

POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY
OF WARREN COUNTY

MINUTES OF REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING

April 24, 2017

Chairman James Cannon called the regular monthly meeting of the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County to order at approximately 9:30 am.

Authority Members present: Bud Allen, Marc Pasquini, Joseph Pryor and James Cannon.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Allen	-	Present
	Mr. Pasquini	-	Present (left at approximately 10:50am)
	Mr. Pryor	-	Present
	Mr. Mach	-	Absent
	Mr. Cannon	-	Present

Also present: James Williams, Director of Operations; Dan Olshefski, Chief Financial Officer; Katherine Fina, General Counsel; Edward Smith, Freeholder Deputy Director; Archie Ross, T&M Associates; Jim Peeples, T&M Associates; Jeff Winegar, T&M Associates; Jamie Banghart, Administrative Supervisor; Crystal Gild, Recording Secretary.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Cannon.

Mr. Cannon read the following statement: "Adequate notice of this meeting of April 24, 2017 was given in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act by forwarding a schedule of regular meetings of the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County (PCFAWC) to the Warren County Clerk, the Warren County Board of Chosen Freeholders, the Express Times, and by posting a copy thereof on the bulletin board in the office of the PCFAWC. Formal action may be taken by the PCFAWC at this meeting. Public participation is encouraged".

MINUTES

Mr. Cannon presented the regular monthly meeting minutes from March 20, 2017.

Mr. Pryor noted some corrections that need to be made to the minutes on pages 1, 9 and 10 respectively.

Mr. Pasquini made a motion to approve the revised regular monthly minutes of March 20, 2017 as presented, seconded by **Mr. Pryor**.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Allen	-	Yes
	Mr. Pasquini	-	Yes
	Mr. Pryor	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Absent
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes

Mr. Cannon stated that Executive Session was not necessary on March 20, 2017.

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Allen to brief the board regarding the Warren County Planning Board Meeting that he attended.

Mr. Allen stated that he attended the Warren County Planning Board Meeting which involved discussions regarding the Tilcon expansion application. Mr. Allen noted that Tilcon's application for expansion was deemed incomplete at the meeting.

He stated that he was satisfied with the efforts made by the engineer and the planning board at the county level to ensure that the crossing would be a safe crossing. He noted that gates would be put in on both sides of the road which would be timed by a caution sign. He also noted that the caution sign will have lights around it and that the lights will flash when a truck approaches the intersection and then the gates will come down. Mr. Allen stated that the speed limit on Mt. Pisgah Avenue would be 40 MPH. He noted that the truck capacity limitation would be 70 tons.

Mr. Allen stated that he expressed the Authority's concerns at the meeting.

Mr. Allen noted that at the end of the meeting he had a conversation with the engineer regarding the concerns of the PCFA. He stated that the engineer said that if the Authority still had concerns regarding Tilcon's expansion application in White Township that we would need to correspond with Paul Sterbenz who is the engineer for the White Township Planning Board. He mentioned that he had a brief conversation with Paul Sterbenz a couple of weeks ago at the Planning Board meeting in White Township and that Mr. Sterbenz said that Tilcon's application has been approved with conditions and that those conditions had not yet been met.

Mr. Allen recommended that the Authority should continue attending meetings regarding the Tilcon expansion application and offered to be the representative for the Authority at these meetings.

Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Allen has a great grasp for what is going on with the application and that he would appreciate it if Mr. Allen continues to attend the meetings. Mr. Pryor thanked Mr. Allen for attending the meetings on the Authority's behalf as did Mr. Cannon.

Mr. Williams briefed the board on the correspondence from Mr. Anthony Fontana of Cornerstone Environmental. Mr. Williams stated that the landfill expansion application was submitted to the NJDEP on March 29, 2017. He also stated that he had a follow-up conversation with Cornerstone and a representative from the DEP regarding the review process and that the DEP representative stated that it is on their agenda to provide us with an Administratively Complete letter by the end of April and a Technically Complete letter by the end of May.

