

**CONNECTICUT RESOURCES RECOVERY AUTHORITY**

**THREE HUNDRED FORTY-SIXTH MEETING**

**JULY 18, 2002**

A regular meeting of the Connecticut Resources Recovery Authority Board of Directors was held on Thursday, July 18, 2002 at the 211 Murphy Road, Hartford. Those present were:

Chairman Michael A. Pace

Directors:

Benson Cohn  
Theodore Martland (arrived at 9:05 a.m.)  
Howard Rifkin (delegate for Director Nappier)  
Stephen Cassano (left at 11:20 a.m.)  
James Francis  
Alex Knopp (left at 12:55 p.m.)  
Andrew Sullivan  
Mark Cooper  
John Mengacci (delegate for Director Ryan)(left at 11:30 a.m.)  
Mark Lauretti (arrived at 9:25 a.m.)  
Raymond O'Brien

Directors Blake, Nappier and Ryan did not attend.

Present from the CRRA staff:

Ann Stravalle-Schmidt, Director of Legal Services  
Gary Gendron, Director of Administration  
Brian Flaherty, Communications Coordinator  
Lynn Martin, Insurance and Claims Manager  
Angelica Mattschei, Executive Assistant  
Peter Egan, Director of Environmental Services  
Thomas Gaffey, Recycling and Environmental Education Division Head  
Bettina Bronisz, Assistant Treasurer & Director of Finance  
John Clark, Operations Division Head  
Diane Spence, Secretary  
Mathew Bessette, Human Resources Administrator  
Christopher May, Systems Analyst  
John Romano, Project Manager  
Robert Constable, Senior Analyst  
Michael Tracey, Director of Civil & Construction Engineering  
Christopher Fancher, Facilities Engineer

Others in attendance were: David Arruda and George Sparks of MDC; Peter W, Hull of Cummings and Lockwood; Jerry Tyminski of SCRRRA; John Cimoehowski of DEP; Catherine Boone of the Treasurer's Office; Theodore Doolittle and Clare Kindall of the Attorney General's Office; Steve Kesten and Robert Reilly of CTN; John Maulucci of BRRFOC; Joyce Tenor and Steve Sonnone of HEJN; Kachina Walsh-Weaver of CCM and Paul Doyle.

Chairman Pace called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and noted that a quorum was present. Chairman Pace requested that everyone stand up for the Pledge of Allegiance, whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

### **PUBLIC PORTION**

Chairman Pace said that the first item on the agenda allowed for a public portion between 9:00 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. in which the Board would accept written testimony and allow individuals to speak for a limit of three minutes. Chairman Pace asked whether any member of the public wished to speak.

Mr. John A. Alexander from 12 Lord Meadow Lane in Old Lyme introduced himself and said he had several questions for the Board. Mr. Alexander asked whether the nonproject ventures account had been closed and whether the balance in account had been returned to the Mid-Connecticut project. Mr. Alexander continued by asking how much of the \$66.8 million of assets taken from the Mid-Connecticut project had been returned and whether the Board had a detailed accounting of expenditures made from the nonproject ventures account. Mr. Alexander also inquired whether the Board would vote to apply the returned funds to the reduction of the tipping fees.

Chairman Pace commented that Mr. Alexander's questions would be addressed throughout the course of the meeting.

Ms. Joyce Tenor from East Hartford introduced herself and noted that she was a member of the Hartford Environmental Justice Network (HEJN), an organization that closely followed the activities of political, public and private entities that could create change in the quality of the environment. Ms. Tenor said that HEJN has grown to an over 60-member organization since its formation four years prior and was generally recognized as one of the most credible organizations of its kind in the nation.

Ms. Tenor stated that CRRA had a public mandate to not harm the public which it served with a special responsibility to the communities that hosted its facilities. The host communities, she said, bore the burden of additional noise, traffic and air pollution with both toxic and nuisance emissions. Ms. Tenor continued that the job opportunities to the residents of those communities in other than low-wage positions was uneven. Ms. Tenor stated that while non-host

communities received the benefit of having their waste removed, they did not bear the additional burden that host communities faced. Allowing one community's air to become or stay polluted because another of the community's air may be legally lesser polluted was not a definition of being a good public or corporate citizen, she said.

Ms. Tenor said that the economic and safe disposal of waste was a challenge to every community in a customer-oriented society. Ms. Tenor added that the CRRA Board members had an opportunity to examine new and creative ways to manage that challenge and HEJN would be there to help.

Chairman Pace responded that the Board was aware of the public policy issue concerning the environment and quality of life.

Mr. Leroy Robinson introduced himself and noted that he has been a resident of Hartford for 17 years. Mr. Robinson said that many Hartford residents were concerned for their health and safety due to the five facilities around the City of Hartford operated by CRRA.

Mr. Robinson stated that CRRA workers should also reflect the Hartford population. Mr. Robinson said that he has examined the CRRA's Auditor's report and CRRA was not in compliance with minority contracting requirements. Since the Hartford population was 80% black and Puerto Rican, CRRA workers should also be 80% black and Puerto Rican. Mr. Robinson commented that employees who live in the town they work in were more careful with matters which might endanger the lives and health of the people in their community. Employees who did not live in the towns they worked in did not care, he added.

Mr. Robinson said that Manafort Brothers was a prime example. Manafort Brothers had been awarded large contracts to work in Hartford and they did not hesitate to dump contaminated soils in Hartford. They were neither forthcoming with the information regarding the contents of the soil, nor were they concerned about the health and welfare of the people who lived in those areas, he said. Mr. Robinson continued that Manafort Brothers also operated a construction storage facility in Hartford even after the city had asked them to stop and they were illegally providing services to CRRA with overloaded trucks. Mr. Robinson commented that CRRA had enough problems of its own without continuing to associate with companies that operated illegally.

### **APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 13, 2002 SPECIAL BOARD MINUTES**

Chairman Pace requested a motion to approve the minutes of the June 13, 2002 Special Board meeting. Director Knopp made the motion which was seconded by Director Martland.

Director Martland said that the word "Fourth" was incorrectly spelled "Forth" on the first page of the minutes.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

## **APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 20, 2002 REGULAR BOARD MINUTES**

Chairman Pace requested a motion to approve the minutes of the June 20, 2002 regular Board meeting. Director O'Brien made the motion which was seconded by Director Sullivan.

Director Cohn noted that the following statements should have been included in the multipart resolution on page 26 regarding Legal Services Agreements with Nixon Peabody, LLP, Cummings and Lockwood, LLC, and Cohn, Birnbaum and Shea to "Move forward with a broad RFP for all categories of counsel necessary to support CRRA except for bond counsel."

