

POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY
OF WARREN COUNTY

MINUTES OF REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING

April 27, 2015

Chairman Davenport called the regular monthly meeting of the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County to order at approximately 9:00 am.

Mr. Davenport stated that the first order of business is the Oath of Office. He also stated that Mr. Kern has other commitments and will not be able to serve as a member of our Board.

Mr. Kern was present at the meeting. Mr. Kern spoke to the Board and appreciated the Freeholder Board's faith in him to serve on this Board. He is unfortunately unable to serve. He was offered a new opportunity with work and will not be able to commit to this Board at this time.

Mr. Victor (Bud) Allen took Oath of Office of the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County.

Authority Members present: Robert Davenport, Richard Mach, James Cannon and Bud Allen.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Allen	-	Present
	Mr. Mach	-	Present
	Mr. Cannon	-	Present
	Mr. Davenport	-	Present

Also present: James Williams, Director of Operations; Katharine Fina, General Counsel; Dan Olshefski, Chief Financial Officer; Mark Swyka, Cornerstone; Freeholder Director Ed Smith; Jamie Banghart, Recording Secretary.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Davenport.

Mr. Davenport read the following statement: "Adequate notice of this meeting of April 27, 2015 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".

Mr. Davenport asked for Nominations and Election of Officers for Secretary and Treasurer of the Authority.

Mr. Allen nominated Mr. James Cannon as Secretary, seconded by **Mr. Mach**.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Allen - Yes
 Mrs. Mach - Yes
 Mr. Cannon - Yes
 Mr. Davenport - Yes

Mr. Cannon was elected as Secretary.

Mr. Cannon nominated Mr. Bud Allen as Treasurer, seconded by **Mr. Davenport**.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Allen - Yes
 Mr. Mach - Yes
 Mr. Cannon - Yes
 Mr. Davenport - Yes

Mr. Allen was elected as Treasurer.

MINUTES

Mr. Davenport presented the regular monthly meeting minutes from March 23, 2015.

Mr. Mach made a motion to approve the minutes as presented, seconded by **Mr. Cannon**, with questions.

Mr. Cannon appreciated the revised changes. Mr. Cannon stated that he spoke with Mr. Allen and Mr. Allen had some issues and questions after he reviewed the minutes.

Mr. Allen stated that he received the By-Laws of the Authority. Mr. Allen questioned the By-Laws of the Authority in regards to a number of resolutions passed at March's meeting. He was curious about the quorum of three and some of the votes that were passed with two votes. He would like clarification of this from the Authority By-Laws on page 6 which reads "Three members of the Authority shall constitute a quorum at any meeting. The concurrence of the majority of the members (not the quorum) shall be required for the adoption of any motion or resolution." He would like this clarified.

Mr. Davenport stated that we did get clarification from the attorney that this was valid. Ms. Fina stated that the majority of the quorum generally rules. Mr. Allen stated that the By-Laws state clearly that it is a majority of the Authority not the quorum.

Mr. Williams stated that he will have Counsel review the language in the By-Laws.

Mr. Cannon did bring this to Mr. Williams' attention because he believes that a 2-1 vote is not good. This is why he abstained on a vote because this would just hold over to the following month. Mr. Cannon understood that we were going to have one or more new members coming on the next month. He stated that Mr. Allen sited the By-Law to him and it is rather clear that the vote, if it is a five member Board, and you only have three members of that Board show up, yes it's a quorum, but any votes have to be 3-0. The majority of the Board is 3 votes. Mr. Davenport questioned what is the purpose of having a quorum? Mr. Cannon stated so that you can have a meeting. Mr. Davenport questioned how can you have a meeting if you can't have a vote? Mr. Cannon stated that you can have a vote but two people can