Freeholder Deputy Director Smith stated that he met with NJDEP Division of Land Use Assistant Commissioner Ginger Kopkash and that he did not get the sense that there was a tremendous amount of concern regarding our application. He noted that he would have liked to have gotten a written letter stating so, but that he did not. He also stated that he spoke with Kerry Plfugh who is our DEP liason and that she told him that the application is in the process of being technically reviewed. He noted that Ms. Plfugh did not make any comments regarding a lack of information in our application regarding the Wetlands.

Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Jeff Winegar, Mr. Jim Peeples and Mr. Archie Ross from T&M Associates were present today to give an overhead presentation to the board and thanked them for coming.

Mr. Cannon stated that since the initial interview with T&M that he was a big advocate for them. He noted that he was an advocate for them because he felt that they understood the stages approach that the PCFA was looking at. He also noted that it seems to have rolled into something else than what had been discussed. Mr. Cannon stated that he thinks the range in difference between \$100,000.00 and \$2,000,000.00 is beyond what had been discussed that day. He also stated that he has spoken to some other members and they seem to be disappointed across the board. He noted that he wanted to say this upfront to be honest with T&M before they began their presentation.

Mr. Cannon stated that this seems to have turned into a little bit of a “juggernaut”. Mr. Cannon also stated that he knows that during the interview he was pretty sure and that he thinks he will get nods across the table that they spoke about doing small stages with the lime addition being the biggest one as to seeing what results that it would have.

Mr. Cannon noted that they talked about bench testing and that was their “Stage 1A” for lack of a better description. He stated that it appears as though we have gotten much farther than that and that in his opinion the April 10th report reads like a run-on sentence. He noted that for us uneducated people up here who aren’t engineers it is very difficult to match up the expenses and stages Mr. Cannon also noted that he doesn’t see stages but that he sees more “boom! \$100,000.00” and “boom!” right to another stage of “crazy” money.

Mr. Cannon stated that he wanted to give T&M this information upfront. He also stated that he won’t speak for the board and asked if the other members would like to add anything else before the presentation.

Mr. Cannon reiterated that frankly, he is a little disappointed and that he believes that the feeling is unanimous across the Board.

Mr. Pryor asked if T&M would be providing copies of the overhead presentation? Mr. Peeples answered that he would send over copies.

Mr. Peeples from T&M began his presentation to the board. He stated that this presentation was an update to the presentation they had given a few months ago. He noted that the presentation encompassed a review of our existing pretreatment system, problems that exist with making the current system more cost-effective and an alternative approach for pretreatment.

Mr. Peeples noted that there has been optimization done on the current pretreatment system and that Mr. Archie Ross from T&M had been working with the treatment plant staff to make changes for optimization.

Mr. Peeples stated that our current system is very effective at treating ammonia, removes BOD completely, almost completely eliminates TSS, considerably reduces COD and nitrifies most of the leachate. He stated that the current system does not remove TDS.

Mr. Peeples stated that the biggest problem with our current system is that it does not remove TDS and actually results in a small increase in TDS and that it is not cost-effective.

Mr. Pryor asked if it would be cheaper to haul all of the leachate off site? Mr. Peeples answered, yes. Mr. Peeples stated that at the time of their initial evaluation that the cost to treat the leachate on site was 2.7 cents more per gallon than was to haul the leachate off site.

Mr. Peeples referred to his slide to show what T&M has done so far regarding optimization of our current system. He noted that optimization was not originally part of their proposal. Mr. Cannon stated that it had been discussed and that the board was okay with T&M optimizing the current system.

Mr. Peeples stated that Mr. Ross has been working with the treatment plant to lower the amount of dilution water being used.

Mr. Peeples stated that with the current optimization that is in place that the savings using the existing treatment system will be approximately \$68,000.00 per year.

Mr. Peeples stated that our current system would not get us to the lowest point of cost or ever be able to remove TDS and with that knowledge T&M came up with other options for treatment. Mr. Peeples referred to his slides to show the proposed changes. He stated that the raw leachate would be taken in, go through a softening process, sludge from the softening process would go back to the landfill and then there would be an ammonia stripping process. He noted that the key aspect with the ammonia stripping process is that it takes away the need for a biological ammonia removal. Mr. Peeples also noted that ammonia stripping includes going through ultra-filtration and then reverse osmosis which would result in a clean water source, treated water, concentrate and RO reject water. He noted that T&M feels that these solutions could be put back into the landfill.