Director Mengacci noted that under "Public Portion" on page 7 of the minutes, the sentence should read "CWPM 'took' over operations" instead of "CWPM 'too' over operations."

Director Rifkin noted that the attendance on page 1 of the minutes should have shown that Director Ryan left the meeting at 12:30 p.m. Director Rifkin also said that under "Critical Issues and Corrective Actions" on page 28, it should be added that "Director Rifkin suggested that a record retention policy be added to the list of matters to address."

On page 20, Director O'Brien said that the sentence that read, "Several options had been examined, he said," should read, "Several options had been examined, Mr. Clark said." Director O'Brien said that the wording implied that he had made the comments when it was Mr. Clark who had responded to a question he had asked.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

## **FINANCE**

### **REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE REPORT FOR MAY 2002**

Ms. Bronisz distributed a handout regarding the Bridgeport and Southeast Projects Operating and Risk Reserves as of June 30, 2002.

Ms. Bronisz said that the projects for the month of May were operating with a surplus, except for Mid-Connecticut which was operating at a loss due to the absence of the Energy Capacity payment from Enron. The project incurred a \$2.1 million loss and was operating at the expected \$15.1 million loss for the fiscal year to date due to lower income interest income, greater than anticipated waste transport expenses and outstanding nonpayments from Enron which totaled \$17.1 million.

Ms. Bronisz stated that the Bridgeport project had a May operating surplus of \$89,000, but was operating fiscal year to date at a loss of \$1.5 million. The SNCR system being installed at the project was originally estimated at \$2.5 million and called for using \$1.9 million from the risk fund reserves and \$600,000 from the construction account in the Reserve Recovery Facility. The two amounts totaled \$2.5 million, she said.

Ms. Bronisz said that the cost of the SNCR system has been adjusted downward from \$2.5 million to \$2.1 million. The Authority was responsible for 80% of that cost, she said, which would be \$1.7 million. Ms. Bronisz continued that the \$600,000 from the construction account would still be used to pay the \$1.7 million, but the amount used from the risk reserve fund would be \$1.1 million instead of \$1.9 million. She noted that there was a savings of \$800,000 in the Bridgeport account.

Ms. Bronisz said that the Bridgeport project was operating at a \$1.5 million deficit. The budgeted use of retained earnings of \$675,000 would be booked in June, she explained, so the \$1.5 million deficit was actually \$846,000. Ms. Bronisz said that the reason for that deficit was that a much higher amount of interest income had been budgeted and interest rates had dropped significantly during the fiscal year. The estimate for the interest income was overbudgeted by \$468,000. In addition, she continued, there was a similar budget shortfall on recycling sales of \$355,000. The two amounts totaled \$823,000.

Director O'Brien asked how the cost of the SNCR system could have been so overbudgeted. Mr. Clark responded that there was some conservatism in the estimate and that CRRA relied on RESCO for the estimate as well. Mr. Clark said that staff did not know whether new air compressors or other equipment modifications would be needed or how the operation boilers would be affected. The estimate was driven off what had been expended at the Mid-Connecticut facility for the same installation, he explained, and since then installers of the SNCR systems had gained some knowledge and required less research.

Ms. Bronisz said that the Wallingford project continued to operate at a surplus. She said that the May surplus was \$464,000. Wallingford operated at a \$2.2 million surplus, she continued, which was due to an increase in waste deliveries and a decrease in the month of May in the amount of expenses paid to the operator. Ms. Bronisz added that overall the general administration expenses were lower than budgeted and that Wallingford continued to operate at a very healthy level.

Ms. Bronisz stated that the Southeast project operated at a surplus of \$14,000 during the month of May mainly due to higher member tipping fee revenues and increased revenues from spot deliveries due to waste diversion from Mid-Connecticut. There also were lower general administration expenses that contributed to the monthly surplus, she added.

Ms. Bronisz stated that the operating and risk reserve as of June was \$4.7 million. The Southeast project was operating at a \$1.2 million loss for the fiscal year to date. Ms. Bronisz said that \$935,000 would be used against that amount from the budgeted use of retained earnings which would be applied in June. The deficit then, she explained, would in actuality be approximately \$304,000. The major contributing factor towards that deficit, Ms. Bronisz continued, was the shortfall in interest income.

The Non-Project Ventures, Ms. Bronisz said, incurred a \$263,000 operating loss, but overall was running at a surplus of \$3.3 million to date. Ms. Bronisz explained that the loss for May was attributed to the monthly \$175,000 operation and maintenance fee which had not been received from Enron, coupled with lower than anticipated interest income.

Ms. Bronisz said that the Non-Project Ventures account was booked as a separate account and that, due to the shortfalls the Mid-Connecticut project was experiencing from the \$2.2 million loss in capacity payments, money was being transferred from the nonproject ventures account to the Mid-Connecticut operating account.

Director Sullivan commented that the Finance Committee was going to continue to study the issues concerning the Non-Project Ventures and Mid-Connecticut projects, taking into consideration the various financial alternatives available to the total enterprise. It was his view, Director Sullivan said, that the drill down would then fall to the individual projects.

Director Rifkin asked whether there was a transfer of assets from the Mid-Connecticut project to the Non-Project ventures fund and what those assets were. Chairman Pace responded that staff would provide him with the information.

#### **AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH SCILLIA DOWLING & NATARELLI, LLC REGARDING AUDITING SERVICES**

Chairman Pace requested a motion on the referenced topic. Director O'Brien made the following motion:

**RESOLVED:** That the Chairman is hereby authorized to enter into a contract with Scillia Dowling & Natarelli, formerly known as Simione, Scillia, Larrow & Dowling LLC, substantially in the form discussed at this meeting, for said firm to audit the financial statements of the Authority for the year ended June 30, 2002.

Director Cassano seconded the motion.

Director Sullivan said that the financial audit for fiscal year ending June 30, 2002 had to be submitted to the State by September 30, 2002. The Finance Committee felt that it was imperative to ask for an engagement letter from CRRA's incumbent audit firm to continue their work with CRRA for this particular audit. The audit firm had been without an agreement as of April 30, 2002, he said, and it was the Finance Committee's recommendation that CRRA engage Scillia Dowling & Natarelli to complete the audit. Director Sullivan noted that the fee expressed in the firm's engagement letter was \$24,000 for the June 30, 2002 audit.

Director Sullivan said that the Finance Committee would deal with the RFP process for three-year contracts in September.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

## **FISCAL YEAR 1998, 1999 & 2000 STATE AUDITORS REPORT**

Mr. Gendron referred to a letter included in the Board materials from former CRRA Chairman, Richard Belden, regarding the status report to the Auditor's of Public Accounts dated April 6, 2002. Mr. Gendron said that item number one which stated that "CRRA, in conjunction with the DEP, should produce the required annual reports for the inclusion in the Statewide Solid Waste Management Plan" was a closed matter until the DEP issued a Statewide Solid Waste Management Plan. There was nothing CRRA could do until that plan was issued, he explained.

