

POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY
OF WARREN COUNTY

MINUTES OF REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING

November 16, 2015

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

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

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

Also present: James Williams, Director of Operations; Brian Tipton, General Counsel; Dan Olshefski, Chief Financial Officer; 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 November 16, 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".

MINUTES

Mr. Davenport presented the regular monthly meeting minutes from October 26, 2015. He stated that the Board was presented a revised copy of the minutes.

Mr. Cannon made a motion to approve the revised regular monthly minutes of October 26, 2015 as presented, seconded by **Mr. Pryor**.

Mr. Pryor stated that he had a few revisions to the minutes on page 4 and page 6 with minor word changes.

Mr. Cannon made a motion to amend his previous motion to include the changes cited by Mr. Pryor to improve the revised minutes of October 26, 2015, seconded by **Mr. Pryor**.

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

Mr. Davenport presented the executive session meeting minutes from October 26, 2015.

Mr. Cannon made a motion to approve the executive session minutes as presented, seconded by **Mr. Davenport**.

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

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Williams presented a letter from Warren County Landfill Energy dated October 24, 2015 requesting a letter of consent from the PCFA because they are doing a transfer of ownership. He stated that he had Mr. Tipton review this letter.

Mr. Tipton stated that he sees no reason why we should not give them the consent. They is no significance to this Authority. Mr. Cannon questioned if this would impact our ability at all to claim anything down there? Will the transfer of ownership no longer allow us to get the credits? Mr. Tipton replied that he does not see any negative impact from giving them the consent.

Mr. Williams suggested that the Board make a motion.

Mr. Davenport made a motion to send the consent letter to Warren County Landfill Energy, seconded by **Mr. Allen**.

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

Mr. Williams presented a letter from the Township of Oxford dated November 3, 2015 to the PCFA requesting their fall clean-up fee to be waived in the amount of \$1,508.76. He stated that this is something that the Authority has addressed in the spring and fall over the years because Oxford provides the first responders to our facility. He stated that the waiver of the fee is up for Board discussion and approval.

Mr. Allen questioned if we do this for any other towns? Mr. Williams replied with no we do not. He stated that White Township is automatically free because they are the host community. Mr. Pryor questioned if Oxford gets any rebate or consideration elsewhere? Mr. Williams stated that Oxford does get the host community fee from Covanta.

Mr. Allen made a motion that the Board approve the waiver to Oxford Township for the town wide cleanup in the amount of \$1,508.76, seconded by **Mr. Pryor**.

Mr. Pryor stated that he does not have a problem with the letter but was wondering if it was necessary for the Township of Oxford to come back year after year if we are going to do this, which it is not a lot of money and they are the first responders. Mr. Tipton stated that if the Board wanted to make it a running situation, he does not foresee a problem with that. He stated that this is up to the Board. Mr. Mach stated that this is a nice gesture, but he does not like the lack of control. Mr. Cannon stated that the process that we have works well because they have to send us a letter asking for permission. Mr. Davenport stated that we are also aware of the amount.

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

Mr. Williams presented a letter dated October 27, 2015 from Cornerstone to the NJ DEP Historic Preservation Office regarding a historic evaluation on the property. He stated that at one time there was a house on the property called the Titman House, which has since been removed from the property. This is part of the expansion application that will need to be submitted. Cornerstone prepared this document stating that in their opinion there is no further review is necessary but this is a requirement of the permit renewal application. Mr. Cannon suggested that we put this letter off until we discuss the landfill expansion project status and just add this letter to that discussion.

Mr. Davenport stated that in the maps provided, Quarry Road is marked as Edison Road. This will also be discussed later with the expansion project status.

PUBLIC COMMENTS (AGENDA ITEMS ONLY)

None

PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Davenport stated that the first presentation we have today is Balken Risk Management Services, David Balken.

Mr. David Balken introduced himself and a brief overview of his company. He stated that his company is a public entity insurance brokerage firm. He has been doing public entity work, which includes schools, townships, housing authorities, sewage districts, and water authorities for 25 years. He also stated that Balken Risk Management Services was recently named broker of record with Warren County. He has access to all the carriers which is very important because they will take our program and every year they will look at the broker coverage to save us money. He also stated that his company likes to be part of our meetings and safety meetings as much as they can. They are always looking for ways to reduce their claims.