Mr. Pryor asked what the fraction would be of the concentrate coming out? Mr. Peeples answered that it would be 10,000 gallons out of 40,000 gallons, so about ¼ or 25 percent.

Mr. Cannon stated that there have been discussions regarding having a gas line brought in to the landfill in hopes of heating the leachate so that some of it could be evaporated. Mr. Peeples stated that there is some unused landfill gas and that some form of evaporation could be used in the overall process. He stated that currently he does not think that it is practical to attempt to evaporate all of the leachate given the current levels of landfill gas. Mr. Cannon stated that he was not talking about using the landfill gas and reiterated that we were looking into having a gas line ran to the landfill. Mr. Peeples stated that he does not think that this would be the most cost-effective way to go.

Mr. Cannon asked if we would still be trucking leachate out and sending leachate to Oxford using T&M's proposed treatment system? Mr. Peeples answered that trucking would be eliminated and that everything would either go back into the landfill or sent to Oxford.

Mr. Peeples referred to the slides to show the pricing variables depending on if trucking is or is not eliminated.

Mr. Cannon asked if there is an analysis that reflects the cost if we incinerated as much as possible and put it back into the landfill? Mr. Cannon stated that in theory if we did this that nothing would have to be sent to anyone. Mr. Peeples stated that this was correct. Mr. Peeples also stated that they took this off of the table early on because there is not enough landfill gas to do this. He noted that if we purchased natural gas for this purpose that it would pretty much cost as much as trucking does.

Mr. Allen referred to the current slide and asked how T&M came up with the estimated costs for equipment repair and replacement. Mr. Peeples responded that the information came from experience with other systems and vendor estimates.

Mr. Peeples stated that he feels that the key decision points are to determine whether or not to proceed with their proposed approach and if we want to continue with the optimization of our current system.

Mr. Pryor asked what kind of savings are possible if we continue with the optimization of our system? Mr. Peeples stated that he feels that the best case scenario is to get the cost down to a little bit less than the cost of trucking.

Mr. Peeples stated that we will not be able to take our current system and add-on a TDS removal process and end up with a process that is cost effective compared to hauling.

Mr. Allen asked if the proposed repair and maintenance costs were higher or lower than our current repair and maintenance costs? Mr. Peeples answered that the numbers in their proposal are probably higher than what we are paying now. He noted that they try to be conservative with the numbers. He also noted that there have not been many repairs or modifications needed on our system this year and that it seems to be running well.

Mr. Pryor stated that so far, it is his understanding from this presentation, that it is currently cheaper to haul out the leachate than to treat it here and that if we further optimize our system that we could get to the point where it costs the same to haul out the leachate as it does to treat it here on site. Mr. Peeples answered, yes. Mr. Pryor stated that then we could simply stop everything right now and simply haul out the leachate. Mr. Peeples said yes, that this is certainly an option.

Mr. Cannon stated that the TDS limitation that we are having an issue with is not our issue, that it is another entities issue. He noted that we would be modifying our system based on someone else's limitations and that the TDS limitation amount could change at any time.

Mr. Cannon stated that the bottom line he sees is that we can eliminate a lot of the treatment and simply truck out the leachate and save money that way and Mr. Peeples agreed that his assessment was correct.

Mr. Pryor asked if PR (MUA) and Passaic Valley's charges were fixed or variable? Mr. Cannon answered that they are not fixed.

Freeholder Deputy Director Smith asked what would happen if the dilution component was eliminated and we were able to concentrate the leachate through evaporation. He stated that he was wondering if reducing the amount of leachate using heat would drop the number of gallons that would need to be sent out. Mr. Peeples stated that this is something that could be considered.

Mr. Peeples stated that the higher the levels of TDS are, the harder evaporating is.

Mr. Pryor asked what would happen if we eliminated sending leachate to Oxford and just did the RO and preformed the treatment needed to run through the RO and then reclaimed a portion of it and minimized the amount that is hauled? Mr. Peeples stated that yes, this is a possibility as long as you can find a POTW that would accept the leachate with a high ammonia content and that this is a reasonable option to look at.

Mr. Cannon stated that he feels the PCFA would have a little bit more control if we made some of the changes that he and Mr. Pryor had mentioned.

