

MINUTES
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
RUTLAND COUNTY SOLID WASTE DISTRICT
BUSINESS MEETING
May 3, 2017

DRAFT

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Brandon	Gabe McGuigan	Poultney	
Castleton	Tim Gilbert	Proctor	John Jazowick
Clarendon	Alf Strom-Olsen	Rutland City	Bob Barrett
Danby	Steve Haines		Christopher Etorri
Hubbardton	Mike Wetmore		
Ira	Larry Taggart	Killington	
Mendon	Susannah Loffredo	Wallingford	
Mt. Holly	Joseph McDonald	West Rutland	John Harvey
Pittsford	Baird Morgan		

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jim O’Gorman, RCSWD Manager	Deane Wilson, RCSWD
-----------------------------	---------------------

At 6:30 the meeting was called to order. A quorum was present.

1. SET AGENDA

Mr. O’Gorman stated that item 7 would be in open session. Mr. O’Gorman asked that under the review for SWAC fees, Pam Clapp, Administrator for SWAC be allowed to call in and discuss pricing concerns. Also Mr. O’Gorman offered that there was new information regarding the July 1, 2017 requirement of ACT 148

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES APRIL, 2017

Mr. Jazowick moved to accept the April minutes. Mr. Barrett provided the second. The motion passed unanimously.

3. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS MARCH 2017

Mr. O’Gorman read his managers’ report. For administration, tonnage was up, but on par for this time of year. Revenue met expectations for all departments. Markets for all commodities have continually improved. Mr. Strom-Olsen asked how the annual budget showed an increase yet the direct expenses were down. Mr. O’Gorman stated that the 2016 HHW expense for disposal at \$90,000 was \$30,000 over 2015. Mr. O’Gorman offered that the State SWIP grants were used to subsidize HHW programs. Mr. Barrett moved to accept the financials. Mr. Jazowick provided the second. The motion passed unanimously.

4. OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

No public in attendance

5. OLD BUSINESS

A. Scales at Gleason Road

Mr. O’Gorman provided a timeline for the next steps of the scale installation. Mr. O’Gorman stated that he had received a letter from Randy Dapron concerning the split axle weighing issue. The state has indicated that since there aren’t any momentary transactions based on the split weight, the state wasn’t requiring the tractor trailer length installation. After discussion and at the recommendation of the engineer, it was decided to go ahead with the bid on the original design. Mr. Gilbert asked if there had been any further discussion with Casella about assistance with financing with the project. Mr. O’Gorman said there hadn’t been.

B. Town of Castleton-proposal of withdrawal

Mr. O’Gorman said that the Castleton Town Manager had said that the issue of withdrawing from the District has been postponed. Discussion followed on the larger waste generators in Castleton and those that use the Castleton transfer station. Mr. Jazowick asked if any other towns had indicated an interest in withdrawing from the district or if any other towns that weren’t members had inquired about joining. Mr. O’Gorman said there hadn’t been any discussions. Ms. Loffredo asked if East Coast Rubbish had caught up with their overdue surcharge. Mr. O’Gorman said they hadn’t and would talk to the District attorney tomorrow.

C. HHW Fee structure SWAC towns

Mr. O’Gorman distributed a page detailing proposed price changes to SWAC that had been discussed at an executive board meeting on April 26th. After some changes and adjustments; the primary change to the service arrangement was instituting a \$1000 set up fee per event. Discussion followed on the reasoning for establishing a set up fee. Mr. O’Gorman stated that the HHW budget expense for material disposal had increased \$30,000 over the previous year and that the private sector had a set-up fee for their events. Mr. McGuigan asked how close should the billing to the actual cost be? And what options were there for the public? Mr. O’Gorman stated that the State required that towns had access to HHW disposal service a minimum number of 4 times per year.

