

**CONNECTICUT RESOURCES RECOVERY AUTHORITY**

**THREE HUNDRED FORTY-SEVENTH MEETING**

**AUGUST 15, 2002**

A regular meeting of the Connecticut Resources Recovery Authority Board of Directors was held on Thursday, August 15, 2002 at the 211 Murphy Road, Hartford. Those present were:

Chairman Michael A. Pace

Directors:

Benson Cohn (Present by phone for part of the meeting)  
Theodore Martland  
Catherine Boone (delegate for Director Nappier)  
Stephen Cassano (left at 12:27 p.m.)  
James Francis  
Andrew Sullivan (left at 11:35 a.m.)  
Mark Cooper  
John Mengacci (delegate for Director Ryan)  
Mark Lauretti (arrived at 9:15 a.m.)  
Raymond O'Brien  
R. Christopher Blake (arrived at 10:30 a.m.)

Directors Knopp, Rifkin, 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  
Christopher May, Systems Analyst  
Robert Constable, Senior Analyst  
Michael Tracey, Director of Civil & Construction Engineering  
Christopher Fancher, Facilities Engineer  
Virginia Raymond, Project Analyst

Others in attendance were: Paul Rachmuth of Anderson Kill; George Sparks of MDC; William H. Bright of Cummings and Lockwood; Jerry Tyminski of SCRRA; Theodore Doolittle and Clare Kindall of the Attorney General's Office; John Maulucci of BRRFOC; Joyce Tenor of HEJN; Barry Zitser of Perakos & Zitser, P.C.; George McKee of Legislative Program Review; and John A. Alexander.

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. George Sparks, Chief Executive Officer of the Metropolitan District Commission, introduced himself. He said that he, along with the Chairman of the MDC, Mr. Albert Reichin, met with Chairman Pace on August 12, 2002 to begin the dialogue to try and resolve differences between the two organizations. Mr. Sparks stated that he believed the meeting was productive and the two entities would continue to meet to address important issues. Mr. Sparks said that it was both Chairman Pace and Chairman Reichin's hope that the discussions would lead the way to advancing the relationship between CRRA and MDC to best serve member municipalities.

Chairman Pace agreed that the meeting was productive and that more meetings would be scheduled to continue to build a bridge to reconnect the organizations for a better relation in the future. Chairman Pace thanked both gentlemen for attending the meeting on August 12, 2002.

Mr. John A. Alexander from 12 Lord Meadow Lane in Old Lyme introduced himself and noted that he was present at the July 18, 2002 Board meeting with a series of questions. He said that he would like to ask the CRRA staff to respond to the questions.

Mr. Alexander asked whether the Non-Project Ventures account had been closed. Chairman Pace replied that the Non-Project Ventures account had not been closed, but that it was a part of the Mid-Connect project on both expense and revenue. Mr. Alexander asked whether that included the revenue from the operation of the gas turbine. Chairman Pace replied that it did. Mr. Alexander also inquired whether the Board would consider applying the balance in the Non-Project Ventures account to maintain last year's tipping rates as long as that balance sustained that expenditure. Chairman Pace responded that the balances were being used to reduce the cost to the Mid-Connecticut project.

## **APPROVAL OF THE JULY 18, 2002 REGULAR BOARD MINUTES**

Chairman Pace requested a motion to approve the minutes of the July 18, 2002 regular Board meeting. Director O'Brien made the motion which was seconded by Director Cassano.

Director Mengacci noted that on page 7, third paragraph of the minutes, the last sentence should read "Item number five related to minutes for all committee meetings." The last word "minutes" was replaced with "meetings." On page 8, Director Mengacci noted that in the first paragraph, second sentence, the word "ha" should have been "had."

Director Martland noted that on page 8 where he asked a question regarding percentage holdbacks, he was referring to the 2% withheld after the project had been completed and during warranty period.

Director O'Brien asked whether the report on the number of employees had been prepared. Chairman Pace replied that it was being prepared.