Mr. Pryor stated that he thinks it may be worth having a workshop session to further look at the T&M report and Mr. Cannon agreed.

Mr. Peeples stated that this was the conclusion of his presentation and Mr. Cannon thanked him for attending and presenting at today's meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS (AGENDA ITEMS ONLY)

None

FINANCE (Dan Olshefski)

Mr. Olshefski stated that the 2016 audit has been completed and that he received a draft copy of the audit late last week. He noted that he reviewed the audit and that it was another strong audit for the authority and that essentially it states that the financial condition remains strong at years end with adequate liquid assets, that the current unrestricted assets increased by 2.1 million dollars, that the restricted assets went up 9 million and that there were no findings or recommendations in the audit. He stated that we are poised to go forward with the expansion and other projects with no debt.

Mr. Pryor asked if the no findings or recommendations means that they feel that our accounting systems are sound? Mr. Olshefski answered, yes. Mr. Olshefski gave tribute to the staff at PCFA and his own staff for another great year.

Mr. Olshefski stated that each year the county receives an annual recycling grant. He noted that previously it was for \$110,000.00 and that this year it went up to \$140,000.00. Mr. Olshefski stated that the grant currently has unexpended funds in it. He noted that Dave Dech had called him about reshuffling the funds to get the maximum use of the grant. Mr. Olshefski stated that the Authority pays the recycling coordinator approximately \$7,000.00, about half of his salary, out of the grant and that Mr. Dech will be asking for his full salary to be paid with the grant money this year. Mr. Olshefski stated that the recycling coordinator's salary is approximately \$15,000.00 annually.

Mr. Cannon explained that the Authority is essentially a funnel for this recycling grant.

Mr. Cannon stated that frankly, he is disappointed with Warren County's recycling program. He also noted that in his time served on the board he has never even met the recycling coordinator. Mr. Cannon stated that the fact that Warren County is the worst recycling county in the state of New Jersey needs to be addressed. Mr. Cannon stated that the computer/electronics recycling issue has not been resolved yet and that we have had no help from the recycling coordinator regarding this. Mr. Cannon stated that frankly, he does not feel that he has seen \$15,000.00 worth of work from the recycling coordinator.

Mr. Cannon paused the conversation to discuss resolutions R-04-03-17, R-04-04-17 and R-04-05-17 regarding donations to Oxford Township, the Oxford Volunteer Fire Department and the Oxford Rescue Squad while Mr. Pasquini was still present since Mr. Pasquini needed to leave early.

Mr. Cannon stated that he believes that Mountain Lake Fire Company should also receive a donation from the PCFA. He also stated that he feels that the suggested donation figures are a bit high. Mr. Cannon suggested to reduce each donation amount by 25 percent. Mr. Cannon also stated that when it comes time for the checks to be distributed that he would like to have all of the entities come to the PCFA and be handed the checks as opposed to simply just mailing them out.

Mr. Pryor stated that the way that he, Mr. Williams and Mr. Pasquini came up with the figures to donate which total \$8,000.00, was by looking back historically at the amount previously given to Oxford as a clean-up waiver.

Mr. Pasquini asked for the board not to reduce the amount that they would donate to the different entities because all of the entities really need the money.

Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Pasquini's request to not reduce the amount of money would be considered.

Mr. Cannon moved the meeting back to the financial update.

Mr. Cannon reiterated that he is disappointed with the recycling program.

Mr. Williams stated that he thinks the recycling coordinator should be reaching out to the different municipalities and work on setting up educational programs for recycling. He suggested offering an

incentive using the funds from the recycling grant to the municipalities whom show proof that they have been working on improving their recycling rates, such as increasing advertising.

Mr. Cannon stated that something different needs to be done with recycling. He asked where the initiative is for improving recycling? He also asked if there could be incentives for people who recycle as opposed to those who put everything in the garbage?

Mr. Cannon noted that the only recycling information passed out in Warren County is the one page ad with the “green thing and the alligator on it.”

Mr. Williams stated that he would reach out to Dave Dech.

Mr. Olshefski stated that Mr. Dech’s request is a one-time request due to there being extra funds left from the grant. Mr. Olshefski stated that he did pass along the fact that the Authority felt that Warren County needs more recycling education to Mr. Dech.

