this was going to be a big jump for some of the haulers. Mr. Flanagan stated that they also have not discussed the sweetheart deal that their biggest customer had. Mr. Flanagan stated that in the history of the landfill there were legal battles fought over flow control which meant that any garbage from Chenango County had to go to the Chenango County landfill. Mr. Flanagan stated that the BOS was generally opposed to dictating to the garbage haulers that they must come to us. Mr. Flanagan stated that there was finally a deal made with their biggest customer and it was a very, very, very generous deal. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was not opposed to giving them a deal, he was opposed to the volume discount this hauler was getting because it was set too low. Mr. Flanagan stated that they were getting less than \$40 per ton by the time the Town of Pharsalia received their cut, which was \$4 of every ton. Mr. Flanagan stated that if raising the fee was meant to discourage garbage, it would do that if they went to \$80.00 or \$70.00 per ton. Mr. Flanagan stated that maybe there would be some push back, which once again put flow control back on the table. Mr. Flanagan stated that they could set any price they wanted and by law they could enforce it. Mr. Flanagan stated that increasing the fees by \$20.00 a ton or 33% in the next six months was a pretty stiff jump. Mr. Flanagan stated were they going to have \$80.00 per ton and 30,000 tons of garbage or were they going to have \$70 a ton and 35,000 tons of garbage. Mr. Flanagan stated whether there would be any action or reaction he couldn't say. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was in favor of raising prices on a steady basis, which they have not done over the history of the landfill and it has now caught up to them. Mr. Flanagan stated to go back to the other discussion that if they bought the land across from the landfill and they expect to expand, maybe they ought to pay attention to where they put that pile of dirt as well.

Mr. Fry stated that he fully agreed in terms of a structured tipping fee. Mr. Fry stated that maybe in November raise it to \$70.00 and possibly sometime next year look at raising it in a structured idea. Mr. Flanagan stated that raising it \$10 per year was pretty steep. Mr. Flanagan stated going back to discussing efficiency and money, they could also save money. Mr. Flanagan stated that he thought that there should be a bigger spread in the

tipping fee for garbage that is delivered to Pharsalia and garbage that is delivered to the transfer stations. Mr. Flanagan stated why should we let them drop it off and have us pack it and haul it. Mr. Fry stated that he agreed. Mr. Fry stated that the way they had it set up was to try to hopefully entice many of the commercial haulers to go to Pharsalia.

Mr. Flanagan stated that they needed to raise the tipping fees but if they were going to raise them by 33% by whenever the date was established, it was a pretty good whack.

Mr. Grace stated that he agreed with all that Mr. Flanagan said. Mr. Grace stated that raising the fee possibly in November and then possibly again in May would let them know in advance. Mr. Grace stated that they also should look at the disparity between what the haulers were paying and maybe change that so that it was not favoring one hauler with such a volume discount. Mr. Flanagan stated that they were our best customer and that he was not opposed to a volume deal, but they should look at their best customer and tell them here is what we are going to offer and if they did not like it, we enforce flow control. Mr. Flanagan stated that they had the upper hand if they needed to they could use it. Mr. Flanagan stated that for 20 years their best customer would not bring any garbage to our landfill and it would not surprise him to see their best customer to do something similar, maybe then we would not fill up our landfill. Mr. Fry stated that Mr. Flanagan was right and that there were two ways of looking at this. If they all of a sudden lost Mr. Adams' business the life of the landfill extends out which was a good thing. Mr. Flanagan stated that if that happened they would not make enough revenue to meet their expenses and then it would fall onto the taxpayers. Mr. Fry agreed with that statement.

Mr. Jack stated that if no one wanted to make a motion to increase the tipping fees they needed to move on to the next item on the agenda. Mr. Fry stated that this was just a suggestion and a discussion and something that he may come back in July to ask for a motion to increase the fees. Mr. Fry stated that this was something that needed to be talked about and thought about. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was in favor of the concept and that it was something that they could address during the next meeting with a specific proposal which included a proposal for their best customer. Mr. Jack stated that he agreed that this was a good discussion for the next meeting.

City of Norwich Request for Reduced Tipping Fee:

Mr. Fry stated that he spoke with the City of Norwich's Code Enforcement Officer about the leachate offer that was discussed during a previous committee meeting. Mr. Fry stated that the City of Norwich let him know that they could not accept that offer due to auditing purposes.

Mr. Jack stated that the City was asking for a reduction in tipping fees for the demolition of an old building. Mr. Jack stated that they have already made a referral to raise the tipping fees to \$85 as of August 1, 2020. Mr. Jack stated that if they gave it to them at the current rate no matter when they brought it in it would be a reduction already.

Mr. Fry stated that there was another factor. Mr. Fry stated that because of the structural integrity of the building and its partial collapse they would not be able to safely conduct an asbestos study. Mr. Fry stated that because of that fact they could not guarantee that the materials they brought to the landfill would be free of asbestos so they had to treat everything as if it had asbestos in it by landfill regulations. Mr. Fry stated that due to that fact they have to charge them the normal fee of \$60.00 per ton. Mr. Fry stated that they have never given anyone a break on that because they have to do extra work because of that. Mr. Jack stated that they should charge them no less than \$60.00 because of the extra work involved.

Mr. Fry stated that they estimated that this brick building alone would be 2,200 tons of material. Mr. Fry stated that if you broke that down it was 5% of the annual permitted volume for the landfill. Mr. Fry stated that this was a big hit for the landfill. Mr. Flanagan stated what would happen if they went over the permitted volume, would the State come in and shut it down. Mr. Fry stated that he did not know what would happen and that he

did not want to know what would happen either. Mr. Fry stated that he has talked to B&L about it and with the DEC Representative about it. Ten to fifteen years ago they would have received a letter telling them here is your waiver and to try to do better next year. Mr. Fry stated that in this day and age since the regulations have been changed they would have to start the permitting process all over again, which the County did not want to have to do or get into because it would cost millions of dollars. Mr. Fry stated that the last permitting process that was done in the State was the land fill in Ava, NY that cost over \$12 million. Mr. Flanagan asked if that was a similar incident. Mr. Fry stated no, that was the last permitted landfill allowed in NYS and that was in 2013 or 2014.

Mr. Fry stated that his point was that he did not want to think about the idea of going over and if they got in those four or five buildings they were just going to have to deal with that when the time comes. Mr. Fry stated that he and the Recycling Coordinator were checking with Delaware County's idea of using a separate cell for construction and debris but at this time he did not know much about it.

Mr. Flanagan stated that the City wasn't going to test the materials, so they had to handle it as if it were contaminated. Mr. Fry stated that was correct. Mr. Flanagan stated that if his math was correct they were talking about \$132,000. Mr. Fry stated that it was great for revenue, that was no question, but it was going to take up a lot of volume.

Mr. Flanagan stated that the City was kind of partners for us in that they treated the leachate for the County and he would like to do something for them. Mr. Flanagan stated that it would be a precedent for them in that it would only apply to municipalities. Mr. Flanagan stated that he thought that this instance would continue to come up. Mr. Flanagan stated that they were all municipalities and that maybe the City would think that the County's leachate would become more expensive. Mr. Flanagan stated that he would like to do something for the City.

Mr. Jack asked Mr. Flanagan what his suggestion would be. Mr. Flanagan stated that he did not know maybe \$5.00 a ton or something. Mr. Cammarata stated that the City had a fire that occurred on a vacant City owned house recently that might end up coming into play as well. Mr. Fry stated that was correct. Mr. Flanagan stated that they gave a volume discount to Bert Adams and that this was a volume construction and debris issue. Mr. Flanagan stated that the County did not want the construction and debris obviously by the sounds of it, but this is what we had a landfill for not to keep stuff out of it. Mr. Flanagan stated that the whole recycling theory was to keep things out of the landfill but he did not think that you could recycle construction and debris.

Mr. Jack asked Mr. Flanagan if he was going to make a motion on the matter.

Mr. Flanagan made a motion that the County offer the City of Norwich a \$55.00 per ton rate for construction and debris that would be valid until January 1, 2021 for the brick building located at the corner of State & Mitchell Streets. Mr. Henninge seconded the motion. Carried.

Resolution to Follow

Mr. Cammarata asked if there were signs posted at the landfill indicating the rates charged at the landfill. Mr. Fry stated that he was unsure if there was a sign posted, but the fees were posted on the website and in flyers that were distributed. Mr. Fry stated that if they weren't posted it was a good suggestion and he would look into having them posted at the landfill. Mr. Cammarata stated that it was also a good idea to post something about the rate increases too.

Highway:

Various Refill and Subsequent Backfill Requests:

Mr. Fry stated that back in April he asked for some refills, but due to the COVID issue and people not working the Committee tabled the request until staffing was back up to 100%.

Mr. Fry stated that the DPW was back up to 100% staffing as of June 15th and he was requesting to refills of various positions.

Mr. Fry stated that he was requesting the refill of a LMEO position and subsequent refills because this position became vacant when they filled the vacant position at the landfill.

Mr. Fry stated that he was requesting to refill a Monday -Friday laborer position and subsequent backfills. The individual went to work for a private contractor.

Mr. Fry stated that he was requesting to refill a Tuesday -Saturday laborer position because this individual went to work for the City.

Mr. Cammarata asked if Mr. Fry had anyone in mind for those positons. Mr. Fry stated no, they would have to post those vacancies.

Mr. Cammarata made a motion, seconded by Mr. Wakefield, to refill the LMEO position and subsequent refills, to refill the Monday-Friday laborer position and subsequent backfills and to refill the Tuesday -Saturday laborer position. Carried.

Referral to Personnel Committee

Project Updates:

Mr. Fry stated that Broome Bituminous came in and did the true and leveling paving on County Roads 8, 29, 33 and 38. Mr. Fry stated that all of that work was completed on June 9, 2020. Mr. Fry stated that all of that work would sit until the beginning of August when Suit Kote would begin putting down oil and stone on those roadways.

Mr. Fry stated that they had Suit Kote come in and do a mile and a quarter of County Road 32 between NYS Highway 23 and NYS Highway 320 of in place cold recycling. Mr. Fry stated that work was completed on June 8th and 9th. Mr. Fry stated that in mid-August Broome Bituminous would come in and do a hot mix pavement over that section of the road.

Mr. Fry stated that they started the bridge project on McDonough Road in the Town of Preston. Mr. Fry stated that was a complete bridge reconstruction project that should take around eight weeks to complete.

Mr. Fry stated that they were a little bit behind in ditch digging/shoulder grubbing work and painting of road lines that they normally did during this time of the year.

Mr. Fry stated that they received and started using their brand new shoulder machine combination dirt loader.

Weights & Measures: Mr. Fry stated that the Committee received the report in their packets and that there was not a lot of work to do during the shutdown for weights and measures.

Other:

Mr. Flanagan asked if they had received any responses back for the mowing requests. Mr. Fry stated that he did not receive back very many and that the Towns of Sherburne, Smyrna and Pitcher was helping them with

roadside mowing. Mr. Flanagan stated that from the Town of Preston's viewpoint, the County was not paying enough. Mr. Fry stated that he has heard that response from a lot of townships.

Mr. Grace asked what the status of the CHIPS funding was. Mr. Grace stated that he understood that 80% was guaranteed and asked if it had changed from that. Mr. Fry stated that he received notice last week and if he was correct, today was the actual date of the 1st CHIPS reimbursement funding. Mr. Fry stated that he has not heard anything different and that the last notification received was that they eluded supposedly that the 80% was guaranteed and maybe the 20% might be cut, but there was no real solid determination made about that 20%. Mr. Fry stated that it was hard to say what would happen.

Mr. Flanagan asked if the County had any carry-over funds. Mr. Fry stated no, he does not recall every carrying over any funds for the County. Mr. Flanagan stated that the Town of Preston had some carry over and that it was his understanding that those funds were not in jeopardy. Mr. Fry stated that he heard that up until this point they felt that that money was okay and safe.

Mr. Flanagan asked if the snow plowing requests had been sent out yet and if they were anticipated to be a little more lucrative. Mr. Fry stated that those were usually sent out around the end of September. Mr. Fry stated that last year's rate \$18.57 per centerline mile. Mr. Fry stated that Mr. Stein came back with an offer for \$25.00 per centerline mile last year and that rate was quite a difference. Mr. Fry stated that he would not offer it at a rate that high. Mr. Fry stated that maybe they could do \$19. Mr. Flanagan stated that he is requesting Mr. Fry to come back to committee next month with the number of miles they were asking for and how much of it was done last year and how much money it cost the County. Mr. Flanagan stated that they could look at that to determine the cost for this year.

Adjournment:

Mr. Wakefield made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cammarata, to adjourn the meeting. Carried.

Mr. Jack adjourned the meeting at 11:42 a.m.

slh

**Public Works Committee Meeting
Chenango County Office Building – Committee Room
Thursday July 23, 2020 – 10:00 am**

Present Were: Supervisor Peter C. Flanagan, Supervisor Raymond Wakefield, Jr., Supervisor Joseph M. Henninge, Director of Public Works Shawn Fry, Clerk of the Board/County Auditor RC Woodford, Chairman Lawrence Wilcox and Supervisor Stanley D. Foulds arrived at 10:21 a.m.

Present Via Teleconference Were: Chairman Daniel S. Jack, Supervisor Thomas P. Grace, Supervisor Jennifer B. Boudreau and Supervisor John J. Cammarata.

Chairman Daniel S. Jack called the meeting to order at 10:00 am.

Shawn Fry, Director, Public Works

Recycling:

Monthly Report: Mr. Fry stated that the recycling revenue for the month of June was \$5,198. MR. Fry stated that they marketed scrap metal, white goods and E-waste. Mr. Fry stated that they did better this month because they were able to move junk newsprint materials, cardboard and some plastics and that they should have better numbers in July. Mr. Fry stated that as everyone was aware things were way behind due to the COVID issue.

Mr. Flanagan asked what the shortfall might be and what the number was in the budget. Mr. Fry stated \$140,000 and that right now they were at \$30,000. Mr. Fry stated that they were hoping they would do better as they went into fall. Mr. Fry stated that the market was very fluctuant and that the market was doing better. Mr. Fry stated that it has been tough and the only good thing was that the construction market was doing really well and hopefully the other markets would follow.

Mr. Flanagan asked were the volumes down. Mr. Fry stated that their volume was doing pretty well. Mr. Flanagan stated that in other words they were only seeing what was sold and not taken in. Mr. Fry stated that was correct and that they have taken in pretty good amounts since they reopened in June and hopefully the market will pick back up. Mr. Flanagan stated that there was no question that they were going to be down this year. Mr. Fry stated that there was no question that they would probably see a shortfall.