Mr. Balken stated that 90% of the public entities in this State are joint insurance funds. He stated that he PCFA is not part of a joint insurance fund right now, but it is a possibility down the road. Joint insurance funds are when the public entities group their insurances together, which they buy them

together where it gets to be a little bit cheaper. He stated that joint insurance funds are actually membership owned groups, owned by the people that operate the public entities. He also stated that if company has no claims in a year then the company will get money back. He stated that he can look into this for the PCFA.

Mr. Pryor questioned Mr. Balken if he has looked at our policies? Mr. Balken replied with yes and that the policies come up for renewal next month. Mr. Pryor questioned if Mr. Balken had any problems with our policies that we have now? Mr. Balken stated that the PCFA is good where we are now. Mr. Pryor questioned that some of these policies that are coming up, will Mr. Balken service the policies in his interim in case something come up? Mr. Balken stated that he would service the policies that are in place, it is just a matter of a broker of record letter to send to the companies so that he can renew what we have and also look into other options.

Mr. Allen stated that to his understanding Mr. Balken been retained by the County. Mr. Balken stated that this is correct. Mr. Allen questioned if there would be any advantage if the County was in agreement with combining the two to save money for both of us? Mr. Balken questioned if Mr. Allen was asking about putting the PCFA with the County? Mr. Allen replied with yes. Mr. Balken stated that this is up to the Board to make that decision. Mr. Allen questioned if there would be any significant advantage to doing this price wise? Mr. Balken stated that if we incorporate the two together, it could give the PCFA access to other programs because the PCFA would be in with the County. He also stated that the County is in a joint insurance fund now. He stated that he will explore this for the PCFA. Mr. Allen stated that this is something for the Board to consider.

Mr. Cannon questioned the liability on site, how our policies currently are set up, and when we have the subs coming in and working on our site? He stated that we have had a lot proposals with subs coming in for recycling, installing equipment, etc. He stated that he and counsel had a previous discussion regarding this as to what our liabilities are beyond our boundaries and what we are covered for. He also commented on the public fund issue, grouping together and combining the monies. He questioned that depending upon the co entities in there, is your risk dependent upon who you are grouped with? Mr. Balken replied that with yes. Mr. Cannon also stated that he does not think that the County would be interested in being fully exposed with the PCFA jointly as to the PCFA and the landfill. He thinks that anyone would advise to keep these two entities separate.

Mr. Balken stated that with the OSHA compliance, he would hope that when the PCFA has outside contractors that are working on the landfill, that we are getting certificates of their insurance. Mr. Williams questioned Mr. Balken if his company offers safety training? Mr. Balken stated that his company can do that because he has contracts with safety laws control people that can do the safety meeting with the PCFA onsite. He also stated that he likes to have all of his clients have quarterly safety meetings with a log list to show what training was done. Mr. Williams stated that with our previous broker of records, we were doing these programs and he wanted to make sure that the PCFA continue with this moving forward.

Mr. Mach commented that he would like to see Mr. Balken from time to time, quarterly to give us an update of where we are. Mr. Balken stated that he would attend the PCFA meetings quarterly to give the Board an update of insurance. He also stated that he could attend the January meeting after reviewing the policies and renewals.

Mr. Williams stated that the Board should approve Resolution to Appoint the Exclusive Broker of Record to Balken Risk Management Services, LLC (R-11-03-15).

On a motion by *Mr. Cannon*, seconded by *Mr. Davenport*, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *November 16, 2015*.

RESOLUTION

R-11-03-15

TO APPOINT THE EXCLUSIVE BROKER OF RECORD TO Balken Risk Management Services, LLC

WHEREAS, the Pollution Control Financing Authority has been informed that their insurance account has been sold; and

WHEREAS, the Local Public Contracts Law (N.J.S.A. 40A:11-5, et. seq.) requires that a resolution authorizing the award of contracts for professional services without competitive bids and the contract itself must be available for public inspection; and

WHEREAS, the appointment of Exclusive Broker of Record to Balken Risk Management Services, LLC, will require no compensation from the Pollution Control Financing Authority; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of the County of Warren in the State of New Jersey as follows:

1. Balken Risk Management Services, LLC shall be appointed Exclusive Broker of Record, their successors and/or assigns with a 30 day termination provision, and that;
2. An agreement between the Pollution Control Financing Authority of the County of Warren, Oxford, New Jersey and Balken Risk Management Services, LLC, located at 143 Washington Street, Morristown, New Jersey, for Broker of Record services with the Pollution Control Financing Authority be made part of this resolution by reference and approved and entered into by the Pollution Control Financing Authority Board of the County of Warren subject to approval of Counsel;
3. The Chairperson and Director of Operations are hereby authorized to execute said Professional Services Agreement by signing same;
4. A notice of this action shall be published within a local newspaper, as required by law, within ten (10) days of its adoption.

