

POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY
OF WARREN COUNTY

MINUTES OF REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING

July 25, 2016

Chairman James Cannon called the regular monthly meeting of the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County to order at approximately 9:33 am.

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

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Allen	-	Present
	Mr. Pasquini	-	Present
	Mr. Pryor	-	Present
	Mr. Mach	-	Present
	Mr. Cannon	-	Present

Also present: James Williams, Director of Operations; Brian Tipton, General Counsel; Dan Olshefski, Chief Financial Officer; Joe Algieri, Atlantic Scale; Joe Luongo, Atlantic Scale; Mark Swyka, Cornerstone; Matt Beebe, Cornerstone; Jamie Banghart, Recording Secretary.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Cannon.

Mr. Cannon read the following statement: "Adequate notice of this meeting of July 25, 2016 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 June 27, 2016.

Mr. Pasquini made a motion to approve the regular monthly meeting minutes as presented, seconded by **Mr. Pryor**.

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

Mr. Cannon presented the Executive Session Minutes from June 27, 2016.

Mr. Pasquini made a motion to approve the executive session minutes of June 27, 2016 as presented, seconded by **Mr. Allen**.

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

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Williams stated that we received a letter from the NJ DEP to Covanta approving the extension of their R&D project, liquid injection, which originally expired on June 30th and has now been extended to September 30th.

Mr. Williams presented a letter that we received from the NJ DEP dated July 13th. He stated that they are finally getting around to doing the public comment on our air permit application, which we submitted approximately one year ago.

Mr. Pryor had a question regarding Covanta. He asked if they were getting an extension because they had trouble getting started or if the schedule slipped? Mr. Williams replied that he does not know exactly why that is. Mr. Pryor questioned if Covanta was undertaking the pilot program now? Mr. Williams replied that they are doing it and from his understanding, it is working out well. Mr. Cannon questioned should we send them an email as to asking them how the progress is? Mr. Williams replied with he will send them an email.

PUBLIC COMMENTS (AGENDA ITEMS ONLY)

None

FINANCE/PERSONNEL

Mr. Olshefski reported on the June Financial Report. He stated that everything is going on target. He also stated that the solid waste collection are continuing to be ahead of last year. The cash balances are up over one million dollars for the year. The average fee per ton is \$22.95 for cover and \$51.76 for solid waste. He also stated that our receivables are in line. He also stated that we are ahead to date with our revenue and our operating expenses for the year are only at 36%, which is good.

Mr. Olshefski reported that the credit card transition has gone through with no issues.

Mr. Olshefski stated that on sheet 20 of the finance report, there are two small receivables that have been out there since 2014, which were cash customers. There is a receipt of \$24.56 from one and \$21.78 from the other for a total of \$46.34. He recommends that we write those two off as uncollectable. Mr. Pryor questioned if we have an arrangement with any collection agency at all? Mr. Williams replied that what we would do is take them to court, except he believes that these two customers are not in the area. Ms. Pluto stated that these two customers were not bounced checks. They paid some of their bill and did not have enough money to pay the amount owed. She stated that

she spoke to White Township regarding this and we would not be able to do anything with this because it was not a bounced check. Ms. Pluto stated that she got all the information from the customers, including driver's license and their addresses, sent them the bill. They never paid. Mr. Cannon agrees with Mr. Olshefski that we should just write them off instead of carrying them over.

Mr. Cannon questioned Mr. Olshefski if we have received the Pequest number? Mr. Olshefski replied with no we have not but he thinks that it will be similar to what we have been getting. The flow has been pretty consistent. He also stated that we should receive that this week. He will check on that.

Mr. Cannon requested that Mr. Olshefski give the Board an update on how we are going to proceed and/or decide and/or keep track of our County contribution. He questioned Mr. Olshefski if he will do this completely separate or incorporate this within his report?

Mr. Olshefski replied that he was going to bring this up as we got closer to the fall. He stated that what we started last year was the discussion about giving a contribution to the County. He also stated that we disbursed to the County \$100,000.00. There was a calculation that he had done, which he can bring for the next meeting that showed that our annual expenses were roughly \$6,000,000.00 and any revenue above and beyond that, if the Board chose, 10% of that could possibly go back to the County. He also stated that this is how we arrived at the amount of \$155,000.00.

Mr. Cannon stated that he is not going to speak for any other member, but he did not get any phone calls, no picture was taken, or no plaque was given to the PCFA for this contribution. Mr. Olshefski stated that he thinks that we got a thank you from Mr. Smith. Mr. Cannon stated that the reason he is asking is because we did not get much of a thank you from the first one, so he does not know if it is an expectation on the second one. He would have expected Mr. Williams in the newspaper with a big check in his hand. Mr. Olshefski stated that it is not an expectation. He also stated that the County does not have it as an anticipated revenue. This is strictly up to this Board if they want to do this.

Mr. Cannon stated that the process that we went through and he had tried to get this done the last time he was on this Board and he was laughed out of this room when he brought this up. He also stated that this has been a long time coming and he thinks that there should have been some more acknowledgement of it.

Mr. Olshefski stated that he thinks that on the acknowledgement part, at a Freeholder meeting, Freeholder Smith brought this up and it was in the Freeholder minutes, that they were appreciative and recognized the Board members at that time.

Mr. Olshefski stated that we do have a CD that is maturing in about a week or two. We will be out to get some bids and enroll in currently where we are at of .65% on that CD.

Mr. Williams stated that he and Mr. Olshefski will be working on the 2017 budget sometime in early August. They will have a draft for the Board no later than the September meeting.

Mr. Cannon presented the Resolution to Pay the Bills (R-07-01-16)

On a motion by *Mr. Pasquini*, seconded by *Mr. Allen*, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *July 25th, 2016*.

R E S O L U T I O N

R-07-01-16

To Pay Bills – July 25, 2016

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	-	Yes
	Mr. Pryor	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Yes
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes

We hereby certify Resolution to Pay Bills in the amount of \$412,157.16 to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County on the *25th* day of *July, 2016*.

Jamie Banghart, Recording Secretary
James Williams, Director of Operations

Mr. Cannon stated that a motion was needed to write off the outstanding amounts from 2014.

Mr. Pasquini made a motion to write off \$24.56 and \$21.78 from 2014 for a total of \$46.34, seconded by *Mr. Allen*.

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

PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Cannon introduced Mr. Joe Algieri and Mr. Joe Luongo from Atlantic Scale.

Mr. Williams stated that as we all have discussed at last month's meeting, he asked Atlantic Scale to come back and give a refresher for us on where we stand with the fix that was done on this scale. Then, moving forward, as far as installing an additional new scale and technologies.