Mr. Flanagan stated that the other issue to address with this garbage was that he heard that Bert Adams was charged for their recyclable materials. Mr. Fry stated he was not positive and that he did not know what Bert Adams was doing. Mr. Fry stated that he was busy enough, and the he very well might. Mr. Flanagan asked if that was an option for them because it has always been a money loser, even in the best of circumstances. Mr. Fry stated that they could think about it. Mr. Flanagan told Mr. Fry to mention it to the Recycling Coordinator. Mr. Fry stated that they could look at it. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was curious to know if public landfills were charging for recycling. Mr. Fry stated that as far as he knew, no municipal landfills were charging for recyclables and that they could check into it.

Mr. Flanagan stated that in terms of volume, things were going well. Mr. Fry stated that the volume was there, they were just trying to catch up and get things done in order to be able to market them.

Landfill:

Monthly Report: Mr. Fry stated that the overall tonnage for June was 3,944 tons, which was pretty decent. Mr. Fry stated that to date they were up to just over 20,000 tons.

Mr. Fry stated that leachate for June was about 600,000 gallons.

Mr. Fry stated that as of June they were tracking just under about 1,000 tons less than last year, which was good news.

Mr. Fry stated that things seemed to be going pretty well at the landfill.

Mr. Flanagan asked if there had been any reaction to the price increases. Mr. Fry stated that the increase hasn't taken affect yet, but people were aware of the increases.

Mr. Fry stated that they have gotten construction and debris in from a house that burned down in the City of Norwich and that they know they were going to be receiving another one coming up next week, in addition to the brick house.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he was wondering if there was any reaction to the proposed regular fees. Mr. Fry stated that matter was tabled last month. Mr. Flanagan asked if that was where they ended up. Mr. Fry stated yes, it was tabled in order to discuss it further. Mr. Fry stated that they drafted a letter regarding the raise in the rates for asbestos and construction debris to send out. Mr. Flanagan asked if they were going to address the rate increase. Mr. Jack stated that he wanted the matter to remain tabled until they were all seated in the same room together because it was difficult to discuss over the phone. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was not crazy about it either and that he just wanted to bring up the thought that there was a significant difference in price between hauling it to a transfer station and hauling it to the landfill in Pharsalia. Mr. Flanagan stated that it might save them a lot of time handling it. Mr. Flanagan stated that he thought that they should encourage them to take it directly to Pharsalia so that they did not have to pay pack it and haul it to Pharsalia. Mr. Fry stated that those fees would be built into the new proposal.

Land Purchase: Mr. Fry stated that he spoke with the County Attorney and that he has been working with the property owner. Mr. Fry stated that the property owner's attorney has been working on preparing the paperwork for the sale and transfer of the property over to the County. Mr. Fry stated that according to the County Attorney everything sounded very positive and once the real estate paperwork was completed and the County Attorney reviewed the paperwork, it could them be presented to the full board for final approval.

Highway:

Refill Monday-Friday Laborer and Subsequent Tuesday-Saturday Laborer:

Mr. Fry stated that this person left to go back to college. Mr. Fry stated that he was requesting to refill the Monday-Friday laborer and subsequent Tuesday-Saturday laborer positions.

Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Grace, to refer to the Personnel Committee in order to refill the Monday-Friday laborer position and subsequent Tuesday -Saturday laborer position. Carried.

Referral to Personnel Committee

Refill Motor Equipment Operator (MEO) and Subsequent Backfills:

Mr. Fry stated that he was requesting to refill the MEO position and subsequent backfills because this gentleman was retiring as of August 1, 2020.

Mr. Wakefield made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cammarata, to refer to the Personnel Committee in order to refill the MEO position and subsequent backfills. Carried.

Referral to Personnel Committee

Discussion: Mr. Flanagan asked if the salary was fixed or if the guy that was retiring was at a higher level than what the new individual would be. Mr. Fry stated that it was a contract position and that the salary would be determined by the current rate for that position.

Budget Line Revision: Mr. Fry stated that he has been working with the Treasurer's Office on a revision for the snow and ice budget. Mr. Fry stated that they would like to add a new line for the payment for machinery rentals to the towns that they contract snow and ice removal for.

Mr. Fry stated that by creating this new line it would help them to track the revenue paid to the towns better for the snow and ice work.

Mr. Fry stated that he was requesting to create appropriations account #D5142.40 – Contract Sanding and to transfer \$70,000 from account #D5110.46 – Materials Road Widening to the newly created account.

Mr. Flanagan made the motion, seconded by Mr. Wakefield, to refer to the Finance Committee in order to create appropriations account #D5142.40 – Contract Sanding and to transfer \$70,000 from appropriations account #D5110.46 – Materials Road Widening to the newly created account. Carried.

Referral to Finance Committee

Discussion: Mr. Flanagan asked if this was just a change made on paper and were they increasing the budget to do this. Mr. Fry stated that no, they were not spending any more money and that this was just a book keeping procedure to keep the budget on the plus side.

Mr. Flanagan asked how it was determined that the towns used \$70,000 for snow and ice removal. Mr. Fry stated that cost this year was \$66,000 and that was why he was moving \$70,000.

Mr. Flanagan asked what the mileage rate would be this year for the towns to plow the county roads. Mr. Fry stated that he did not know. The contracts weren't in yet and that the amount may change because they were adjusting some of them, some towns may not want to do it any more or they may be lucky enough to pick up some more towns.

Project Updates:

Roads: Mr. Fry stated oil and stone work on County Roads 8, 28, 33 and 38 was scheduled to start on July 28th pending weather delays.

Mr. Fry stated that hot mix overlays were scheduled for the beginning of August on sections of County Roads 10A, 32 and 33.

Bridges: Mr. Fry stated that there were two bridge projects underway. One on County Road 9 in the Town of Greene and the other one on McDonough Road in the Town of Preston. Mr. Fry stated that both of them were total replacements and that the roads were closed for those bridge replacements.

Mr. Fry stated that they anticipated that the roadway would be opened on the County Road 9 project by the end of the week.

Mr. Fry stated that they are anticipating opening McDonough Road by mid-August.

Major Culverts: Mr. Fry stated that they were replacing a large culvert and guiderails near 928 County Road 36 in the Town of Guilford that resulted in a road closure.

Mr. Fry stated that they have been replacing culverts and competing shoulder work on County Roads 3 and 3A, getting it ready for next year's work.

Weights & Measures:

Mr. Fry stated that the June report for weights and measures could be found in their packet.

Mr. Grace asked if they could have a more detailed report to explain some of the numbers that were specified on the report. Mr. Fry stated that he would ask the Director of Weights and Measures about those numbers and let the Committee know.

Adjournment:

Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Grace, to adjourn the meeting. Carried.

Mr. Jack adjourned the meeting at 10:27 a.m.

slh

Public Works Committee Meeting
Chenango County Office Building – Committee Room
Thursday August 20, 2020 – 10:00 am

Present Were: Chairman Daniel S. Jack, Supervisor Peter C. Flanagan, Supervisor Thomas P. Grace, Supervisor Jennifer B. Boudreau, Supervisor John J. Cammarata, Supervisor Raymond Wakefield, Jr., Supervisor Joseph M. Henninge, Director of Public Works Shawn Fry, Clerk of the Board/County Auditor RC Woodford and Chairman Lawrence Wilcox.

Absent: Supervisor Stanley D. Foulds.

Chairman Daniel S. Jack called the meeting to order at 10:00 am.

Lawrence Wilcox, Chairman of the Board of Supervisors

2021 Budget Update:

Mr. Wilcox stated that the department heads across the County have done an excellent job at getting their budgets in to the Treasurer's Office on time and have been very diligent in understanding our financial situation for 2021. Mr. Wilcox stated that work still needed to be done and he was asking Supervisors to look the budgets over carefully and if they feel there are some ways that they could save dollars because they were looking for \$200,000 across the County. Mr. Wilcox stated that he understood that a lot of the budgets were pretty much boilerplate and could not be changed but he asked that they do what they could.

RC Woodford, Clerk of the Board/County Auditor

2021 Tentative Budget – 148-Mass Transportation Services:

Mr. Woodford stated that this was a zero local share budget and they have a contract with First Transit, a private enterprise that performs the public transportation services in the County.

Mr. Woodford stated that the majority was paid for by state and federal aid.

Mr. Woodford stated that the budget reflected prior years and if they got down to the adopted/modified 2020 versus the 2021 local share being zero, he backed off a little bit on bus operations/ First Transit as well as the corresponding state aid/First Transit due to a reduction in both miles as well as riders. In 2020, prior to COVID-19, they budgeted \$980,000 for the purchase of buses and they have stepped away from that for a while because he was not entirely confident that the State would be upholding their obligation by sending them a check to cover the reimbursement for the buses. Mr. Woodford stated that they decided to step away from that for a little while.

Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Ms. Boudreau, to refer the 2021 Tentative Budget – 148-Mass Transportation Services to the Finance Committee as presented. Carried

Referral to Finance Committee

Appropriate NYSDOH Transitional Assistance for Mass Transportation:

Mr. Woodford stated that in 2013 as part of the NYS Medicaid program they took over non-emergency medical transportation for Medicaid and that function was done predominately by the public transit system. Mr. Woodford stated that it was about a \$1.3 million reduction in their service. Mr. Woodford stated to accommodate the unanticipated consequences, the removal of that function from the public transit system kind of gutted not only our transportation system but a lot of Upstate NY rural counties, the State provided transitional assistance funds.

Mr. Woodford stated that it was followed each year in the amount of \$970,519. Mr. Woodford stated that the funding essentially helped First Transit to pay the bills. Mr. Woodford stated that this funding came in last week and there was some question whether it would again or not. Mr. Woodford stated that if it did not, it could be quite catastrophic to the public transit system.

Mr. Woodford stated that he was asking the Committee for a referral to the Finance Committee to authorize the appropriation of the dollars so that they could be disbursed to the contractor.

Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Grace, to refer to the Finance Committee in order to appropriate Transitional Assistance for Mass Transportation funds in the amount of \$970,519. Carried.

Referral to Finance Committee

Discussion: Mr. Flanagan stated that this was typical state procedure. They do one thing to save money and it costs somebody else money. Mr. Flanagan stated that now they were actually paying for it twice, they were paying Transitional Assistance which the bus company that hopes it never goes away and we're paying the ones that were going to solve our problem.

Mr. Flanagan stated now the State in its infinite wisdom doubled the cost, whether it came from Albany or manna from heaven that was just the way they operated.

Mr. Woodford stated probably more correctly, triple because their cost saving measure probably costs more. Mr. Woodford stated it was for the A & D Taxi service that you saw running around town.

Shawn Fry, Director, Public Works

Recycling:

Monthly Report: Mr. Fry stated that the recycling revenue for the month of July was \$20,206 bringing the total to about \$51,000 for the year. Mr. Fry stated that they should have some more revenue coming in August because they had scrap metal go out towards the end of July. Mr. Fry stated that they received all of the information in their packets earlier so he would not go into detail, but they were doing a lot better.

Household Hazardous Waste Day: Mr. Fry stated that household hazardous waste day was conducted on August 15, 2020. Mr. Fry stated that the details for household hazardous waste day was in their packets. Mr. Fry stated that they have had many compliments on the service and all in all he felt that it was a success.

Mr. Fry stated that he wanted to remind the Committee that this was a 50% reimbursement through DEC. Mr. Fry stated that he did not know if the funding would come in this year or next year, but they were better at getting them the money quicker.

Mr. Flanagan asked if they could be provided with a list of customers by location that participated in the event during next month's meeting. Mr. Fry asked why and if there was a problem. Mr. Flanagan stated that he would like to know where a majority of the people came from that took advantage of the event. Mr. Fry stated that they could have a list made available for them.

2021 Tentative Budget – 196-Recycling Operations:

Mr. Fry stated that labor was up by \$2,618.56 due to contractual increases, equipment was not increased and contractual was down by \$12,881.

Mr. Fry stated that revenue was decreased by \$12,500 bringing a decrease to the local share by \$381 as compared to the 2020 budget.

Mr. Flanagan stated he wanted to point out that this budget did not include a couple of attendants that they moved over to the landfill budget.

Mr. Flanagan stated that his calculation recycling was probably, if you figured in the benefits and everything else, was closer to \$400,000. Mr. Flanagan stated that as the cost of recycling, it was something that they had to do and it was quite costly. Mr. Flanagan stated whether there was anything they could do to make it less costly, would be something that he was interested in pursuing to see if there was something different that they could be doing. Perhaps farming it out would reduce costs.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he has mentioned it before and he mentioned it again. He will vote in favor of this budget, but he thought going forward they had to look at a less expensive way to handle recyclables. Mr. Flanagan stated that there were others that did it other ways and they have not. Mr. Flanagan stated that as the landfill costs continued to escalate, they spent \$275,000 at the last meeting, they needed more money than that going forward for development. Mr. Flanagan stated that they talked about raising landfill fees, which they would talk about later, but he thought that they needed to see if they could do the recycling cheaper than they did.

Mr. Flanagan stated that rather than getting into the details today, he believed that it was something that they should look at going forward.

Mr. Jack asked Mr. Fry what the wire recycling baskets were used for that were included in his equipment request. Mr. Fry stated that they held the products until the guys could put them into the bailers to bale them. Mr. Fry stated that they were at the two facilities for people to put their recyclables in.

Mr. Flanagan asked Mr. Wilcox if they would cover the shortfall this year for their projected recycling revenue because he did not think that they were going to catch up and if it would in fact be local share. Mr. Wilcox stated that he did not think they had any choice. Mr. Flanagan stated that he knew and he was just pointing out that they were going to have to dip into contingency or someplace to come up with the \$54,000 shortfall.

Mr. Grace stated that he agreed with Mr. Flanagan and that he wanted to say that during each meeting they talk about the problems that the State caused them and he saw a real problem here. Mr. Grace stated that to him it was obvious that they had to recycle as much as they could. Mr. Grace stated that the problem was that the County had to do it. Mr. Grace stated that he supported the budget and he was going to vote for it, but the rules of the State allowing all different kinds of plastic and all different kinds of materials and then not creating markets for them was really a failure of leadership at the top in Albany and probably beyond that. Mr. Grace stated that he saw the County as being trapped. Mr. Grace stated that the County had to do the right thing and they actually had to do this effort. Mr. Grace stated that he believed that they should be pounding on the State representatives and tell them to make this a more sensible situation so that they did not have to try to recycle ten types of plastic if two could be done and if markets could be created, then create them. Mr. Grace stated that if they wanted them to recycle, then the State needed to show them a sensible path in which to do it. Mr. Grace stated that this was just an incredible lack of State leadership.

Mr. Flanagan stated that his point earlier was not to not do it, it was to do it in a less costly way. Mr. Flanagan stated that he had no intention of holding his breath and waiting for the State to do anything that made sense in creating businesses and he did not think the State would know how to in a million years. Mr. Flanagan stated

that they had to look to their own house to see if they couldn't do it cheaper and more effectively. Mr. Flanagan stated that he thought that they could.

Mr. Henninge made a motion, seconded by Mr. Wakefield, to refer the 2021 Tentative Budget – 196-Recycling Operations to the Finance Committee as presented. Carried.