Mr. O’Gorman described how district towns HHW disposal was paid for. District household generated material was covered by the surcharge on trash. District businesses were responsible for the disposal cost of their hazardous waste. SWAC towns covered the HHW disposal through a per capita fee. A comparison was made between per capita and surcharges in Castleton’s situation and Castleton’s cost were lower through the surcharge. Mr. McGuigan asked about the status of the contract? Mr. O’Gorman stated that a verbal contract had been discussed at the SWAC October 2016 meeting. Discussion followed on the cost of the HHW program to the District. Mr. O’Gorman stated that the program is partially offset by a State grant. EPR programs for bulbs, paint, mercury, electronics and pesticides provide reimbursement for disposal and some revenue for handling. Mr. Ettori asked if there were any additional fees for the SWAC HHW service? Mr. O’Gorman stated that there is a labor charge, a mileage charge and an additional 30% added fee. Mr. McGuigan stated that we should provide a clear explanation for the proposed \$1000 set up fee and that if the District loses the SWAC account that results in a loss of revenue. A voice vote was called for, to raise the SWAC item fees and to begin charging a \$1000 set up fee for all future SWAC events. The vote was unanimous to raise the fees and install the \$1000 setup fee per event.

At 8:00 pm Mr. O’Gorman phoned Ms. Clapp to participate in the conversation. Ms. Clapp introduced herself and provided a review of the years the District and SWAC have worked together. Ms. Clapp stated that the SWAC board of directors were willing to negotiate fees at the beginning of the year that were fair to everyone. The 2017 schedule and fees had been set at the beginning of the year and to adjust them now would cause the cancellation of them. Ms. Clapp asked if there had been a true cost accounting of what the SWAC events cost compared to the fees charged? Mr. Gilbert stated that the District was losing money on the HHW program and needed to adjust fees July 1, 2017, including instituting a set up fee of \$1000. Ms. Clapp left the conversation at 8:25.

Mr. O’Gorman stated that there was an 11th hour push to amend the July 1, 2017 haulers requirement of ACT 148. The transfer station requirement offering food waste collection was still in place. Mr. O’Gorman has ordered a number of totes to distribute to transfer stations that will be used to collect food waste. Discussion followed on the logistics required at transfer stations, who would be picking the material up and what happens to the food waste. Mr. O’Gorman said that negotiations with TAM Waste Management were underway to collect the material and compost it at their site in Bennington.

6. NEW BUSINESS

A. Personnel Pay Grade & Evaluation Process

The executive board meeting April 26, 2017 discussed personnel pay grades and an evaluation process for the employees. At that meeting Mr. O’Gorman was instructed to present the approved pay scale and position rating manual to the full board. Mr. O’Gorman provided a copy of the evaluation process and discussed the point system assigned to each category. Discussion followed on the manual with the conclusion that the vote to include the manual be postponed, there were unanswered question on how to proceed and some issues needed to be addressed. It was offered that the executive committee would meet to address the concerns before the June meeting.

B. Fee for non-District trash using Gleason Scale

The executive board meeting April 26, 2017 discussed the non-District commercial tonnage using the Gleason Road scale. At the meeting Mr. O’Gorman was asked to present a cost to be added to commercial non-customers equating to the \$19.97 per ton charged to district customers. Discussion followed on who constituted non-District and how the fee structure was set up. Mr. O’Gorman mentioned that there was also a \$1 per ton fee on trash using the Gleason Rd scale that was used to pay the “in lieu of taxes” to the City on District properties. Mr. O’Gorman was asked if all trash tonnage using the scale paid the \$1/ton? Mr. McGuigan suggested that the \$19.97 per ton District charge was used for programs offered to District businesses and citizens. Non-district didn’t have the same services offered so the consideration needed to be addressed in establishing a “user” fee. Mr. O’Gorman was asked to present a trash tonnage breakout at the next meeting. Question was asked how soon the evaluation process needed to be implemented. Mr. O’Gorman stated that he needed it for the next budget process to evaluate the pay increases.

7. Executive Session – Personnel Pay Grades and Evaluation Process (moved to NEW BUSINESS)
Policy on Bank Deposits
8. ADJOURN
Mr. Baird moved to adjourn at 9:25pm. Mr. Barret provided the second. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted
Deane Wilson