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

The Board meeting was recessed at 9:10 a.m. to convene an Executive Session to discuss legal reports. Chairman Pace requested that Ms. Schmidt stay during the executive session and that Mr. Zitser, Mr. Rachmuth, Mr. Doolittle, and Mr. Bright be brought in as needed for each of the items on the legal reports. The motion to go into Executive Session made by Director Cooper and seconded by Director Cassano was approved unanimously.

The Executive Session began at 9:10 a.m.

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

Chairman Pace reconvened the Board meeting at 11:12 a.m.

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

Chairman Pace requested a motion to rearrange the agenda in order to cover Board action materials first. Director Martland made the motion which was seconded by Director O'Brien. The motion made and seconded was approved unanimously.

## FINANCE

### BOND COUNSEL RFQ SELECTION PROCESS

#### AGREEMENT WITH SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP

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

**RESOLVED:** That the Chairman, Vice Chairman or President is hereby authorized to enter into a Legal Services Agreement with Sidley Austin Brown & Wood, LLP, substantially in the form discussed in this meeting.

Director O'Brien seconded the motion.

Director Sullivan thanked members of the Finance Committee, specifically Directors Boone, Cohn, Lauretti, Mengacci, and O'Brien and Mr. Clark and Mr. Doyle for their assistance with the RFQ and selection process for bond counsel. Director Sullivan said that two sessions were held. The first was on August 1<sup>st</sup> and involved the 13 firms that responded to the RFQ, and the second on August 5<sup>th</sup> involved a narrowed down list of the strongest candidates. Director Sullivan said that the Committee was ready to present the recommended firms to the Board for approval. The Committee agreed to engage a Connecticut-only firm to handle CRRA-specific matters and thereby become more efficient in the use of a nationally recognized firm. Director Sullivan said that it was important to retain a nationally recognized firm because it added credibility to CRRA's financing packages. If CRRA were to go out for a refunding or refinancing its indentures, he continued, the reputation of a national firm would enhance that process both in terms of marketability to the various bond holders and presumably helpful in terms of CRRA's rating. Director Sullivan added that the firm also agreed that they would stay within the \$400 per hour parameter when involved in specific projects such as a refunding.

Director Sullivan noted that a subcommittee consisting of himself and Directors Lauretti and Boone was charged with the responsibility of negotiating a fee structure with the national firm. Rates were running from a high of \$400 per hour to a low of \$175 per hour. Director Sullivan commented that CRRA would most likely be blending in around \$350 per hour depending on the type of work involved. Director Sullivan stated that CRRA's prior history had been with Hawkins Delafield and they were paid approximately \$158,267 in FY1999, \$2,888 in FY2000, \$271,754 in FY2001. Those years were tied to some of CRRA's refundings, he added. Director Sullivan said that they were paid \$79,700.97 in FY2002 and that there was also an invoice for \$86,000 that had not yet been paid.

Director Sullivan said that four attorneys from Sidley Austin made a presentation and each indicated both their backgrounds and their commitment and willingness to understand CRRA's business. Director Sullivan said that Mr. Frank Robinson, the lead attorney, agreed that in no case would the blended rate exceed \$400 per hour for their services. Further, Director Sullivan added, Mr. Robinson had indicated to him without compensation that they would bring

themselves up to speed with CRRA indentures and background information at their own investment. Director Sullivan said that they had already been through a whole series of Board minutes and that it was a good indication of their professionalism and willingness to commit to the organization.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

### **AGREEMENT WITH PULLMAN & COMLEY, LLC**

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

**RESOLVED:** That the Chairman, Vice Chairman, or President is hereby authorized to enter into a Legal Services Agreement with Pullman & Comley, LLC, substantially in the form as discussed in this meeting.

Director O'Brien seconded the motion.

Director Sullivan said that the Committee relied heavily on advice from Directors Rifkin and Boone who had done a lot of work with various firms through the Treasurer's office and Director Lauretti who had been involved in bond activities through his work as the Mayor of Shelton.

Director Francis asked whether the bond counsel agreements for both firms were the same. Director Boone replied that there was only one contract and that the only things negotiable on that contract were the fees.

