

DUTCHESS COUNTY RESOURCE RECOVERY AGENCY
AUGUST 12TH, 2010 – SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
(amended 9/16/10)

A special meeting of the Dutchess County Resource Recovery Agency convened at 5:00 pm at the offices of the Dutchess County Resource Recovery Agency located at 96 Sand Dock Road, Poughkeepsie, New York. Those present included W. Conners, Chairman; E. Mills, Vice Chairman; D. Nestler, Treasurer; Board Members, R. Stephen Lynch and E. Kinkade; Agency Staff, W. J. Calogero and C. Tamney; Agency Counsel, J. Nelson; D. Leibnitz, HDR; R. Chance and B. Connolly, Covanta Hudson Valley Renewable Energy LLC; L. Carille, Dutchess County Planning Department; A. Surman and S. Goldberg, Dutchess County Legislators; M. Cahill, Germano & Cahill; H. Arnold, Gerhardt LLC, and S. Parris Riley, Poughkeepsie Journal.

Chairman W. Conners called the meeting to order at 5:10 pm to decide upon processing a Solid Waste Management Plan and to discuss the proposed Solid Waste Management Plan written by consultants M. Cahill and H. Arnold.

The proposed plan from the consultants was distributed to all Board Members prior to this meeting. Chairman W. Conners noted that he would like the questions for the consultants to be given today so that they may be prepared to address all questions by the next board meeting on August 19th. At the August 19th regularly scheduled board meeting, he will proceed through the fixed agenda and devote the remainder of the meeting to the Solid Waste Management Plan. The plan will be released as a draft as soon as the Board has been able to comment on it. There has been no answer from the County Legislature if they want to be part of the Solid Waste Management Plan public meeting.

The second issue for discussion was to proceed with the SEQRA resolution declaring the intent for the Agency to take the role as the lead agency and also to determine how many days are to be provided for public comment. E. Mills asked what potential involved agencies would be sent the Part One EAF notice. M. Cahill responded that the involved agencies would be the NYSDEC and the County Legislature because both would have to approve the plan. All the towns, villages, neighbors, etc. are interested agencies that could receive the plan and comment on it but none would be eligible to be lead agencies. J. Nelson also added that the approval of the County Legislature is something that the NYSDEC has informed this Agency they do want. There is no statutory requirement that the County Legislature must approve the plan. The NYSDEC is an involved agency because they have to approve it. R. Stephen Lynch replied that from his understanding of the NYSDEC, the Legislature of the planning unit is the entity that submits the plan because it is the elected body. Discussion continued. E. Mills summarized this discussion specifying the three involved potential agencies

for this SEQRA resolution would be DCRRA, the Dutchess County Legislature and the NYSDEC.

J. Nelson presented and explained the resolution to the Board that designates one of the three agencies to do SEQRA. It specifies the Executive Director to give notice to Dutchess County and the NYSDEC that the DCRRA intends to declare itself as lead agency and if there are any objections the DCRRA is to be informed within thirty days. R. Stephen Lynch was opposed to DCRRA as lead agency as he feels DCRRA should have not prepared the plan to begin with. A motion to proceed with the resolution was made by D. Nestler. The motion was amended by E. Mills to direct the notice of the DCRRA intent be provided to Dutchess County; i.e., the County Legislature, the Clerk of the Legislature; and the NYSDEC. The amended motion was seconded by E. Mills.

Roll Call Vote:

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
R. Stephen Lynch		√
D. Nestler	√	
E. Mills	√	
E. Kinkade		√
W. Conners	√	

Motion failed.

Discussion followed about having the public meeting. W. J. Calogero did reach out to the County Legislature but has not heard back yet to see if it is their intent to have a public meeting. The public needs to have the opportunity to look at the plan. It will need to be posted on the Agency website. It will need to be sent out to other jurisdictions as the solid waste agencies and surrounding counties so they can be made aware of what the DCRRA is doing by way of the solid waste plan. It will also give them the opportunity to comment on it. R. Stephen Lynch and E. Kinkade were opposed to continue on with this discussion. R. Stephen Lynch remarked on how it is not clear that the DCRRA will be in charge of the public comment details that the County has to go through and furthermore any small administrative items should be discussed at next week's regular meeting. E. Kinkade recommended keeping this special meeting focused solely on the presentation of the plan.