Mr. Cannon asked if Mr. Dech needs the Authority’s approval to pay the second portion of the recycling coordinator’s salary with grant monies? Mr. Olshefski answered no, that they are just letting the Authority know what he is doing.

Mr. Allen asked how the state comes up with the numbers in the recycling report? Mr. Cannon answered that reports are generated from townships, counties and other entities and then the state compiles the information from there.

Freeholder Deputy Director Smith stated that the recycling report is very loosely audited and that there is virtually no verification done. He stated that it could end up that if a county was on the bottom and did not want to be on the bottom they could simply come up with more data and say that it was better. He said to quote it saying that “people can play with the numbers.” Freeholder Smith noted that the current process for recycling is that the Solid Waste Advisory Council meets quarterly. He also noted that the council is made up of recycling coordinators. He then noted that the members of the council do have to do Continuing Education credits in order to maintain their certification.

Freeholder Smith stated that the problem they are running into is a lack of market for recyclable products which eliminates a lot of incentive for recycling. He also stated that previously newsprint was the only item that was providing significant tonnage for recycling. He then stated that corrugated cardboard is starting to rise in the amount that is recycled.

Freeholder Smith stated that the recycling tonnages are calculated by the local municipal coordinators and not the county.

Mr. Allen asked how they come up with the tonnage amounts? Freeholder Smith answered that commercial accounts are supposed to be provided with the recycling tonnage amounts by the landfill they bring it to or the collector they use. He also answered that the local municipal amounts are collected by the carrier and then brought to the landfill and scaled and that is where the municipalities get their tonnage amounts from.

Freeholder Smith asked if our recyclables are going directly to Colgate? Mr. Williams answered, yes.

Mr. Allen asked if the annual recycling report was done by comparison per capita? Mr. Cannon answered that population is taken into consideration on the report.

Mr. Williams stated that once there is an electronics recycling program setup that the money from the grant should be used to pay for that and Mr. Olshefski agreed.

Mr. Olshefski stated that Mr. Dech has been talking about putting out a mass mailing regarding recycling.

Freeholder Deputy Director Smith noted that at the recycling breakfast he mentioned that the landfill expansion will be able to last “x” amount of years based upon its current design and that enhanced recycling could make it last maybe 50 percent longer.

Mr. Cannon stated that enhanced recycling would not hurt us but that it would hurt “our neighbors to the South” and that he wasn’t going to get into detail but someone should check what is going in their facility.

Mr. Williams stated that the representative from the DEP who attended the recycling breakfast mentioned that the recyclables that are being placed in the bagged garbage need to be dealt with. Mr. Cannon reiterated that if there are recycling incentives maybe fewer people would put recycling in their bagged garbage.

Mr. Cannon mentioned possibly using grant money to pay for scanners and barcodes that could be used to track recycling amounts.

Mr. Olshefski stated that about this time last year the Authority decided to accept credit card payments from haulers and that we would charge a two percent fee on those charges but that the credit card processing fee would only be charged to haulers and not all customers. Mr. Olshefski stated that he spoke to Ms. Katherine Fina and sent an email to Mr. Brian Tipton trying to reconfirm that we can charge a convenience fee to only our commercial customers but not our residential customers. Mr. Olshefski recommended that we do not charge a credit card processing fee until we hear back from counsel regarding the matter.

Mr. Olshefski stated that the waste volume is down 3 percent and that this will probably continue to be the case given that we no longer have contracts with Gaeta and DJM. He also noted that the Lovenberg situation will impact this amount as well. Mr. Olshefski also stated that the average fee per ton is down slightly from last year, with last year’s average being \$51.15/ton and this year’s being \$50.52/ton.

Mr. Olshefski stated that the restricted cash balance is up 1 percent and that the unrestricted cash balance is down \$18,000.00 which is primarily due to capital expenses and the fact that we prepaid all of the insurance for the year.

Mr. Olshefski stated that for the year so far our revenues are at 21 percent and that our operating expenses are at 15 percent and that we are doing a good job with the expenses.

Mr. Olshefski stated that the amount of customers paying at the scale with credit card is at 40 percent.