Director Mengacci noted that the two firms, Sidley Austin Brown & Wood and Pullman & Comley, had worked together in the past in the exact same capacity as needed by CRRA on a national and state level on behalf of the Treasurer's Office. Director Mengacci said that information did not enter into the decision but was coincidental. The two firms had a very good, professional working relationship, he said.

Chairman Pace said that it was important to mention that the Treasurer's Office and OPM were part of the selection process.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

## OPERATIONAL REPORTS

### BRIDGEPORT

#### AGREEMENT WITH THE TOWN OF WILTON FOR WASTE TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

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

**RESOLUTION:** The Chairman, Vice Chairman, or President is authorized to enter into an agreement with the Town of Wilton substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions presented and discussed at this meeting.

Director Cooper seconded the motion.

Mr. Clark said that CRRA was responsible for the transportation component of getting the waste from the Wilton transfer station to the Bridgeport project. Wilton was the lowest bidder, he said, and staff would recommend that Wilton be allowed to continue to haul waste from the Wilton transfer station to the Norwalk transfer station and ultimately the Bridgeport facility.

Director Lauretti asked why Wilton did not go directly to the Bridgeport facility and whether there were additional costs associated with going from Norwalk to Bridgeport. Mr. Clark replied that the Town of Wilton did the hauling and they wanted to go to Norwalk instead of directly to the facility. It did not cost CRRA extra monies for the transfer, he said. Mr. Clark explained that the cost was embedded within the contract with Wheelabrator for the overall system operation. The cost would be borne by Wheelabrator, he continued, and would not get passed on to CRRA because there were no additional per ton fees for the tons that they hauled from the transfer stations.

Director Boone asked how the referenced item related to the existing rate for waste transportation services. Mr. Constable responded that it was several dollars less. The existing rate that CRRA was paying was \$12.95 per ton, and the Wilton bid came in at \$9.50 per ton. Director Boone asked whether the \$12 rate included the premium to Norwalk. Mr. Constable replied that it did not and that it was purely a transportation cost.

Director O'Brien asked whether the contract with Wilton imposed a cost on the rest of the CRRA towns because of the indirect route to the facility. Chairman Pace replied that page 2 of the document illustrated an estimated \$30,258 savings by awarding the contract to transport waste from Wilton to the Norwalk transfer station. Director Boone asked whether the savings included the transportation to Bridgeport. Mr. Constable replied that CRRA had a contract with Wheelabrator RESCO that obligated them to provide transportation and operation of the project transfer stations. They were responsible for the cost of transportation from the Norwalk transfer

station to the project, he said. Mr. Clark added that if CRRA transported directly to the facility, Wheelabrator, not the project, would save money.

The motion made and seconded was approved unanimously.

### **AGREEMENT WITH WASTE MANAGEMENT OF CONNECTICUT FOR WASTE TRANSPORTATION SERVICES**

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 Waste Management of Connecticut substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions presented and discussed at this meeting.

Director Lauretti seconded the motion.

Mr. Clark explained that CRRA transported the Town of Weston's Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) from the local transfer station to the Bridgeport project. Mr. Clark said that the agreement would allow CRRA to go directly to the plant instead of transporting the MSW from Weston to Norwalk. Mr. Clark stated that Norwalk would lose out on the \$1.41 subsidy for handling the extra waste, or approximately \$7,000 per year. Chairman Pace noted that the Board would act in the opposite direction as the Town of Wilton Waste Transportation Services Agreement, but that this agreement had a negative impact on cash to the Town of Norwalk.

Chairman Pace said that the referenced item directly related to Director Knopp's town but that he was not present at the meeting. Mr. Clark said that Director Knopp requested that the referenced item be postponed until he had the opportunity to speak with his Public Works director, who was on vacation.

Director Mengacci asked whether there were any risks in tabling the item. Mr. Clark replied that there was a slight risk because the 120-day window that Waste Management gave CRRA for their bid would expire and Waste Management may not honor an extension for one month with the lower prices. Director O'Brien asked when the bid from Waste Management would expire. Mr. Clark replied that Waste Management would hold the bid until the end of August. He added that Waste Management would let him know at a later date if they would be willing to extend the bid.