Mr. Algieri stated that they were present at our January meeting. He stated that Sands Construction went ahead with the concrete repairs that were needed on the scale and Atlantic Scale put some new steel underneath and a couple of new load cells. He also stated that it seems to be working fine.

Mr. Algieri stated that last week, Weights and Measures were here and we were sealed with what they call subject. This means it is 50 pounds off on approximately 55,000 pounds. He also stated that they came in behind them and made the necessary adjustments, which was an electronic adjustment. He also stated that even new scales will do this and this is not an issue.

Mr. Algieri stated that the repair looks like it is holding up ok but he thinks that the last time we spoke, we spoke about possibly adding another unit or doing something with the existing scale that we already have.

Mr. Cannon stated that the thought process with the expansion and changing roads, access, and egress, that there is a possibility to place an alternate site with another scale. We also then can possibly weigh in and out without having the same line. Then we could have a scale offline to properly repair the existing scale. This is the overview of the thought process not necessarily putting another scale right next to that scale but the ability to not have down times. This would make the scale last much longer. Mr. Cannon stated that we are trying to get an overview of where and what we could do with that and what Mr. Algieri's and Mr. Luongo's thoughts are on that.

Mr. Algieri stated that speaking on the existing unit that we have now, and if we had a bigger window they would like to come in and do some more structural work. He also stated that they would change the technology that is underneath of it from the MTX type technology to the PDX technology. There would not be junction boxes and the diagnostics goes quicker, which is less of a down window every time there is an issue with it.

Mr. Cannon questioned the date of technology that we have in there now? Mr. Algieri replied that the technology is from the early 1990's. He stated that this technology is fine and there are hundreds of them still used in the State of New Jersey and all over the country.

Mr. Algieri stated that the technology is to the point where it has had thousands and thousands of weighments over it. It cycles after a while. He also stated that if we put new technology under it, this does not make the super structure better. We still have a 15 year or older super structure. Mr. Algieri stated that their plan was to make it a little bit better to get a little more out of it so that we could possibly put another unit in.

Mr. Cannon stated that if we could have another scale, the wear and tear on the existing scale, theoretically we would be able to max that out for a much longer time. Mr. Algieri stated that it is cut in half. Half the cycles that it sees now because we are in and out weighing on that unit. Mr. Williams stated that on average we are putting 50,000 vehicles times two per year for 25 years. Mr. Algieri stated that he does not know what the original quote was. Every weighing device has a quoted number of

cycles that it is designed for and he is sure that we are far beyond what it was originally quoted for. He also stated that they have engineering specs on the thickness of the steel, the cross members in it. Certain units are built for low throughput and other units are built for high throughput many cycles over and over again.

Mr. Cannon stated that the thought process, instead of investing entirely in a single new unit to replace the existing unit, was to dovetail a new scale with our existing scale and then we would be able to extend the life of that one. The difference of being able to take them in and out, we could fix a lot of problems as far as the traffic issues that we have here.

Mr. Cannon questioned regarding the location, what can Atlantic Scale do and not do? Are there any requirements that it cannot go in a certain place? Obviously besides electricity, is there any? Mr. Algieri replied that you are only limited to the amount of conduit that you want to put in the ground, basically because there is only a single quarter inch cable that communicates from the scale platform back to the scale house. Everything else happens in the scale house as far as data communication. There is one run out to the scale. He stated that typically if you were to do a study and look at dual scales in New Jersey, meaning scale house in the middle, there is usually one to the left and one to the right. This is usually the model that they see more because then you have possibly one operator working both sides.

Mr. Mach stated that Mr. Algieri said that the limit is to how much conduit you want to put in the ground. Do you lose transmission? Do you lose signal as you go longer and longer? Mr. Algieri replied that they can go 1,000 feet before they have to say the data signal is not as robust as it should be. He stated that what is nice is what is coming back is not a voltage signal, it is coded in ones and zeros. He also stated that before it was voltage that came back. If the signal got weak, it did not return to zero quickly. He also stated that now basically you are having digital information come over it from every load cell. On load cell number one, this is my weight. Throughout the number of load cells that they have up to 64, that is the way it collects the information.

Mr. Allen questioned what was the life cycle for the structure for the existing cell? Mr. Luongo replied the model that we have is 7560 model SD is about a 15 year life span on average. Mr. Allen questioned that we are at the end of that 15 year? Mr. Cannon stated that we are way beyond that. Mr. Williams stated that this was installed in 1986, so we have gone way over that. He also stated that it has worked out to our benefit. He stated that we have not had a lot of down time but now it is getting to that point where literally the structure is beginning to fail.

Mr. Algieri stated that they sell Mettler Toledo weighing equipment. He also stated that every manufacturer has a life cycle number that is associated with it. It is only attribute to the way the engineer, Mettler Toledo, prepared it in the factory, the sealed preparation, what they do inside, and what we cannot see before they weld all the channels up to keep it from rotting from the inside out. He also stated that it is a great unit.

Mr. Cannon questioned that we bought the right one first time around? Mr. Algieri replied with he thinks so and we made the right decision.

Mr. Luongo stated that something to consider with reference to the existing scale, if we were to replace the load cell system with a new patented PDX load cell system, which comes with a 10 year warranty, we would in essence have a new scale that is doing all the weighing. He also stated that here is the key, we know that the super structure is limited but it may be good for another four or five years. If we did that, Mettler Toledo has a program that if we get the PDX load cell system, the clock starts

running. Within five years, if we decide to get a new scale which we will need to within that time period, they will credit 75% of what you pay for the PDX load cell system toward a new scale. He stated that this may be something to consider. He also stated that with our situation, this may come in to play. This way with the budgeting, we would not have to put all that money out one time on one new scale. He stated that we could get the load cell system and then a few years later, we get the scale and the credit towards it. This is how confident Mettler Toledo is with what they sell.

Mr. Luongo stated that the PDX load cell system came out approximately eight years ago. It was first in Europe for a couple of years, then it came to the United States. He stated that it came with a five year full warranty, which is parts, labor, trucking, everything. After having five or six years of data, which they have now, they went from a five year to a ten year warranty on the entire program as of January 2016. He stated that this speaks volumes for how well it is performed.

Mr. Pasquini questioned that we are looking at replacing the first one and then possibly adding a second one? Mr. Cannon replied with he would not say replacing the first one. He thinks that the thought process is to get the maximum allowable even farther down the road with the first one without having the full stress that it has had for the amount of time we have had it on it now. He also stated that we are in dangerous area right now with the existing scale. Mr. Pasquini questioned that we are considering a second one? Mr. Cannon replied with correct. Mr. Pasquini stated that this would be a true benefit to our customers with moving the trucks in and out faster. Does this help us with more customers coming in? Does this make it more efficient? Mr. Williams replied that this will enhance the operation because right now everybody has to cue back in and there are a lot of hot headed people out there. He stated that there has almost been fist fights because people not letting other people cut in to weigh out. This will eliminate all of that and the friction between customers. There is a lot of that going on. He also stated that it helps our operation here, it lessens the line because a lot of times they will be backed up because others are trying to weigh out on the same scale. If we have an inbound and an outbound scale, this literally cleans up the operation to the way it should be. He thinks that we may have discussed that last time, if we do add a second scale and once that is in place, then we take the original scale down and replace the load cells, fix the super structure at that time all while we have a brand new one in place. When that is done, then we have two almost brand new scales.

