

Stormwater Consortium Meeting Minutes:

Meeting Date: January 19, 2010, 2pm to 3:30 pm at CCE, Stony Point NY:

Present: Frank Fleischer, Rockland County Drainage Agency; Charles Sawicki, Village of Suffern; Doris Ulman, Village of Chestnut Ridge and Village of Pomona; Vin Morgan, Village of Upper Nyack; Ron Delo, Town of Orangetown; Mike Sadowski, town of Ramapo; Joe Caruso, Town of Haverstraw; Manny Carmona, Village of Spring Valley, Dennis Letson; Chuck Stead, Cornell Cooperative Extension of Rockland, and Dana Treacy, Cornell Cooperative Extension of Rockland.

Meeting opened with a vote on accepting minutes from the December meeting, this was set in motion by Ron Delo and seconded by Vin Morgan. The vote was in favor with one abstention by Doris Ulman. Chuck then announced a reminder that Barbara Kendall was coming for a seminar on Inspection and Enforcement of Construction Activities for Storm Water Management on the 26th of the month. He then introduced the first item on the agenda concerning a contract review.

Contract Review:

Chuck initiated a discussion about CCE not billing for any of the 2009 round given the less than stellar list of accomplishments and then talked about the awkwardness of the billing system coming in toward the end of the round usually near to the last two months of the cycle. He proposed that CCE not bill for this last round, write in a few changes to the next contract that would include a line for representatives and alternates, send out a cover letter explaining this with the new contracts and a new set of deadlines toward getting the billing and contract approvals in line. Doris Ulman thought this was an okay idea and suggested that billing go out with the contracts. Ron Delo agreed to this and suggested that the cover letter fully explain that payment for the 2009 contracts would now be exempt. Mike Sadowski also agreed to this so it was put to a vote and approved.

Representative/Alternate Discussion:

Given that Chuck brought up the placement of representatives (reps) and alternates (alts) into the annual contracts (as opposed to the intra-municipal agreements as originally done) there was now a discussion on this topic. Doris liked the idea that reps and alts would now be updated in the annual contracts. Vin Morgan expressed some concern that alternates may fall into an officer's position if a designated representative was frequently absent at the meetings. Ron suggested that this be worked out by the village or town board in terms of the kind of authority a municipality granted to an alternate. Dana Treacy argued that the association would need to be clear as to what limits were to be placed on an alternate. This then brought the group into a discussion of the authority of rep and alt voting power. Vin argued that voting power is established by rep and alt presence at the time of the vote. Dana reminded the group that this would have to do with the preparation for the vote, in other words assuming a vote was coming in the next meeting an alternate would need some preparation in advance of that vote in order to properly represent his/her municipality. This discussion turned into a further discussion about the by-laws.

By-Laws:

Doris agreed with Dana about the preparation required for a vote and suggested that a notice of any pending vote be sent out fourteen days in advance of that notice. While there was some discussion about the wording of such an addition to the by-laws it was scuttled by a further discussion brought on by Doris who was concerned about the quorum issue, this being the business of towns having a there vote power and villages having a one vote power (See Consortium Minutes Dec. 15, page 2 under Town and Village Membership Status). Ron argued that the group was now revisiting something that only complicates matters and wanted to move on. It was motioned that the By-Laws be accepted as they stand and if necessary they can be amended later on. This vote was unanimous. Despite having voted on this a discussion on officer requirements led the group back into voting ratio.

Voting Ratio:

Mike expressed concern about the pool of talent that may or not be available for officer positions. Ron suggested that pulling officers from the reps would be the first choice and if that did not suffice another strategy would be needed. Doris returned to the voting and quorum issue. Mike went over the how the By-Law Committee came to their Town-3 votes and Village-1 vote ratio. Doris indicated some villages were bigger than towns but despite that fact if five towns call a meeting and vote on something they could actually exempt the villages in the process. She argued that the voting ratio should be 1 to 1 but now Mike argued that more villages joining in could weigh out the 3 to 1 ratio. He believed that towns shelter villages and he described this as their geographical relationship, he believed because of this towns tend to work in the interest of the villages. Dennis pointed out that if towns were reduced to one vote that too would present an inequality. Ron said that this notion of towns vs. villages was not the issue and that to keep it from being an issue it should be decided upon that any vote must include an accepted upon ratio of town and village participation. Dennis suggested six villages and three towns need to participate but Mike argued against this as it still presented an imbalance. Vin expressed a desire to keep the ratio as it was written in the by-laws. Charles agreed and expressed that it was up to the Board at the time of any voting procedure to make whatever arrangements it saw fit to police the process fairly. Manny agreed with this and wanted to keep the ratio as currently expressed in the by-laws. Ran agreed to this and here the discussion ended but no formal vote was taken on this matter.

New Time Line:

Chuck suggested a time line as follows: He will send out a 2010 contract with a cover letter explaining the exemption payment for 2009, as well as a bill for 2010 by the end of the month. *By the end February we want to have the 2010 contracts signed and sent back to CCE with checks for the 2010 period to follow by the end of March. At the March meeting a vote can be held to accept the By-Laws formally, a nominating committee can be formed and at the April meeting a vote for officers can be held.*

The Money:

Chuck asked the question of how members felt about any potential funds coming back to Consortium from the DEC (he expressed that he thought this goes back three years

running). Mike believes that the Consortium members have a chance at getting some of these funds, as he believes that it is only the groups who are out in the forefront who will be in the running for this. He believed that as the group formalizes its structure and continues to report on its activities it makes a stronger argument for these funds. Frank pointed out that this project would not be the only project in the state that went unfunded. Ron indicated that the First Round (being Round Eight) requests were going in next week according to Jim Dean.

Close of the Meeting:

At the end of the meeting Mike reminded everyone that the annual report summary was due in March. Ron indicated that the group should be getting copies of audits. Mike asked if Barbara was adding a question sheet to her presentation. I said I did not know but either way I would be adding an evaluation sheet which would be suitable for a record of participation if that was what he wanted. With that the meeting ended.