Director O'Brien asked whether CRRA had provided the solid waste information to DEP in a timely manner so that the onus was fully on DEP and not jointly CRRA and DEP. Mr. Egan responded that CRRA has provided the DEP with all the solid waste management information they had asked for via permits and regulations.

Mr. Gendron said that item number two, which addressed internal controls over violation reports, was a closed matter. Mr. Gendron continued that item number three related to public notice requirements of various statutes. CRRA's in-house counsel had reviewed the statutes and the auditor's remarks, he said, and had instituted new internal procedures whereby all changes to the policy and procedures were noticed to the public and was a closed item. Item number four related to the appointment of Board members. Mr. Gendron said that the Governor's office in appointing the existing Board paid very careful attention to the appointment process rendering item number four a closed item. Item number five related to minutes for all committee minutes. Mr. Gendron said that effective July 2001, internal procedures were put in place and there were currently minutes for all committee meetings. Item number five was a closed matter, he noted.

Mr. Gendron said that item number six related to various set-aside provisions in the state statutes. Ms. Schmidt stated that the item was still being addressed. She said that CRRA had been out of compliance with the statutory requirements for a few years. Ms. Schmidt explained that an establishment of goals was necessary in conjunction with quarterly reports. The establishment goals were complex, she said, because they were a percentage of the budget. There were certain allowable exceptions and certain exceptions that required the approval of the DAS. Ms. Schmidt commented that four of the personnel that had worked on the item were no longer with CRRA and she has had to start from the beginning. She said that she was awaiting financial information in order to approach the DAS to determine exemptions and then calculate the goal of 25% of CRRA's budget. Ms. Schmidt said that the 25% accurately reflected what CRRA could put aside for the set-aside. Once that was achieved, Ms. Schmidt continued, the quarterly reports could then be fine-tuned. CRRA currently only had a yearly report, she added.

Director O'Brien said that, once Ms. Schmidt finished with the report, he would like to understand what impact the set-aside would have on the tip fees or other sources of revenue.

Chairman Pace said he would like to get some of the Board members' assistance in setting management goals. Ms. Schmidt added that there were also good faith efforts that would require CRRA to outreach to certain communities as part of the set-aside program. It should either be incorporated in the notice procedures or the bid process for certain contracts, she said.

Mr. Gendron said that item number seven pertained to the statutory requirement that for every employee over forty-five, CRRA had to show a reduction in consulting costs equal or greater to the cost of that employee. Mr. Gendron commented that a report has not been filed since the early nineties. Mr. Gendron noted three options: 1) obtain legislative revisions eliminating the requirement; 2) have fewer than 45 employees; 3) file a report.

Chairman Pace recommended that a report be filed if CRRA had 45 or more employees. Chairman Pace said that the cost benefit of adding or subcontracting to staff would be examined.

Mr. Gendron said that item number eight pertained to CRRA's past practice of entering into separation agreements with employees. Mr. Gendron explained that the auditors recommended that CRRA adopt a policy governing the use of separation agreements. The matter was referred to the Personnel Committee, he continued, and would be tabled until the next meeting. Mr. Gendron said that item number nine pertained to submittal of documentation supporting the amounts paid or expended under various contracts for goods and services. The Policies and Procurement Committee was doing a complete review and overhaul of the CRRA's procurement policies, he said. Additionally, Mr. Gendron continued, CRRA's outside auditing firm had been engaged to assist with examining payment controls.

Director Martland asked whether CRRA engaged in percentage holdbacks if a contractor was not in compliance. Chairman Pace replied that contracts usually allowed for a 10% holdback. Mr. Clark added that there are also provisions for construction performance bonds.

### **RFP FOR BOND COUNSEL SERVICES**

Ms. Bronisz said that the Finance Committee recommended placing an ad in "The Bond Buyer" and to make a reference in the ad that the RFP also would be available on the Authority's website or by calling the staff. Ms. Bronisz noted that as of July 16<sup>th</sup>, 23 firms had called to request the RFP for the bond counsel services. In addition, she said, a mailing to bond counsel firms that had generally recognized expertise in resource recovery and solid waste financing was also undertaken. Ms. Bronisz commented that there was no way to tell how many firms had actually hit the website since that technology was not in place. The RFPs were due on July 25<sup>th</sup>, she said.

Director Sullivan said that the Finance Committee felt that the RFP process for bond counsel was a role for their committee because it was so finance related in terms of activities that the bond counsel would have to perform on behalf of the Authority. Director Sullivan stated that the Finance Committee would hold a review of the firms that responded to the RFP on August 1st and a presentation from a reasonable number of firms would be held on August 5<sup>th</sup>. Director Sullivan added that the Finance Committee was going to be making a recommendation to the Board on August 15<sup>th</sup> so that appropriate action could be taken at the regular Board meeting on August 22<sup>nd</sup>.



Director Martland asked who the existing bond counsel was. Ms. Bronisz responded that CRRA at that time did not have one but bond counsel had been Hawkins, Delafield & Wood.

## **CHAIRMAN’S AND COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **ORGANIZATIONAL SYNERGY & HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

#### **RECRUITMENT PROCESS FOR PRESIDENT**

Chairman Pace requested a motion to move item seven, Organizational Synergy and Human Resources Committee, to item one on the agenda. The motion made by Director Cassano and seconded by Director O’Brien was approved unanimously.

Director Cassano said that Organizational Synergy and Human Resources Committee had recommendations on the table to start filling vacant positions in order to make changes within the organization and to strengthen and recognize the efforts made by existing employees. Director Cassano noted that a handout was available to the Board regarding the job description for the President of CRRA. Director Sullivan had done much of the work in identifying the items that needed to be addressed by the new President, Director Cassano said. The requirements were balanced between the need to work with the State Legislature, the need to work with staff and the need to work with the financial deficit. Director Cassano stated that it was the committee’s recommendation to immediately fill the position with a contract of 18 months to two years and would be renewable. It served the same purpose as hiring someone on an interim basis, he explained, but with the option to retain if the person was right for the job.

Director Cassano said that two search firms had been contacted to aid with the search. One of the firms had a contract to hire the chief financial officer, Director Cassano commented, and the other firm had a lot of experience in the area. Director Cassano stated that both firms felt that they could have a list of qualified candidates by the end of August. Director Cassano added that seven to ten applications had been sent in and other names had been suggested.