Mr. Pasquini questioned how much money are we talking about? Mr. Williams replied that he thinks that this cost is around \$80,000.00 or \$100,000.00. Mr. Luongo stated that the cost is closer to the \$80,000.00. He stated that it is approximately \$50,000.00 for the entire scale and then approximately \$25,000.00 to \$30,000.00 for the construction for the ramps, the approaches and that type of thing. He also stated that all together it would be between \$75,000.00 and \$80,000.00 for the new scale. Mr. Mach questioned how much for the repairs on the old scale? Mr. Luongo questioned Mr. Mach about when he says repairs, do you mean just switching the load cell system? Mr. Mach replied with yes. Mr. Luongo replies with it will be probably be under \$25,000.00.

Mr. Pasquini questioned if there was a time frame for when we were looking to do this? Mr. Williams stated that we have to remember that the fix that we just did was guaranteed for twelve months and we are six or seven months into that already. Mr. Williams stated that if we could put an RFP together relatively quickly. He believes that if Atlantic Scale were awarded it, they could probably get the concrete work done October or November.

Mr. Cannon stated that it was at his suggestion that we have Atlantic Scale in today so we are looking forward enough so we are not behind the eight ball. If we get close to out of warranty and we have a catastrophe, then we are stuck with not planning financially properly. He also stated that maybe the

ideas of what Mr. Williams could incorporate into an RFP is his knowledge is day to day operations and future locations.

Mr. Pasquini questioned is that our intention that we start the process of the RFP? Mr. Cannon replied with he just wanted to make sure everybody, not necessarily an RFP but he wanted to get an idea that we can do an RFP but feeling from the Board as to direction, then we can go from there. He wants everybody to be eyes wide open as far as what we are facing and/or again he thinks that we are on fumes with the existing scale. He thinks that we have been luckier than lucky. If the scale goes down, he knows that Covanta has been nice neighbor, but that is not how we want to run a business. He stated that this is where we are at.

Mr. Pryor questioned that once the signal reaches the scale house, are we current on our hardware and software for billing and customer service? Mr. Williams replied with yes. He stated that the hardware that we have is through WasteWorks and they are tied in on a daily basis. They do the upgrades and we pay a maintenance fee with them. This is all up to date. Mr. Luongo stated that it would just be a matter of bringing another serial cable to our system and we would have two inputs. Mr. Williams stated that the information from the scale is downloaded on a daily basis back to this building through a dedicated fiber optic line.

Mr. Allen stated that if we went to the two scales, the calibration of those two, weighing somebody in and then you are weighing somebody out on two different scales, does that add to the calibration? Mr. Algieri replied that it is acceptable in New Jersey to weigh in on one and weigh out on the other. He stated that it is a normal practice. He also stated that in the beginning many years ago, it was something that they did not really like but you have to get vehicles through. He also stated that as long as they are both within tolerance, which of course Weights and Measures comes in and Atlantic Scale comes in on a quarterly basis to check them anyway as far as getting tare weights and gross weights lined up.

Mr. Algieri suggested to the Board that whatever they want to do is fine with them, it is just that they do not want to put concrete in the ground much later than November.

Mr. Williams questioned Mr. Algieri and Mr. Luongo, since they have done these installations in the past, as far as the RFPs that they have worked with in the past, is there a site plan done by somebody else that if you were doing the installation that you would need? He is just thinking about as far as where the location of the scale is by our building. Mr. Algieri replied that this really differs from site to site. Most of the sites that they work with, the scales are basically side by side and trailer in the middle. He does not know if we have the real estate for that or not. He stated that they went out and looked around the last time they were here, and he did not really see anything that would stop them other than moving some small things around from stopping that. Mr. Williams stated that as far as if they had this job here, having a site plan with the scale house and the existing scale and another one drawn in, then that is something that they would not think they would need? Mr. Algieri replied with no. Mr. Williams questioned as far as locating it in the right spot? Mr. Algieri replied with that this is totally up to the mechanics of how the business runs. He stated that this is your business mechanics and it really does not have anything to do with them. He also stated that we tell them where we want it, they put the lines on the ground, and then they start digging.

Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Williams wants something in between spray paint and us hiring an engineer, he thinks that is what he is saying. Mr. Pryor stated that he thinks that this is something that Mr. Williams could do. He thinks that when you bid these things that you have to show them the

configuration. He also stated that Mr. Williams could probably sketch that out. That is probably enough.

Mr. Cannon stated that we do have the room out there for a new scale. He thinks that the 1,000 feet as Mr. Mach said is extremely important also. He does not see us going past that number as far as 1,000 feet. He would look at the recommendations.

Mr. Cannon stated knows there could be laundry list of things that would be recommended on the existing scale. He does not think we need to go down the RFP route with the existing scale as to repairs. He thinks that with a new scale that is a different story.

Mr. Pryor stated that we would need a building permit for this, would we not? Mr. Pasquini stated that this is correct. He stated that we will need a sketch for the building permit. Mr. Cannon agreed.

Mr. Williams stated that he thinks that if we will be changing the load cells on the existing scale, then we could incorporate that work in with this RFP. Mr. Cannon thinks that it would be fairer if we are comparing apples to apples, then we are just looking at a new scale for an RFP as opposed to what may be recommended on the existing scale. Some people can say you need A, B, and C then others can say you only need A and C.

Mr. Algieri stated that what he would like to caution the Board on also, is that they do not want to get to a point where we keep on putting dollars into a unit that needs to be changed. This is the other thing. He also stated that they could put load cells under it and it will work and weigh incredible. This does not make the steel, the welds, all the nuts and bolts, and all the threaded holes new again. He also stated that all this does is give us a good piece of weighing equipment. He stated that believe him, that if this was him sitting on the other side, he would want to make sure that he was not just throwing money down a black hole.

Mr. Allen questioned that the super structure that is underneath of there is way more than past the 15? Mr. Algieri replied with the original foundation is from the scale before this one.

Mr. Cannon stated that let us work it backwards from Mr. Williams' point then, what on the existing scale? Are we talking about entirely brand new or is there anything in the existing scale or percentage of that existing scale's components that we would be able to keep? Mr. Luongo stated that if we were to do the PDX conversion, we would keep everything the way it is except put some new sensors under it, meaning that there are some adaptor blocks and so on that they would put in. He also stated that when it comes time for a new scale for that foundation, then what they really need to do is to break the substantial amount of that old concrete away and expose some good rebar, put some new rebar in and make some good footings for the new scale.