Director O'Brien said that he would amend his motion authorizing the Chairman to execute the agreement with a delay until he had a chance to discuss the matter with Director Knopp. Chairman Pace said that he would accept the amended motion with the understanding that he would act in the best interest of CRRA and its member municipalities. Director Cassano added that the resolution simply authorized the Chairman and that it did not make the agreement concrete. Director Lauretti said that the Chairman could reject the agreement and have the

matter brought back to the Board if he did not want to move forward.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

## **MID-CONNECTICUT**

### **APPROVAL TO REPLACE NINE (9) LANDFILL GAS EXTRACTION WELLS AT THE HARTFORD LANDFILL**

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

**RESOLVED:** That the Chairman is authorized to have CRRA's contractor, NEO Hartford, LLC, install nine landfill gas extraction wells at the Hartford Landfill, for a cost of \$121,187.00, substantially as discussed and presented at this meeting.

Director Lauretti seconded the motion.

Mr. Egan said that a landfill gas collection and control system at the Hartford landfill was installed in the mid-1990's and it was operated and maintained by NEO Hartford, LLC. They captured and transferred the gas to three internal combustion engines to produce two and a half megawatts of power, he explained. Mr. Egan said that over time nine or ten wells had been abandoned as the west side of the landfill was filled. Mr. Egan continued that due to the settling of the landfill and leachate collecting in low points of the system, the wells had become nonfunctional and that it was important to replace the wells along the west side.

Mr. Egan said that it was important to ensure that off-site gas migration did not occur. Mr. Egan stated that there had been a slight detection of gas in the previous year in the southwest corner of the landfill and CRRA had installed four wells in that area.

Mr. Egan said that the work was anticipated and budgeted at approximately \$150,000. Three bids came in, he said, and Emcon/WOT was significantly lower. Mr. Egan stated that he spoke at length with staff from NEO Hartford, LLC as to why Emcon/OWT's bid was significantly lower. Emcon/OWT essentially wanted the business to maintain their market share, he said.

Mr. Egan explained that the contract with NEO was essentially structured so that NEO was the company that contracted the effort and would be reimbursed by CRRA. Mr. Egan said that NEO was comfortable with Emcon. Mr. Egan added that the power generated and sold by NEO was shared with CRRA, with CRRA receiving 10% of the revenues. NEO generated revenues of approximately \$720,000 per year and CRRA received approximately \$72,000 in revenue sharing.



Director O'Brien suggested that a cost offset analysis be included in future Board memos to illustrate to member towns that CRRA was spending money but would be receiving a cost offset.

Director O'Brien asked whether Mr. Egan and his staff were comfortable that precise performance and system specifications were built into the contract. Mr. Egan said that the contractor had to install the wells as specified in the bid package and that CRRA's own landfill engineer would be reviewing and providing project oversight.

Director Laretti asked whether OWT was in bankruptcy. Ms. Schmidt replied that the OWT situation was resolved and that Shaw Industries had assumed their contracts. Mr. Egan added that CRRA had no ties to a company that was under bankruptcy proceedings regarding the referenced matter.

Director Cassano asked whether there was a cap time or penalty if the work was not completed within the estimated timeframe of six to eight weeks. Mr. Egan replied that there was none. Director Cassano suggested that that matter be examined.

Director Francis asked whether it was confirmed that the nine wells were needed. Mr. Egan replied that it was. Mr. Egan explained that staff examined the old system to ensure that the installation of the wells would capture gas at that perimeter. Director Francis asked whether the wells were out of compliance. Mr. Egan replied that CRRA was not out of compliance but that these additional wells needed to be installed to ensure that the gas collection system continued to operate as it was originally designed and approved by DEP. None of the nine wells that are to be replaced are functioning properly; some are not functioning at all, he said. Director Francis asked whether the initiative to replace the nine-nonfunctioning wells came from CRRA or NEO. Mr. Egan replied that the initiative came from both parties following the short-term-off-site migration problem at the southwest corner of the landfill. As part of the evaluation, all parties agreed that it would be appropriate to install the wells to ensure that no problems along the west slope would occur.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

### **AGREEMENT FOR A WASTE BY RAIL FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR THE MID-CONNECTICUT PROJECT WITH URS CORPORATION**

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

**RESOLVED:** The President, Vice Chairman or Chairman is authorized to enter into an Agreement for A Waste By Rail Feasibility Study for the Mid Connecticut Project with URS Corporation substantially as presented at this meeting.