Chairman Pace said that using a headhunter would cast a wide net, perhaps beyond the Connecticut borders, in order to fully examine the talents available to the Authority.

Director O’Brien suggested that in the “Expected Results” section of the job description, the second item regarding minimizing the tip fee should include minimizing the tip fee levels and variability. Director O’Brien said that the tip fee levels should be smooth and not fluctuate up and down through the years.

Director Rifkin said that the Board was making a mistake if they were to market for a permanent president. Director Rifkin explained that he did not believe that the Board has had the discussions regarding the organization to determine what specific characteristics would be appropriate for the position. Director Rifkin continued that the Board has had only two full Board meetings and one special meeting and a discussion has not yet been had regarding what

the organizational needs were, where the organization has been and what the macro problems were. He said that he did not feel comfortable as a representative of the Treasurer to voice what CRRA needed and wanted for that position.

Director Rifkin added that, with all due respect to the search firms, it was his experience that finding and interviewing candidates for high-level executives in important positions took time. Director Rifkin commented that he did not believe that the search firms were going to have a full list by the end of August. Director Rifkin suggested that what CRRA needed was someone who was willing to come in on a temporary basis. Director Rifkin said that he had been told of retired executives who may be willing to take on the task for an interim basis and would not be interested in continuing as president beyond that timeframe.

Director Cassano said that the committee had examined the same concerns and discussions and he continued that five staff members had left key positions because they were looking for continuity and found it elsewhere. The staff needed true leadership, he said, and hiring someone for an 18-month contract, which could be interim with caveats in that contract for the potential of a renewal or dismissal, might bring much needed continuity.

Director Knopp asked Director Rifkin what timeframe he envisioned an interim person would serve. Director Rifkin said that he envisioned someone who would come on board for a minimum commitment of one year to eighteen months. Director Rifkin said that the Authority needed someone to come in as a change agent and that he differed in perspective in that he believed that there were candidates out there, who may not be interested in a long-term position, who had corporate management experience and would accept the challenge and work with the Board and the Steering Committee to be that change agent. Director Rifkin added that he was very dubious that an executive search firm would be able to find candidates as quickly as they had represented.

Director Knopp noted that one of his concerns was that the Board was being asked to take on a level of administrative detail that was simply unrealistic for a board to take on. Director Knopp said that the Authority needed to get leadership in place to take over all the administrative duties that has been given to the Board in order to provide the Board the opportunity to examine the bigger picture.

Director Martland said that the use of headhunter was unnecessary and that the Authority needed an administrator who could come on quickly and make recommendations and modifications to support the organization and its mission. Director Martland continued that he would add a caveat to give due consideration to someone who would be willing to fill the position on a temporary basis as a turn-around agent.

Director Cohn said that timing was critical and that the time it would take to perform the process for a permanent hire would put the Board in a position of having to write the report to the General Assembly at the end of 2002 with a president that had only arrived at that position. The Cibes committee, Director Cohn continued, identified one very credible candidate who could be immediately available to take on the task. Director Cohn commented that he did not

believe that the committee was looking at the candidate he was referring to. Director Rifkin said that that candidate, and the others who may be able to begin immediately, would be pivotal given the legislative deadline.

Director Cassano reiterated that his biggest concern was providing continuity and security to existing staff and an interim president would not send that message to them.

Director Knopp asked Director Rifkin what process he would suggest for finding an interim leader. Director Rifkin responded that there were several people who were available, lived in Connecticut and had management expertise who should be interviewed, keeping in mind the job description and criteria that has been written.

Director Knopp asked Director Cassano what direction he would give a search committee in terms of prime parameters. Director Cassano replied that the committee would try to limit the search to the New England area using regional papers and the internet, the resources in place with the two firms and the list that was at the time available to them. Director Cassano added that the committee would like to have a list of five candidates no later than the end of August.

Chairman Pace said that the Board disagreed with whether a short list of people who had previously been identified would be used or whether to go to a broader arena. The Personnel Committee would like to take advantage of the expertise of the search firms, he said, to examine those who have sent in unsolicited resumes and to search for qualified candidates that may not have had the opportunity to apply.

Director Cassano made the motion to authorize the Organizational Synergy and Human Resources Committee to engage a search firm to assist CRRA in the hiring of a president and for the committee to make recommendations to the Board of Directors.

Director O'Brien seconded the motion. Director Lauretti suggested that the motion be amended to go into executive session for the purpose of discussing the names of certain individuals regarding the presidency. The motion made by Director Martland and seconded by Director Lauretti was approved unanimously.

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

The Board meeting was recessed at 10:35 a.m. to convene an Executive Session to discuss matters related to the presidency.

The Executive Session began at 10:36 a.m.

The Executive Session concluded at 11:04 a.m.

Chairman Pace reconvened the Board meeting at 11:05 a.m.

Chairman Pace noted that no votes were taken in Executive Session.

### **RECRUITMENT PROCESS FOR PRESIDENT (CON'T)**

Chairman Pace said that the Board had confidence in the definition and descriptors that were offered in the president's position and with the Personnel Committee working with a consultant to do the background check on the candidates. Chairman Pace said that the Board was willing to authorize the Personnel Committee to advertise for the job of presidency; screen the candidates; have an outside consultant perform the background check; conduct the interview and bring qualified candidates to the Board. Chairman Pace continued that the timeframe for the employment was September 1<sup>st</sup>. Chairman Pace stated that, whether it was a short-term or permanent position, the contract would be for an 18-month to 2 years initial agreement with a possibility for renewal. Director Cassano added that the search would be local.

Director Lauretti made the motion to accept which was seconded by Director Rifkin and approved unanimously. Director O'Brien noted that this was a substitute motion from the one previously made.

### **DIRECTOR OF ACCOUNTING VACANCY**

Chairman Pace requested a motion on the referenced item. Director Francis made the following motion:

**RESOLVED:** that Nhan Vo-Le be promoted/reclassified to fill the Director of Accounting vacancy effective July 22, 2002, and that the Personnel Committee be authorized to establish a new salary range for her within the salary range of the position.

Director O'Brien seconded the motion.

Director Francis said that there was work to be done in the Finance Division regarding the audit and the existing employees had been performing those duties.

Director O'Brien asked how the candidate met the qualifications listed in the job description. Director Sullivan replied that Ms. Vo-Le was not a CPA but had hands-on experience and clear-cut understanding of what she was capable of. Director Sullivan commented that he has had discussions with Mr. Schuyler and Ms. Bronisz and they were positive of Ms. Vo-Le's capabilities to fill the position. Director Francis added that she had a Bachelor's degree and ten years experience. She had halfway completed her Master's degree, he said.