ROLL CALL:

Mr. Allen	-	Yes
Mr. Cannon	-	Yes
Mr. Pryor	-	Yes
Mr. Mach	-	Yes
Mr. Davenport	-	Yes

I HEREBY CERTIFY the above to be a true copy of a motion adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of the County of Warren on the date above mentioned.

Jamie Banghart, Recording Secretary

Approved: *November 16, 2015*

Mr. Davenport presented Covanta for the next presentation for the Board.

Mr. Richard Sandner, Covanta, presented an overview of their facility over the past couple of years and the economics at their facility which have been declining. He stated that Covanta has been looking to find alternative ways, environmentally sound ways, to generate additional revenue or increase the margin. They have looked into an arc system, which is where they recycle the waste before it comes in and then process it. This was not cost beneficially to Covanta in the end. Mr. Sandner stated that others recommended spraying liquids, mostly water, into their boilers because there is water available for disposition that Covanta is trying to get a permit to push the fluids through their boilers. He also stated that they think that this is an option that is going to hopefully help Covanta sustain the facility longer until energy prices recover or tip fees increase. He stated that they think this is a viable opportunity that can be approved by the DEP and they think that the DEP is in favor of this. He stated that Covanta had a very high level meeting with the DEP on Friday to test their interest in the project. Seemingly, the DEP believe that Covanta can go and do a temporary operation to try to demonstrate whether this can be done and in an environmentally sound manner to not increase emissions, not increase truck traffic. He stated that the DEP is tough on these things so for them to even consider granting Covanta a temporary upgrading permit, at least the three months to demonstrate the applicability, is something Mr. Sandner has not seen in a long time with DEP. Mr. Sandner stated that Covanta does not want to do anything and will not intend anything that is going to have a detrimental impact to the community, the Board or the County. He stated that any economic benefit that Covanta would have from this, they would be willing to share with the PCFA.

Mr. Mach questioned Mr. Sandner if this project will be on their property? Mr. Sandner replied with yes. Mr. Davenport stated that the only connection is the ash. Mr. Sandner stated that on the temporary permit, Covanta does not need County approval but they feel they want to get the PCFA's blessing.

Mr. Sandner presented a power point presentation for the Board.

They are permitted 448 tons of waste per day. He stated that Covanta can actually do up to 200,000 tons per year. They have been operating less of that. The electricity that they generate is 80,000 MWh per year.

Mr. Sandner introduced Covanta employees Herman Love, Warren Plant Manager; Richard Gesumaria, Sustainable Solutions Group; and John Frotton, Sustainable Solutions Group in Morristown.

Mr. Love stated that several years ago in order to eliminate discharge to the sewer system or PRMUA, Covanta approached the DEP about adding a furnace injection capability to their boilers. He explained

that essentially they will have water that is going to leak out of pumps or packing glands that is collected and run through their separator that would normally go into the sewer system, which had to be treated. They installed, with the DEP approval, a furnace injection system. The idea of the system is that it collects the water that would normally go into the waste water system and it injects or sprays with an atomization approximately 3-5 gallons per minute per boiler. This is the system capability right in the primary combustion zone, just above the flame where it is going to be evaporated instantly. He stated that this system has been in service for several years. He stated that they have plenty of additional capacity with the 3-5 gallons per minute because they have worked hard to minimize what water is collected or what leaks out or what they gather. They are proposing the injecting of these liquids which are 90% plus water in these boilers. He stated that several of their other plants (one example is their Niagra facility) are already doing the same process and we have demonstrated ash testing results for several years. He explained that basically the water gets sprayed into the combustion zone and it evaporates immediately with no additional emissions because it is all collected by the back end air pollution control equipment.

