

MINUTES
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
RUTLAND COUNTY SOLID WASTE DISTRICT
BUSINESS MEETING
November 9, 2017

APPROVED
12-6-17

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Brandon	Gabe McGuigan	Poultney	
Castleton	Tim Gilbert	Proctor	John Jazowick
Clarendon	Alf Strom-Olsen	Rutland City	Bob Tanner
Danby			Mike Bookman
Hubbardton			
Ira	Larry Taggart	Killington	
Mendon	Susannah Loffredo	Wallingford	
Mt. Holly		West Rutland	Sean Barrows
Pittsford			

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jim O’Gorman, RCSWD Manager	Deane Wilson, RCSWD
David Petty, RCSWD	Joe Corsi, RCSWD
	Art Maroun, RCSWD

At 6:29 a quorum was present. Mr. O’Gorman began by providing an overview of current business starting with the scales at Gleason

1. SET AGENDA

Mr. Taggart asked if there were any changes to the agenda. Mr. O’Gorman stated that “open to the public” and “adjourn” needed to be added. And a line item needed to added for “employees” after open to the public.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OCTOBER 4, 2017

Mr. Jazowick asked that the October minutes paragraph on Gleason Rd Scales remove reference to grade. Mr. Strom-Olsen asked for clarification on the discussion of fees for Non-District customers. Mr. Strom-Olsen understood the new rates would be \$170/ton for non-district customers. Discussion followed on existing fees and what was proposed for the first of the year. The fee for “non-permit” has been \$170/ton. Since there will be a requirement that everyone have a permit, the “non-district” permit fee would be \$170/ton. District permit holders would pay the \$145/ton. There would be a change in the permit purchase, district permits will now be \$10/permit, non-district permit holders would pay \$40 for the permit. Ms. Loffredo moved to accept the minutes with the correction offered by Mr. Jazowick.. Mr. Gilbert provided the second. The motion passed unanimously.

3. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AUGUST & SEPTEMBER 2017

Mr. Strom-Olsen asked where the transfer station fees were represented on the financial statement. Mr. O’Gorman said the fees were represented on the transfer station page within the transfer station fees. Mr. O’Gorman read his managers’ report. Revenue met expectations for all departments. Markets for all commodities have softened. Mr. Strom-Olsen asked if the transfer station scale had been paid for? Mr. O’Gorman stated that it hadn’t Mr. Tanner moved to accept the financials. Mr. Jazowick provided the second. The motion passed unanimously.

4.added OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

No public in attendance

5.added DISCUSSION WITH EMPLOYEES

Mr. Petty voiced concern, on behalf of the staff, with the misinformation and lack of information regarding the job description review. Questions to Mr. O’Gorman were going unanswered, and information offered at the staff meeting on October 4th was conflicting. Information that was offered to staff was that the COL and any raises would not be implemented until 2019 because the job descriptions would not be completed until the end of this year. Mr. Taggart said that the board wanted to do a thorough job and that there was a 3 step process involved in developing the descriptions. 1) Mr. O’Gorman was tasked with writing the descriptions for the positions. 2) employees would have an opportunity to review and critique the descriptions and 3) the job descriptions would be submitted back to Jim to present to the executive board. Discussion followed on the time frame needed to implement the rewritten job descriptions.

6. OLD BUSINESS

A. Scales at Gleason Road

Mr. O’Gorman stated that the paving had been done last week at the scales. The engineer would do a walk-through of the project next week and develop a punch list. Mr. Tanner asked who was involved with the inspection. Mr. O’Gorman stated that he would be, along with the engineer. Mr. Strom-Olsen questioned if there would be a charge for this service? Mr. O’Gorman says no additional fee from engineers is part of the original contract.

B. Fees for Non-District customers

Mr. Taggart offered that the disposal fees were not being adjusted, the change discussed is who the fees apply to. The discussion is on district versus non-district and the changes for a minimum fee structure to use the scales. There will be a requirement that all visitors using the facility will need a permit, and an adjustment will be made on “non-district” permits costing \$40 per year. Currently the minimum fee to use the scale has been \$7 which enables anyone to dispose of up to 100 pounds. Discussion followed on what the fee should be adjusted for “non-district” permit holders. Mr. Alf-Olson asked if there was a concern of losing customers and if a financial analysis has been done detailing how much revenue was currently generated through the “non-permit” fee structure. Mr. Petty offered that “non-permit” customers are currently charged the \$170 and that this program generates a great deal of revenue. And that some customers, no matter where they’re from, are reluctant to purchase a sticker and are willing to pay the higher fee. Mr. Petty also stated that if there is a requirement that all visitors were going to be required to purchase a sticker to utilize the programs, that an educational element needed to be underway in advance of implementing the program. Also, if this is implemented, Mr. Petty stated that administrators needed to be on site to explain the new program to the customers. Mr. Gilbert offered the reason for implementing the “district” and “non-district” permit/fee schedule is that it was viewed district towns were subsidizing non-district town residents that historically had a “permit” and been charged the “district permit” fees. Mr. O’Gorman stated that commercial non district had a fee of \$1/ton and that would be increased to \$12/ton with \$3 allocated to capital improvements. Mr. McGuigan asked that a written review be provided detailing how “district” vs “non-district” compares to “permit” vs “non-permit” and a reference be provided with theatricals; someone who arrives with 200 pounds of material to dispose of and how this would look under the different scenarios. Mr. Strom-Olsen asked that direct expenses for disposal and direct sources of revenues should be detailed.

Mr. Taggart said that at the December meeting, the next year’s budget would be presented and that the break out of cost and revenues for the programs would be discussed. Mr. Jazowick requested that the board packets be mailed out earlier than they had been so that the board members had adequate time to review the information.

C. Audit 2016

Mr. O’Gorman stated that TJ Sabotka would be at the December meeting to discuss and answer questions on the 2016 audit. Mr. Strom-Olsen asked if there were an audit every year and if the report could be received earlier and if it was put out for bid? Mr. O’Gorman stated that an audit is done every year, a requirement of municipalities and the audit usual happens after tax season. Mr. O’Gorman also stated that he has to do a managers report for the audit and that the audit isn’t put out to bid. Mr. O’Gorman indicated that there are very few firms that have the ability to audit municipalities. Mr. Strom-Olsen stated that an independent audit is not required of municipalities, but an annual audit is required by the RCSWD charter. Discussion followed on the usefulness of the audit when another year had already elapsed.

7. NEW BUSINESS

A. RCSWD Boards purpose

Mr. Strom-Olsen asked for guidance on the role the board has in responsibilities for the District. Reading the bylaws there is no mention of a director. Any subsequent documents show any transfer of authority from the board to a director? Discussion followed on who’s responsible for daily operations and what Jim/Board requirements are and that there needs to be an understanding of what the boards purpose is.

B. _____

8. EXECUTIVE SESSION

The board moved to go into executive session at 7:59pm

The board came out of executive session at 8:25pm

9.added ADJOURN

Mr. Barrows moved to adjourn at 8:25. Mr. McGuigan provided the second. Motion passed.

Next proposed Scheduled Meeting December 6, 2017

Respectfully submitted

