

June 12, 1989

An attempt to override the County Executive's veto took place at a Regular Session of the Legislature held on September 12, 1989.

Roll call vote at the time resulted as follows:

Ayes: 18

Nays: 17—Babiarz, Ballo, Bartles, Bleakley, DelSanto, Goldberg, Hammond, Higgins, Knapp, Lavole, Lombardi, Luty, Mark, Murphy, Roberts, Susczynski, Schiarello.

Motion defeated.

**RESOLUTION NO. 257—1989**

**RE: Local Law No. 4 of 1989 Amending Local Law No. 2 of 1972, a Local Law to Establish a County Environmental Management Council**

Legislator Loedy offers the following and moves its adoption:

RESOLVED, that this Legislature of the County of Dutchess adopt Local Law No. 4 of 1989 which has been submitted this day for consideration by said Legislature.

**LOCAL LAW NO. 4 OF 1989**

**A Local Law Amending Local Law No. 2 of 1972, a Local Law to Establish County Environmental Management Council**

BE IT ENACTED, by the Legislature of the County of Dutchess as follows:

**SECTION 1. Legislative Intent.** The Dutchess County Legislature finds that during the last few years the Dutchess County Legislature and the Executive Branch have increasingly relied on the Dutchess County Environmental Management Council to provide recommendations and solutions to the County's environmental problems. Moreover, these environmental problems and issues have become more complex and controversial thereby creating the need for the appointment of additional qualified members to the Environmental Management Council.

**SECTION 2.** Section 3 of Local Law No. 2 of 1972 entitled "Membership and Terms" is hereby amended so as to provide for the appointment by the County Legislature of 11 members to the Dutchess County Environmental Management Council instead of 9 members as previously provided.

**SECTION 3.** Local Law No. 2 of 1972 is, in all other respects, hereby ratified and confirmed.

**SECTION 4.** This Local Law shall take effect upon the compliance with all statutes of law applicable to its passage.

The foregoing Local Law (Resolution #257) was laid on the desks at this meeting and considered at a Regular Session of the Legislature held on July 10, 1989.

Roll call vote at the time resulted as follows:

Ayes: 31

Nays: 0

June 12, 1989

Absent: 4—Ballo, Hansen, Lafuente, Wilson.

Resolution adopted.

The County Executive held a public hearing on the foregoing Local Law on July 26, 1989. The effective date is July 11, 1989.

On motion by Legislator Wilson, duly seconded by Legislator Karn and carried, the Rules were suspended to allow the public to address the Legislature on non-agenda items.

Deborah Scheer of the Town of Washington read the following letter and requested that it be part of the record.

P.O. Box 166  
Millbrook, N.Y.  
June 12, 1989

To Chairman Schroeder and all Legislators  
Dutchess County Legislature  
22 Market Street  
Poughkeepsie, New York, 12601

At its May 24th meeting at the Farm and Home Center, the Resource Recovery Agency announced its decision to select two landfill sites,—one for ash in Red Hook, and the other for municipal solid waste and by-pass waste in the Town of Washington. I will not again reiterate our many objections to this decision today; that is already on the public record. We have now entered a new stage of the SEQR process which requires specific on-site hydrogeological testing, further consideration of alternative sites, and preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). My message to the RRA on May 24th is the same message that I bring to you today: it is time now to take stock of where we are going in this headlong rush to burn and bury. A great deal of time and money has been spent without producing a well researched and intelligent long range plan for waste management in Dutchess County.

The Agency has been lulled into thinking that they hired a qualified and reputable consulting firm in I.T. Corp., that the DEIS and the FEIS prepared by them is complete and acceptable; and that any argument from citizens can be summarily dismissed as NIMBY,—as if protecting our own health and environment were not the proper concern of all residents. The Agency's tactic right along has been adversarial. It has railroaded this process along by overcoming the objections of one town after another, and attempting to pit one candidate against another. In the face of incontrovertible evidence to the contrary, it has declared its whole-hearted approval of the work of I.T. Corp. and its obviously flawed recommendations.

How can we turn the Agency's attention toward a comprehensive policy that includes burning, to be sure, but includes other less profitable but also less toxic alternatives? Citizens' suggestions for such useful solutions as source separation, mandated recycling, incentives for commercial and individual waste reduction, composting of yard waste, and special handling and disposal of household hazardous waste were largely ignored. The Agency's minimal acknowledgement of these needs came not from any strong commitment, but rather from D.E.C. requirements in the new Part 360 regulations. The Agency will say that 40% waste reduction through recycling by 1992 is enough. We say we can do better. Why not 60%? Why not 80% in 10 years? Why not begin cooperative efforts between towns to create regional recycling centers? We in the Town of Washington are ready to work with others in searching for long term solutions to the County's garbage crisis. That is why we have been attending meetings of the EMC, of its Ad Hoc Recycling Committee, and both the Solid Waste Advisory and