Mr. Cannon questioned the capacity which is 3-5 gallons per minute on one boiler? Mr. Sandner replied that this is per boiler and they have two boilers. Mr. Cannon stated that it could be 500 gallons per hour approximately. He questioned if this is the capacity that they want to be at or are they looking at one of the other ones going online to increase that? Mr. Sandner replied with right now they have 3-5 which is what we are looking to basically fully utilize. They just want to test at different levels of atomization. They would like to go higher if the system can do this without any detrimental impact on their permit limits as they exist today. He stated that they estimate approximately two tanker trucks per day which would be the additional truck traffic. He also stated that the DEP said that this is an effective beneficial reuse to the extent that when this water goes through their facility, instead of it going through a waste water treatment plant, it gets sprayed into the boiler where it evaporates. Then it goes through the secondary control system because it goes through their bag house.

Mr. Pryor stated that when Covanta evaporates this, there will be some sort of residue. He questioned does any of this residue end up in the ash? Mr. Love replied with basically it evaporates and the residue that is left is part of the primary combustion zone which will combust and be a part of the ash. This does become a constituent to the ash but it also becomes part of the combustion part of the process. Mr. Pryor questioned if the PCFA's contract with Covanta has any testing or quality on the ash? Mr. Williams replied with yes we do the testing on the ash. Mr. Mach stated that if we are going to go into a program then we should be testing the quality of the ash coming out and things that we should be looking for before Covanta starts program. He also suggested that when Covanta starts the program if it is approved, then we continue the testing to see what the difference is in the ash before and after. Mr. Sandner stated that Covanta has a rigorous testing protocol as it relates to the ash today. Mr. Love stated that they take a sample every hour of the day of the ash, which is compiled every week. Then they take a monthly sample which the PCFA receives every month of all the constituents that are in the ash. The DEP receives all the testing results also. Mr. Mach stated that his concern is what constituent may wind up in the ash and is then put here as a cover on the landfill, which may leach out when rainfall goes through. He stated that we have to be careful of this. Mr. Sandner understands 100% and stated that this is why we do not anticipate seeing anything slide. He also stated that they will not only look into this with the test protocol but there will be an ongoing view.

Mr. Sandner introduced Mr. John Frotton for the details of the types of feed stock in their presentation.

Mr. Frotton stated that he is the environmental area manager for their corporate profile waste department. Profile waste are waste streams that come into not only their Warren but any facility that are outside of MSW. He also stated that this is waste that is generated by various industries that they do not want to end up in a landfill. Mr. Frotton stated that this goes through his department to make sure the waste streams are environmentally approvable by both federal and individual state environmental regulations, from a health and safety stand point that there is no undue risk to their employees but whoever else would be on the tipping floor at any given time, and then they look at operational viability because it can meet environmental and safety standards but operationally it may not meet. He stated that this is not just the liquid streams but these are any streams that come in outside of MSW.

Mr. Frotton stated that Covanta requires any customer/generator to fill out a profile sheet so that they have an accurate understanding of the chemical makeup of whatever waste stream that is coming to their facility as well as any process that was used to generate the waste. He stated that typically the types of streams that they are talking about are approximately 90% aqueous, 10% washout materials usually from a pharmaceutical manufacturing process e.g. health or beauty aids, lotions, or shampoos. He also stated that none of their facilities can handle anything that is considered hazardous wastes. If there are any constituents in there, that are going to be problematic from a hazardous waste standpoint, the material is rejected up front.

Mr. Frotton commented on the previous question regarding potential issues with the ash. He stated that they tend to see them mostly with heavy metals. They do not process a lot of streams with heavy metals in them and they do not see a lot of impact to their ash with respect to heavy metals. He also stated that they have a process where these materials are profiled into them and they review them from the corporate standpoint. Once they review them and they are ok, they send them down to the plant. The plant environmental and management review this is as a second set of eyes. After all this is acceptable to Covanta, they go back to the customer and let them know that they will accept their material with terms and conditions on how they will accept this type of material.

Mr. Frotton stated that the types of streams that Covanta is looking for is pharmaceutical streams, chemical streams, food manufacturing, creams and lotions that are 90%-95% aqueous. He stated that they do get on occasion some consumer products in bulk for example a load of shampoos. He also stated that the products they do receive are typically wash water streams of some kind.

Mr. Mach questioned that in regards to the pharmaceuticals, where are they processed now as opposed as to being processed by what Covanta is planning to do? Where is that waste stream? Mr. Frotton replied that this could be going to a POTW (Publically Owned Treatment Works, Waste Water Treatment Plant). He stated that specifically with pharmaceutical companies, they like to have everything that they generate from a waste standpoint permanently disposed of. He also stated that they sometimes make the decision of pouring them down the drain into the POTW, even though that this may be within their permit right, they chose not to.