Mr. Cannon stated that just for abstract not holding to anything, \$100,000.00 on the existing scale, of that \$100,000.00 that was a completely new scale, how much of that is now existing in place that we would be able to take off that \$100,000.00? Is it 10%? Is it 20%? How much of that are we still able to use? Any of it? Mr. Luongo replied with he would say zero. Mr. Cannon stated that we are now back down talking about two brand new scales. Mr. Luongo replied with yes.

Mr. Williams stated that the installation of a new scale and upgrading the technology of the old scale until at some point in time, four or five years from now, that super structure fails. We will be fixing it at that time. He stated that what he was getting at is the technology that is going to be used in the new

scale, incorporate that technology for the existing scale in with that RFP so they both have the same technologies. He also stated that replacing the load cells and the technology that is in the existing scale with that of the new scale so it is done simultaneously. This way all of the technology on both scales are exactly the same. Then four or five years from now when we do replace the existing scale, he stated that is when we do the concrete work, the deck at that time. This is what he was saying.

Mr. Cannon stated that so what Mr. Williams is thinking, the electronic change out, which he thinks that we are all agreeing on that, but ride that existing scale out. Mr. Williams questioned if this is what Mr. Luongo was saying was to ride that out? Or no? Mr. Luongo stated that this is what he was eluding to. He stated that the point is the deck itself is, the integrity is comprised, he does not think that it is as far as looking at a window of three four years down the road. He thinks that we will be fine as long as we have the new load cells with the new base plates and that ensures everything up for a couple of years. Then we go into that program that he discussed earlier. Mr. Cannon stated that then we are taking 50% of the trucks off of it. Mr. Luongo stated that this is correct with the less cycles.

Mr. Allen stated that regarding the super structures themselves, if there is a failure, a catastrophic failure, and there is a big truck on it fully loaded, is there a possibility that there could be some damage to the truck? Does this thing collapse in on itself? Mr. Algieri stated that there is only about ten to twelve inches, and if it does collapse then it would fall onto the load cell then there is thick base plates. He also stated that the chances are minimal. It might be two inches that it would drop. It would not go down into a hole or anything like that.

Mr. Algieri stated that what they are trying to get at is that they are trying to protect everybody, including themselves. He stated that we have old steel out there that has a lot of welds in it and there is connections that are made through those welds. It is cycled. He also stated that the scale is our cash register. They want to make sure it is always working the best it possibly can for us. He also stated that they knew what they were up against the last time, and thank goodness it is working and everything is fine.

Mr. Cannon stated to Mr. Algieri and Mr. Luongo that we greatly appreciate and he thinks that they will be hearing from us.

Mr. Pasquini questioned that before we move to the next presentation, do we want to make a motion? Mr. Cannon stated that we are going to talk to Mr. Tipton on what we can or cannot do just for the public bidding and the numbers but he would like to talk to Mr. Tipton before we put a resolution out there.

Mr. Algieri and Mr. Luongo left the meeting at 10:13 am.

Mr. Cannon stated that for informational purposes, A-3, any discussion on this will be discussed in executive session.

Mr. Cannon introduced Mr. Mark Swyka and Mr. Matt Beebe from Cornerstone to go over the issues with the submissions to the State and the wetlands.

Mr. Beebe stated that earlier this month, they sent a memo on the wetland delineation. He stated that the summary of that memo was that there were wetlands found within the project area. He also stated that to continue the project in its current form, a mitigation would have to be done to those wetlands. We would have to move them to a different location on site. Mr. Beebe stated that typically a mitigation would

involve adding extra wetland area to the one. Mr. Mach questioned if this meant creating a new wetland area? Mr. Beebe replied that this means creating a new wetland to take the place of the wetland that would be removed.

Mr. Beebe stated that to do that work, there would be two permits for the wetlands for this site.

One would be a General Permit 1 (GP1), which would involve just cleaning out our existing storm water basin as a matter of general maintenance. This necessarily does not need to be done with the landfill expansion but since we already entered a permitting for the other wetlands, then they would recommend doing that permitting and that work within the bounds of the landfill expansion work.

The other permit would be General Permit 6 (GP6). This permit would be for the mitigation of the isolated fresh water wetlands as part of the expansion work. He stated that in that we would have to do a permitting because we let them know that we would want to mitigate those wetlands moved to another location. Then we would have to have a wetland mitigation plan developed. A wetland mitigation plan would be to the State saying here is the area where we would place them and this is our plan of how we are going to replace those wetlands. We would then need the approval from the State on that to go forward after that point, which would be the construction of those wetlands as part of the landfill expansion.

Mr. Cannon stated just to expand a little bit to give an overview to the other members. He also stated that basically the DEP has made a determination as to that is a wetland. We still have not submitted our plans to the State, as to the expansion. He also stated that he knows that these guys expected the wetland delineation to not happen, but it has happened. The footprint of the landfill is in the submission for the current permit that we have been trying to get in since April/May. He also stated that then with the wetland delineation what we would have to do with the other GP6 permit and what we would have to do then around the landfill, around the footprint, would be determined thereafter, which is where he has a question. He is trying to figure out the disconnect if we make a submission and we are then approved on that submission to the State as the expansion, and we are held to that is what the expansion is going to be. Then some other things come up with the wetlands and archeological study, which is now required. He stated that this could impact the plan we already submitted to the State. His concern is that if we could not do all of that together, so that if some change in our submission to the State, would help or lessen the impact on what we had to do with the wetlands and/or the recreating of the wetlands. If the difference is that we took two years off the life of the landfill because of the footprint change that then we were not impacting a wetlands and/or we were not having to create a new wetlands and/or what may come up in an archeological study. He stated that this is where he is at with this. He is concerned that if we submit something for our expansion on a footprint that we have proposed and we get approved for that and then that impacts more so on what may come back on the wetlands archeological afterwards because we are not doing this in conjunction. We are doing this separately.

Mr. Beebe stated that with our proposal, he would suggest that we would do the wetland delineation permitting mitigation plan and the archeological at the same time we have already submitted the permit application. He also stated that the end of August beginning of September, they would hopefully have the permit application for the landfill expansion into the DEP. In that, they would state that the archeological study would still be ongoing and that the permitting for the wetlands in the mitigation plan.