not vote and run through ordinances and/or resolutions of a five member Authority. He also stated that it is true on planning boards, on board of adjustments that if you have four or five members present of a seven or eight board that they represent the majority of that board. He has had many professionals state before these meetings that any of the items that they are going to vote on for tonight would have to be unanimous. Mr. Mach stated that he has never experienced this in the nine years. Mr. Cannon read the By-Laws after Mr. Allen brought this up to his attention. He thinks that it is clear, and is not sure if Mr. Tipton and/or the firm looked at the By-Laws for us, which seem to be more on the Robert's Rules where that majority of the Board needs to be all voting affirmative for any resolution to pass if the Board has five members. He is concerned and this is why he phoned Mr. Williams. When Mr. Cannon read the minutes where the vote for the drilling was 2-1, but the minutes did not say whether yes it is adopted and it proceeded thereafter. This was a question in his mind. He thinks the language of the By-Laws are rather straight forward. Mr. Mach stated that this is a matter for Counsel. Mr. Cannon agrees. Mr. Cannon reiterated that before we go ahead and approve minutes of votes that were 2-1 (the Express Times and the drilling issue), that these votes may not be legal votes.

Mr. Allen stated that when he first read the minutes the first one he came to was the resolution on doing the borings. He was unclear on whether the vote was approved or not approved because it did not say it was approved. He assumed it was not approved with the 2-1 vote. This is when he looked this up in the By-Laws. He suggested that the only answer is to amend the By-Laws.

Mr. Allen stated that some of the votes that were taken, under the circumstances knowing the dialogue that was there, were important to get a vote on the borings to stay on schedule. He appreciated the concern but would hate to see a precedent being set and that we are not following the By-Laws. He also stated that it is important that we have a quorum. He stated that you cannot conduct business if you have a quorum but a presentation can be given but cannot be voted on. The copy of the presentation is presented in the next packet for the members that were absent and vote is held for the next meeting. He acknowledged that what the Authority has to accomplish and the schedule that we are facing, it is important that we have a majority vote.

Mr. Williams will provide Ms. Fina a full copy of the Authority's By-Laws.

The March 23, 2015 regular monthly meeting minutes will be tabled until further discussions with Counsel.

Mr. Allen questioned to the Board if the borings have started? The borings have not started.

Executive session was not necessary on March 23, 2015.

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Williams presented two letters to the Board. The first letter was from Counsel to Freeholder Director Ed Smith requesting additional information from the County of Warren regarding some Capital projects for a possible fiscal contribution from the Authority to the County in the near future. The second letter was a response from Steve Marvin that lists some of the programs as far as the Capital improvements that the County will be doing in the fiscal year 2016.

PUBLIC COMMENTS (AGENDA ITEMS ONLY)

None

PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Davenport welcomed Mr. Mark Swyka from Cornerstone for a presentation on the conceptual designs for the landfill expansion.

Mr. Swyka stated that most of his presentation today has been presented to most of the Board previously in one form or another. He also stated that he will be reporting on the progress of engineering toward expansion of the landfill.

Mr. Swyka discussed the feasibility study that was completed last year where we looked at what portions of the County property may be used for landfill expansion. The feasibility study identified what we had in terms of limitations, boundaries, existing infrastructure that we want to avoid. He also stated that this determined a footprint. From this footprint, Cornerstone started to look at how we might utilize that footprint in a macroscopic way as opposed how we might use it on a day to day basis, but how we might develop it over time for the landfill. Mr. Swyka stated that his presentation will show how we can advance the landfill expansion, what large land areas are available, and what the expansion will look like in terms of air space, volume, and site line.

Mr. Swyka displayed a power point presentation which represented the conceptual engineering designs towards expansion of the landfill of essentially two areas; the first was to the West of the existing landfill footprint which is Cell 6 and to the North of the existing landfill which is Cell 7, the second was to the West with a reduced Northern footprint, the third was to the West only, and the fourth was to the North only.