Mr. Allen stated his concern on the transportation of this material and what they are transporting. Mr. Frotton stated that the transportation is arranged by the generator and that the transporters all have A-901, permits through the NJ DEP as licensed waste haulers in NJ. Mr. Allen questioned if Covanta spot checks the loads coming in or do they plan on having a regular process to test the material before it comes off of the truck before it goes into the furnace? Mr. Frotton replied that they look specifically for the pH levels which would be the main concern because the pH is going to screw the system up the most.

Mr. Allen also questioned if this process will change the emission permits in any way? Mr. Frotton replied with not that he is aware of. In fact, he stated that in their presentation later, there are testing results included from Indianapolis and Niagra plants that are doing the same process where for the most part there has been a drop in emissions with respect to these streams. Mr. Sandner stated that the DEP has also made it very clear and they have made it clear to the DEP that there is no modification to their existing levels. Mr. Frotton stated that the DEP will require prior to any formal permit modification, they will have gone through a stack test specifically when they are processing these materials to confirm that there are no negative impacts to the emissions.

Mr. Frotton stated that they have a furnace injection tank. They are looking at initially getting a double wall tank for environmentally containment unloading straight from the tanker truck into the double wall tank. He also stated that then they will have an on demand system where a pump will pump it from into the furnace injection tank where the DCS (distributed control system) will take over to pump this into the boiler. Mr. Davenport questioned what size tanks will they have? Mr. Frotton replied that the furnace injection tank is 5,500 gallons. They have another tank in the maintenance shop that is also another 5,500 gallons. He stated that the double wall tank that they are proposing to rent or lease is around 21,180 gallons.

Mr. Sandner stated that as they put together what they are doing on the temporary operating permit, they will provide the PCFA with the type of stuff that they will be submitting. Mr. Cannon questioned if this system will need to have a steady stream or is this an on/off? Mr. Frotton stated that even as the system works now, they will sometimes cut back to the point where they will actually turn it off. He also stated that with the pilot standpoint, the DEP will set them maybe at a 90 day pilot period. The system will not be continuous because one of the things the DEP has asked them to do is to try and take a variety of different streams to really understand where the issues may be.

Mr. Davenport questioned if Covanta has any issues with loading various loads from different places into the same tanks? Mr. Frotton replied that they have had practically no issues what so ever. The only issues they ever had was related to pH.

Mr. Williams stated that he knows that they had looked into this several years ago when Covanta first introduced their waste water stream was the possibility of landfill leachate. He questioned if this is still a possibility as our leachate is today or the concentrations and strengths are they out of the norm for what they are looking for? Mr. Sandner replied that he does not think that this will be an option for them. Mr. Allen questioned if this is because of the DEP requirements? Mr. Sandner stated that some of the experiences that they have had with processing leachate has been troublesome. The leachate is an act on their boilers and he is not sure about the emissions. Mr. Frotton stated that their Indianapolis plant received large quantities of leachate over time and they have seen some negative impacts on the boilers as well as combustion. Mr. Williams questioned if they knew if there was any treatment involved of the leachate that they received prior or was it completely raw? Mr. Sandner replied that the leachate was not treated prior. Mr. Williams stated that the PCFA has the leachate two ways here. He also stated that we have it treated because it is going literally right through Covanta's system in a treated state. Mr. Sandner stated that Covanta would be willing to look into this. Mr. Cannon stated that maybe this is something we can save for down the road to discuss with Mr. Sandner regarding contract negotiations.

Mr. Sandner presented the high level estimates of what Covanta thinks of the formal system and not the temporary system. He estimated that the costs would involve Capital, annual O&M costs, labor, marketing, wear and tear on boilers and other systems, chemicals, pricing, and estimate of volume.

Mr. Sandner presented the data from their Niagra and Indianapolis facility. He stated that what Covanta has been doing at these facilities has not had a detrimental impact on either facility. Mr. Frotton stated that there has not been a negative impact change to their emissions. Mr. Frotton stated that part of their stack testing in Niagra and Indianapolis are for Cd (Cadmium), Pb (Lead), Hg (Mercury), PM (Particular Matter) Dioxin, HCl (Hydrochloric Acid), and CO (Carbon Monoxide).