Mr. Cannon stated that they would not all be presented at the same time to the State. He wanted to make sure that he understood that. Mr. Beebe stated that they would not all be presented at the same time to the State. Mr. Cannon stated that he just wanted to make sure that he understood that properly because

he is afraid of a disconnect. He knows that they were confident that the wetlands were not going to be an issue. He also stated that we are here in late July, and we were going to submit this in April or May, have a workshop and submit this. The wetlands turned out differently, we cannot know what the State is thinking, but they may have the same type of thoughts on other things out there if they decided that this was a wetland. He is concerned if we are doing this separately that we cannot make a tweak in our submission plan that would make them happier with the surrounding property, with either limiting us where we can recreate this wetlands, limiting us what we can do or cannot do with roads around the existing landfill. This is where he is at.

Mr. Pryor questioned if we actually have an L.O.I., or do we just have a delineation that Cornerstone did?

Mr. Williams presented the Board with a drawing to where the location of the wetlands are.

Mr. Pryor stated the L.O.I. is a determination of here are your wetlands. Has this been approved? Mr. Beebe questioned approved by the State? Mr. Pryor replied with yes. Mr. Swyka replied with no not yet. Mr. Pryor stated that what we have is our professional opinion of where they are. He is sure that this is a good opinion but that still has to be approved by the State. Mr. Swyka replied with correct. Mr. Pryor stated that we do not have a positive on where they are. He questioned how do they affect the footprint of the landfill?

Mr. Swyka used the drawing to show the Board the location. He stated that remember when we originally looked at the feasibility for the landfill, we looked at building out to the west and to the north. He also stated that we all agreed that it made sense to not build out as far to the north as possible so we pulled that footprint back in. The wetland, and we are not talking about a lot, we are talking about less than half of an acre. Mr. Cannon stated that part of that reason that we pulled back was because of the shaft. Mr. Swyka stated that is correct. He stated that he is just trying to say that we brought it back because that is a key point for what he will mention. He stated that wetland area is 10,000 square foot to 20,000 square foot which it is not a big area. He also stated that there are just a couple of little areas that aggregate to that. They are here in this corner along the road. Mr. Beebe stated that they are along the road and inside the borrow area there is a separate small area. Mr. Swyka stated that to say ok we would not go into that area, would mean that we would then have to pull this back further. He also stated that because we already pulled the area back when we ran the stability analysis, we have to have at least that much base area, base of the landfill in order to maintain stability. He stated that we have a very steep hill that comes down, so we need that base area and as small and as much of a nuisance as the wetland may be considered, we need that area in order to make sure that we can go forward.

Mr. Cannon questioned so this will be less than the height of the expansion? Mr. Swyka replied that this will be less than the height and less than the lateral extent. Mr. Cannon questioned where you said for stability, you are saying it is because of the height of what we currently have planned and/or the footprint? Mr. Beebe replied that part of it goes to the slope that we build at and right now we currently, a typically practice, we build at a 3 to 1 which is what the State allows us. He stated that to get the stability with a smaller footprint, we would likely have to kick back our final cover slopes to 4 to 1 or less and by doing that we would substantially reduce the size. Mr. Mach questioned what is the substantial number? Mr. Swyka replied with millions. Mr. Mach questioned cubic feet, cubic yard? Mr. Swyka replied with yards. Mr. Pryor questioned a million out of what? Mr. Swyka replied that he does not have that number. Mr. Cannon stated that again this is part of us being able to, as Mr. Pryor was saying, the final delineation from the State but it gives us where is our wiggle room if we need to do any wiggling with the footprint.

Mr. Pryor questioned that we not only have the wetland itself, do we have a buffer that we can encroach on? Mr. Swyka replied with correct. Mr. Pryor stated so it is not just the delineation. What is it 50 feet? Mr. Beebe replied that he is not certain what the wetland buffer for this one would be. He does not believe that they are extraordinary wetlands.

Mr. Swyka stated that when he talks about the stability, we have essentially a wedge of waste that we are building because the base slope is fairly steep and we have quite a significant driving force. We need as much of a relatively flat area to build up the strength that we need to have in order to resist that driving force. He stated that it is sort of like this area is driving down then we get this area down here where we are able to build up more strength on the flatter slope being the passive wedge to resist that force. Mr. Cannon stated that he understood it but he did not know until now where that wetlands delineation was until just now. He also stated that it puts a big light on it where we found out where it was.

Mr. Pryor questioned that they are at the toe of that slope? Mr. Swyka replied with correct.

Mr. Swyka stated that we are talking about something that is right in there, so that would force us to cut back to here. We then are not able to build a wedge that we need in order to resist that force.

Mr. Cannon stated that going back to Mr. Mach stating about millions of cubic yard, he questioned can we get a number that what reduction would have to be made and the capacity? Mr. Mach added and how many years that takes off the life of the landfill? Mr. Swyka replied with sure.

Mr. Pryor questioned that if we did not impact the wetlands at all, we would no longer deal with land use that would get us out from the archeological? Mr. Swyka replied with correct. Mr. Pryor stated so that is the payoff. Mr. Cannon stated the big question mark is what possibility could the archeological find that would have further? Again, these are questions that he does not think that any of us have an answer to but his concern was it may be a big difference of what we are allowed to take in but what else if there was something else found that would impact it. He also stated that then we would have to change our submission of what we got approved by the State and say the archeological study in the wetlands have determined that x y and z is present over here.

Mr. Pryor stated that he could break this up in two pieces. He is pretty confident that their wetland delineation is going to stand up but competent delineator almost always gets approval from the State. He also stated that you would have to get a permit in conjunction with that corrected and then to get that permit you would have to do some sort of mitigation. He would think that they would have two alternatives there. They could create an artificial wetland or you can put money into a fund. Mr. Pasquini replied with yes that in Oxford they have 166 acres that is just for one of those offsetting wetland mitigation funds. Mr. Pryor stated that if that is not practical, he thinks that they could contribute to a fund. He stated that this is not a professional opinion but he thinks they could probably deal with what falls out of the wetlands.

Mr. Mach questioned Mr. Pryor regarding the funds, are the funds to create wetlands somewhere other than on the site? Mr. Pryor replied with that he believes so. It is an alternative solution to creating your own wetland. He also stated that we could look into that. He also stated that the problem is, and it is not necessarily a problem, you bring land use in, the archeological kicks in and that has been all over the place. His experience is more utility projects. He stated that he has had to stop a project where they have come out and excavated. He assumes that if they want to preserve a mine shaft then we would have to come up with a way to preserve that. Sometimes, we can argue that we are preserving this since we are not excavating it. He also stated that to him there is a lot of unknowns there.

Mr. Cannon questioned the location of the new wetlands if we have to recreate on site? He stated that this is a study too. Mr. Beebe stated that with this, we already have a wildlife mitigation area that we need to do where we are relocating wildlife mitigation area that was within the project area. Mr. Cannon stated right which it is a low impact. Mr. Beebe stated that we could put the wetland mitigation within our wildlife mitigation. Mr. Pryor stated that we would have to make sure that the soils supported wetland and we would have to put in wetland vegetation. We would have to ensure that it grew.