Mr. Olshefski stated that the leachate is down this year compared to last year and that last year was down compared to the year prior. He noted that in April the amount may go up due to the wetter weather.

Mr. Olshefski stated that there are a couple receivables that are over 60 days past due and some that are even over 90 days past due. He noted that there was an outstanding receivable for Covanta but that it has been resolved. Mr. Olshefski stated that the outstanding receivables are with Gaeta, whom did not renew their contract and Lovenberg, which is being handled currently by general counsel.

Mr. Williams stated that Gaeta had us use their Escrow of \$34-35,000.00 and that Mrs. Jamie Banghart has since invoiced them for the remainder that they owe which is approximately \$17,000.00. Mr. Williams stated that Gaeta said that they would pay their outstanding balance and that reminders of outstanding invoices and letters threatening legal action have been sent to them repeatedly.

Mr. Cannon asked if Gaeta was still coming in to dump at the landfill? Mr. Williams answered, no and stated that they have not come in since the end of February.

Mr. Pryor asked how and why we had Escrow for Gaeta? Mr. Williams answered that a credit application was ran on Gaeta and that it came back saying that their credit was very poor. Mr. Pryor asked if that was the only company that we had an Escrow on? Mr. Williams answered, yes.

Mr. Williams stated that the Escrow was only for 30 days and it did not cover the whole amount and that a 60 day Escrow would be better and the board agreed.

Mr. Olshefski suggested having at least a 45 day Escrow.

Mr. Cannon instructed Ms. Katherine Fina to send Gaeta a letter notifying them that they have 10 days to pay their past due balance before legal action will be taken.

Mr. Cannon asked for an update regarding Lovenberg. Ms. Fina stated that the complaint had been filed and that they have not yet received the file copy back from the court. She noted that once the file copy is received that Lovenberg will then be served.

On a motion by *Mr. Allen*, seconded by *Mr. Pryor*, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *April 24, 2017*.

RESOLUTION

R-04-01-17

To Pay Bills – April 24, 2017

WHEREAS, the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County has been presented with invoices for services, supplies and other materials rendered to it or on its behalf;

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County that the following bills be paid:

See Attached

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Allen	-	Yes
	Mr. Pasquini	-	Absent
	Mr. Pryor	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Absent
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes

We hereby certify Resolution to Pay Bills in the amount of \$476,644.44 to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County on the *24th day of April, 2017*.

Crystal Gild
Recording Secretary

James Williams
Director of Operations

PERSONNEL

PRESENTATIONS

T&M – See above.

FACILITIES/RECYCLING

Mr. Williams stated that we would table resolutions 3, 4 and 5 and that he would prepare new ones and add a fourth resolution for next month to include Mountain Lake Fire Company. Mr. Williams stated that we should decide today how much money we are giving.

Mr. Cannon asked if the words “first responder” needed to be used in the resolutions? Mr. Williams answered no and noted that we can change the wording.

Mr. Williams suggested leaving the first 3 resolutions as they are and adding Mountain Lake with another \$1500.00.

Freeholder Deputy Director Smith noted that the emergency squads are now all sent out on fire calls. He stated that the Oxford Emergency Squad would be the only squad that would be responding to any event here. He stated candidly that the number of responses to a property are more for squad than they are for the fire department. Freeholder Smith also noted that the squads and fire departments are struggling financially and even to get volunteers.

Mr. Cannon stated that he does not like calling the money going to Oxford a “host fee” and asked for the wording to be changed.

Mr. Williams stated that counsel should be asked what the appropriate language to use would be.

Mr. Cannon stated that \$1500.00 for the Oxford Rescue Squad, \$1500.00 for the Oxford Fire Department, \$1500.00 for Mountain Lake Fire Company and \$5000.00 for Oxford Township is acceptable but that he simply does not want the word “host fee” used regarding the money for Oxford Township.

Mr. Pryor stated that counsel should come up with better wording.

Mr. Williams stated that treatment plant operations were discussed earlier.

Mr. Williams stated that there is not much of an update for landfill operations. Mr. Williams noted that the annual topographical survey had been received and that as expected, it showed that we need to limit our waste intake as the board had discussed last year. Mr. Cannon noted that this had been addressed and Mr. Williams agreed with him. Mr. Williams stated that he wants to make sure that everyone knows that there is a legitimate reason behind reducing our waste intake. Mr. Williams stated that the waste totals need to be kept down over the next 3-3.5 years and that we need to set the limit at approximately 160,000 cubic yards per year.