Mr. Sandner stated that they are seeking community approval. He also stated they are in the process of putting a temporary permit together for the pilot program but they would like the PCFA's approval. Mr. Sandner stated that Covanta is open to coordinating a field trip to their Niagra facility to see the process first hand for the Board or whomever would like to attend.

Mr. Cannon questioned if the State was pushing for the project to begin because there is a need for the disposal of the materials that they have been told about and companies saying where can I go with these streams? Mr. Sandner stated that what they have heard from the State is that they were typically negative on just about everything, and they were open to this. He stated that the State thought that it would be a viable solution.

Mr. Allen questioned if the DEP expressed an interest in monitoring of this process to see how the trial goes? Mr. Sandner replied with yes.

Mr. Pryor stated that if environmentally this process is feasible, it would seem to be another way of handling some of these waste streams.

Mr. Allen questioned Covanta on their current emissions permit and what are they permitted for, VOCs? Mr. Sandner replied that he will provide the Board with their permit because he does not know the specifics frankly. Mr. Allen stated that it seems to him that if they are going to burn some of this material, there is going to be a possibility of VOCs being emitted from the process. Mr. Sandner will get back to Board shortly on the current permit. Mr. Allen stated that he would be interested in having a correspondence regarding this because with their response that the DEP is not requiring any change to their emissions, baffles him. Mr. Frotton stated that from an environmental standpoint from meeting with the DEP, the pilot study that they do and from them bringing in a variety of different waste streams, may result in something that is change to their permit, but right now the DEP has not pushed that with them at all. Mr. Allen stated that he has no problem with Covanta going forward with this but he recommends that the PCFA generate a letter to the DEP that we have some reservations about the process and we look to the DEP for guidance on the process. Mr. Cannon stated that the PCFA's concern is the end result of the ash and make this part of our approval. He stated that he thinks that it is a possibility of the program going forward. He also stated that we have to look at the initial 90 days and the results, then the PCFA can make a determination from that.

Mr. Sandner stated that he could possibly give a monthly for the Board on what they are seeing, how they are seeing it, volumes they are taking, and what they are taking.

Mr. Pryor stated that during Covanta's 90 day pilot program, he wants to ensure that the PCFA does not wind up with an ash on our landfill that does not meet our specs. Mr. Frotton stated that the testing at Covanta will continue every hour of the day.

Mr. Williams questioned Mr. Sandner that as they move forward between now and the beginning of that 90 day period and even during that 90 day period, would he have any objection including this Authority in any correspondence that they have with the DEP with their protocols, so that the Board can be informed as to what Covanta is doing. Mr. Sandner stated he will check with his seniors in his company on this, but it seems to him that it sounds straight forward. Mr. Williams stated that this would just keep us in the loop so that this Board is well informed.

Mr. Cannon stated that he has no problem with the trial balloon and if we are kept in the loop, then we make a determination after the trial balloon as far as where we stand with information from both the DEP and Covanta provide. Mr. Sandner stated that Covanta does not need a formal approval from the County or PCFA to proceed but he wanted to inform the Board.

Mr. Love stated that the DEP does this process in 90 day increments no matter what. He stated that what they talked about was to start the 90 day with an EIPT, where they can look at different sources. They have a five year stack test lined up at the end of May. The DEP would prefer to monitor and be a part of the five year stack test planned to keep that timeframe, to give us another 90 day extension so that end the end of or before that six month period a full five year stack test is done for all the emissions and then testing at a range of flow rates. This will be a full comprehensive set of results for the test with the DEP input and monitoring.

Mr. Love stated that the pilot program can start sometime in early 2016.

Mr. Sandner requested that since Covanta will be in a test phase, he is asking if the PCFA could hold the ash price flat for the first six months. Mr. Cannon suggested that Mr. Sandner come to our next month's meeting to discuss this.

Mr. Sandner thanked the Board for their time.

FACILITIES/RECYCLING

Mr. Williams reported that the treatment plan operations are continuing to run smooth with no issues.

Mr. Williams reported that the landfill operations are going well. He stated that we received our check from the auctioneer for the sale of the landfill compactor. He also stated that he has been in contact with the trucking company that is out of Florida. They should be here sometime this week to transport the compactor to Florida. He also stated that it is costing the company \$7,000.00 to transport it to Florida.