Referral to Finance Committee

Landfill:

Monthly Report: Mr. Fry stated that the overall tonnage for July was 3,986 tons total and leachate was about 447,000 gallons. Mr. Fry stated that operations were going good.

Landfill Compactor: Mr. Fry stated that during the last part of July the landfill compactor was running very poorly and they had Milton-Caterpillar come out and look at it. Mr. Fry stated that they thought it was a fuel injector, they made some adjustments and left. Mr. Fry stated that it was still running poorly so he called Milton Caterpillar and told them that they needed to return and look at the machine.

Mr. Fry stated that after a little bit of back and forth Milton Caterpillar finally agreed to come take a look at it. Mr. Fry stated that on July 31st the technician did some more in depth work in analyzing it and determined that cylinder one on the machine was hardly functioning, the cam shaft was damaged, and they had brass metal filings in the oil.

Mr. Fry stated that back in 2017 the landfill compactor had the same exact issues. The cam shaft was damaged and had to be replaced. Mr. Fry stated, without getting too technical, what was known as a lifter that was inside the engine by the cam shaft broke allowing a lobe on the cam shaft to wear prematurely. Mr. Fry stated that once the lobes were worn the compactor would not function properly. Mr. Fry stated that in 2017 Caterpillar stood behind their engine at that time and replaced the cam shaft and a bunch of different parts.

Mr. Fry stated that this time they were told that because there were metal parts down in the oil pan, they were worried that there was more damage to the engine than before and they told us that we had to transport the compactor down to their facility in Binghamton. Mr. Fry stated that Jay Smith, his Deputy Director, was able to get the compactor down there for about \$800.

Mr. Fry stated that Milton Caterpillar tore the compactor apart and they were working with them to come up with some sort of a viable solution for what they were going to do. Mr. Fry stated that they were talking with them about an engine rebuild or putting a completely new engine in the machine because this was the second time that this has happened and the machine was six years old with only 6,000 miles on it. Mr. Fry stated that it was going to be hard to trust if they rebuilt it.

Mr. Flanagan stated that it sounded like if they put a new engine in it then they might get three years out of that.

Mr. Fry stated that they were being very cautious and they were also waiting on exactly what Caterpillar was going to help them with this time because they were being a little more hesitant this time.

Mr. Flanagan asked if there was a warranty on it. Mr. Fry stated that the extended warranty ran out in January, 2020.

Mr. Fry stated that they were using two excavators to compact the pile at the landfill in the meantime and hopefully they would get some news.

Mr. Flanagan stated that it was disappointing and to him this was a new piece of equipment. Mr. Fry stated he agreed, these things were made to last and in that environment daily.

Mr. Flanagan asked if Mr. Fry thought someone was improperly operating it. Mr. Fry stated no, they were made to operate 6 to 7 hours a day, daily and therefore he did not think it was over used.

Ms. Boudreau stated that it seemed to her that this was a flaw in their system and that Caterpillar should be the ones to fix it since it's only been six years since it was purchased. Mr. Fry stated that he agreed and Caterpillar was saying that their repair in 2017 was to specifications and was done right. Mr. Fry stated that this was why he was saying that they were being hesitant with regards to what they were going to do.

Mr. Fry stated that if they chose the new engine it sounded like Caterpillar might not offer any help, but he didn't know yet and he needed to wait to see what they said.

Mr. Flanagan stated that it might be one of those circumstances where they got a bad machine and that it might be better to ask them what they would give us for it and move one with a new one. Mr. Flanagan stated that he imagined it would be an expensive repair. Mr. Fry stated that the complete engine overhaul would cost them about \$28,000.

Mr. Flanagan asked what the cost of a new machine was. Mr. Fry stated that in 2014 when they bought it, it was around \$465,000. So a new one might be around \$500,000.

Mr. Cammarata asked how much a new engine would cost. Mr. Fry stated that he did not know and asked them for copies of the warranty and where the help from Caterpillar was at. Mr. Fry stated that they were not being very cooperative at this point in time.

Mr. Cammarata stated that if they replaced the engine chances were it was going to be the same style engine with the same problems.

Mr. Jack stated that they would have to wait to hear back from them first.

2021 Tentative Budget – 197-Landfill Operations:

Mr. Fry stated that the budget reflected a \$16,060 decrease in labor, a zero equipment increase, a \$760 contractual increase, for an overall reduction of \$15,299 from the 2020 budget.

Mr. Flanagan asked if that was basically accomplished by an increase in revenue. Mr. Fry stated no, it was from the decrease in labor due to the new employees taking over for the retirees.

Mr. Wakefield made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cammarata, to refer the 2021 Tentative Budget – 197-Landfill Operations to the Finance Committee as presented. Carried.

Referral to Finance Committee

Mr. Flanagan stated that some of the Supervisors had gotten a call from one of the haulers about the proposed price increase. Mr. Flanagan stated that one of the items mentioned was haulers meetings. Mr. Flanagan stated that years ago they used to hold haulers meetings on a somewhat regular basis when they started the landfill.

Mr. Flanagan stated that this objection was no surprise in many ways because it was a pretty stiff increase, which they had discussed. Mr. Flanagan stated that they had seen no reflection in the traffic, right? Mr. Fry stated that they have also received phone calls and there has been a reduction in some of the volume and traffic and a couple of the haulers have shown their disdain by not coming at all. Mr. Fry stated that hopefully things will work out.

Mr. Fry stated that with the compactor down, a little less tonnage was a benefit. Mr. Flanagan stated that his point was that they had to watch the revenues and make sure that they got them.

Mr. Flanagan asked where they were going. Mr. Fry stated that they did not know, they have some idea of where they were going. At this point they were not too worried about their businesses because they were trying to concentrate on their own. Mr. Flanagan stated that they were part of the landfill's business. Mr. Fry stated that Mr. Flanagan was right.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he proposed the haulers meetings as a way to let them have a say, and it was not to say that they might not have some ideas or better ideas. Mr. Flanagan stated that he suggested at the last meeting with the price changes that they widen the gap between what was delivered to the transfer stations and the landfill itself because it was a value to them to have it taken directly to the landfill. Mr. Flanagan stated that he did not know what that spread should be but apparently it was not enough to encourage anyone. Mr. Flanagan stated that one of the main haulers told him that they would basically drown the North Norwich transfer station because he would rather pay the \$55 at North Norwich than drive to the landfill. Mr. Flanagan stated that was probably an issue that would be raised during a haulers meeting.

Mr. Jack asked what the haulers meetings looked like. Mr. Flanagan stated that you invited all of the haulers, who were the customers, and asked them what was up and what they thought. Mr. Flanagan stated that they would probably tell you what they would like and some of them might be good ideas.

Mr. Flanagan stated that they held them for years, some of the counties continued to have them, but he did not know why they stopped having them here. Mr. Flanagan stated but anyway, that was one of the suggestions and if they were going to increase prices 60% or 70% maybe they ought to hear what they had to say. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was sure that they would not all be in favor of it.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he thought that they could be more efficient with their landfill operations by maybe taking a different tact with some of those things particularly in paying them to drive it up to the landfill. Mr. Flanagan stated that they have an interesting system at the transfer stations, the busiest day was Saturday when they had the least number of employees working. Mr. Flanagan stated that initially the transfer stations were designed for people who were bringing their bags of garbage in and the haulers were required to go to Pharsalia. Mr. Flanagan stated that changed about ten years in. Mr. Flanagan stated that it increased the volume tremendously, but once again they might have still gone up the hill to the landfill if the price was right. Mr. Flanagan stated that would have saved picking up the garbage, dropping it off and then the County packing it and picking it up again to drop it. Mr. Flanagan stated that it was not a model of efficiency and maybe they could address it with pricing.

Mr. Jack stated that he thought that while the compactor was down, they were okay because it was going to wear out their excavators a lot quicker and maybe next month when they knew more they could address it.

Mr. Flanagan asked how much garbage they were losing and how much was the boycott costing them. Mr. Fry stated that it was hard to say, they were losing Adams' garbage because he was the only one right now that he was aware of that was not bringing garbage to them. Mr. Flanagan asked where he was going. Mr. Fry stated that they heard he was going to either Broome County or to Chemung County. Mr. Fry stated that he did not know for sure.

Mr. Flanagan stated that once again, they have some revenue obligations and they have never analyzed what it cost them and how long they wanted the landfill to last. Mr. Flanagan stated that if nobody put anything in there it would last longer but it would also cost them a heck of a lot more and it would cost the people who were hauling the garbage a lot more if they did not subsidize it. Mr. Flanagan stated that the intention of the landfill was for the people that created the garbage to pay for it.

Mr. Flanagan stated that recycling was costing them \$300,000 a year and that it was really a part of the landfill. Mr. Flanagan stated that they stuck some money in there over the years from the old landfills and that they have not done a bad job of running it but if they lost revenue, there were many times that he thought that they ought to fill it up as fast as they could and be done with it.

Mr. Flanagan stated that now they have purchased some land and this was another concern. If they were going to pile the dirt on this land that was potentially a future site, he didn't want it piled on the future site. Mr. Flanagan stated that he probably wouldn't be around to worry about it but it was just a thought.

Mr. Grace stated that he agreed with almost everything that Mr. Flanagan said and he thinks that they should try to get the haulers to take their garbage to Pharsalia. Mr. Grace stated that he also thought that haulers meetings would be a good idea.

Mr. Grace stated that legally the County had the power to force the garbage to stay here by Supreme Court decision. Mr. Grace stated that they could tell them that they either bring their garbage here or they would go down this other route. Mr. Grace stated that maybe part of the conversation was being nice and looking at incentives and being a good partner with the haulers, but at the same time letting them know that they were either going to do it this way or the County was going to go down this other route. Mr. Grace stated that he thinks that they would be a little more amenable. Mr. Grace stated that they were always having a hard time with one hauler, he had a feeling that a little bit of power on the County's side the hauler would know that he did have to haul it to Pharsalia.

Mr. Grace stated that he wanted to extend the life of the landfill, not shut it down, because he feared that what came next would be much more expensive. Mr. Grace stated that at one time while he was a reporter he traced a Styrofoam cup. It was thrown out in Laurens and it went to some other collection point in Otsego County and from there to Howe's Cave and then to Buffalo. Mr. Grace stated that then they calculate what it cost to throw away this cup. It was enormous. Mr. Grace stated that it was a crazy system and once again there was no leadership from the State on this.

Mr. Grace stated that he did think that they had the right to tell the haulers where their garbage was going to be sent and there was a law that you could not take garbage from another county and mix it in with our garbage. There were certain rules and without even doing it if the County let them know that we might do it he thinks that they might be more amenable. Mr. Grace stated that he favors the idea of getting them together and talk about it.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he spoke to the County Attorney about it before and yes, they did have the whip hand but he was not a fan of that type of law or that type of government. Mr. Flanagan stated that it was certainly worth mentioning if it meant that it was going to cost the county taxpayers money. Mr. Flanagan stated that they were not enriching themselves by raising fees, someone would pay the cost to bear it. Mr. Flanagan stated that the original intention was to let the garbage makers pay for it.

Mr. Jack asked what it would take to have a haulers meeting. Mr. Jack stated that he was all for hearing what they had to say. Mr. Jack stated that they were not all in the garbage business and he would not mind hearing what the haulers had to say. It didn't mean that they would abide by it, but it would be good to know what their ideas were.

Mr. Fry stated that he would reach out to them and find out how many were interested in meeting and let the Committee know.

Mr. Flanagan asked what the revenue prediction was for the landfill. Mr. Fry stated that it was down \$10,000.

Highway:

Road Projects: Mr. Fry stated that oil and stone work that was done on County Roads 8, 29, 33 and 38 was finished on August 1st, with 27.3 miles completed.

Mr. Fry stated that so far the paving work that they did was completed on sections of County Roads 10A, 32 and 33. It amounted to almost four miles of paving.

Mr. Flanagan asked when the last time County Road 10A was paved because he got a couple of calls regarding it and the water problems not being fixed. Mr. Fry stated that the last time it was done was in 2011, ten years ago per the CHIPS rotation. Mr. Flanagan asked Mr. Fry if he felt confident that they would get another ten years out of that because the road had a lot of heavy traffic on it. Mr. Fry stated yes.

Bridge Projects: Mr. Fry stated the bridge work on County Road 9 was completed.

Mr. Fry stated that the bridge on McDonough Road in Preston would hopefully be completed within the next two weeks.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he had a resident that owned land on both sides of the bridge ask him why a bridge was being replaced on a road that only had one seasonal residence on it because he felt that it was not needed. The resident stated that they should just close the road because the seasonal resident could easily access the property from a very short detour. Mr. Flanagan stated that he must have missed that it was on the schedule. Mr. Flanagan stated that he drove over it from time to time and maybe they could have done without it. Mr. Flanagan asked what it cost the County to replace the bridge. Mr. Fry stated that they received CHIPS reimbursement for the bridge project. Mr. Flanagan stated that it was no cost to the County and the resident referred to it as the bridge to nowhere. Mr. Flanagan stated that he spoke to the landowner, Mr. Gary Tompkins and they tried to go down that road a couple of times with his predecessor and it was nice to think about. Mr. Fry stated that there were circumstances where they have done that but a lot of times, the minute you tried a lot of people would be opposed to it. Mr. Flanagan asked if they had a process in those cases where they could close them. Mr. Fry stated that they did with Red Mill Hill bridge, one in Plymouth that they abandoned and one in Afton. Mr. Fry stated that there has been circumstances where they made that decision. Mr. Fry stated that maybe they could have on this one but all it took was one resident to raise the issue. Mr. Fry stated that there was a farmer that utilized that land on both sides who may have been very upset with the idea of abandoning it.

Mr. Jack stated that the bridge was almost done, correct. Mr. Fry stated yes. Mr. Flanagan stated that he just wanted to say that going forward if they ran into these they should look at them. Mr. Flanagan stated that it did not occur to him until he stopped and spoke with Mr. Tompkins on the side of the road and got an earful from him about it.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he was thinking that with something like this they should try and if someone objected then they wouldn't do it.

Major Culvert Projects: Mr. Fry stated they finished the box culvert work on County Road 36 and the road was reopened to traffic on August 19th. Mr. Fry stated that project also included major guiderail replacement.

Refill Sign Maintenance Supervisor: Mr. Fry stated that he was requesting to refill the Sign Maintenance Supervisor position due to a retirement. Mr. Fry stated that the individual retired on August 14th.

Mr. Fry stated that it was necessary to refill the position because the position was responsible for all of the signage for the County, the replacement of signs, striping all of the county roads and responsible for the six county traffic signals, and supervised a three to five employee crew in the spring, summer and fall. This

individual also supervised a crew during the winter for snow removal. Mr. Fry stated that this position was important in maintaining the balance of the on call rotation schedule system.