Director Cooper seconded the motion.

Mr. Tracey said that the Mid-Connecticut essentially produced three by-products from the power block facility. The three by-products were process residue from the waste processing operation, ash residue from the burning of the MSW boilers at the PBF and the delivery of bulky waste material to the Mid-Connecticut project. Mr. Tracey continued that bulky waste was delivered at the WPF and then transported to the Hartford landfill.

Mr. Tracey stated that the Hartford landfill was divided into two areas: a process residue area and an ash residue area. The area for process residue was estimated to close around June or July of 2004 and the ash residue area was estimated to close in late 2007. Mr. Tracey said that based on CRRA's municipal solid waste agreements with all of its member towns, CRRA was going to need to find a new home for process and ash residue upon the closure of the Hartford landfill.

Mr. Tracey said that one of the options for alternative disposal was the development of a Waste-By-Rail program from the Mid-Connecticut site to an out-of-state landfill. CRRA could transport materials to one of four landfills by rail, he said, two of those landfills are located in Ohio, one in Georgia and another located in South Carolina. The feasibility study would examine those landfills and destinations, Mr. Tracey continued, but it did not necessarily mean that options would be narrowed down to only four of these landfills.

The study would essentially determine whether implementation of a Waste-By-Rail program would be possible at the site and to examine issues associated with the DOT for additional crossings in the area of the power block facility. There was an engineering aspect to the study, Mr. Tracey explained, which included an engineering evaluation and concept design of the rail spur, the rail yard and designation of a bulky waste handling area. The other part of the study, Mr. Tracey said, was to examine the railroads themselves, primarily through Rail America, and to determine what the transportation costs would be for the four landfills.

Ms. Raymond added that the property at the South Meadows site was 90-acres, and that the rail project would use approximately 10 to 12 acres.

Director O'Brien asked whether the Hartford zoning regulations would permit the rail siting, as well as with the DOT and the railroad. Mr. Tracey responded that staff has had several meetings with the Rail America and that they were very interested in participating in the project. Ms. Raymond added that CRRA staff has had preliminary discussions with the DOT and Rail America has already had several conversations with the DOT as well. She said that they were very enthusiastic about the project due to lesser truck traffic if CRRA took the rail option.

Director Mengacci asked when the study would be finished. Mr. Tracey replied that it would be available in 90 days.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

## **CHAIRMAN'S AND COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **ASSIGNMENT TO AMADO BUDY TO CONSIDER REVIEW OF OFFICE SPACE**

Chairman Pace asked Ms. Martin to speak regarding the referenced item in Mr. Budy's absence. Ms. Martin said that the Legal Department was evaluating the sublease provisions of the existing lease in order to determine CRRA's rights and responsibilities if it were to consolidate from two floors to one. Engineering was looking at putting the finishing touches on the amount of space available to do that, she said, and a two-scaled sketch and additional information would be available to the Board at its next meeting.

### **STEERING COMMITTEE TIMELINE**

Mr. Flaherty said that as the Communications Coordinator he was tasked with compiling the report to the General Assembly as to the financial restructuring plan of the Authority. The report was required under Public Act 02-46, he said, which was the legislation under which reconstituted the Board and the powers and duties of the Authority. The timeline, Mr. Flaherty stated, was that Committee Reports would be due to the Steering Committee on September 15<sup>th</sup>, a rough draft would be completed by October 31<sup>st</sup>, the Board of Directors would review and approve the final report by November 21<sup>st</sup> and December 19<sup>th</sup> respectively, and the report submitted on December 31<sup>st</sup>. Mr. Flaherty said that he was working on finding a uniform format to use for all three Committee reports so that their findings and recommendations could easily be compiled into one report.