M. Cahill began with a general overview of what the proposed plan contains and noted how the format of the plan was assembled from what the NYSDEC has required. An additional chapter will be added at the end of the process that will

be the summary of the public notice and comments, responses to comments and the SEQRA determination made on it. It was made quite clear by the NYSDEC that a new solid waste management plan needs to be in place by December 31, 2010. E. Kinkade asked if they had estimated the tipping fees that would be necessary to eliminate the net service fee. M. Cahill replied that if everything was to be funded out of the tipping fees at the waste-to-energy facility, it would be close to \$128.00/ton and that includes bond servicing. E. Kinkade asked about their recommendation of a user fee. A user fee would raise the funds based on the waste generation from property classifications. It would be a dedicated revenue source that would be devoted specifically. The user fee revenues would allow Agency tip fees to be stabilized and it would build reserves for needed future capital improvements. This fee would bring in properties that are presently tax exempt because it is a user fee instead of a tax. The general fund presently in place would be eliminated by this user fee. R. Stephen Lynch raised concern over the cost to the taxpayer. E. Mills asked if the cities would be implemented differently. The cities would not be implemented differently.

With reference to recycling, the plan deals with having a new regional scale MRF that would be able to process 35,000-45,000 tons of recyclables per year possibly developed through a public-private partnership. D. Nestler asked if these numbers were realistic. H. Arnold replied that they are with the right facility and can be coupled with an aggressive public education program. E. Mills asked about the percentage of recyclables that are incorporated in the 35,000-45,000 tons. H. Arnold answered that presently in New York State there is no common required way to measure waste in recyclables. It gets recorded and reported differently in planning units across the state. There is no true accurate percentage number to report in ones recycling program. Over time, you will be able to get better numbers especially if you are handling all the waste in the county through flow control and you have a central facility that is up and running that is generating a good volume of recyclables. The target should be based on tonnage, not percentage, and moving to the single stream facility that has been recommended would position Dutchess County to be in a leading position on recycling. R. Stephen Lynch asked about the overall cost. An estimate if one were to build a single stream recycling facility in an existing building, the equipment expense would be roughly 13 million. The operating loss when the markets are down was not calculated since one would have to assume a certain set of market conditions for each of the twenty or thirty commodities that would come out of that facility and try to estimate what that would be. The capital expense would be covered from additional user fees. Highly recommended are the continuation of the HHW recovery efforts through dedicated collection days, educational activities and the encouragement of product stewardship. Also was to continue to evaluate the development of beneficial uses of ash. R. Stephen Lynch asked if building a local ash landfill had been explored for Dutchess County. H. Arnold answered that it would certainly save on the expenses incurred for the haul and disposal fees presently spent; however, it is a very

difficult, close to impossible task to site a landfill in addition to being a major expense in New York State. The plan does not completely rule out an ashfill but it would not be a practical or feasible thing to do.

M. Cahill followed by speaking about the Agency's Energy Recovery Facility. The Facility is healthy and has a lot of good useful life left. It is very critical to prepare a good bid for the existing contract that runs out with Covanta in 2014. It is recommended to have a good diagnostic examination done by an engineering firm and the results be made available to the marketplace. An upgrade of the turbine and the installation of more efficient fans is recommended. The use of waste-to-energy technology, as opposed to other disposal means that are available out there for the Agency, is the the most environmentally beneficial technology one can have. It is far better from a global warming standpoint than loading trash in trucks and hauling it away. The maximum tonnage this Facility can handle has not been coming in. Flow control will be the means of getting that extra tonnage in. Estimation for tonnage produced in Dutchess County is 250,000 tons. Once the recycling initiatives are maxed out, seeing what can be done with organics, and all options optimized, the plan recommends an expansion of the Facility by adding a third burner to pick up the extra waste that is being landfilled. E. Mills asked about grant programs for energy efficiency as NYSERDA. M. Cahill wasn't aware of NYSERDA being involved with waste-to-energy facilities or even power plants. Times are difficult and uncertain right now in energy. E. Mills asked about what realistic goals are in the plan for organics recycling. H. Arnold answered that Dutchess County has McEnroe Farm that is permitted to take 40,000 cubic yards per year of organics. Organics covers anything from leaves, grass clippings, vegetable waste to food preparation waste in institutions. There have been food separation programs done already by the Culinary Institute, Marist, Vassar and Bard Colleges all of which have been brought to McEnroe for processing. In addition, there has been a small scale organics separation collection pilot program done by Royal Carting that provided containers to households. More details of this pilot program are provided in the draft plan. There is an estimation of 1,200 tons of food waste currently being recovered through organics recovery facilities in Dutchess County. The plan sees the food waste processing number in organics to increase to 5,000 tons by 2015.

The Board discussed how to release the document. It was agreed that the Plan would be sent to the County Legislature. R. Stephen Lynch made a motion to post it on the website and to make it available for any citizen that may want it. The motion was seconded by E. Kinkade. R. Stephen Lynch revised his motion to state that if a citizen is to request the Plan through the FOIL process, the Agency will make it available for examination in their offices and available to be copied at .25 per page effective tomorrow morning. The motion was seconded by D. Nestler and unanimously approved.

With no further business to discuss, a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:15 pm was made by E. Mills, seconded by D. Nestler and unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,

William J. Calogero
Executive Director