Mr. Williams stated that Covanta had reached out to him and asked if they could bring 50,000 tons of Essex ash to our facility. He noted that he advised them via email that he would need to discuss their request with the board and that we do have to conserve air space over the next few years. Mr. Williams recommended to the board that we do not accept this ash because we simply do not have the room for it and the board agreed.

Mr. Cannon stated that we should send Covanta an official letter stating that at the meeting the board determined, after careful consideration, that due to our limited air space we cannot accommodate their request at this time.

Mr. Williams stated that there are no issues with the H2S removal system.

Mr. Williams stated that there are no updates regarding the Solar Panel Project.

Mr. Williams stated that there are no changes to A-2 the 2017 Waste Disposal Fee Schedule.

Mr. Williams noted that Sunday is our HHW event and that everything is all set up and ready to go for the event. Mr. Pryor asked what the event was? Mr. Williams answered that it is the Household Hazardous Waste collection event.

GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT

Nothing to add.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Cannon asked for an update regarding the evaporator system.

Mr. Williams stated that he has spoken with Elizabethtown Gas twice and that they wanted to know the sizes of our out buildings because there is a possibility that they could be tied into for heat sources. He noted that Elizabethtown gas explained to him that the more locations they can tie into, the more feasible it would be for them to run the new gas line. He also noted that they were supposed to get back to him last week to let him know if there would be a cost for them to install the line but that he has not heard back from them yet.

Mr. Williams stated that the vendor who has the evaporator has mentioned that the more leachate we can put in the evaporator, the cheaper the cost will be.

Mr. Cannon asked if we could have the evaporator vendor come to a meeting within the next few months and present the different options to the board? Mr. Williams stated that the vendor would like to attend the May board meeting.

CLOSING PUBLIC COMMENT

None

PRESS COMMENTS & QUESTIONS

None

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Executive Session was entered at 11:36 am.

RESOLUTION

R-04-02-17

AUTHORIZING EXECUTIVE SESSION

WHEREAS, the Authority has a need to discuss the following matter(s) in Executive Session:

It is not possible, at this time, for the Authority to determine when and under what circumstances the above-referenced item(s), which are to be discussed in Executive Session, can be publicly disclosed;

NOW, THEREFORE, Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 10:4-1 et. seq., BE IT RESOLVED by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County that the matter(s) as noted above will be discussed in Executive Session.

Moved By: Mr. Pryor

Seconded By: Mr. Allen

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Allen	-	Yes
	Mr. Pasquini	-	Absent
	Mr. Pryor	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Absent
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes

I hereby certify the above to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County on the date above mentioned.

Crystal Gild
Recording Secretary

Dated: 04/24/2017

Mr. Pryor made a motion to come out of Executive Session, seconded by **Mr. Allen**.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Allen	-	Yes
	Mr. Pasquini	-	Absent
	Mr. Pryor	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Absent
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes

Regular session resumed at 11:45 am.

Mr. Cannon stated that we are back in public session.

Mr. Cannon stated that during the Executive Session the PCFA board members discussed the release of 18 months of Executive Session minutes pursuant to an OPRA request. He also stated that 18 months of legal bills had been sent out previously per the OPRA request.

Mr. Williams stated that the Executive Session minutes being released date from September 28, 2015 through February 27, 2017.

Mr. Cannon made a motion to approve the release of the Executive Session minutes as requested in the OPRA request, seconded by **Mr. Pryor**.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Allen - Yes
 Mr. Pasquini - Absent
 Mr. Pryor - Yes
 Mr. Mach - Absent
 Mr. Cannon - Yes

ADJOURNMENT

With no other business to discuss, **Mr. Pryor** motioned to Adjourn, seconded by **Mr. Allen**, at 11:47 am.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Allen - Yes
 Mr. Pasquini - Absent
 Mr. Pryor - Yes
 Mr. Mach - Absent
 Mr. Cannon - Yes

Respectfully submitted by:
Crystal Gild
Recording Secretary

Approved: 05/22/2017