### **ORGANIZATIONAL SYNERGY & HUMAN RESOURCES – REPORT ON ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE COMMITTEE**

Director Cassano said that 35 candidates had applied for the Presidency vacancy, seven of them stood out as strong candidates. He said that the Committee expected to have the interviews completed by August 29, 2002.

The Committee promoted Ms. Diane Le to Assistant Director of Accounting, Director Cassano said. She had been with CRRA for 7 years, he informed. There were two in-house candidates for the position, Director Cassano added.

The Committee was still in search for both the senior counsel with environmental expertise as well as human resources. Director Cassano thanked Director Francis for providing his assistance with the search.

The Committee was reviewing and rewriting the Budget Analysis position to make it a system wide position that dealt with both operations and finance. Director Cassano said that more time was needed for that review.

The Committee was also reviewing personnel policies that included the Separation Agreements and Affirmative Action Plan. Director Cassano said that the Committee was reviewing the organizational structure of CRRA and they were finding a variety of items that needed to be strengthened. Director Cassano noted that it would take time to accomplish that. Director Cassano said that particularly through the Chairman's efforts, the Executive Assistant has returned to full-time status on August 8, 2002.

## **CHAIRMAN REPORT OF MEETINGS**

Chairman Pace said that he spoke with representative from DPUC regarding CRRA's license and concerning a potential review of the selling of power. Chairman Pace said that he met with representatives from CL&P to open the dialogue concerning the current sale of power surrounding future activities. Chairman Pace said that he and Mr. Romano met with haulers concerning the wait time at the WPF. Chairman Pace stated that it was his understanding that through the efforts of Mr. Clark's department, the wait time was still reasonable and that other solutions were being implanted to ensure that the haulers got in and out as quickly as possible.

Chairman Pace said that he met with Keyspan in an effort to see if there was some resolution to issues other than legal actions. Chairman Pace said that he would report back to the Board with the progress. Chairman Pace said that he met with the South End Merchants in East Hartford, a group that was specifically concerned with the odor that may drift from the plant to East Hartford. It was simply a meet and greet, he said, and that it was a productive meeting. Chairman Pace advised them of the existing activities at the plant and CRRA's future plans to assure air quality. The group invited CRRA to participate in their September 1<sup>st</sup> activity, he said, and Director O'Brien has volunteered to spend some time at that event.

Chairman Pace informed the Board that he would be meeting with Moody's and that Ms. Bronisz has helped prepare documents for his review. Director Mengacci asked what the implications would be if the Mid-Connecticut subordinated bonds dropped below an investment grade. Ms. Bronisz replied that they would be considered junk bonds but it would not affect the debt service that the Authority paid. However, they would trade differently in the secondary market. Also, Ms. Bronisz added, the public perception of having non-investment grade bonds would not be good. Mr. Egan added that there was an environmental implication. CRRA ensured postclosure care and maintenance of the landfills with a financial assurance mechanism called "The Local Government Financial Test." Mr. Egan said that in order to qualify for use of that financial test, CRRA had to meet certain financial criteria. If the bonds dropped below investment grade, Mr. Egan continued, CRRA would have to ask the DEP if they would continue to allow CRRA to use the local government financial test or CRRA would need to put in place a different financial assurance instrument, trust fund or letter of credit.

**AJOURNMENT**

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

There being no other business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 12:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Angelica Mattschi  
Corporate Secretary to the Board

**CONNECTICUT RESOURCES RECOVERY AUTHORITY**

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

**AUGUST 15, 2002**

An Executive Session was called for the purposes of discussing legal reports, was convened at 9:10 a.m.

**DIRECTORS**

Chairman Pace  
Director Cohn (present by phone)  
Director Martland  
Director Boone  
Director Cassano  
Director Francis  
Director Sullivan  
Director Cooper  
Director Mengacci (absent for some)  
Director Lauretti  
Director O'Brien  
Director Blake

**STAFF**

Ann Stravalle-Schmidt

**A.G.'S OFFICE**

Theodore Doolittle

**OTHERS**

Barry Zitser  
William Bright  
Paul Rachmuth

No votes were taken in Executive Session.

The Executive Session adjourned at 11:11 a.m.