Mr. Swyka presented a slide demonstrating the existing landfill footprint, landfill gas infrastructure, maintenance building, leachate treatment plant, and the leachate lagoons. Mr. Swyka also pointed out where the solar electric generation is located on the property. The areas to the North and the West are what they found to be feasible for expansion. The corner of the property was ignored because the slope of the land is towards the property boundaries, so it is impractical for construction and also represents a view break for additional construction of the landfill to the West.

Mr. Swyka presented the first concept plan which is to the West and the North. This concept design is approximately 37.7 acres of land. He stated that the final grades of this design will pick up over 7.59 million cubic yards of air space which equates to thirty eight (38) years of site life.

The second concept plan is to the West with a reduced northern footprint which is away from the property boundary to the North. This concept design is approximately 34.3 acres of air space. The volume for this footprint is approximately 7.06 million cubic yards with approximately 35.3 years of site life.

The third concept plan is to the West. This concept design is approximately 19.2 acres of air space. This concept is approximately 3.63 million cubic yards of air space which equates to 18.2 years of site life.

The fourth concept plan is to the North only. This concept design is approximately 15.4 acres of air space. Mr. Swyka stated that this concept is 1.98 million cubic yards of air space. This is approximately 9.9 years of life. Mr. Swyka stated that this is the least attractive alternative for the expansion.

Mr. Allen questioned the maximum cubic yardage. Does that include any vertical expansions? Mr. Swyka stated that is correct. Mr. Allen questioned that there is no possibility for another expansion vertically? Mr. Swyka stated the maximum cubic yards max out the landfill. Mr. Swyka also stated that with the conceptual designs presented, none can be additionally expanded vertical. Mr. Allen questioned for clarification that with the DEP permit for expansion, are you permitted for the full expansion vertically? Mr. Swyka answered that this is correct.

Mr. Swyka presented a view shed analysis from the intersections of Routes 46/519 and from the open field east of Hot Dog Johnny's for the proposed conceptual designs.

The line of site for conceptual plan number one was presented to the Board. A visual demonstration was provided from intersections of Route 46/519 across the wooded hill side to the peak of the landfill. The existing landfill peak is below the tree line and is not visible from the intersection of Route 46/519, but with the landfill expansion some visibility will be present. Mr. Cannon questioned the height number with going forward? Mr. Swyka stated that the base height is 390 and the peak height is 780. The next visual demonstration for conceptual design number one was provided from the cross section from Route 46 and the open field east of Hot Dog Johnny's to the landfill peak. The existing landfill peak is visible from this location and will continue to be visible with the landfill expansion.

The line of site for conceptual plan number two was presented. Mr. Swyka stated that the line of site for conceptual plan number two will be similar to the line of site in conceptual plan number one because there is not too much of a change from the Northern property line. He stated again that the existing landfill peak is below the tree line and is not visible from the intersection of Route 46/519, but with the landfill expansion some visibility above the tree line will be visible once the landfill develops. The next visual demonstration for conceptual design number two was provided from the cross section from Route

46 and the open field east of Hot Dog Johnny's to the landfill peak. The line of site, similar to conceptual plan number one, is visible with the existing landfill peak and will continue to be visible with the landfill expansion. Mr. Swyka stated that the base height is approximately 390 and the peak height is approximately 780, which is essentially the same as conceptual plan number one. Mr. Cannon questioned that the peak and base line height stays the same as conceptual plan number one? Mr. Swyka stated that there may be a few feet difference at the top, but essentially the same number. Mr. Cannon stated that it is just encroached farther in because the piece that is not extended North, but the peak line stays the same? Mr. Swyka explained that the plateau area gets a little smaller, but we are still talking about the same elevation. Mr. Cannon stated that the base at top of the plateau is a smaller space but the height will be the same.

The line of site for conceptual plan number three was presented. Mr. Swyka stated that the line of site for conceptual plan number three is where we start to see some difference. He explained the line of site from the intersection of Route 46/519 where the peak of the expansion to the West remains underneath the view block from the topography and the tree line. There is no change in the line of site from the cross section from Route 46 and the open field east of Hot Dog Johnny's to the landfill peak. He stated again where the existing landfill is visible, it will remain visible with the expansion.