Director O'Brien asked what the salary range was for the position. Mr. Gendron replied that the position would be salary grade six with a range of \$45,000 to \$77,000.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

### **ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF ACCOUNTING VACANCY**

Chairman Pace requested a motion on the referenced item. Director Francis made the following motion:

**RESOLVED:** the advertising for the requirements of CRRA’s “Hiring, Compensation, Promotion and Dismissal Procedures” be waived in filling the Assistant Director of Accounting vacancy; and, be it further

**RESOLVED:** the vacancy in the Assistant Director of Accounting position be internally posted; and, be it further,

**RESOLVED:** the Organizational Synergy & Human Resources Committee be authorized to fill the vacancy through promotion of a qualified internal candidate and to establish a salary for the promoted employee within the salary range for the new position.

Director O’Brien seconded the motion.

Director O’Brien asked whether there would be a conflict with the Affirmative Action policy. Director Cassano responded that there would be no conflict.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

### **SENIOR COUNSEL VACANCY**

Chairman Pace requested a motion on the referenced item. Director Francis made the following motion:

**RESOLVED:** the Personnel Committee is authorized to fill the Senior Counsel vacancy.

Director O’Brien seconded the motion.

Director Laretti asked what the salary range was for the position. Chairman Pace replied that the applicants would have to be reviewed and that the committee would look for a candidate with environmental expertise. The salary grade would be examined and brought back through the Personnel Committee for recommendation, he said, and would then be referred to the Finance Committee allocate and identify the funds.

Director Laretti asked whether the Board would be part of the final approval of the individual. Chairman Pace replied that the Board would be notified of the selection. Chairman Pace explained that the Board had to approve to fill the position, but that there was an internal

process on filling those positions. The presidency was an exception, he said. Chairman Pace noted that the Board could be included in the whole process as a courtesy if that was their wish.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

### **BUDGET ANALYST POSITION**

The Chairman requested a motion on the referenced topic. Director Francis made the following motion:

**RESOLVED:** the vacant Senior Analyst position be transferred to the Finance Division; and, be it further

**RESOLVED:** the position be reclassified to Budget Analyst and the job description for the new position be approved; and, be it further

**RESOLVED:** the Personnel Committee is authorized to fill the vacancy.

Director O'Brien seconded the motion.

Chairman Pace said that part of the previous budget was moved from the Finance Division to the Operations Division. There would be a minor reorganization, he said, to move that position back to Finance with a connection back to Operations and the other departments.

Director O'Brien said that the job description should include involvement with the operating committees of the facilities. Director O'Brien said that the skills required knowledge of the operations and functions of the Authority and would favor someone internal.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

### **HUMAN RESOURCE ADMINISTRATOR VACANCY**

Chairman Pace requested a motion on the referenced topic. Director Francis made the following motion:

**RESOLVED:** the revised Human Resources Administrator job description be approved; and, be it further

**RESOLVED:** the Personnel Committee be authorized to fill the vacancy.

Director O'Brien said that the Human Resource Administrator job description also favored an internal candidate. He said that the Authority was advertising for and requiring applicants to know the CRRA policies and procedures before they apply. Director Francis said that he would amend the motion to say that the candidate should have knowledge of personnel

policies but not necessarily CRRA's. Director O'Brien suggested that a timeline be given for the individual to gain knowledge of the job requirements, but it should not be a requirement for the search.

Director Lauretti asked whether the position could be outsourced. Mr. Bessette replied that it would be very difficult to outsource the position with all of the ongoing and very specific projects throughout the year such as 401(k), affirmative action, flexible benefits and hiring. Mr. Bessette added that one of the important functions of his position was records management and updating personnel and ledger files. Outsourcing would not be effective, he said. Director O'Brien added that, given the concerns within the organization, it was important to have an in-house human resource person that the employees could go to rather than a contractor that they may have to call or visit at another location.

Director Martland asked whether payroll was handled internally. Mr. Bessette responded that it was done through ADP but that an in-house employee had to collect and transmit it to ADP to be processed.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved. Director Martland voted "nay."

#### **EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT VACANCY**

Director Francis said that the motion and recommendation of the committee was for authorization to fill the Executive Assistant if it became vacant and the incumbent did not return to full-time status in August. Director O'Brien seconded the motion.

Chairman Pace said that he was confident that the person was going to stay with CRRA.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

#### **AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM**

Chairman Pace requested a motion on the referenced item. Director Francis made a motion to designate the Director of Legal Services as the Director of Equal Employment Opportunity. The motion made and seconded by Director Martland was approved unanimously.

Director Francis made a motion to table the Affirmative Action Program as presented. Director O'Brien seconded the motion.

Director Francis said that the committee was examining the whole program and would present the matter on the agenda for discussion at the next Board meeting. Director Rifkin provided input to the committee regarding the draft document: 1) he said that he was not positive that the appropriate people in the organization were designated to be responsible for the

oversight and implementation of an Affirmative Action Program; 2) there should be some language within the document regarding the compliance for the set-aside program and goals within the agency to utilize minority and women-owned businesses, perhaps those that had been certified by the state through the Department of Administrative Services; 3) with respect to contractors and subcontractors, there should be a review of what requirements they should have regarding an Affirmative Action Program within their organization; and 4) affirmative goals and timetables should be outlined with respect to hiring practices and the various EOC classifications within CRRA.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

### **SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY**

Chairman Pace requested a motion on the referenced topic. Director Francis made the following motion:

**RESOLVED:** the CRRA Sexual Harassment Policy be adopted, substantially as presented at this meeting.

Director O'Brien seconded the motion.

Director O'Brien noted that the motion reflected the revision of existing names and positions in the document and did not imply that the Board had reviewed it thoroughly. The Board was approving the policy as stated, Director O'Brien said.

Director Rifkin asked why the Acting Finance Division Head was charged with overseeing the Sexual Harassment Policy. Director Francis replied that, in the absence of a Human Resource Administrator, somebody within the organization had to be designated. Director Rifkin asked whether Ms. Bronisz has had the necessary training in accepting and investigating sexual harassment complaints. Chairman Pace answered that training would be provided.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

### **EMPLOYMENT SEPARATION AGREEMENT POLICY**

Director Francis said that there was a substitute motion to table the reference item until the next Board meeting. The motion made and seconded by Director O'Brien was approved unanimously.



## **MISSION STATEMENT**

Chairman Pace said that one word was omitted from the first page, second bullet of the document. The sentence should include the word “soil” to read “standards for air, water, ‘soil’, solid waste and recycling.” Chairman Pace noted that the committee attempted to keep the Mission Statement short and very direct. It was a basic statement of what CRRA was about, he said.