Mr. Cannon stated that the other side of the coin, not only the side where the existing wetlands delineation is pretty much locked in there, but then we have to recreate it somewhere else on site and what impact that has and the plans on that and what the State may have with that. The only way he can see this going is towards the water. He questioned are we going towards the river? Mr. Swyka replied with yes. Mr. Cannon stated that who knows what that could be impacting or requirements they may have because we are moving to the Pequest. He does not know.

Mr. Pasquini stated that all this conversation that we had, has nothing been submitted to the DEP? Is that correct? Mr. Swyka replied correct. Mr. Cannon stated that if we submit one piece and then we get approval. Then we are going to supplement later on with the wetlands and archeological. He also stated that if the wetlands and the archeological find something then that would make us possibly change our original submission. Why not do that at the same time and find out for sure? Mr. Pasquini stated that he agrees with Mr. Cannon. He also stated that we are here to discuss both of these submissions to the DEP. Mr. Cannon stated that part of this plan and/or expenses incurred which did not include wetlands in our archeological so they will have to make a submission as to requesting more funds because Cornerstone is going to have to put together a plan with remediation of existing wetlands, moving and creating new wetlands, and including our archeological study. Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Pryor brought up something where would we not have to create new wetlands and we pay into a fund as opposed to creating a wetlands. Is that going to be less of a problem with the State? He does not know. This is what Cornerstone is here for. We want to do these additional things but let us go ahead with the submission of our footprint then supplement it with the wetlands and the archeological study. His concern again is that we are not doing that together because of the findings and/or delaying with archeological and/or wetland study that now we have a disconnect of six months, eight months, or nine months.

Mr. Pryor stated that the wetlands generally get solved particularly when you have low value wetlands like this. He also stated that he does not see this as a deal breaker. He has less experience on the archeological side and you are dealing with different people. He does not know the value they attach to whatever they are going to find out here.

Mr. Cannon stated that he knows that Mr. Pryor is assuring us that he feels the State would agree with a qualified delineator as to wherever it may be but we do not have that yet. Mr. Pryor stated that we have a delineation and they have prepared a report. The DEP reviews that and they may come out and look at it. He stated that it is rare that it changes so much that it has a significant, in his experience.

Mr. Cannon questioned does the report of the delineation include the suggestion and/or the plan to where the new one would go? Mr. Beebe stated that we would need approval to go ahead with a mitigation plan. At that point, he stated that they would look at locations that we would have onsite, figure out where the best location would be of where you have available to put it.

Mr. Cannon questioned that this is after the State gives the stamp approval of yes I agree with the delineator and this is where the wetlands are located, then a submission is made as to wetlands delineator or does Cornerstone decide to put a plan to say this is where we should move it down towards the Pequest if we recreated onsite? Mr. Swyka replied with right we would put the plan together. He stated

that his expectation is the preference will be to recreate it onsite if possible and he thinks that the wetlands banks are areas of wetlands on other sites become the preference for sites that do not have a place to recreate new wetlands. Mr. Cannon stated that we would like him to at least look into this option and to see what is available because that could limit us in the future as far as roads and/or buildings. Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Beebe stated that we could put the wetlands inside of the wildlife, so we will not be able to put anything in there anyway. Mr. Beebe stated that his suggestion is that we go for that approach. Mr. Cannon stated but we do not know if that approach would be ok. He also stated that if the possibility exists that the wetlands may have to be, if we recreated them onsite, that they would have to be outside of that because they would not want that disturbed. Mr. Beebe stated that there is that possibility. Mr. Cannon stated so that is done and that could impact what we could do in that area in the future because that would now be designated wetlands forever. He thinks finding out other options would certainly be at least a good idea whether they may be exceedingly expensive or not worth it but he thinks that the Board should have them in front of them before they plow ahead and said let us make new wetlands.

Mr. Pryor stated that each time you create a wetlands you burden yourself with more constraints. Mr. Cannon stated exactly. He also stated so if it was a dollar figure as opposed to putting those more constraints on the footprint of the property and/or DEP or EPA decides that it should be 1,000 feet from the Pequest five years down the road and now we have a problem with that because we did something within that 1,000 foot boundary. There are a lot of questions. He also stated that the impact of again putting them in order and he thinks that Mr. Swyka has it right that we do not know what is going to happen with one so let us look at it all together. This is his unprofessional opinion.

Mr. Pryor stated that there is three components to this. What wetlands do you have? And he thinks that they have a pretty good handle on that. What are you going to do to mitigate that? They have a proposal but that is not finished yet. Then the archeology, once you touch a wetlands the archeology comes into it. Who knows where that heads? He senses his discomfort with spending dollars not knowing these answers and he understands that. Mr. Cannon stated that his concern is that we would have to change that plan somehow that we submit to the State for the expansion footprint based on something that comes up after we submit the expansion footprint plan. He knows that we could all say that we are certain that it is not going to happen to a degree but we were certain there was not going to be a wetland delineation. We were certain that we were going to be submitting this by May back in the winter time. He also stated that August is knocking on the door next week. He is concerned with doing them separately. He does not like the holding back one without knowing. He does like holding back one without knowing the impact that the wetlands may dictate to us and/or the archeological may dictate to us.

Mr. Mach stated that one more alternative is that we move the base of the landfill expansion back so that it does not impact on the wetlands at all. Mr. Cannon stated that he thinks that a wetlands study as to making new wetlands and/or the archeological study may give us some more information to where that may be on the table to where it would be necessary. Mr. Mach stated that it would be interesting to know what it would cost to reengineer the change to the base of the extent of the expansion of the landfill to where they described bringing it back from the wetlands altogether. He also stated that again how much time it cuts off of the life.

Mr. Cannon stated that all of the above are great questions and the impact of the surrounding. He knows that the submission to the State on the expansion footprint has not withstanding wetlands and not withstanding archeological has no impact on what we decide to do around the outside of that footprint, roads wise, structures, so on and so forth but the archeological study and the wetlands could very well

impact what we can or cannot do outside of the footprint. We would want to know that before we had the footprint approved.

Mr. Pasquini questioned if we have gone to the DEP? Do we have a liaison here with our agency? Mr. Williams stated that there are quite a few people down there that is solid waste and Mr. Swyka and Mr. Beebe know them all.

Mr. Cannon stated that we are at the point of the wetlands issue but he is not comfortable submitting our expansion footprint plan without knowing the other two pieces of the puzzle.

Mr. Pryor questioned that if we delay this to wait for those, how does that impact our own needs? We are not going to run out of capacity if we delay. Mr. Cannon stated that we do not want to delay. They are going to tell us now what they think is needed in monies and work and timeline as far as what we need to do for the archeological and wetlands from here on out. He also stated to set aside the submission to the State, let us talk about those two things.