The line of site for conceptual plan number four was presented. Mr. Swyka stated that the line of site for conceptual plan number four shows no visibility from the intersection of Route 46/519. The line of site from the cross section from Route 46 and the open field east of Hot Dog Johnny's to the landfill peak goes a little bit higher where this phase is bit closer to road than it was previously, but essentially the visibility remains the same.

Mr. Swyka presented the summary table for the landfill expansion concepts; conceptual plan one (1), two (2), three (3), and four (4). The different footprint sizes are 37.7, 34.3, 19.2, and 15.4 acres. The net airspace ranges from 7,595,000 cubic yards, 7,064,000 cubic yards, 3,632,000 cubic yards to 1,978,000 cubic yards. He also stated that the baseliner construction costs associated with this area estimated at \$29,050,000.00 for conceptual plan one (1), \$26,100,000.00 for conceptual plan two (2), \$14,560,000.00 for conceptual plan three (3), and \$12,490,000.00 for conceptual plan four (4). He stated the cost per cubic yard of air space ranges from \$3.83/cubic yard for conceptual plan one (1), \$3.70/cubic yard for conceptual plan two (2), \$4.01/cubic yard for conceptual plan three (3), and \$6.32/cubic yard for conceptual plan four (4).

Mr. Swyka presented the timeline of development for the landfill expansion. He stated that we expect the drilling to be completed in May 2015. The major modification application will take approximately nine (9) to twelve (12) months to prepare. He stated that Cornerstone would like to have authorization from the Board at this point, so we can make our target submittal date of May 2016. Mr. Swyka stated that we expect the DEP review approval process to take twelve (12) to eighteen (18) months. The target approval date at eighteen (18) months would be November of 2017. Mr. Swyka pointed out that Cornerstone made an essentially identical submittal to DEP for the Sussex County Landfill in January of 2014, they have not yet received approval of that submittal. With that approval, construction documents

could take four (4) to six (6) months and contractor procurements could take two (2) to three (3) months. He stated that the construction may take twelve (12) to eighteen (18) months for the first phase. A target completion date for the first construction phase may be as early as 2020. The preparation of the certification report submittals will take approximately three (3) months. Mr. Swyka stated that the DEP review and approval process could take three (3) to six (6) months. He also stated that by fall of 2020, Cornerstone believes that we may have DEP approval for use of the first expansion cell, with the existing landfill reaching full capacity by the Fall/Winter of 2021.

Mr. Swyka recommended that the Board select an expansion alternative from what he has proposed and authorize the next step of the major modification application. Mr. Williams stated that what Mr. Swyka requests from the Board is the permitting end of the expansion, not talking about how big we are going to make the next cell. Mr. Williams questioned that this will come after the DEP approvals? Mr. Swyka answered that in the course of preparing the engineering, we would talk about what makes sense or how to develop the landfill, what cells to construct and when, how you would develop the life of the facility as you move forward. Mr. Williams stated that this is a phased approach. Mr. Swyka explained that what Cornerstone will submit to DEP is what we are going to expand into this whole area and then how we utilize that space once the facility is permitted is up to us in the future. Mr. Williams stated that this will evolve over ten to fifteen to twenty years how that space eventually gets utilized or doesn't get utilized. Mr. Cannon stated that this also depends upon what the DEP may have or feel should be changed and/or not permitted. Mr. Swyka does not expect DEP to have issues because this is not a complex site. Mr. Allen questioned the proximity to the Pequest River, is there a setback requirement for a landfill? Mr. Swyka replied that we have a 300 foot setback and as long as we comply with this, then there are no issues.