Mr. Fry stated that they were down to four supervisors and this put them down to only having three which would really put a stress on them. Mr. Fry stated that if the Committee remembered they have not replaced the last two which took them down to four supervisor positions. Mr. Fry stated that he felt strongly that they needed four supervisors.

Mr. Cammarata asked if the person that was moved over would be an increase in salary. Mr. Fry stated that if it was hired from within it would be a 5% increase in salary.

Mr. Flanagan stated that regardless of the title it sounded as if this position was more of a foreman of a crew or whatever. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was going to say what signs were they maintaining but it sounded like this was a supervisory position that ran a crew. Mr. Flanagan asked if it was a constant crew. Mr. Fry stated that as he said, they supervised a crew in the spring, summer and fall. Mr. Flanagan stated that they were not always out there doing signs and striping obviously. Mr. Fry stated that from March until October they were and November through March, during the winter they became part of the snow and ice help and the individual oversaw part of the snow and ice operations also.

Following further discussion, Ms. Boudreau made a motion, seconded by Mr. Grace, to refer to the Personnel Committee in order to refill the Sign Maintenance Supervisor position. Carried.

Referral to Personnel Committee

Mechanic Refill: Mr. Fry stated that they have had a hard time refilling the vacant mechanic position and he believed that it was the result of the low salary for the position. Mr. Fry stated that the current hourly rate was \$18.68 and that others were making \$25 to \$30 an hour elsewhere.

Mr. Fry stated that the current mechanics made \$19.62 an hour and maybe setting the rate to \$19.00 would help.

The Committee discussed the proposal but did not agree to act on it.

Construction Inspection Proposal: Mr. Fry stated last fall they entered into an agreement with a contractor for bridge repairs for two bridges. One in North Norwich and one in Oxford.

Mr. Fry stated that they were ready to put the contract for the repair work out to bid with the bid opening scheduled for September 10, 2020, four days prior to the September 14, 2020 BOS meeting.

Mr. Fry stated that he was requesting a resolution that would authorize awarding the bid for construction and maintenance agreement as well as authorizing the contract with McFarland Johnson for the construction and inspection.

Mr. Woodford stated that this would be on the non-preferred agenda because they would not know who the construction and maintenance bid was awarded to until the bid opening on September 10th.

Following further discussion, Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Grace, to refer to the next BOS meeting for a resolution to award the bid and authorize the construction and inspection agreement. Carried.

Non-Preferred Resolution to Follow

Mr. Cammarata stated that County Road 3 was undergoing a lot of culvert replacements and this morning he was made aware of some lines that were owned by Frontier that were damaged during the digging that was occurring on County Road 3. Mr. Cammarata stated that he guesses that the County would be getting a bill for

the repairs and that it would be very costly to have to pay for the repairs to those lines. Mr. Fry stated that he was not aware of the issue yet.

2021 Tentative Budgets:

Mr. Jack stated that Mr. Fry would provide a brief overview for the highway budgets, but they would make one motion to approve all of them with the exception of the Sealer of Weights and Measures budget.

200-Highway: Mr. Fry stated that labor was down by \$14,233, there was no increase for equipment and contractual was decreased. Mr. Fry stated that overall there was a \$19,528.63 decrease in the budget.

201-Engineering: Mr. Fry stated labor was up due to contractual agreements by \$2,573 and all other lines remained flat. Overall there was a \$2,573 increase to the budget.

202-Maintenance-Roads & Bridges: Mr. Fry stated labor contracts increased but overall there was a \$23,327 decrease to the budget.

203-Road Construction: Mr. Fry stated there were no increases made to this budget

204-Snow Removal-County: Mr. Fry stated this budget was up by \$80,000 but that was due to moving the snow and ice removal contracts over to it as approved during the last BOS meeting.

206-Highway Special Items: Mr. Fry stated there were no increases made to this budget.

210-Highway Revenues: Mr. Fry stated highway revenues increased by \$1,000. The Extreme Winter Recovery line decreased and the Pave NY line increased.

Mr. Fry stated that overall with the combined budgets, it changed the amount of surplus needed to balance them. Mr. Fry stated that it decreased from \$804,000 last year to \$769,817 this year.

Mr. Flanagan asked that in general, what the total compensation increases were. Mr. Fry stated that the labor increase from 2020 to 2021 was \$34,000.

Mr. Flanagan stated that state aid was up and then down and asked if they knew what was happening with that. Mr. Fry stated that he consulted with the Treasurer's Office and when they finally released the CHIPS letter this year they talked about the fact that they would only be receiving 80% funding in 2021. Mr. Fry stated that this year with the funding he budgeted for and utilized 80% of the Pave NY funds and he did not utilize any of the Extreme Winter Recovery funding. Mr. Fry stated that they were hoping that they would get at least 80% of it and if they did he could then apply that towards his materials.

Mr. Flanagan stated that the budget did not include the fringe totals and that it was costing more than what they saw here for Highway.

Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Wakefield, to approve the 2021 tentative budgets for 200-Highway, 201-Engineering, 202-Maintenance-Roads & Bridges, 203-Road Construction, 204-Snow Removal-County, 206-Highway Special Items and 210-Highway Revenues as presented and refer them to the Finance Committee. Carried.

Referral to Finance Committee

220-County Machinery Fund: Mr. Fry stated that labor was up by \$8,000 due to contractual agreements, there was a no increase to equipment and contractual was up by \$5,000.

Mr. Fry stated that there was an overall increase of \$13,000 in this budget from 2020 and he would need approval to utilize the \$13,000 from surplus to balance this budget.

Mr. Fry stated that the proposed machinery list was attached to this budget. Mr. Jack stated that they just purchased a shoulder machine. Mr. Fry stated that they purchased one four years ago and with the amount of use that they got out of it between themselves and the towns it was time to replace it. Mr. Fry stated that they were going to auction it off and hoped to be able to make some money off of it.

Mr. Flanagan asked if they documented what they did for the towns with it. Mr. Fry stated yes. Mr. Flanagan asked if they used that towards the shared services plan. Mr. Fry stated yes.

Mr. Woodford stated that he believed that quite often maintenance on the shoulder machines was a nightmare.

Mr. Cammarata made a motion, seconded by Mr. Henninge, to refer to the Finance Committee in order to approve the \$13,000 surplus fund transfer and with that the 2021 Tentative Budget – 220-County Road Machinery Fund as presented. Carried.

Referral to Finance Committee

Weights & Measures:

2021 Tentative Budget 158-Sealer of Weights & Measures: Mr. Fry stated that labor was down \$1,000, equipment was flat at zero and contractual was down by \$1,411.

Mr. Fry stated that overall the local share to this budget was down by \$1,411.

Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Grace, to refer the 2021 Tentative Budget – 158-Sealer of Weights and Measures as presented to the Finance Committee. Carried.

Referral to Finance Committee

Referral from Planning & Economic Development Committee: Mr. Fry stated that there was a referral from the Planning & Economic Development Committee to dispose of old tires at the airport in order for the weights and measures equipment storage to be relocated.

Mr. Flanagan stated that there was a storage area at the airport that had equipment in it for Weights & Measures. Mr. Flanagan stated that the equipment was stored there without charging Weights and Measures rent for that space and there was a long standing tenant at the airport that wished to rent that space. Mr. Flanagan stated that there was another location that the equipment for Weights & Measures could be stored, however there were tires left over from the former fixed based operator that were in that storage area. Mr. Flanagan stated that the tires have been stored in that facility for ten years because the current Airport Administrator had been waiting for a tire amnesty day at the landfill. Mr. Flanagan stated that he did not think the landfill has ever offered a day for people to dispose of their used tires. Mr. Flanagan stated that they would like to move weights and measures so that they could make some money at the airport.

Mr. Fry stated that they could check it out and as long as the space was comparable he would make arrangements to dispose of the tires and move the Weights and Measures equipment so that the airport could rent the current space.

Other:

Mr. Flanagan stated that he wanted to give the Committee a heads up that Ms. Nucero-Alger, the Supervisor for Plymouth would be coming in to talk. Mr. Flanagan stated that she was perturbed by the potential expansion of the landfill and once again it went back to an old sticking point for both Plymouth and Preston. Mr. Flanagan stated that basically the original approach to a benefit package was what he referred to as a bribe for the Town of Pharsalia because it did not benefit anyone that surrounded the landfill. Mr. Flanagan stated that the landfill was about 600 yards into Pharsalia and Plymouth and Preston got the focus of traffic and they received more smell complaints than Pharsalia.

Mr. Flanagan stated that it was to address the potential benefits for Preston, Plymouth and or actually to ameliorate some of the issues such as smell, which seemed to be a losing battle by the nature of what was there. The fact that this was going to be extended was an issue.

Mr. Grace stated that he would like to see a copy of the contract that provided for the special benefit of Pharsalia. Mr. Grace stated that Mr. Flanagan has mentioned it many times and it would be nice to see what the terms of the agreement were. Mr. Wilcox stated that the County Attorney has the contract in his office.

Adjournment:

Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Grace, to adjourn the meeting. Carried.

Mr. Jack adjourned the meeting at 11:36 a.m.

slh

Public Works Committee Meeting
Chenango County Office Building – Committee Room
Thursday September 24, 2020 – 10:00 am

Present Were: Chairman Daniel S. Jack, Supervisor Peter C. Flanagan, Supervisor Thomas P. Grace, Supervisor Jennifer B. Boudreau, Supervisor John J. Cammarata, Supervisor Raymond Wakefield, Jr., Supervisor Joseph M. Henninge, Director of Public Works Shawn Fry and Clerk of the Board/County Auditor RC Woodford.

Absent: Supervisor Stanley D. Foulds.

Chairman Daniel S. Jack called the meeting to order at 10:00 am.

Shawn Fry, Director, Public Works
Recycling:

Monthly Report: Mr. Fry stated that the recycling revenue for the month of August was \$9,000 and the materials marketed were scrap metal, newspaper, junk mail and metal cans.

Mr. Fry stated that as of today's date they have already marketed \$7,000 for the month of September.

Mr. Fry stated that the recycling department received a grant from the DEC for the Recycling Coordinator in the amount of \$45,000.

Referral from Finance Committee – Single Stream vs. Source Separated Recycling: Mr. Flanagan stated that he did not know whether he should ask questions now or later regarding the recycling policies. Mr. Fry stated that they had a referral from the Finance Committee on September 11, 2020. Mr. Fry stated that included in the package was a brief outline of the recycling staff's job duties and a cost analysis for single stream recycling versus source separated recycling in the county.

Mr. Fry stated that the referral came from Supervisor McNeil, who was questioning the policy of separating the materials versus bringing everything in and dumping it all into one bucket for the County to try marketing it all as one product.

Mr. Fry stated that he would like to have more time to conduct a more in depth comparison. Mr. Fry stated that Mr. Hendricks put together a quick comparison that they could discuss now or later on during the committee meeting.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he would be holding his questions for later because he would probably be calling an executive session to discuss some other issues involving personnel.

Mr. Fry stated that he would like to be able to defer this referral to the October meeting to give them more time to do some better research and allow Mr. Hendricks time to be able to call around to different counties to see what they were doing in regards to marketing their materials.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he would agree to that approach and referred to an online meeting that was conducted by Tioga County that Mr. Hendricks attended. Mr. Flanagan stated that Tioga County was revising some

policies and what little he gleaned from the news broadcast from the meeting was interesting but he did not quite understand what they were doing. Mr. Flanagan stated that he would also like Mr. Hendricks to report to committee next month what he learned during that meeting. Mr. Flanagan stated that he guessed that they contracted those services out and maybe they were returning back to doing it themselves. Mr. Flanagan stated that he would like it to be on the agenda for next month.

Landfill:

Monthly Report: Mr. Fry stated that the overall tonnage for August was 2,374 tons and overall they were up to about 26,000 tons for the year.

Mr. Fry stated that leachate was about 373,000 gallons, which they have been very lucky with due to the dry weather.

Mr. Flanagan stated that they might as well address the elephant in the room and that was that they were down 1,600 tons this month. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was uncertain if everyone knew the reason why and asked the committee members if they knew the reason why. Mr. Cammarata stated because one of their haulers was no longer bringing their garbage to the landfill. Mr. Flanagan stated that their biggest provider was not going there because of a kerfuffle over the actions that the Board took and a decision that was made by someone to do something. Mr. Flanagan stated if the loss of that 1,600 tons continued there was going to be a large hole in this year's budget as well as next year's budget, which could extend into the following year.

Mr. Grace stated that there was a solution to that too if they wanted to get into it. Mr. Flanagan stated that they would do that later.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he would not call it a good month.

Mr. Grace stated for the benefit of the new committee members there was a possibility for the County to enact legislation that would force all of the haulers to bring all of our garbage to our landfill. Mr. Grace stated other counties did it, Otsego County did it. Mr. Grace stated that it was acted upon in the Supreme Court. Mr. Grace stated that it was a bit of a hassle to begin doing it, but once you did they would never have to see numbers like those again. Mr. Grace stated that he proposed this for years and he believed that they were at the point where they should actively look at it.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he wouldn't disagree with Mr. Grace and he took the liberty of talking to the County Attorney over the past several months, seeing this coming, because he figured it would probably happen. With a precipitous increase somebody was going to flee and if the one that fled has fled then they were in a bigger ball game. Mr. Flanagan stated that being said the County Attorney thought at the very earliest if they started the process now, the earliest that they could get this passed would be February or March if they went through proper procedures, which they should.

Mr. Flanagan stated that Cortland County enacted flow control and have had to tinker with their law, partly because of disqualifying loads because they had a bagful of garbage from a neighboring county. Mr. Flanagan stated they had laws that they could not enforce and did not enforce and some were saying that this law could not be enforced. Mr. Flanagan stated that if someone went across the street in Earlville and got garbage from Madison County they could take it to somewhere else.

Mr. Grace stated that those were little problems that always cropped up, but they were talking about a very big problem. Mr. Flanagan stated the big problem was how to craft the law to avoid that. Mr. Flanagan stated that they must do their due diligence and he was in agreement with Mr. Grace. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was looking at the rosier horizon and according to the County Attorney he did not think it could be done at the earliest before February or March.

Mr. Grace stated that if they waited until next month it would be March or April. Mr. Flanagan stated he agreed.

Mr. Grace stated that flow control was a law that would mandate all garbage within the county come to the county's designated facility. Mr. Grace stated that it had been litigated through the Supreme Court, so he did not think it was on shaky ground but as Mr. Flanagan said, it would have to be crafted just right. Mr. Grace stated that he believed they should do it because this would just continue. Mr. Grace stated that if they had this law there would be some protection. Mr. Grace stated that in Otsego County the enforcement was somewhat effective because someone got caught once or twice and everybody else said no and not take that chance. Mr. Grace stated as Mr. Flanagan said we have borders and if someone took a bag of garbage from over the border they couldn't come to our facility. Mr. Grace stated clearly that was not the case here, someone was deliberately not coming to the County's facility, this was not an instance of an occasional bag.

Mr. Grace stated that in his opinion they should ask the County Attorney to attend our next meeting to apprise them on the issue.