Mr. Beebe stated that he does not have a solid number. He has an approximate number of \$30,000.00 to \$35,000.00 for the permitting, mitigation plan, and the archeological study at this point. He stated that this is excluding whether the archeological study comes up with some more and we have to go a little bit further detailed archeological study or whether the State rejects the mitigation plan and there has to be more done but that would be just to do the permitting, the mitigation plan, and the archeological study. Mr. Cannon stated that if we wanted to go that route.

Mr. Cannon stated that we need to find out what options are available to us with the bank or whatever where we contribute to a fund somewhere else, then we do not have to recreate the wetlands. We want to find that as an option. He also stated that so the possibility exists there to where we could benefit another community. Whether we have some water by the face of the landfill or some water by the Pequest or we recreate some better wetlands in Oxford or wherever the case may be to help the water table. He thinks we would want to know that before we can go down the road as saying yes we are going got commit to \$35,000.00 in a study that is going to put the wetlands down by the river. He thinks that would be something we would want to do right away.

Mr. Beebe stated that regarding schedule, he questioned Mr. Swyka how long did Sussex County take for the DEP to review and issue a permit? Mr. Swyka replied that Sussex County permit review period was two years. However, he stated that part of that, at that time, they were dealing with the after math of Super Storm Sandy. It is probably not a good case. He stated that ordinarily they take about one year.

Mr. Cannon stated that he sees that August 23rd as an available day because we have a calendar that we keep up. He also stated that we would not need the professionals but they are welcome very much. This was the only date members showed availability. He stated that if we could get to that point to where we would have our numbers; How much we would have to change our footprint and as far as tonnage if we had to bring that back as Mr. Mach pointed out to stay away from the designated wetlands. Will we have a definite distinction as to from the State yet as to where we know that yes they are in agreement as to that is the wetlands? Would the State have an affirmative? Could we push that with their agreement with the wetlands delineation? Mr. Swyka stated that he thinks at this point, we would not get their agreement on that until we actually submit a permit application. Mr. Pryor stated that he hates to sit up here and disagree but they could always get an L.O.I. independent of anything else. Mr. Swyka will check on this. Mr. Pryor stated that an L.O.I. is good for five years. Mr. Cannon stated that the archeological has to be done either way it appears to him. The State has already made the wetlands

determination whether the location may be changed, but that has to be done either way, right? Mr. Beebe stated that if you have a wetland permit, you will need to do the archeological. Mr. Cannon replied with ok and that is something that we are going to have to do either way because we are going to have a wetlands permit. Mr. Mach stated that this is relatively inexpensive for the archeological review. Mr. Cannon stated that this is something we could approve and get rolling today for them. Mr. Swyka stated that that would be good.

Mr. Williams stated that he thought that maybe the archeological may be covered. Mr. Beebe stated that they put some money in their budget for wetlands and archeological, that number was \$25,000.00 classified to deal with these issues. He also stated that we have used some of that already and that is way the number is \$30,000.00 \$35,000.00. It would be higher but we are using some of the remainder of what was in that \$25,000.00. Mr. Cannon stated that the original plan was that they did not know how extensive the archeological would have to be, is that fair to say? Mr. Beebe replied with that they did not know the extent of what they were doing with wetlands or archeological so they put \$25,000.00 to the side.

Mr. Cannon stated that if we did a workshop on the 23rd, depending on what we are going to hear from the State, knowing what numbers those entail, both tonnage reduction, both contribution to towns or whatever the case may be to bank the wetlands somewhere else, he thinks this will give us a better idea whether we could at our August meeting yes this does impact too much because of tonnage and life of the landfill or either that is on the table or not on the table then we have to go down the road of the wetlands and/or the monies to some place that may need the mitigation of some positional wetlands.

Mr. Mach stated that he sees that the life of the landfill is more of a political thing than anything else. Mr. Cannon stated that the cost of just the engineering \$35,000.00 of the wetlands to engineer a new wetlands, but that it not actually just doing the work. Mr. Swyka stated that is correct. Mr. Cannon stated that this could be another whatever. So if we could get a ballpark nothing to hold to so that we could weigh that against how much we would send to a town to mitigate, transfer our wetlands, responsibility to another town. Mr. Mach stated that they could also take a look at the engineering costs are of what Mr. Cannon is talking about are on a cost per cubic yard basis on the cubic yards that they are going to add by not backing this thing up or what we would lose. Mr. Swyka stated that the wetland buffer is somewhere between 25 feet and 75 feet. Mr. Cannon questioned that would they be able to put something a drawing showing us how far the wetlands delineation is and if we have to come back an additional 50 feet from there, would that give us the true number as to how much we would lose in capacity?

Mr. Mach asked Mr. Swyka to bring out the chart again. He stated that we really do not have to cut clean across the face. We have to just take off a corner. Is that what they are going to do? Mr. Swyka stated essentially, but it is a pretty big corner. Mr. Cannon stated that slope in that area because it is such high ground, that slope would probably have to increase because we would holding more with less of a wall. He also stated that is why Mr. Swyka was saying it was 4:1. Mr. Swyka stated that it is possible that is enough to say we may not even be able to construct this because of the stability. He also stated that everything has to be stable.

Mr. Williams stated that we have our Board meeting on August 22nd. He suggested that instead of meeting on the 23rd, we can do it all on the 22nd. Mr. Cannon stated that we will hold the regular monthly meeting and workshop meeting on August 22nd. Mr. Williams asked Mr. Swyka if this works for him. Mr. Swyka replied with yes.

Mr. Cannon questioned Mr. Pryor if he had any other recommendations that he would like to see come back number wise or anything that we can have Mr. Swyka and Mr. Beebe push for that we would definitely want to see a month from now? Mr. Pryor stated that just to clarify that they are going ahead with the L.O.I. that is in your dollars and you have your report and you are going ahead with that now? Mr. Swyka replied that they are proceeding. He stated that they will proceed with the limited phase 1A archeological study. Mr. Pryor stated that is basically library research and a little test pitting, as he recalls. Mr. Swyka stated that is correct. He does not know if he would call it test pitting. Mr. Beebe stated that it would be a site walk. They may put a shovel in the ground a couple of times. Mr. Pryor stated that the archeology is like an onion, you start peeling layers and you never know when you get down to the end.

Mr. Pryor stated that his own observation is the most valuable thing here is the space. His opinion is that these other things we have to deal with but he thinks that there is the concern about rework and deal breakers. Mr. Cannon agreed and let us just see the numbers so that we have the numbers. Mr. Pryor stated that he understands Mr. Cannon's concern here and if there is no harm to the schedule, he means that the safe route is trying to nail these things before we submit the permit.