Mr. Cannon had a question regarding the earthwork numbers on the summary table being quite different on conceptual design number two (2), where is that additional amount? Mr. Cannon stated that conceptual plan number one fits into conceptual plan number two because conceptual plan number one is bigger than conceptual plan number two so why does the cut on two have such an additional amount of earthwork? Mr. Swyka replied that this is a mathematical confrontation of the cut and the fill. If we build two, then we are going to use less fill then if we built one because of the reduced northern footprint.

Mr. Cannon suggested to Mr. Davenport that since we have four Board members today, he doesn't think that there is a contention on the 2-1 votes that were holding up the minutes, that maybe we could revote those today for clarity pending Counsel's review on the two issues of votes on the borings for Cornerstone and the newspaper. Ms. Fina clarified that if the votes were ok from the previous meeting, the votes would stand, but just in case you can revote today. She also stated that if the vote is found valid from previous meeting then the votes today would be invalid.

Mr. Allen stated that he was going to make the same suggestion. He also stated that since we have four members here today, based on the presentation and what he has read in the minutes, that it is important that we move on and get that vote legalized so Cornerstone can go ahead with the borings given the time table.

Mr. Cannon made a motion to authorize Cornerstone to move forward with the borings, seconded by **Mr. Davenport**.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Allen - Yes
 Mr. Mach - Yes
 Mr. Cannon - Yes
 Mr. Davenport - Yes

Mr. Cannon made a motion designating the Express-Times as our official newspaper for notices for the PCFA, seconded by **Mr. Allen**.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Allen - Yes
 Mr. Mach - No
 Mr. Cannon - Yes
 Mr. Davenport - Yes

Mr. Cannon made a motion to approve the regular monthly meeting minutes of March 23, 2015 if Counsel thinks we should do this or hold this out. Ms. Fina stated that we might want to hold out on this. Mr. Davenport stated that the vote relieves the situation with the borings.

Mr. Davenport stated that the Board needs to vote on authorization for Cornerstone to go to the State to get a permit. We have four conceptual plans presented from Cornerstone. He also stated that if we take the biggest conceptual plan and the State approves and we want to use smaller amounts, then we can do that or whatever we want. He understands that the first conceptual design goes closer to the Pequest than the second conceptual design. He suggested that the first plan would not be appropriate to permit.

Mr. Allen agrees with Mr. Davenport on the first conceptual plan. He is concerned about the Pequest, even though the 300 foot setback is required. Mr. Davenport stated that going with second conceptual plan, we are losing approximately 3-4 acres.

Mr. Cannon concurs for the permitting process that conceptual plan number two (2) makes the most sense for the permitting issue. He fully understands that we have steps ahead. He stated that in regards to the Pequest River and Route 46, the net difference it is not that much permitting conceptual plan number two (2). He also stated that through this process when we have hearings, Freeholder meetings, and public presentations, it is important that we showed our diligence as to the impact that the expansion would have. Mr. Cannon concurs that conceptual plan number two (2) is what we should proceed with as to permitting at this stage.

Mr. Davenport made a motion to authorize Cornerstone to proceed with the major modification permit for conceptual plan number two (2), seconded by **Mr. Cannon**.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Allen - Yes
 Mr. Mach - Yes
 Mr. Cannon - Yes
 Mr. Davenport - Yes

Mr. Williams suggested, for bookkeeping purposes, that we should get a quote from Mr. Swyka of what this is going to cost. He also stated that throughout each piece of this process, we have been doing contracts with Cornerstone. Mr. Cannon questioned that we are looking at a contract on taking everything out of conceptual plan number two (2) and present to the DEP, in the form of their paperwork? Mr. Swyka stated that is correct and that is a simple way to say it, because it is a lot of paperwork. Mr. Cannon stated that we are not going to spend money on anything else, just DEP paperwork. Mr. Williams stated that there is always that point in time, if we decided to, where we can make a decision to stop from proceeding further. Mr. Mach questioned that we already had a vote on approving the process, shouldn't we have a monetary value attached to that vote? Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Swyka will get back to us on the cost that we are going to have to approve as to what the cost is going to be to make the filing with the DEP, then we will approve that at that time. Mr. Swyka stated that the process is straight forward in terms of what they require for drawings, engineering design, and environmental impact assessment, all of that is spelled out. Mr. Allen questioned that we really do not have everything we need to go forward with the permit to the DEP? Mr. Swyka stated no, these are not the documents submitted to the DEP, what we are talking about now is the authorization to prepare the documents to submit to the DEP for the major modification application. Mr. Swyka also stated that the DEP term it a major modification application because it essentially increases your air space.