Director Rifkin said that he appreciated the effort put forth in putting the Mission Statement together, but that he would have to vote no on it. Director Rifkin commented that he did not believe that the Board has had an opportunity to step back and discuss what the organization does and how it does it and where it should or should not be going.

Director Martland asked whether the statement could be modified. Chairman Pace said that the document was an indication of the philosophy but that it was also a living document and could be updated at any given time.

Director Martland suggested that the first bullet be placed last in order to set public policy and accountability as a priority.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved. Director Rifkin voted “nay.”

## **CORRESPONDENCE RELATED TO THE CHAIRMAN’S COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE STATE ETHICS COMMISSION**

Chairman Pace said that he had corresponded with Mr. Alan Plofsky, the Executive Director for the State Ethics Commission with regards to scheduling separate training sessions for the Board and staff. Chairman Pace asked that the Board members circle two or three of the suggested dates order to gather as many of them as possible for the training session. The session, he said, was approximately an hour and a half.

## **CORRESPONDENCE RELATED TO RECENT DISCUSSIONS WITH KEYSpan**

Chairman Pace said that he included materials on the referenced item to serve as an FYI to the Board. Chairman Pace stated that he had met with members of Keyspan to identify issues, identify costs relative to both parties and to review alternatives to litigation. Chairman Pace continued that he was working with staff in identifying damage and benefit costs.

## **CORRESPONDENCE TO RELATED TO RECENT DISCUSSIONS REGARDING THE COVANTA BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS**

Chairman Pace noted that this was again included as an FYI to the Board. Ms. Schmidt distributed a document from Cohen & Birnbaum to Mr. Clark requesting that CRRA join the Public Client's Working Group. The Public Client's Working Group was a group of creditors that were victims of the Covanta bankruptcy, she had, who ran waste-to-energy plants. They wanted to form a committee under the U.S. Trustee so that they would be kept aware of what was going on with Covanta, Ms. Schmidt explained. CRRA would like to be a part of that committee, she said.

## **FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT**

Director Sullivan noted that the minutes of the June 26, 2002 Finance Committee meeting was marked "Draft" because the minutes were not approved until the next Finance Committee meeting which occurred the day before the regular Board meeting. Director Rifkin commented that the approved minutes would be submitted to the Board to reflect his position that Ms. Schmidt should sit on the selection process for bond counsel, under legal matters.

## **POLICY AND PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE REPORT**

Director Cohn noted that the July 2, 2002 Policy and Procurement meeting minutes were unapproved and that, as a practice, he felt more comfortable if the unapproved minutes did not appear in the Board package as the approved minutes.

Director Cohn said that the committee had made some headway in rewriting the procurement procedures and would bring that item to the Board in the August meeting. The draft would be reviewed first internally by staff and then the committee and then the Board, Director Cohn noted.

Director Cohn said that he would like the Board to discuss the threshold for contracts that came to the Board as opposed to those that are approved by the president or staff. The amount had been \$50,000 and Director Cohn felt that it was not the right amount. The amount was higher than the other authorities, but Director Cohn explained that CRRA also engaged in a lot more of such contracts. Director Cohn said that the other two items that the committee was reviewing regarding the procurement procedures were the changes in the presumption of a competitive process, except where there were specific reasons not to engage in a competitive process and that the procedures outlined those specific reasons, and who would make the determination of such reasons. Director Cohn said that the Board would have to make a decision as to whether it would want to delegate such items to the committee or to the president.

## **LEGAL**

### **LEGAL SERVICES AGREEMENTS FOR CUMMINGS & LOCKWOOD AND COHN, BIRNBAUM & SHEA**

Ms. Schmidt said the documents were a follow-up to the Board's wishes at the June 20, 2002 meeting. The revised First Amendment to Legal Services Agreement with Cummings and Lockwood shortened the term of the underlying agreement from June 30, 2004 to August 31, 2002. Ms. Schmidt stated that the First Amendment to Legal Services with Cohn, Birnbaum & Shea shortened the term from November 30, 2002 to August 31, 2002.

## **PROJECT REPORTS**

Chairman Pace requested a motion to move from the Legal reports to the Project reports due to time constraints. The motion made by Director Knopp and seconded by Director O'Brien was approved unanimously.

## **BRIDGEPORT**

### **AGREEMENT WITH SUPERIOR WASTE DISPOSAL INC.**

Chairman Pace requested a motion on the referenced topic. Director O'Brien made the following motion:

**RESOLVED:** The Chairman, Vice Chairman, or President is authorized to enter into a First Amendment with Superior Waste Disposal Inc. substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions presented and discussed at this meeting.

Director Martland seconded the motion.

Mr. Clark explained that CRRA had an agreement with Superior Waste Disposal, Inc. to deliver all acceptable waste at the Stratford transfer station to CRRA's Bridgeport facility. Mr. Clark said that there has been a violation to that agreement and Superior has admitted to taking the waste out-of-state. Rather than going through a lengthy arbitration, Mr. Clark continued, Mr. Doyle, CRRA's in-house counsel, had worked on an agreement with Superior that was satisfactory to both parties. Mr. Clark stated that Superior would deliver 26,000 tons of commercial waste to the Bridgeport facility to make up for the tons exported out-of-state.

Director Lauretti asked whether the agreement required CRRA to raise the tip fee. Mr. Clark responded the agreement allowed CRRA to raise the tip fee. Mr. Clark added that Superior was going to be paying CRRA the incremental increase.

Director Knopp asked whether there was a connection between the shortfall within the recycling account shown in the Bridgeport plan with ADS and its successor's failure to abide by

its contracts. Ms. Schmidt replied that there was no connection.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

### **PURCHASE OF, AND SUBSEQUENT SALE OF LANDFILL GAS FLARES**

Mr. Egan noted that this was an FYI for the Board of Directors. Mr. Egan said that he had advised Chairman Pace that CRRA had an opportunity to purchase a used landfill gas flare and in turn sell it for a profit.

Mr. Egan said that, three years prior, the DEP had ordered CRRA to install two landfill gas flares, a primary and backup, to operate for an interim period of time until CRRA could permit and install a permanent landfill gas flare. The permanent flare was installed and operating and CRRA no longer had a need to employ the two temporary flares. Mr. Egan stated that the subsidiary had offered CRRA an option to buy the flares at a buy-out price of approximately \$14,000 and \$15,136 with a spare blower. Mr. Egan continued that Waste Management of New Hampshire had inspected the unit and offered to buy it for \$45,000.