Mr. Cannon questioned if there were any other questions or anything anyone is not sure of? He stated that we are just going to proceed with the archeological where it has already been included but now we have to do more of it than anticipated. He also stated that they will have that dollar figure discussion when this is done.

Mr. Williams questioned Mr. Swyka and Mr. Beebe that for them to proceed, do they need any additional funds? Mr. Beebe replied that they can proceed right now with the archeological investigation with the funds that they have. He stated that when they get to the point where they need more, he will send a request.

Mr. Cannon thanked Mr. Swyka and Mr. Beebe and we will see them next month.

Mr. Swyka and Mr. Beebe left the meeting at 10:53 am.

Mr. Cannon stated that as he said before, A-3 will be in executive session.

FACILITIES/RECYCLING

Mr. Williams reported on the treatment plant operations. He stated that everything is running smooth down there. He has been in contact with T&M and they gave him a list of parameters that they would like us to start testing. He is waiting to hear back from our lab if that has begun. Once the data starts coming in, he will forward this over to T&M so they can proceed. Mr. Cannon questioned if they started some of the testing? Mr. Williams replied with they should have. It has not been confirmed from the lab. This is moving forward. He also stated that this is really the TDS evaluation also.

Mr. Williams reported on the landfill operations. He stated that everything seems to be running fine. The waste coming in is as normal with no issues.

Mr. Williams reported on the H₂S removal system. He stated that everything is fine with the H₂S system. Nothing has changed.

Mr. Williams reported on the solar panel projects. He stated that there are no issues there.

Mr. Williams stated that there were no changes to A-4 2016 Waste Disposal Fee Schedule.

Mr. Cannon questioned Mr. Tipton if that contract went through on the solar contract? Mr. Tipton replied with yes.

GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT

Mr. Tipton reported that he has no report.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Williams presented the Board with an update on the tires collected through June. He stated that we collected approximately 150 tires in the month of June at the recycling center. He also stated that the tire recycling is still working well.

Mr. Williams stated that he was thinking sometime in late September, we could hold another tire amnesty program for the residents only. If there is no objection, he will start putting that together. He also stated that we could pick a date right now. Mr. Pryor questioned the residents meaning car tires as opposed to other tires? Mr. Williams replied with correct and no farm tires or equipment tires. Mr. Williams stated that the date of September 22nd for the tire amnesty day for residents. Mr. Cannon questioned if we time that? He stated that people change their tires before the winter. He also stated that we talked about the spring for the farmers. Mr. Williams stated that we will see what kind of funds are left over. This will strictly be residential.

Mr. Cannon questioned regarding the funds issue, is there anything on the electronic recycling? Have we heard anything? Mr. Williams replied with no, nothing. He stated that his understanding, the last he spoke with Mr. Dave Dech and Freeholder Smith, there has been no movement down at the State as far as funding goes.

Mr. Cannon questioned that the memorandum on the employee is just an FYI for the Board? Mr. Williams replied with yes. He stated that along that line, he has received ten applications and if there is no objection from the Board, he will go through take a look at them and see if there is any worthwhile to start interviewing some of these people. Mr. Pryor questioned where do we advertise for this? Mr. Williams replied that we put it on our website.

Mr. Williams stated that one of our other full time employee in the scale is going out for surgery for six weeks for a shoulder replacement. He also stated that the good thing is, is that Ms. Pluto can operate the scale and Mrs. Banghart has been cross trained, but he would like to get that position filled with the right person fairly quickly. Mr. Cannon questioned if we had a pay scale for that position? Mr. Williams replied with yes.

Mr. Williams stated that if there is no objection with the Board, if he goes through these and find a good candidate, he would like to get them hired prior to our next meeting. Mr. Cannon questioned if the Board has to approve the hiring? Mr. Williams replied he does not know and he will leave that up to Board and he would ask Counsel. Mr. Mach stated that the Board ought to have a chance to take a look at who the candidate is and what the qualifications are. He also stated that this is no disrespect to Mr. Williams. Mr. Williams questioned if the Board would like to interview the person? Mr. Mach replied with not interview but to at least know what the qualifications are and who the person is. Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Williams can send an email with his recommendation.

Mr. Cannon questioned if August 22nd would be ok for him if the Board signed off on it that day? Mr. Williams replied that he would like the date to be sooner than that, because that is over a month from now. This is up to the Board.

Mr. Pasquini stated that Mr. Williams has to live with his decision day to day. Mr. Pryor stated that he tends to agree with Mr. Pasquini because he has had this argument at the town level all of the time. They authorize positions but the department head has to live with them. Mr. Cannon stated that plus there is a thirty day starting thing. Mr. Williams stated that there is a probationary period. Mr. Pryor stated that he tends to have faith in the general manager for hiring in operations. Mr. Cannon stated that if you need them sooner to start then this is his basic concern. Mr. Williams stated that this is his concern because there are vacations planned. Mr. Cannon stated that he is not sure if there is a legal issue with Mr. Tipton that is the only thing he would say. Mr. Tipton stated that he does not believe so because we are just filling an existing position, right? Mr. Williams replied with yes.

Mr. Cannon questioned what is the Board's consensus here? Mr. Allen stated that just to cover the Board, he kind of agrees that we can trust Mr. Williams' opinion on it but he thinks that they should be somewhat in the loop from an information standpoint. Mr. Williams stated that he would absolutely definitely do that. Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Williams will send an email to the Board on his selection.

Mr. Olshefski left the meeting at 11:00 am.

OTHER BUSINESS

None

CLOSING PUBLIC COMMENT

None

PRESS COMMENTS & QUESTIONS

None

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Executive Session was entered at 11:01 am.

RESOLUTION

R-07-02-16

AUTHORIZING EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

Possible Litigation

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	-	Yes
	Mr. Pryor	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Yes
	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.

Jamie Banghart, Recording Secretary

Dated: 07/25/16

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

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

Regular session resumed at 11:13 am.

No action was taken in Executive Session.

Mr. Tipton stated that now we are public session, a vote is required to go out with an RFP.

Mr. Cannon stated that we need a motion that the Board has recommended to Counsel and Mr. Williams to put together an RFP for a new scale.

Mr. Allen made a motion, seconded by **Mr. Mach**.

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

Mr. Cannon stated that we need a motion that the Board has recommended that we get quotes for repairs and upgrading to the existing scale.

Mr. Pasquini made a motion for repairs and technology upgrade to the existing scale, seconded by **Mr. Allen**.

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

ADJOURNMENT

With no other business to discuss, **Mr. Pryor** motioned to Adjourn, seconded by **Mr. Allen**, at 11:14 am.

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

Respectfully submitted by:
Jamie Banghart, Recording Secretary

Approved: 08/22/16