Mr. Mach questioned the Board if it was a proper protocol to authorize Mr. Swyka to give us a cost and then when we have the cost and the number associated with the expansion, or what he has to do, and then vote on the permitting? Mr. Davenport stated that what we just authorized is for Mr. Swyka to use that specific plan to do his permitting, but until we get a quote from him. Mr. Williams stated that Mr. Swyka will get us a number which will be in a contract. Mr. Mach questioned that shouldn't that be in the resolution as well? Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Swyka did not know the scope of what that permit would entail until we chose a conceptual plan today. He also stated that we picked a conceptual today and now Mr. Swyka is able to know the exact scope of what would need to be put into the DEP. Mr. Mach stated that when Mr. Swyka comes back with a more precise number, then we vote again? Mr. Cannon answered yes, we will need to approve the contract.

FACILITIES/RECYCLING

Mr. Williams stated that the Agenda item "A-2" will be held for executive session as a contract negotiation.

Mr. Williams stated that the treatment plant operations are operating smooth with no issues. He also stated that we continue to have an open communication with PRMUA in Oxford. Everything is fine. Mr. Cannon questioned Oxford's upgrade schedule? Mr. Williams stated that the upgrade was scheduled to be done in March, which did not happen. He stated that the next schedule for completion is September or possibly October because of issues with their contractor.

Mr. Williams reported that the landfill operations are running smooth with no issues. All the equipment is running well. He stated that the old compactor continues to be started up periodically.

Mr. Williams reported on the H2S Removal System. Mr. Williams stated that the H2S levels are in the single digits since the media change was completed a couple of months ago. No issues.

Mr. Williams reported on the Solar Panel Project. Everything is going well with the discounts as per our contracts.

Mr. Williams presented to the Board the next item on the Agenda that deals with the residential recycling program. He stated that through discussions over the last several months and having discussions with Freeholder Director Smith, the Mosquito Commission has been concerned with mosquito issues that come up in the spring, summer and the fall and a lot has to do with the tires that lay around. Over the last several months, Mr. Williams has been researching reputable tire recycling entities. He presented the Board with two companies with a breakdown of costs of recycling the tires. He used two separate scenarios in his cost breakdown; the transportation with a 100 cubic yard container or a 40 yard roll off box. He narrowed the companies down to two; RubberRecycle which is in Lakewood, NJ and Covanta, which is in Conshocken, PA. He stated the difference between the two in the numbers is transportation to both facilities is straight forward, about \$25.00/load difference charge. It becomes costly with RubbeRecycle because they grind up the tires and use as playground material and/or melt them down for a number of other products. Both facilities have limitations of how the tires can be transported and what they can accept. He also stated that both facilities cannot accept a tire larger than 20" in size. The Covanta facility can accept the tires larger but they have to be chopped into quarters and we do not have the equipment here on site to do that. For comparison purposes, Mr. Williams left the limitations the same for both facilities; 20" and smaller.