Director Lauretti suggested that the Authority retain at least one of the flares in the event that there may be a need for it. Mr. Egan replied that that option was considered, but that the temporary flares did not meet the best available control technology. It could not be employed at one of the landfills, he explained, because the DEP would not allow it. The only time it could be employed would be during a catastrophic event in which case the DEP may allow the use of the flare on an emergency, temporary basis. Mr. Egan stated that in event of a catastrophic incident, CRRA could lease a unit on a temporary basis to comply with a DEP order.

Chairman Pace said that staff would evaluate the situation and make a decision regarding the second flare unit.

### **LANDFILL SURFACE MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS AT THE SHELTON LANDFILL**

Mr. Egan said that there was a need to conduct repairs to the land surface of the Shelton landfill using the one of the on-call contractors. Mr. Egan said that staff has developed a scope of work and solicited proposals. Three companies gave proposals, he noted, with Infantino Property Services being the lowest with \$54,000. Mr. Egan commented that staff was comfortable utilizing Infantino for the project.

Director Martland asked whether the range in prices could be due the way the specs were written. Mr. Egan responded that the highest bidder of the three companies was Park Trucking. He said that Park Trucking was essentially an on-call manager for the Shelton landfill and had historically done a lot of work at the site. The bid indicated that history, Mr. Egan explained. Earth Tech, the second highest bidder, was a much larger company than Infantino with more

overheads. Mr. Egan informed the Board that Infantino Property Services was a small business with a small staff which partly explained the discrepancy in price.

## **MID-CONNECTICUT**

### **ADOPTION OF THE MID-CONNECTICUT PROJECT PERMITTING, DISPOSAL, AND BILLING PROCEDURES**

Chairman Pace requested a motion on the referenced topic. Director O'Brien made the following motion:

**RESOLVED:** The Board of Directors hereby approves to adopt the Mid-Connecticut Project Permitting, Disposal, and Billing Procedures substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions discussed at this meeting.

Director Knopp seconded the motion.

Chairman Pace noted that a copy of the Public Notice was included with the document to illustrate to the Board that the procedure was being followed, as recommended by the auditor's report of the previous year.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

## **AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH CWPM, LLC**

Chairman Pace requested a motion on the referenced topic. Director O'Brien made the following motion:

**RESOLVED:** The Chairman, Vice Chairman, or President is authorized to enter into an agreement with CWPM, LLC substantially in accordance with the terms presented and discussed at this meeting.

Director Sullivan seconded the motion.

Mr. Clark said that CRRA had a contract with CWPM to deliver approximately 50,000 tons of waste from the New Haven transfer station to either the Bridgeport or the Mid-Connecticut project. That contract has expired, he stated, and CWPM did not want to enter into a new agreement indicating that market rates yielding better deals. Mr. Clark continued that CWPM was willing to enter into a spot waste agreement under which additional waste could be accepted from New Haven if waste was needed in order to maximize revenues from tip fees and electricity. It was a mutual agreement, he stated, and CWPM could either say yes or no to the bringing waste to CRRA facilities.

Director O'Brien asked whether CWPM could dispose of waste at a CRRA facility without being called upon to deliver waste. Mr. Clark replied that unless CRRA had a need for nonmember waste, CWPM would have to take its waste elsewhere.

Director Rifkin asked what would happen if CRRA needed waste but CWMP could not provide it. Mr. Clark responded that they would go down the list. Mr. Clark said that agreements had already been signed with the other listed entities and the agreement that the Board was being asked to vote on was to add CWPM to that list.

Director Rifkin asked whether staff was confident that the waste could be identified as nonmember waste in case someone tried to sell member waste as spot waste. Mr. Clark answered that loads would be inspected to verify that they did not contain member waste. Mr. Clark added that a hauler would have to pay the incrementally higher tip fee and receive a fine if their spot waste was identified to be generated from within the boundaries of a participating town.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

#### **AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH THE BRISTOL RESOURCES RECOVERY FACILITY OPERATING COMMITTEE**

Chairman Pace requested a motion on the referenced topic. Director O'Brien made the following motion:

**RESOLVED:** The Chairman, Vice Chairman, or President is authorized to enter into an agreement with the Bristol Resources Recovery Facility Operating Committee substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions presented and discussed at this meeting.

Director Martland seconded the motion.

Mr. Clark explained that this agreement would allow CRRA to send waste to the Bristol Resources Recovery Facility in case of an overflow instead of sending the waste out-of-state. It was the best and cheapest alternative, Mr. Clark said, and would keep trucks off the road.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

#### **ELLINGTON TRANSFER STATION 938 LOADER**

Mr. Clark said that rebuilding the loader was an expenditure of \$19,000 that would be paid for out of the Rolling Stock Reserve Fund. Mr. Romano noted that the unit was a 1993 Caterpillar 938 Loader used exclusively at the Ellington transfer station. A full engine reconditioning and other repairs to the unit was determined by H.O. Penn and by rebuilding the

loader it would save the Authority money on having to purchase a new one. Mr. Romano stated that purchasing a new unit would cost approximately \$430,000 while rebuilding a piece of equipment would cost approximately \$170,000. There was a very aggressive maintenance program, Mr. Romano added, which allowed the continued use of the equipment.

Director O'Brien asked what function the Lennox Group had in the project and what they were getting paid for it. Mr. Romano replied that the Lennox Group monitored all of Mid-Connecticut's Rolling Stock and establish maintenance programs that would give longevity to the equipment. They gave reports on the condition of the equipment, how it was being maintained and what adjustments could be made in the maintenance area to increase the longevity of the equipment, he said. Mr. Romano continued that the original cost on an annual basis was \$125,000. The prior year's cost was \$100,000, he said, without establishing a new contract with them for the coming year.

Director O'Brien asked whether it would be opened to competitive bidding. Mr. Romano replied that it would be.

## **WALLINGFORD**

### **APPROVAL TO ADOPT THE WALLINGFORD PROJECT PERMITTING, DISPOSAL, AND BILLING PROCEDURES**

Chairman Pace requested a motion on the referenced topic. Director O'Brien made the following motion:

**RESOLVED:** The Board of Directors hereby approves to adopt the Wallingford Project Permitting, Disposal, and Billing Procedures substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions presented and discussed at this meeting.

Director Sullivan seconded the motion.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING AT THE FORMER BARBARINO PROPERTY FY'03**

Mr. Egan said that there was a 50-acre parcel of land directly south of the Wallingford landfill under which leachate plume that emanated from the Wallingford landfill has migrated. CRRA's lease with the Town of Wallingford obligated CRRA to take responsibility for any off-site plume. Stephen Barberino owned the parcel, he said, but was purchased by CRRA in September of 2001. CRRA purchased the property so that it could control the leachate plume. Mr. Egan explained that it was an obligation in the environmental rules of the State of Connecticut for anyone who had or intended to obtain a groundwater discharge permit, which

CRRA was obligated to have at the Wallingford landfill.