Mr. Jack stated that he agreed, but he wanted to look at both sides of this law. Just because there was a law it did not mean there wasn't an expense to it. Someone needed to enforce it. Mr. Grace stated in Otsego County the Planning Department enforced it and it was very effective. They took a camera and followed trucks around for about two to three weeks and took pictures catching them. After a few of them were caught the rest of them all came around.

Mr. Flanagan stated that it was a tool that they had and to go back to the original concept of the landfill was that it would not cost the property tax owners anything to run the facility, it would cost the garbage producers the money to run it. Mr. Flanagan stated that they should pay as they go. He was never in favor of flow control but if they had to they would.

Mr. Flanagan stated the fact that they were looking into flow control should be communicated to their haulers.

Following further discussion, Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Grace, to ask the County Attorney and the DPW to investigate the possibility of a flow control law in the County. Carried.

Discussion: Mr. Henninge asked Mr. Fry how soon he could get the information together. Mr. Fry stated that he did not know, he could give an opinion today but as far as facts and figures and cost he was going to need some time. Mr. Fry stated as Mr. Jack said, the law was absolutely worthless without enforcement. Mr. Fry stated that they would need to have the Sheriff's Deputies to want to enforce, the Planning Director was not going to want to enforce it, and so it would drop back to the DPW to enforce. Mr. Fry stated that he did not have anyone at the DPW that could enforce it. Mr. Fry stated that he would have to hire more people, qualified people. They couldn't just grab someone off the street they would have to be knowledgeable in what they were doing and be diplomatic.

Mr. Flanagan stated being diplomatic would be great, but he'd talk about that juncture later during an executive session.

Ms. Boudreau stated that there was a haulers meeting and she would like to hear about that first. Mr. Flanagan stated that she had a copy of the minutes for that and they could talk about that later. Mr. Flanagan stated that his view was that they were going to lose, at the rate that the garbage had declined, about a quarter of a million dollars of revenue and they were not going to meet their budget number this year. Mr. Flanagan stated it was not because of COVID it was because of a customer relations issue. Mr. Flanagan stated that it would be likely to be very hard for them to make the budget based on the monthly numbers that they were now seeing.

Mr. Flanagan stated that if they passed it, somebody would enforce it. If we had \$600,000 on the table to lose, they would find somebody to enforce it, they couldn't just say they had no one to enforce it. Mr. Flanagan stated they had to put this on the table, whether it was a negotiating ploy or whatever.

Mr. Flanagan stated that they would lose money if it continued. Mr. Jack stated that he agreed and it definitely needed to be looked into, if they could have the basic concept by the next meeting it would be helpful.

Mr. Flanagan stated that they had a very highly paid County Attorney and he was unsure what he had on his plate currently, but this needed to be looked into. It has been tried. It was litigated in Madison County by the hauler that was boycotting them now and it did not go so well for him. Mr. Flanagan stated at the very least they needed to look at it and if they had to they would.

Transfer of Funds: Mr. Fry stated that he needed to request from the committee to transfer \$13,000 from landfill budget #A8092.152 – Part Time Weigh Station Operator to landfill budget line #A8090.19 – Extra Hire. Mr. Fry stated that all of their extra hire weigh station operators were paid under the extra hire account and that account was getting to the point where they needed to transfer money in order to finish out the year.

Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Ms. Boudreau, to refer to the Finance Committee in order to transfer \$13,000 from Appropriation Account #A8092.152 – Part Time Weigh Station Operator to Appropriation Account #A8090.19 – Extra Hire. Carried.

Referral to Finance

Landfill Compactor: Mr. Fry stated that they were very close to reaching a decision with Milton Cat on the compactor repair. Mr. Fry stated that it looked like they would be putting a brand new engine in the compactor with warranties that they negotiated.

Mr. Fry stated that he obtained quotes for new compactors. To purchase the same compactor that they had the price would be \$625,000 and to go with a comparable model from a competitor the cost would be \$525,000.

Haulers Meeting: Mr. Fry stated that as Ms. Boudreau asked, they held the haulers meeting Tuesday night, September 22, 2020.

Mr. Fry stated that quite a few haulers from the county were in attendance along with himself, Mr. Jeff Barrows the Landfill Supervisor, Mr. Dustin Hendricks the Waste Management Program Director, Chairman Lawrence Wilcox, Supervisor Daniel Jack, Supervisor Peter Flanagan and Supervisor Joseph Henninge.

Mr. Fry stated that he thought it was a successful meeting with a pretty good turnout. Mr. Fry stated that he tried to briefly explain why they enacted the recent rate increases. Mr. Fry stated that a lot of the complaints or discussion was the fact that the rate increases were implemented quickly which did not allow the haulers time to adjust their customers' fees.

Mr. Fry stated that they tried to explain how the materials took up air space, making it hard to work with.

Mr. Fry stated that they talked about some other issues that the haulers had, like metal and nails in the landfill proper getting in their tires and looking into possibly getting some mounted magnet units that would pick up some of the nails and metal.

Mr. Fry stated that there was a discussion about recycling mattresses. Mr. Fry stated that Otsego County recycled some mattresses, but he thought the cost of it was pretty steep. One of the haulers stated that it was about \$25 per mattress for recycling and when the committee held the discussion about mattresses it was decided on a \$10 cost because of the worry that people would toss them out in the woods. Mr. Fry stated that it

would be great to come up with a way to get them out of the landfill, but he did not know if people would pay \$25 to recycle them. Mr. Fry stated that they would continue to look for outlets as a recycling idea.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he thought it was a good meeting and as Mr. Fry said, the objection was in the time and not so much in the pricing of the materials.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he read the mattress issues as being a bigger deal that Mr. Fry eluded to because a hauler was charged \$85 a ton as C&D for having a mattress in their load. Mr. Flanagan stated he was curious as to who made that call.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he would say that we made a mistake in not informing people that it was coming and the haulers meetings were important and should be held more often. Mr. Flanagan stated that the objection was if they were going to be bidding a job for 100 tons for C&D at they thought the price was \$40 a ton and they showed up and it was \$85 a ton, there went the bid.

Mr. Fry stated that there was a lengthy explanation given by Mr. Barrows on the mattresses causing us to lose airspace and the individual from Casella's said that they recycle them. Mr. Flanagan stated that they were supposed to be all about recycling but he also raised the same objection that Mr. Fry was referring to, they would probably just end up on the Preston roadsides but maybe there was a case for a little enforcement there too.

Mr. Flanagan stated that they made the mistake on raising the rates and they needed to continue to communicate better with the haulers.

Mr. Flanagan stated that whoever gave the instruction to disqualify one of their customer's loads because they had a mattress in it made it all C&D and the ensuing discussion. Mr. Flanagan stated that they did not know what the customer put in there but there were alternative ways to investigate it.

Mr. Flanagan stated that they needed to have a kinder gentler policy and that was the genesis of the issue. It was not that there was a mattress on the load, it was the fact that they were charged the \$85 a ton for all of it.

Ms. Boudreau asked if letters were sent out to the haulers. Mr. Fry stated yes, they were sent letters and in defense of what Mr. Flanagan was referring to, Mr. Adams was called directly when they heard of the issue. Mr. Fry stated that he was spoken to directly and informed that the notice was sent out. Mr. Fry stated that their office received the letter and Mr. Adams was going by what one of his drivers told him, that supposedly was the rule. Mr. Fry stated that they called Mr. Adams' office directly and spoke to him and let him know what the situation was. Mr. Fry stated that Mr. Adams more or less said he was not going to separate mattresses out of his garbage, he was very irate. Mr. Fry stated that they were not targeting their organization, but unfortunately when their trailers came in to the landfill with 15 or 20 mattress mixed all through the loads, they could not give him a break. Mr. Fry stated if it was just one mattress, yes, they called out to the front scale were told that they would be charged the regular garbage price and the price of the one mattress. Mr. Fry stated that was not the case, it was that they wanted to be able to continue to bring 15 to 20 mattresses in their loads and still be charged their bargain price of \$45 a ton. Mr. Fry stated that it was a he said she said sort of thing and they were mad that they weren't getting the bargain price. Mr. Flanagan stated that there were three sides to every story, he said, she said and the truth.

Mr. Fry stated that following the meeting one of the haulers asked that if they brought in a mattress and sat it off to the side of the scale they were going to be charged the \$10 for the mattresses and then the regular garbage. Mr. Fry stated yes, that was all they were asking the haulers to do. It was that easy.

Further discussion regarding the haulers meeting continued.

Mr. Jack stated that they needed to make the landfill operate as smooth as possible for the customers while not placing the burden on the taxpayers.

Mr. Jack recommended that they hold a haulers meeting quarterly for a little while to work out some of the concerns and then possibly hold them twice a year after that.

Highway:

Supplemental Agreement - NYSDOT PIN 9754.65 Bridge Maintenance Project Phase 1: Mr. Fry stated that there was a draft resolution in front of them for a supplemental agreement from NYSDOT for an agreement between them and the County for a bridge preventative maintenance project with project identification number (PIN) 9754.65.

Mr. Fry stated that it was for the actual agreement between the County and the State to receive the federal funding for the project. Last month they bid the agreements for the contractor and the engineer and this one was where the funding came from.

Ms. Boudreau made a motion, seconded by Mr. Henninge, to refer to the next BOS meeting in order to adopt a resolution authorizing the supplemental agreement for PIN 9754.65. Carried.

Resolution to Follow

Refill T-S Laborer Position: Mr. Fry stated he thought he already came before the committees to refill the M-F Laborer position and subsequent backfill of the T-S Laborer position, but just in case he missed it, he was requesting to refill the T-S Laborer position.

Ms. Boudreau made a motion, seconded by Mr. Wakefield, to refer to the Personnel Committee to refill a T-S Laborer position in the case it was missed. Carried.

Referral to Personnel

Road Projects: Mr. Fry stated that during the beginning of September they were able to pave an additional 1.7 miles of County Road 35 in the Town of Guilford, bringing the total road work in miles for 2020 to 33.3 miles.

Bridge Projects: Mr. Fry stated the bridge on McDonough Road in Preston was still closed because on the day that it was supposed to be paved, there was an issue at the blacktop plant that caused them to hold off on paving it. By having to hold off on paving it they missed the window for the guiderail crew to come through and install the guiderails. Mr. Fry stated that if you missed the window for the guiderail crew you were rescheduled for another month out because they were busy helping everyone else. Mr. Fry stated that they were scheduled to return on September 29th and hopefully next week they would be back.

Other:

Snow & Ice Contracts: Mr. Fry stated that he sent the snow and ice contracts out last month. Mr. Fry stated that they requested to continue to have trucks stationed in Greene, Sherburne and Smithville.

Mr. Flanagan asked if the contracts were the same as far as road miles as in the past. Mr. Fry stated that he adjusted one of the towns to less road miles and he had not heard back from anyone yet because the contracts were not due back yet.

Household Hazardous Waste Day: Mr. Flanagan stated that the reason he asked for the number of attendees for the event was because he had a request to move the location around the county. As he suspected a majority of the attendees were from the Norwich area. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was not saying that they needed to move

the location, and he was not sure where it should be moved to, but the percentage was highly skewed to a certain section of the county. Moving it to the North end of the County and the South end of the County from time to time might not be a bad idea.

Executive Session: At 10:48 a.m. Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cammarata, to enter into an executive session to discuss personnel. Carried.

At 10:59 a.m. Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Ms. Boudreau, to adjourn the executive session, Carried.

Adjournment:

Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Henninge, to adjourn the meeting. Carried.

Mr. Jack adjourned the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

slh

**Public Works Committee Meeting
Chenango County Office Building – Committee Room
Thursday, October 22, 2020 – 10:00 am**

Present Were: Chairman Daniel S. Jack, Supervisor Peter C. Flanagan, Supervisor Thomas P. Grace, Supervisor Stanley D. Foulds, Supervisor John J. Cammarata, Supervisor Raymond Wakefield, Jr., Supervisor Joseph M. Henninge, Director of Public Works Shawn Fry, Waste Program Management Assistant Dustin Hendricks, County Attorney Alan Gordon, Sealer of Weights & Measurers Eric Davis, Clerk of the Board/County Auditor RC Woodford and Board Chairman Lawrence Wilcox.

Absent: Supervisor Jennifer B. Boudreau.

Chairman Daniel S. Jack called the meeting to order at 10:00 am.

**Shawn Fry, Director, Public Works
Recycling:**

Monthly Report: Mr. Fry stated that the recycling revenue for the month of September was \$9,281, bringing the annual total to \$69,883 or roughly 50% of the revenue. Mr. Fry stated that it was a tough year for recycling especially for being shut down for two and a half months. Mr. Fry stated the materials marketed were cardboard, flint glass, #3-#7 plastics and scrap metal.

Referral from Finance Committee – Single Stream vs. Source Separated Recycling: Mr. Fry stated that he brought Mr. Hendricks with him to the meeting and Mr. Hendricks did a lot of work researching this issue.

Mr. Hendricks stated the NYS Solid Waste Act of 1988 provided for the mandatory separation of reusable and recyclable material from solid waste. Municipalities across the state instituted local laws mandating certain materials be removed from the waste stream and reused or marketed for reuse and recycling. Mr. Hendricks stated Chenango County being a small, spread out, remote county, opted to provide source separated collection, where residents sort their recyclable materials into labeled bins for county employees to process and market with the proceeds supporting the program's expenses. Mr. Hendricks stated that was the least expensive method of recycling and met DEC's minimum requirements for the separation of recyclables from the waste stream. Mr. Hendricks stated the program required minimal final sorting during processing and provided the cleanest, most marketable final product due to the minimal introduction of contaminants.

Mr. Hendricks stated in a down market, like the current market that started with the onset of the 2018 SWORD policy, a source separated product was still marketable for small profits whereas dual stream processors shipped their product for little or no money and single stream collectors were forced to stockpile their product or pay to recycle it.

Mr. Hendricks stated Onondaga County Resource Recovery Agency (OCRRA) just enacted a \$34 per ton charge for haulers for processing recycling at their facility. Mr. Hendricks stated the reason for the charge was that the cost of recycling for the county was initially capped at \$10 per ton, but the new contract with Waste Management, the company they contract with for recycling, capped their contract at \$49 per ton. Mr. Hendricks stated Onondaga County estimated that it would cost the average taxpayer \$12 per year.

Mr. Hendricks stated that Oneida-Herkimer's Solid Waste Authority (OHSWA) operated multiple facilities throughout their respective counties. Mr. Hendricks stated as opposed to OCRRA, OHSWA operated their own landfill and recycling sorting facility. Mr. Hendricks stated OHSWA also contracted with other counties for single stream recycling. Mr. Hendricks stated they accepted Oswego, Fulton and Lewis Counties' recyclables and last year they processed around 40,000 tons of recyclables. Mr. Hendricks stated that 40,000 tons was the maximum amount of recycling that they could handle per year so they were not looking to contract with anyone else. Mr. Hendricks stated from the contract with those counties they were able to turn a small profit.