Mr. Cannon stated that with the discussions about the limitations, the cost per ton, obviously Covanta is much cheaper. He also stated that with the limitations included at both sites, is there a possibility where we could use Covanta, but to say no dirt on the tires is going to limit a lot of tires. He suggested a pre-assessment station where we could take the larger tires which are also the problem of getting rid of all over the place. He questioned could we look into the possibility of having some little station that would chop and rinse the tires? They wouldn't be full of water and mud, then we would be able to take all tires. Mr. Williams replied that a cost factor is involved, which would then take the prices up above to where people may not recycle. He also stated that in our tariff as it stands today with the landfill, we have a \$2.50/tire fee included but we do not take them because we could never find a reputable outfit to take the tires to. He added that if the residents do their due diligence and take the rims off, the tires would be accepted. Mr. Cannon questioned who will determine if the tires are acceptable? Mr. Williams stated that the scale house staff are going to determine whether there is water, dirt, rims or 20" or smaller tires.

Mr. Williams recently attended a Mosquito Commission meeting and noted that the tires are notorious for breeding mosquitos. Their concern is not knowing where the mosquito larvae may be coming from within the tires, which may create an infestation from mosquitos that are normally not common in this area. This was a big discussion at the recent Mosquito Commission meeting. He stated that this is why we would exclude the water filled tires from coming to this facility. Mr. Williams stated that all the monitoring of the tires will be done at the scale house. Mr. Williams proposed that we put a box on site, collect the tires on a daily basis and when our containers get full, we call a hauling company in here to put them into the larger container and take them off site. As we store the containers on site, Mr. Williams stated that we would have the containers tarped, to eliminate the collection of water on our site. He also stated that once the 100 yard container is full, that is when we will call a vendor. Mr. Cannon stated that it is going to be a difficult track to determine for the scale house personnel to go through each tire and determine if acceptable or not.

Mr. Williams stated that there is a County tire recycling program out there but the monies have not been released yet. It is a matching funds type deal. He also stated that apparently Warren County may or may not receive \$25,000.00.

Mr. Cannon suggested we look into a processing station for tire recycling. Mr. Williams again stated that this will cause the cost per tire to increase. Mr. Cannon stated that if we had a process or processor in place, and whether we then look to the county for money and/or mosquito commission to apply some grants dedicated to tire recycling. Mr. Cannon thinks it is going to be a problem to just let residents come in without a process in place. Mr. Davenport suggested that we look into this and see if we can come up with a ballpark cost. Mr. Williams stated that the way our tariff is setup, if this cost ends up going above \$2.50/tire then we have to revisit that with the DEP with our tariff and have them change that. Mr. Williams stated he will look into the costs for the Board.

Mr. Mach questioned if we were going to charge residents for the tire recycling? Mr. Williams stated that his understanding that there will be a charge unless we find money and his suggestion is that we charge for this. Mr. Mach questioned what the tire dealers charge per tire? Mr. Williams answered that he thinks it's about \$2.50 per tire also. Mr. Mach stated that the intent is more than to get the tires that are out there in fields. Mr. Williams stated that if we can keep the charge low enough to cause the residents to come here and utilize the fee, than that is a plus to get them out of the back yards. Mr. Allen stated that if the residents could get a better price here, then they will come here.

Mr. Williams stated that the HHW and Electronics Collection Event was held on April 26, 2015. We took in 827 vehicles from 7:30 am until 12:30 pm. He also stated that it appeared this time that a lot of people had everything. In comparison to last spring's event, it was almost identical in vehicular traffic, but it appears that a lot of people had paints, pesticides, and such compared to the previous years. The unloading time was a little bit slower but overall people were happy. Mr. Williams stated that overall the event went well.

FINANCE/PERSONNEL

Mr. Olshefski stated that the HHW and Electronics event is paid through the state grant that we get. The annual \$100,000.00 funds cover the events held in the spring and the fall.

Mr. Olshefski reported on the County contribution which is a donation going back to the County. This was discussed earlier this year. The proposal was for a base \$100,000.00 to the County and then monitor the revenues as we went through the year with \$6.5 million being the threshold of the cost to run this operation and anything above that 10% would go to the County. He stated that the Board wanted the money to be used by the County for Capital. We would book it on the County's end in our general fund and then at the end of the year transfer it to Capital which would be used the following year. This is not a timing issue because it will not be utilized until next year. If the Board decides to do this contribution to County, then we will need to do a budget amendment.