Mr. Egan said that he had asked the contractor who had been doing the monitoring and had been employed by the former property owner for a cost proposal for FY03 and he also obtained a cost proposal from Environmental Risk Limited. The monitoring included evaluations on a quarterly basis and taking samples from the groundwater wells and surface water points. Mr. Egan continued that they would be transporting it all to an analytical laboratory and managing the analytical procedures and reporting the results to the Connecticut DEP and CRRA.

Mr. Egan said that he intended to contract with Environmental Risk Limited for \$36,000.

Director O'Brien asked how long the term period of the contract would be. Mr. Egan replied that it would be for a one-year term.

## **PROJECT REPORTS**

### **MONTHLY OPERATIONS**

Mr. Fancher said that in Bridgeport the SNCR system had come on-line and had been through full testing. There was a complete plant shutdown to replace one of the main step-down transformers, he said.

Mr. Fancher said that Mid-Connecticut was down in all categories from the previous 12 months. He explained that dry weather and required boiler maintenance were factors.

Mr. Fancher said that Southeast had a very good year. The installation of a new mercury control system was complete and was meeting the new standards very easily.

Mr. Fancher said that Wallingford also had a very good year. The processed tons were down again in the project, he commented, due to dry waste.

### **MONTHLY CUSTOMER DELIVERY REPORT**

Mr. Constable said that the report showed the incoming waste flows for each project. Mid-Connecticut was up three percent and Bridgeport was up one and a half percent. Mr. Constable pointed out that all of the projects were down in deliveries in the month of June. It was due partly to lack of rainfall and was an indication that the economy may be slowing down.



## **RECYCLING**

### **MID-CT RECYCLING**

Mr. Gaffey said that as a follow up to his presentation to the Board at the June 2002 meeting, he has included a scope of services provided by the engineering firm of DMJM & Harris for review. Mr. Gaffey said that the commingled container recycling and paper recycling facilities were operated by two separate vendors and those agreements would expire in May of 2003. Staff had been exploring different options to reduce costs and achieve economies of scale, he said. Mr. Gaffey stated that operating with one vendor would clearly achieve cost savings. Mr. Gaffey recommended that CRRA evaluate bringing the operations of both paper and containers on its own property instead of operating at two different facilities with two different vendors. An engineering study as described in the scope accompanied in Tab 8 would be needed, he said. Mr. Clark stated that Mr. Tracey has recommended that the Harris Group conduct the study at a total of \$29,400.

Director O'Brien asked what other options were available and what the timeframe was for consolidating and presenting the options and recommendation to the Board. Mr. Gaffey said that the timeframe for the engineering evaluation was four weeks and would be ready for the September Board meeting. Mr. Gaffey continued that the other option was to remain conducting the operations at 123 Murphy Road.

### **FAIRFIELD ELECTRONICS RECYCLING & MERCURY COLLECTION PROGRAM**

Mr. Gaffey said that CRRA had a very successful electronics collection and recycling program. Mr. Gaffey added that the Southwest area of the state and the Mid-Connecticut region were very happy with the program.

Director O'Brien commented that the program was not only popular but also necessary.

## **GENERAL**

### **AUTHORIZATION REGARDING PART TIME CIO AND IT SUPPORT SERVICES REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL**

Chairman Pace requested a motion on the referenced topic. Director O'Brien made the following motion:

**RESOLVED:** That the Chairman of the Authority be, and hereby is, authorized to issue on behalf of the Authority, the Request for Proposal for Computer Outsourcing Services, substantially in the form presented and discussed at this meeting.

Director Francis seconded the motion.

Mr. Gendron said that he had presented a draft RFP for the Board's review at the previous meeting in order to go out to bid for part-time CIO services. The RFP had undergone some review and revisions, Mr. Gendron said, and an authorization from the Board was needed to proceed with the RFP.

Director Sullivan commented that this was a very reasonable approach both in terms of the financial ramifications and the process undergoing. Director Sullivan said that it would allow integration of work that Mr. Gendron was undertaking with the financial reporting.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

### **AUTHORIZATION REGARDING THE PUBLICATION OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR INSURANCE CONSULTING AND BROKER SERVICES**

Chairman Pace requested a motion on the referenced topic. Director O'Brien made the following motion:

**RESOLVED:** that the Board of Directors has reviewed the Request for Proposals for Insurance Consulting and Broker Services and hereby authorizes its publication in the form as presented at this meeting.

Director Sullivan seconded the motion.

Mr. Gendron said that at the previous Board meeting, the Board extended the existing insurance brokerage arrangement with Marsh USA by six months at the cost of \$54,000. The intention of that extension, Mr. Gendron explained, was to give staff time to focus on the process and review the draft RFP. Comments by Directors Cohn and Francis were incorporated in the RFP and would need authorization from the Board to proceed with the process.

Director Martland asked whether staff was going to address direct writers, niche carriers and the excess market. Ms. Martin replied that the excess market would definitely be addressed. Ms. Martin added that CRRA's insurance was very complicated and would not get a better price if nondirect writers were utilized.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved. Director Martland abstained from the vote.

**LEGAL (CON'T)**

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

The Board meeting was recessed at 1:08 p.m. to convene an Executive Session to discuss legal matters. Chairman Pace requested that Ms. Schmidt remain during the Executive Session.

The Executive Session began at 1:10 p.m.

The Executive Session concluded at 2:29 p.m.

Chairman Pace reconvened the Board meeting at 2:30 p.m.

Chairman Pace noted that no votes were taken in Executive Session.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Pace requested a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion to adjourn was made by Director O'Brien and seconded by Director Cooper. The motion made and seconded was approved unanimously.

There being no other business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 2:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Angelica Mattschi  
Corporate Secretary to the Board

**CONNECTICUT RESOURCES RECOVERY AUTHORITY**

**EXECUTIVE SESSIONS**

**JULY 18, 2002**

Executive Sessions, called for the purposes of discussing legal issues and some personnel matter, were convened at 10:36 a.m. and 1:10 p.m.

**DIRECTORS**

Chairman Pace  
Director Cohn  
Director Martland  
Director Rifkin  
Director Cassano (absent for some)  
Director Francis  
Director Knopp (absent for some)  
Director Sullivan  
Director Cooper  
Director Mengacci (absent for some)  
Director Lauretti  
Director O'Brien

**STAFF**

Ann Stravalle-Schmidt

**A.G.'S OFFICE**

Theodore Doolittle (absent for some)  
Clare Kindall (absent for some)

No votes were taken in Executive Session.

The Executive Sessions adjourned at 11:04 a.m. and 2:29 p.m.