Mr. Hendricks stated Delaware County operated its own landfill and single stream recycling sorting facility for haulers and a source separated recycling collection for residents for a cleaner more marketable product.

Mr. Hendricks stated Broome County, up until last year was recycling with Taylor Garbage but they were now facing costs of up to \$200 per ton to process and ship their single stream recycling. Mr. Hendricks stated the Village of Endicott will be entering into a contract with the Andella Corporation to remove glass from the recycling stream and recycle the glass into reusable aggregate or sand. Mr. Hendricks stated that it would greatly reduce the tonnage for processing, thereby reducing cost. Mr. Hendricks stated they estimate 11% to 20% of their recyclables are glass.

Mr. Hendricks stated that Cortland County contracted with Casella to operate their solid waste and recycling program until the end of 2019 because in 2017 Casella warned Cortland County that, due to the SWORD policy, they would have to drastically increase their prices. After hiring an industry consultant, Cortland County decided to cancel the contract with Casella and operate the facility themselves because it would be cheaper. Mr. Hendricks stated Cortland County used Taylor Garbage for recycling until a fire forced Taylor Garbage to close, canceling their contract. Mr. Hendricks stated Cortland County was stuck with their recyclables and attempted to use Bert Adams, Broome Recycling Facility, but were only able to get in a few loads in between due to Bert Adams being close to his maximum amount of capacity for his facility. Mr. Hendricks stated Cortland County had to apply for a variance through DEC to put the remaining products in the landfill. Mr. Hendricks stated Cortland County was currently looking into purchasing a recycling baler to process and market in-house recyclables.

Mr. Hendricks stated that Madison County operated its own landfill and two transfer stations. Madison County partnered with ARC Madison for reduced staffing costs. Mr. Hendricks stated they practiced dual stream recycling, they collected paper products on one side and plastic, glass and tin on the other side. Mr. Hendricks stated they then separate the glass, plastic and tin, market each individual product, and the paper was processed and marketed as mixed paper.

Mr. Hendricks stated the problems were the same statewide. In the wake of the SWORD policy, recycling processors were competing for domestic end markets for their product. Mr. Hendricks stated that many municipalities that had previously gone to single stream recycling were reexamining their programs because the companies they contract with to process their materials have, in some cases, tripled their cost per ton, or cancelled contracts leaving the municipalities with limited options. For instance, Sullivan County used to receive \$4 per ton for recycling from Republic Services, but now they have to pay \$40.19 per ton.

Mr. Hendricks stated Orange County processed their own recycling and made \$5 per ton, now in order to offset that cost they were charging haulers \$104 per ton to process single stream.

Mr. Hendricks stated Ulster County stopped accepting single stream recycling. Ulster County only accepts dual stream for in-house processing.

Mr. Hendricks stated the problem was bigger nationwide and the largest problem with single stream was the contamination rate. Mr. Hendricks stated the nationwide contamination rate was currently 30% to 40%, which meant that up to 40% of the materials in single stream recycling become solid waste and put into landfills. Mr.

Hendricks stated the problem was two-fold, on one side there were wish-cycled items. Items that people think should be recycled, so they throw it into their bin contaminating the other products. Mr. Hendricks stated the glass in the curbside bins that broke ended up getting mixed into the paper that was in the bin, thereby contaminating the paper. Aluminum cans got crushed and had the same profile as plastic, making it impossible to sort. Mr. Hendricks stated that many industry experts cite the mainstreaming of single stream as the catalyst for the SWORD policy. In 2005 single stream programs covered 29% of communities nationwide with a 7% contamination rate, by 2014 80% of the communities had access to single stream recycling, skyrocketing the contamination rate to 30%.

Mr. Hendricks stated that haulers preferred single stream recycling for obvious reasons, the biggest being able to pick up everything at once minimizing their costs. Mr. Hendricks stated many private recycling processing facilities are operated by major haulers like Waste Management and Republic Services who contract with municipalities to provide curbside services, making it cost effective for those private solid companies to have a processing facility in that region. Mr. Hendricks stated for instance, Taylor Garbage built its recycling processing facility in Tioga County because of the volume of curbside pick-ups they had in the Broome/Tioga area. Waste Management built in Liverpool because of its centralized location in Onondaga County. Republic Services built in Beacon, NY due to the volume of curbside pick-ups in that region.

Mr. Hendricks stated that residents also love single stream recycling because it was easy and they can recycle more materials. Mr. Hendricks stated most source separated programs saw a 20% to 40% increase in participation when they switched to single stream. Mr. Hendricks stated when Fulton County went to single stream in 2017, they saw a 20% jump in tonnage for recycling.

Mr. Hendricks stated that due to the lack of participation by haulers in Chenango County, he forecasted a 40% increase, putting them around 1,300 tons of material being shipped for processing out of the county. Mr. Hendricks stated that the state average for processing was \$120 per ton.

Mr. Flanagan asked Mr. Hendricks what he based the forecasting of 1,300 tons on. Mr. Hendricks stated it was based on the fact that they shipped 750 tons last year and they averaged about 750 tons per year, if they were to see a 40% increase with all of the haulers bringing all of their recycling here. Mr. Flanagan stated let's go to tonnage because he has been on this committee for 26 years and they used to recycle 4,035 tons a year, and in recent years they have been around 1,000 tons. Mr. Flanagan stated he knew that was based on what was sold because he had no idea what was sitting around in piles right now. Mr. Hendricks stated that tonnage wise it was not a lot sitting around because they tried to market the materials as fast as they could. Mr. Hendricks stated the only product they had trouble marketing presently was #3 - #7 plastic, which they have tried to shift away from and only accept #5 plastic because of its value. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was just trying to do simple math and simple math would tell him that at 1,000 or 1,300 tons, what did they think they were spending on the recycling program now. Mr. Hendricks stated he did not know. Mr. Flanagan stated they could look at a budget and add in \$100,000 that was stashed away in the landfill budget for the two recycling attendants and their benefits and they could also add in the benefits for the people who were working in recycling. Mr. Flanagan stated the recycling budget was \$257,000 that did not include fringe benefits for four people, the \$100,000 from the landfill and he came up with over \$400,000. Mr. Flanagan stated right now it appears that \$400,000 would do a lot of recycling versus \$156,000. Mr. Flanagan stated he knew it was not apples to apples, people were doing different things.

Mr. Flanagan stated that a comment was made that increased participation would rise 20% to 40% when they switched to single stream, did that mean volume. Mr. Hendricks stated yes. Mr. Flanagan asked where that volume was going if they did not participate, the landfill. Mr. Hendricks stated sometimes it was the landfill, sometimes it went to private haulers. Mr. Hendricks stated they had people who recycled with them because their hauler would not take certain materials. Mr. Flanagan stated that he understood there was a tremendous variety of ways of how people did things and he wouldn't want to sort through some of the recycling that he has seen, but his point was what were the requirements in terms of recycling. Was there a uniformed recycling

standard statewide? Mr. Hendricks stated no. Mr. Flanagan stated that seemed problematic to him. Mr. Hendricks stated that was one of the major problems with recycling right now, there were no state or federal mandates with uniform codes dictating what was recyclable and what wasn't. Mr. Flanagan stated that it was possible that they could be recycling things that by law was not required. Mr. Hendricks stated they were currently recycling things beyond what was mandated. Mr. Hendricks stated that the County, after 1988, came up with mandatory recycling in the County. Mr. Hendricks stated the materials were glass, metal, tin cans.

Mr. Flanagan stated there seemed to be different things they could do with glass and rather than the disposal of it. Mr. Flanagan stated that perhaps it was time to review what the County mandated because it seemed like they were not bringing in enough revenue and never in the history of the landfill have they ever done that. Mr. Flanagan stated he did not mean to criticize but he understood they could sell things easier than dirty items, but what price were they paying, hence the review. Mr. Flanagan stated it would be interesting to see what other counties were doing, apparently they were struggling also. Mr. Hendricks stated yes, Onondaga in particular. Mr. Flanagan stated in looking at the nearest neighbors, Madison, last he looked they were handling about as much garbage as us, correct. Mr. Hendricks stated they were handling a little more. Mr. Flanagan stated the last time he looked they were in the 40's, we would not make in the 40's this year. Mr. Flanagan stated Madison was doing 40,000 tons of garbage and 12,000 of recyclables the last time he looked. Mr. Hendricks stated yes and our percentage countywide was low from processing at their transfer stations because haulers did not participate at their transfer stations, a majority of them shipped it elsewhere to their own processing center like Bert Adams and Casella. Mr. Flanagan stated do we care as long as they were getting recycled. Mr. Hendricks stated that was a question for the committee, it hurt their percentage when the DEC looked at their ratios of recyclables to solid waste. Mr. Hendricks stated as Mr. Flanagan pointed out, Madison County had a much better ratio for recyclables to solid waste. Mr. Flanagan asked how he would explain that, did flow control control recyclables also. Mr. Hendricks stated not in every county and he did not know if Madison County's law did. Mr. Hendricks stated that Broome County took in about 500 tons of recycling per year because they only accepted it from haulers that did not have a processing facility, they relied on Broome Recycling, which was Bert Adams and Taylor Garbage.

Mr. Jack asked Mr. Hendricks if during his research he found any county where single source was working. Mr. Hendricks stated there was no county that did not offset their cost of recycling with a single stream program. Mr. Hendricks stated that they had to offset their costs from the landfill side or the taxpayer. Mr. Flanagan stated they were doing both actually, they were offsetting through tipping fees by paying for two of the recycling attendants and fringes in the landfill budget and have historically allocated an amount from the general fund. Mr. Hendricks stated many counties did that, Otsego County put it in land taxes for use of their facilities and still had a pay as you throw program on top of that, Delaware had a dedicated sales tax for their solid waste program. Mr. Flanagan stated yes he thought that Delaware was not just sales tax, their landfill was supported by the NYC Water Shed Basin. Mr. Hendricks stated that was correct.

Mr. Jack stated that Mr. Flanagan kept bringing up the recycling attendants and their fringe and pay coming out of the landfill budget and asked Mr. Hendricks if those people did anything besides recycling. Mr. Hendricks stated that the recycling staff currently spent little time sorting the material that was collected from residents. Their time spent on recycling was on the processing end and dumping the materials into the baler creating the marketed product. Mr. Hendricks stated when they are not processing recyclables they are assisting with loading solid waste into the transport containers for the heavy equipment operator to transport. Mr. Hendricks stated that they load scrap metal and construction and debris into the roll-offs, they turn the compost pile and process brush and wood chips, assist customers, cover breaks and lunch for the scale operator, help maintain the facility by picking up wind-blown waste and lawn care and maintenance. Mr. Jack stated basically the positions would not go away. Mr. Hendricks stated not entirely, not without replacing them with another position. Mr. Flanagan stated they wouldn't get rid of everybody, I'm just looking at personnel.

Mr. Flanagan stated Mr. Hendricks noted a cost for \$40 a ton up to \$120 a ton and Onondaga was now going to charge. Mr. Hendricks stated not currently. Mr. Flanagan stated he wondered how that was going to go. Mr.

Hendricks stated they were another tax based blurred line facility that charged their haulers at the point of drop off. Mr. Hendricks stated the haulers that were not Waste Management that contracted with communities up there were going to be charged \$34 a ton. Mr. Hendricks stated it was a similar program in Tioga County as well.

Mr. Flanagan stated that when he asked several meetings ago whether Bert Adams was charging for recycling, he heard he was. Mr. Hendricks stated that he spoke to Broome County yesterday and was told that their current rate for Broome Recycling was \$90 a ton and they had to pay for a separate hauler \$1,140 per load to take it over to them. Mr. Hendricks stated Broome Recycling was owned by Bert Adams. Mr. Hendricks stated that when Taylor Garbage reopens their facility, they planned to charge the County a similar rate as Bert Adams.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he got a quote from Casella's yesterday, they would charge the County \$105 per ton to process plus transportation fees because their nearest facility was in Albany.

Mr. Hendricks stated that Tioga County held a public hearing on the proposed changes to their recycling program.

Mr. Hendricks stated that basically in 1988 under the Solid Waste Management Act Tioga County determined that curbside pickup was in their best interest for all residents so as part of their taxes each resident paid a recycling fee. Mr. Hendricks stated Tioga County contracted with Taylor Garbage to provide curbside pickup of for all of its residents and following the fire at their facility, Taylor Garbage canceled their contract.

Mr. Hendricks stated that in negotiating a new contract the cheapest estimate they got would double the cost to taxpayers and reduce the service. Mr. Flanagan asked if Mr. Hendricks knew how much they collected. Mr. Hendricks stated he did not know. Mr. Hendricks stated that prior to the public hearing they determined that they would be canceling curbside pickup and were forcing haulers in the county to pick up the recycling because they did not have a landfill, only privately operated transfer stations. Mr. Hendricks stated that the owners of the transfer stations were upset with Tioga County because now they had to figure out what they were going to do with recycling and they only had until January to figure it out. Mr. Hendricks stated that the Town of Richfield's transfer station was not set up to collect recycling.

Mr. Hendricks stated that Tioga County recently said that in order to continue their current recycling program, it would force them to raise taxes by 5.1%, which was well over the 2% tax cap.

Mr. Flanagan stated not knowing the numbers he did not know what they meant and he was just curious as to what it actually cost them per year. Mr. Hendricks stated, according to their numbers, they were paying \$60 per year based on assessed value and the new contract would cost them \$120 per year. Mr. Flanagan stated that was pretty cheap, he paid \$30 per month and they occasionally showed up on time.

Mattress Recycling: Mr. Fry stated that during the haulers meeting they were talking about the disposal of mattresses at the landfill and the representative from Casella's brought up the fact that Otsego County had a program with them to recycle mattresses. Mr. Fry stated at first Casella's stated it would cost the County \$14 per mattress and that caught everybody's attention. Mr. Fry stated that as the committee recalled mattresses were raised up to \$10 a piece in August and that raised concerns with finding them being thrown all over the back roads.

Mr. Fry stated they thought the fact that with all the trouble they have with mattresses at the landfill they would look into recycling them with a cost of \$14 per mattress. Mr. Fry stated that they looked into recycling them with Triad Recycling and Energy from Tonawanda, NY because they were the closest recycling center that took mattresses. Mr. Fry stated the end result was that it would cost between \$22 to \$25 per mattress to recycle them depending on how they got to the recycling center, either by county transport versus the company picking them up.

Mr. Fry stated unfortunately for now they were stuck with the mattress problem and would continue to look for a solution.

Landfill:

Used Leachate Tanker Bids: Mr. Fry stated that they opened bids for a used leachate tanker. Mr. Fry stated that they received three bids and asked for a used tanker that was for a 2009 or newer tanker.

Mr. Fry stated that one came in that was 2010, the others were older than 2009. Mr. Fry stated the 2010 tanker bid was received by Vestal Asphalt for \$15,000 which ended up being cheaper than the others as well.