Mr. Williams questioned Mr. Olshefski that moving forward, and preparing our budget for next year, we can then put, if the Board agrees to the \$100,000.00, as a line item? The County would then receive that money up front? Then as we go through the year, would we then continue with the formula of 10% over the base budget for an additional payment at the end of the year? Mr. Olshefski stated that by the statute we are allowed to put a percentage of our fund balance. This year our maximum allowance is \$390,000.00. Mr. Williams suggested that Mr. Olshefski again present the proposal and the layout, then the Board could take this up for possible adoption at the next meeting. Mr. Olshefski will present this to the Board next month.

Mr. Olshefski presented the March monthly report for the Board. The operating monthly report is running normally. It reflected in the budget and expenditures. The expenses from this year to last year are comparable.

Mr. Davenport stated that a motion was needed to pass the Resolution to Pay Bills (R-04-01-15).

On a motion by *Mr. Cannon* seconded by *Mr. Allen* the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *April 27, 2015*.

R E S O L U T I O N

R-04-01-15

To Pay Bills – April 27, 2015

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. Mach	-	Yes
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes
	Mr. Davenport	-	Yes

We hereby certify Resolution to Pay Bills in the amount of **\$575,882.70** to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County on the *27th* day of *April, 2015*.

Jamie Banghart, Recording Secretary
James Williams, Director of Operations

Mr. Williams presented the Waste Disposal Fee Schedule for approval from the Board.

Mr. Williams stated that the handout of the waste disposal fee schedule of the hauler contracts marked in red will need approval from the Board. He stated that all of our haulers have signed a contract.

Mr. Mach made a motion to approve the hauler disposal contracts marked in red, seconded by **Mr. Davenport**.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Allen	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Yes
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes
	Mr. Davenport	-	Yes

NEW BUSINESS

None

GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT

Ms. Katharine Fina had no report for the Board.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Cannon questioned if we have heard anything new from Tilcon? Mr. Williams answered that we have not heard anything from Tilcon.

CLOSING PUBLIC COMMENT

Freeholder Director Ed Smith welcomed Mr. Allen to the Board on behalf of the Freeholders and for taking the position.

Freeholder Director Smith stated that Mr. Williams attended both the SWAC meeting and the Mosquito Commission meeting recently in terms of getting his arms around the tire problem. It was a pretty informative discussion in terms of transport of the species, possibilities there. He stated that the Mosquito Commission has entertained the possibility of making this a monitoring station to make sure that we do not have a migration of species.

Freeholder Director Smith stated that, in terms of the recycling fees, if we were able to obtain funding through SWAC or through the recycling money, this would actually be something that could be incorporated, like on the hazardous waste day. In which case, then it would be a subsidized scenario at that particular time and we do have the ability then to get those tonnage amounts.

Freeholder Director Smith commented, regarding the Capital contribution, that he is greatly appreciated. He also stated that, if we look at this from a road perspective, this has been one of the major complaints from county residents with the importation of garbage. The roads are taking a beating because of this. The contribution would offset one of the major concerns that people have planned to do.

In closing, Freeholder Director Smith mentioned that he is pleased with the choice this Board has taken in terms of moving forward with the landfill expansion. The choice that the Board made is best valued most sensitive to the setback scenario for the Pequest and the concerns for the neighborhood.

PRESS COMMENTS & QUESTIONS

None

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Executive Session was entered at 10:18 am for discussion regarding Contract Negotiations.

RESOLUTION

R-04-02-15

AUTHORIZING EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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. Mach**

Seconded By: **Mr. Davenport**

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Allen	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Yes
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes
	Mr. Davenport	-	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.

Jamie Banghart, Recording Secretary

Dated: 04/27/15