Mr. Fry stated that he was recommending the committee to accept the bid received by Vestal Asphalt.

Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Foulds, to accept the bid received by Vestal Asphalt in the amount of \$15,000 for a used 2010 tanker. Carried.

Discussion: Mr. Flanagan asked what less taxes and discount was for on the bid sheet. Mr. Fry stated that taxes should be removed from the bid sheet. It was something that has been on it for years and it should be removed. Mr. Fry stated it should just say less discount.

Impact to Landfill due to the loss of Bert Adams: Mr. Fry presented the committee with a spreadsheet that estimated airspace value and a spreadsheet that estimated the airspace at year end with and without Bert Adams at the landfill.

Mr. Fry stated the estimated airspace value was a chart that reflected the current tipping fees that were converted over to the airspace value that the tipping fees related to. Mr. Fry stated the average airspace value was \$86.63/Yd³. Mr. Fry stated this provided the committee with the idea that every cubic yard that they could save was saving them almost \$90. Mr. Flanagan stated it was based on what they charged. Mr. Fry stated yes, that was one way of looking at it. Mr. Flanagan stated his question would be what it would really cost rather than what they charged. Mr. Flanagan stated this was sort of going back to they made a profit on paper and well no they don't make a profit at all. Mr. Flanagan stated he was not certain they made a profit at the landfill either. Mr. Flanagan stated that he would say the value of the airspace was not determined by what they charged, it was determined by what it cost them to operate the landfill.

Mr. Fry went over the spreadsheet for the estimated landfill airspace for actual year end 2019 and then went over the projected year end for 2020 and 2021 with two scenarios, with Bert Adams and without Bert Adams.

In 2019 at year end, with Bert Adams as a customer all year, number of constructed landfill years available was 3 years and 11 months and the number of unconstructed landfill years available was 17 years, 3 months. Mr. Fry stated at the end of 2019 they knew that by the end of 2020 they would have to begin constructing cell 5 in 2023 because they would be running out of space in the landfill towards the end of 2024.

Mr. Fry stated that Bert Adams stopped utilizing the landfill in August, 2020. The projected 2020 year end with Bert Adams remaining as a customer, the number of constructed landfill years available was 3 years and 8 months and the number of unconstructed landfill years available was 20 years, 6 months. Without Bert Adams, the number of constructed landfill years available was 4 years and 2 months and the number of unconstructed landfill years available was 22 years, 11 months. Mr. Fry stated this showed how much that little bit of a change helped dramatically. Mr. Fry stated the four or five month loss of Bert Adams to the end of the year gained them almost a half a year of life in the current cell.

The projected 2021 year end with Bert Adams as a customer, the number of constructed landfill years available was 2 years and 7 months and the number of unconstructed landfill years available was 20 years, 0 months. Without Bert Adams, the number of constructed landfill years available was 4 years and 5 months and the number of unconstructed landfill years available was 29 years, 4 months. Mr. Fry stated this showed a real jolt in the numbers and what really made a difference to him was the life of the current cell and the overall life of the landfill. In one year of 2021, they would gain 9 years in the total overall length of the landfill. Mr. Flanagan asked if he meant 20 years. Mr. Fry stated in 1 year, if Bert Adams did not go to the landfill in 2021 they gained 9 years.

Mr. Jack stated he was confused by gaining 9 years in 1 year without Bert Adams going to the landfill. Mr. Jack asked if he didn't come at all, how many years would we have left. Mr. Fry stated he would have to do the math, but it should be another 9 years per year. Mr. Flanagan stated that was impossible, that was saying the landfill would last another 150 years. Mr. Fry stated the reason he made the chart to the year 2021 was because he did not know what the match was going to do. Mr. Fry stated all he was trying to say was that this was just how dramatic the difference in tonnage made to the life of the landfill. Mr. Fry stated the difference was a third of the amount of tonnage per year, they would go from 44,000 tons down to 30,000 tons. Mr. Jack stated it made perfect sense to go from 20 to 29 in one year but he did not think it would be 18 more years in 2022 and 27 more years in 2023. Mr. Fry stated it may not, depending upon the density and the density was a huge factor. Mr. Fry stated they may not the same densities every year. Mr. Flanagan stated you mean volume or density or both. Mr. Fry stated the density determined the volume. Mr. Fry stated there were many variables that made up the equations in landfill mathematics, which was why they only projected to the end of 2021.

Mr. Flanagan stated for a long time they have been trying to calculate the value of the space in the landfill and he appreciated Mr. Fry taking a stab at it and his approach had obviously taken some time and effort. Mr. Flanagan stated the way he read the chart was that if they ran at a certain level they would add 10 years. Mr. Flanagan stated that had a value, but his concern was in the intervening 10 years how would they pay for the landfill operation. Mr. Flanagan asked what was it going to cost them to keep it open for 20 years versus 29 years and how much were they going to lose. Mr. Flanagan asked how they would make next year's budget, which was based on last year's revenues. Mr. Jack stated that they had a budget set for next year without Bert Adams. Mr. Flanagan stated obviously they needed to do that, but as Mr. Fry stated he didn't know what was going to happen next year and he didn't expect them to have a crystal ball. Mr. Jack stated if they didn't know what was happening in one year, they definitely wouldn't know what was happening in 20. Mr. Flanagan stated so much of this was speculation but they should give it their best guess and this was a good start.

Mr. Fry stated that he believed the most important thing regarding the two spreadsheets that he went over was that the County had to save funds for the construction of cell 5. The more they could save for the construction of cell 5, the less burden they would put on the taxpayer. Mr. Fry stated the longer they have to put away each year for cell 5 construction the better.

Mr. Fry stated the other issue was the overburden pile that was sitting on top of cells 5, 6 and 7. Mr. Fry stated there was 150,000 to 200,000 of cubic yards of soil that had to be moved. Mr. Fry stated the longer they had time to lessen the burden the better.

Mr. Fry stated that was why he felt it was very important to not rush into filling up cell 4 as fast as possible.

Mr. Cammarata asked how full cell 4 was right now and what was his projection for when they would need to open cell 5 and how much it would cost. Mr. Fry stated, as of last year, cell 5 was projected to cost between \$4.5 and \$5 million without the cost of moving the overburden pile. Mr. Fry stated their projection for opening cell 5 was late 2023, but he was hoping to get it into the spring of 2024. Mr. Fry stated he would have a better idea when they completed their volume survey in December.

Flow Control Discussion: Mr. Gordon stated that flow control was essentially implemented by a local law. Mr. Gordon stated the County would pass a local law which required that all garbage generated in the county go to the County landfill and also generally prohibited all garbage that was generated outside of the county from coming into the landfill. Mr. Gordon stated that was essentially what flow control did.

Mr. Gordon stated that it has been challenged many times and as per the courts, the current state of the law was that flow control laws were permissible by publicly owned landfills. Mr. Gordon stated there was no question that they could implement flow control.

Mr. Gordon stated the comparable surrounding counties that had flow control were Madison, Cortland and Oneida-Herkimer, which had a joint solid waste authority. Mr. Gordon stated they approached it differently in some ways and there were pitfalls in preparing a law that required a flow control law. Mr. Gordon stated one of the pitfalls was enforcement, you could not pass a law without having an enforcement mechanism in place. Mr. Gordon stated enforcement often involved an enforcement officer to monitor compliance with the law and also usually entailed some kind of due process requirement for commercial haulers to contest the findings of the enforcement officer. Mr. Gordon stated that was typically done by a three person hearing board. Mr. Gordon stated enforcement actions could be done either through the criminal process or by civil enforcement. Mr. Gordon stated the key was to create an adequate enforcement mechanism. Mr. Gordon stated they found in a lot of counties the complaints were if they did not have enforcement, those who violated never suffered consequences and the ones that complied ended up paying. Mr. Gordon stated they did not want to have a situation where people were not being punished for noncompliance.

Mr. Gordon stated the other issue he saw often was what to do, if anything about mixed garbage. Mr. Gordon stated in Cortland County they put into the law that if any garbage from out of the county was mixed into their load, they could not bring it to their landfill. Mr. Gordon stated the haulers found a loophole where if just one bag of garbage was mixed into that load they had to take the entire load elsewhere, which was a lot cheaper. Mr. Gordon stated Madison County essentially ignored the issue, their law stated no out of county garbage could go into their landfill, but it didn't talk about mixed garbage. Mr. Flanagan stated that seemed to be the better approach.

Mr. Gordon stated that there would be policy decisions that the Board would ultimately have to make and decide what to implement into a flow control law. Mr. Gordon stated legally it was not complicated and would probably involve repealing some of their previous laws. Mr. Gordon stated they already had a lot of stuff in place that would be required, for example, a permitting process, which they already had in place. Mr. Gordon stated the fees would also have to be looked at.

Mr. Flanagan asked what the timeframe would be. Mr. Gordon stated with any local law, the law had to be drafted and have it go before the Board and had to hold a public hearing. Mr. Gordon stated it would typically take three to four months at the soonest.

Mr. Jack asked how many of those counties were sued. Mr. Gordon stated they all were. Madison County was sued a lot by all of the haulers, Cortland County not so much. Mr. Gordon stated Madison County enacted their law earlier than Cortland County and by the time Cortland County implemented their law, the flow control case law was pretty well set.

Mr. Flanagan stated initially it was ruled against them in the courts. Mr. Gordon stated for private landfills, but there was a distinction drawn. Mr. Gordon stated the suit against Oneida-Herkimer was the key case where the U.S. Supreme Court finally held that publicly owned landfills could have flow control. Mr. Gordon stated prior to that the case law was uncertain.

Mr. Hendricks stated in 2007 the Supreme Court ruled to validate Oneida-Herkimer's policy, prior to that they had been arguing back and forth since 1992. Mr. Hendricks stated when Madison County initially enacted flow

control they fined everybody and took them to court, and they still have not seen the original fines on certain cases because they were still battling those out. Mr. Hendricks stated Madison County liked their flow control law, however they determined that if they had contract penalties, those were easier to fight in court than the actual flow control law itself.

Mr. Hendricks stated there was also the issue of enforcement. In Oneida-Herkimer everybody knows the law and they conducted spot checks on the loads at least weekly to see if there was any out of county material or excess recycling in their solid waste. Mr. Hendricks stated that Madison County and Oswego County employed part time enforcers in excess of \$40,000 a year, they checked the main corridors and worked with the solid waste facilities and talked to haulers and monitored everything. Mr. Hendricks stated enforcement was a big part of the law and had to really babysit every bin that they see and track it to its final destination.

Mr. Flanagan asked Mr. Hendricks if he knew the prices per ton that were currently being charged by Cortland, Madison and Oneida-Herkimer. Mr. Hendricks stated he wasn't really sure but off the top of his head, Oneida-Herkimer was around \$100 for their public, off the street, non-permitted price. Mr. Flanagan stated rather than pinning him down, he would be interested in knowing at some point in time what the counties with flow control were charging. Mr. Flanagan stated one of the issues about rebuilding the landfill was available funds so that would be germane to the discussion.

Mr. Flanagan stated he would certainly not recommend passing a law that they wouldn't enforce or couldn't enforce because that was the very definition of a bad law. Mr. Flanagan stated his feeling was they had to put this on the table for any number of reasons, whether they ended up passing it or not was another question. Mr. Flanagan stated he for one felt that the process should be initiated and obviously it would need some fine tuning, as Cortland County found out, but he would think that taking garbage from the county to somewhere else wouldn't be much of a loophole, it would also be a violation. Mr. Flanagan stated his interpretation of the law was that it would cut both ways.

Mr. Flanagan stated he would like to know what they charged and if they needed better contracts that was something for Mr. Gordon to review. Mr. Hendricks stated Cortland County charged \$85 a ton and Madison County charged \$95 a ton. Mr. Hendricks stated there were contract discounts based on volume and he would have to FOIL request their haulers contracts to see who was where. Mr. Flanagan stated that what Mr. Hendricks was saying was they have done what we were doing and giving a consideration based on exclusive use, where they gave people a deduction per ton for using our landfill. Mr. Flanagan stated he did not know if they were paying attention to whether or not they were actually doing it, but it seemed they were getting their garbage and they gave their largest a volume discount. Mr. Flanagan stated it was his understanding that was available to anyone bringing in that much volume. Mr. Flanagan stated he was not opposed to volume discounts.

Mr. Gordon stated it was not just a volume discount. What Madison County had done and other counties have done in lieu of flow control was having a contract that required them to bring all of the in-county garbage to their landfill. Mr. Gordon stated essentially they were implementing a private contract flow control. Mr. Gordon stated they could do that in lieu of a law. Mr. Gordon stated he thought that Madison County has found that to be easier to enforce because it was a contract enforcement. Mr. Flanagan stated he was not referring to what they were doing, he was referring to the history of our landfill.

Mr. Jack stated with that option, in the future he thought that if they got to the point of where it was hurting them, it would be easier to work with. Mr. Gordon stated yes it was, enforcement was always a problem, who was going to want to rummage through garbage as a practical matter. Mr. Gordon stated larger down state counties had some unique methods Dutchess County required every hauler to have a GPS on their trucks to monitor their movements. Mr. Gordon stated enforcement has always been the issue and it was hard to tell sometimes where the garbage came from by looking in the truck.

Mr. Jack asked Mr. Hendricks if they were going to research this some more. Mr. Hendricks stated yes, they would definitely be doing more research, it was a very deep subject. Mr. Jack stated that he would like to see some more research on the matter.

Mr. Cammarata asked if that was a motion by Mr. Flanagan to start a flow control law. Mr. Jack stated no, there was no motion. Mr. Flanagan stated he thought they ought to and he could make a motion.

Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cammarata, to continue to investigate the potential proposal of a law before the end of the year. Failed with Jack, Grace, Henninge, Foulds, and Wakefield opposed.

Discussion: Mr. Jack stated that gave them one meeting. Mr. Flanagan stated he was still making the motion.

Mr. Grace stated that he would like to thank Mr. Fry, Mr. Hendricks and Mr. Gordon for the information. Mr. Grace stated that there was an awful lot to think about but it has not changed his mind. Mr. Grace stated that it make him realize that they had to do exactly what they were talking about. Mr. Grace stated that they needed to learn a little bit more about all of the consequences. Mr. Grace stated that it was pretty complicated and he appreciated the effort that they put into today's presentation.

Mr. Grace asked for the motion to be repeated. Mr. Flanagan stated to investigate and have the proposal by the end of the year. Mr. Flanagan stated he would like to see how things went and at the last meeting he was fairly certain that he said that he would like the haulers to be informed that they were considering flow control and asked if anyone had done that. Mr. Fry stated that they were. Mr. Flanagan asked if there was any reaction. Mr. Fry stated they probably knew before anyone else knew. Mr. Hendricks stated not currently, but in speaking with Broome County they had a similar experience with certain people and it took a few months after the rumors started spreading and then things turned back around. Mr. Hendricks stated sometimes the talk encouraged it.

Mr. Jack stated that he did not think they could have anything done with only one meeting left in the year because it was too short of a timeframe for this motion. Mr. Flanagan stated that he was just looking for a proposal. Mr. Jack stated they had one meeting left this year. Mr. Henninge stated he agreed with that, it was too short of time. Mr. Flanagan stated nothing said they had to move it on.

Mr. Fry stated that while the flow control conversation was going on he looked at the chart that he handed out. Mr. Fry stated the area of the landfill was not declining, once you got into dropping the area of the unconstructed landfill that would be declining and those ratios would drop and not be nine years a piece. Mr. Fry stated Mr. Flanagan was right, it would not be a nine year difference every year. Mr. Fry stated every time a cell was built it would enter the area constructed and therefore you would not get nine years every year. Mr. Flanagan stated that extra nine years was worth looking at. Mr. Fry stated exactly, it was very beneficial. Mr. Flanagan stated the question was, what it is going to cost.

Dedicated Landfill Equipment Account: Mr. Fry stated that he would like to request from the committee to make a motion to move to the Finance Committee for the creation of a dedicated equipment account similar to what the highway had in it.

Mr. Fry stated that highway budget had an account called a dedicated equipment account labeled #H5130.20. Mr. Fry stated the purpose of that was to put any money from auctions or surplus money left over at the end of the year into that account to buy extra equipment above and beyond what was listed in the regular equipment list.

Mr. Fry stated that he would like to start one of those for the landfill.

Mr. Jack asked what they would start the funding for that account with. Mr. Fry stated he was recommending that the committee move this to the Finance Committee with the \$28,000 of revenue from the logging project that was sitting in another account.

Mr. Cammarata made a motion, seconded by Mr. Foulds, to refer to the Finance Committee in order to create a new account for landfill equipment and to fund said account with \$28,000 from the landfill logging proceeds. Carried.

Highway:

Refill HMEO Position and Subsequent Backfill: Mr. Fry stated they just refilled the Signage Supervisor position and therefore he would like to request to refill the HMEO position, because he took the Signage Supervisor position. Mr. Fry stated that he would also like to request to move to the Personnel Committee to refill the HMEO position any subsequent backfill to the MEO position. Mr. Fry stated that he assumed a MEO would move to the HMEO position. Mr. Fry stated that they needed to have the truck drivers.

Mr. Wakefield made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cammarata, to refer to the Personnel Committee to refill the HMEO position and subsequent backfill to the MEO position. Carried.

Referral to Personnel

Refill MEO Position: Mr. Fry stated that this MEO position was vacated due to the individual being promoted to the Deputy Director #2 position.

Mr. Fry stated that he was requesting to move to the Personnel Committee to refill the MEO position.

Mr. Wakefield made a motion, seconded by Mr. Grace, to refer to the Personnel Committee in order to refill the MEO position. Carried.

Referral to Personnel

Discussion: Mr. Flanagan asked if they had a lot of applicants for the Deputy Director position. Mr. Fry stated they had some applicants and the person was the first one that he felt comfortable with and felt that the person was qualified. Mr. Fry stated the individual knew the system and would do a good job.

Mr. Flanagan stated at one point they stressed some engineering for the position and asked if he qualified. Mr. Fry stated yes. Mr. Flanagan asked what kind of qualifications the individual had. Mr. Fry stated he had a bachelor's degree and he thought he could learn the other needed parts. Mr. Fry stated that he thought he would do a good job.

Highway Equipment List Alteration: Mr. Fry stated that he would like to request to purchase two ¾ ton pickup trucks to replace trucks from the #A5130.20 equipment line.

A discussion regarding the need for ¾ ton pickup trucks occurred.

Mr. Cammarata made a motion, seconded by Mr. Foulds, to approve the purchase of the two trucks as long as Mr. Fry researched the price differences between the sizes of the trucks and chose the best pricing option between them.

Weights and Measures:

Mr. Davis provided a monthly report of activities to the committee and explained each of the activities to the committee.

Mr. Davis stated that on September 9th, he inspected a vehicle tank meter (VTM) that was used to deliver fuel oil to homes and business. Mr. Davis stated that the VTM was showing a higher volume pumped than was actually delivered. Mr. Davis stated that when he removed the security seal from the meter to recalibrate it, the seal had a copper wire with initials located only in the lead portion. Mr. Davis stated that he did not use copper, he used steel wire for the seals and his lead stamp had the year on one side of it. Mr. Davis stated that he was able to ascertain that the vehicle was new and that they began using it in March or April.

Mr. Davis stated that he was able to obtain the number of gallons that the truck delivered and calculated what was short, which totaled around \$1,000. Mr. Davis stated after consulting with other municipal leaders he decided to fine the company \$500, rather than the maximum fine of \$600 for the first delivery and \$1,200 for each delivery thereafter.

Mr. Davis stated that when he moved his storage location at the airport, he removed 93 airplane tires, 10 vehicle tires, two loads of construction and debris that weighed 400 pounds, 1 refrigerator, 1 old computer monitor, 1 window air conditioner, 1 car battery, some scrap metal and some barrels of what appeared to be the hazardous waste of petroleum from the storage facility that he was directed to relate to.

Mr. Davis stated that he would be sending in a claim in the amount of \$1,213.28 under the Petroleum Quality Program that covered expenses for postage, mileage, and some time and fringe.

Fee Schedule: Mr. Davis provided a copy of the proposed penalty fee schedule for Weights & Measures.

Mr. Davis stated that under Article 16 of the Ag and Markets Law was the authority to set the penalties for violations.

Mr. Davis went over the fee schedule with the committee and stated that he needed to establish the fee schedule before he was audited by the State and found not to have one in place.

Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Wakefield, to refer to the next BOS meeting in order to adopt the penalty fee schedule for Weights and Measures. Carried.

Resolution to Follow

Mr. Grace asked what the name of the company was that was fined. Mr. Davis stated that he was unsure if he could state the company name in open session or if an executive session was needed. Mr. Grace stated he would question it because he thought it was a matter of public record when the County fined an entity. Mr. Davis stated that it was Mirabito Fuel Group.

Adjournment:

Mr. Henning made a motion, seconded by Mr. Flanagan, to adjourn the meeting. Carried.

Mr. Jack adjourned the meeting at 11:48 a.m.

Public Works Committee Meeting
Chenango County Office Building – Committee Room
Thursday, November 19, 2020 – 10:00 am

Present Were: Supervisor Peter C. Flanagan, Supervisor Jennifer B. Boudreau, Supervisor Stanley D. Foulds, Supervisor John J. Cammarata, Supervisor Joseph M. Henninge, Director of Public Works Shawn Fry, Clerk of the Board/County Auditor RC Woodford and Board Chairman Lawrence Wilcox.

Absent: Supervisor Daniel S. Jack, Supervisor Thomas P. Grace and Supervisor Raymond Wakefield, Jr.

Supervisor Flanagan called the meeting to order at 10:00 am.

Shawn Fry, Director, Public Works

Recycling:

Monthly Report: Mr. Flanagan stated they have all had a chance to look at the reports and that Mr. Fry said they have been doing some selling recently. Mr. Flanagan stated that they were probably going to be short for their revenue goals in this difficult year. Mr. Flanagan asked Mr. Fry how much they were going to be short. Mr. Fry stated they would not know until they get to the end of the year and finish things out. Mr. Fry stated that they typically would not know until the end of January or February when all of the receivables came in.

Mr. Fry stated right now they were at about \$74,000 which was only about half of their anticipated income. Mr. Fry stated they were selling as much as they could and hoping to be able to get up to around \$90,000 to \$100,000. Mr. Fry stated he has no idea if they would be able to achieve that, the markets were still very fluctuant.

Mr. Fry stated the good thing this year was that they were able to receive a total of \$61,000 in grant funding this year to help offset revenues.

Scrap Metal Bid: Mr. Fry stated that due to the computer issues they were unable to get the bid advertisements out in a timely manner and the bids would need to be opened in December. Mr. Fry stated that because they would not be holding a meeting in December, he would like the committee's approval to review the bids and award it for the 2021 scrap metal contract.

Mr. Cammarata made a motion, seconded by Ms. Boudreau, to allow Mr. Fry to award the bid for 2021 scrap metal contract. Carried.

Discussion: Mr. Foulds asked if there was a number that Mr. Fry was going to go by or a number not to exceed. Mr. Fry stated that they had a bid that they utilized from year to year and it had more or less dwindled down to usually only one bidder in this area.

Landfill:

Monthly Report: Mr. Flanagan asked if there were any questions or comments.

Mr. Fry stated that Casella's brought in around 127 tons.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he spoke with Mr. Fry about the declining revenue stream due to the lesser amount of tons coming in. Mr. Flanagan stated that they were down 2,100 tons from last year and that last year was their biggest year and he assumed it was also the highest year for revenue as well. Mr. Flanagan stated that the committee could see the downhill trend without a particular customer. Mr. Flanagan stated that this was something that they needed to continue to pursue and address and they needed to keep flow control under consideration.

Mr. Fry stated that if they could bring in the same amount in November and December as they have been tracking, they should be able to meet revenue. Mr. Fry stated that hopefully next year they would be okay. Mr. Fry stated that they were working on some ideas to help. Mr. Flanagan asked how much of the overall tonnage was brought in by Bert Adams last year. Mr. Fry stated that it was about 30%.

Mr. Cammarata stated that he noticed that they still came to the landfill a couple of days each week. Mr. Fry stated that was because they had contracts with Chobani and Kerry Bioscience. Mr. Flanagan stated as a part of those contracts they were instructed to use the county landfill. Mr. Flanagan stated that he knew that Kerry Bioscience had a pretty good deal on disposing their sludge. Mr. Fry stated that they entered into an agreement with the County and were given a \$5.00 discount on the tipping fee as part of their contract with the County. Mr. Fry stated that they hired Bert Adams to transfer their waste to the landfill and on those days Bert Adams also brought in other waste along with Kerry's and Chobani's. Mr. Flanagan stated that they should all recognize that they gave discounts to larger volume customers and the County would be well served by continuing to do that for all of the haulers.

Mr. Flanagan stated that they needed to come up with a number and see what it was worth to have them take garbage directly to the landfill rather than the transfer stations making us handle it again. Mr. Flanagan stated that they were given a discount that didn't seem to impress many of them. Mr. Fry stated they were given a \$5 per ton discount to take it directly to Pharsalia, some were okay with that amount and others did not feel that it was enough. Mr. Fry stated that a couple of them did not go up to the landfill because their vehicles weren't able to make it up the hill to Pharsalia.

Mr. Flanagan stated that maybe it was close to their routes and that was why they used it or were they using it because they thought it was worth it. Mr. Fry stated some of it was due to the size of their loads and not being able to use the transfer station. Mr. Fry stated that it also depended on routing. Some chose to use both. Mr. Fry stated that they were actively looking at this and trying to schedule another haulers meeting in January to talk to them and get their feel on the situation.

Equipment: Mr. Fry stated that he would like to request a motion from committee to add to the 2020 landfill equipment list for the purchase of a ¾ ton heavy duty pickup truck including a snow plow and sander package. Mr. Fry stated that he planned to bid this out in December with the existing 2020 equipment funds. Mr. Fry stated that he was also requesting as part of the motion to allow him to award the bid due to the same issue that was spoken about before.

Mr. Cammarata asked if this was going to be bid out locally. Mr. Fry stated that he was hoping to be able to pick one up locally but if they weren't able to find one locally he may need to utilize the state bid list through the OGS system.

Mr. Foulds asked if there was a not to exceed amount. Mr. Fry stated that he was looking in the low \$30,000 range for the truck and \$13,000 for the plow and sander.

Mr. Foulds made a motion, seconded by Mr. Henninge, to alter the 2020 landfill equipment list for the purchase of a ¾ ton pickup truck with a plow and sander and to allow Mr. Fry to award the bid. Carried.

Discussion: Mr. Flanagan asked Mr. Fry if he was not getting something else in order to purchase this equipment or was he adding to the list. Mr. Fry stated that he was adding to the list.

Mr. Wilcox asked if the money was already in the equipment line in his budget. Mr. Fry stated yes.

Highway:

Refill HMEO: Mr. Fry stated that he was requesting a motion to move to the Personnel Committee in order to refill a HMEO position due to an individual retiring. Mr. Fry stated that the individual's last day would be November 20th.

Mr. Cammarata asked if this was for a snow plow truck driver. Mr. Fry stated yes HMEO's not only did they do snow plowing they also ran excavators, bulldozers and gradalls.

Ms. Boudreau made a motion, seconded by Mr. Foulds, to refer to the Personnel Committee in order to refill the HMEO position. Carried.

Referral to Personnel

Refill Laborer: Mr. Fry stated that this request was for a Monday through Friday Laborer who left them for a new job opportunity. Mr. Fry stated that he was requesting a motion to move to the Personnel Committee in order to refill the Monday through Friday Laborer position and the subsequent backfill Tuesday through Saturday Laborer position as a result of an individual moving up to the vacant Monday through Friday position.

Mr. Cammarata made a motion, seconded by Ms. Boudreau, to refer to the Personnel Committee in order to refill the Monday through Friday Laborer position and any subsequent backfill Tuesday through Saturday Laborer position. Carried.

Referral to Personnel

Project Updates: Mr. Fry stated that under the 2020 Bridge Maintenance program they contracted with Rover Contracting with the assistance of McFarland Johnson for two bridge projects. One on Lyon Brooke Road in the Town of Oxford and one on the Mudge King Road in the Town of North Norwich.

Mr. Fry stated that both of the projects were completed with the sandblasting and repainting but the bridge on Mudge King Road needed to have one minor structural repair made to it. Mr. Flanagan asked what the repair was. Mr. Fry stated that they found a small hole in one of the beams and they repaired it by welding a metal piece over it.

Mr. Cammarata asked why they had engineers involved in the projects. Mr. Fry stated that federal agencies were involved in the approval process and there was a myriad of red tape to get through to make sure all the i's were dotted, and t's were crossed. Mr. Wilcox stated that the projects were 90% reimbursable and it was well worth it to have the engineer's involvement.

Mr. Fry stated that he wanted to let everyone know that funding for bridge projects in the towns was going to be made available soon and explained the requirements for applying for the funding to the committee. Mr. Fry stated their best bet was to contact NYSDOT for more information.

Equipment Update: Mr. Fry stated that he was unable to send out bids for the ½ ton and ¾ ton trucks that the committee approved the purchase for last month. Mr. Fry stated he was asking to be able to carry this over to December and be allowed to award the bids.

Mr. Cammarata made a motion, seconded by Ms. Boudreau, to carry the purchase for the two trucks over to December and allow Mr. Fry to award the bids. Carried.

Adjournment:

Mr. Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Ms. Boudreau, to adjourn the meeting. Carried.

The meeting adjourned at 10:46 a.m.

slh