Mr. Williams stated that last Friday we encountered an issue with our scale, two of the concrete footings that hold up one end of the scale have cracked. He also stated that Covanta is allowing us to send all of our vehicles and use their scale. The scale company has been in contact with their masonry

contractor. He also stated that the PCFA is reaching out to a number of contractors locally to get these footing repaired to get our scale back up in line. In the meantime, he stated that the scale company is ordering all the necessary additional parts they will need to help get these footing fixed. He also stated that they are not sure if they have to remove the footings completely or some kind of heavy duty repair to them.

Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Williams to clarify for the Board that the scale company is separate from footings? Mr. Williams replied that is correct. Mr. Cannon questioned that the PCFA would hire a contractor to replace footings? Mr. Williams stated that the scale company does this repair also so we can use the scale company if we wanted. Mr. Cannon questioned that the scale company repairs footings also? Mr. Williams replied with yes and they do installations. Mr. Cannon questioned if we have any guarantees or warranties with the scale company that when they do something with the scale we have a window of time? He stated that if we do something separate for footings, then the scale company say they are sorry but the PCFA did not do the footings according to our specs. He does not want two different entities working against each other possibly. Mr. Williams stated that this is why he would want to use the scale company and their contractor, that way the scale company could direct their contractor to make sure the footings are done properly. Mr. Williams stated that Mr. Cannon made a good point. Mr. Davenport questioned when the footings were originally put in? Mr. Williams replied they were put in in 1986. Mr. Cannon suggested that with the advent of expansion, are there options out there. Is there a better scale setup or better footings system than there was in 1986? Mr. Williams stated that the PCFA is evaluating all kinds of options. He also stated that technologies have improved. Mr. Cannon suggested that if we can improve the scale while we have to do it, now is the time to do it.

Mr. Allen questioned if this has affected the point of sale? Mr. Williams stated that we have a system in place. Mr. Cannon stated that wouldn't it be beneficial to contact our big companies and let them know that they have to weigh in at Covanta first? Mr. Williams replied that we have contacted all of our haulers to notify them of the scale issue.

Mr. Williams stated that this will not be a short term fix. He also stated that the scale could be down for approximately two weeks and Covanta has been very cooperative of this issue. The DEP has also been notified.

Mr. Williams reported on the H2S removal system. He stated that the system is running great and the H2S levels are < 5 ppm.

Mr. Williams presented A-3, Cornerstone's status update. Mr. Williams asked Cornerstone to start doing this summary in a chronological form as the project moves forward. Mr. Cannon agrees that this summary is in the right direction. He questioned when Cornerstone states in the summary of when a change was needed on something there has not been a clear delineation and/or explanation. Mr. Cannon questioned the berm change in the summary, what was found and caused the change. Mr. Williams stated that when they ran the stability analysis on the landfill what they found was the height of the berm was not adequate to maintain the landfill from sliding. Mr. Cannon was wondering how much this changes from something we looked at and is this a change for safety sake and is this going to change the way this looks. Mr. Williams stated that this does not change the capacity, it does not change the footprint. He stated that what this will change is the height of that berm.

Mr. Cannon questioned if Mr. Swyka was due to come to a meeting for an update? Mr. Williams stated that he thought when Cornerstone was close to getting this application ready, which will be

early 2016, we would invite him at that time. He stated that the application would not be ready until April according to the schedule. He also stated that it is up to the Board to have him attend the PCFA meeting every month or whenever is necessary. Mr. Allen stated that as long as Cornerstone does not charge us for it. Mr. Cannon stated that he has a lot of questions on the summary that Mr. Swyka would be able to answer. He thinks that Mr. Swyka should be providing us an in person update every two meetings or every three meetings. Mr. Davenport suggested that we have Mr. Swyka attend quarterly to our meetings. He also stated that in the meantime if anyone does have questions, there should not be any reason why we cannot submit them to Mr. Williams and then Mr. Williams could get an interim response from Mr. Swyka. Mr. Davenport stated that the reports provided are much more informative than what we had before. Mr. Cannon agreed. Mr. Davenport also stated that when Cornerstone has something that has changed, we would like to know what has changed, and what is the reason for their action.

Mr. Williams questioned the Board if they would like Mr. Swyka attend the meetings or would it be better to have him on a conference call. Mr. Allen stated that why couldn't we just ask him what Mr. Cannon questioned on that specific item regarding the berms and have Cornerstone include that in that paragraph of the summary for next month's report. Mr. Williams questioned if the Board would like an explanation from Cornerstone regarding the berm?

Mr. Allen questioned Mr. Olshefski if Cornerstone was still on target with their billing. Mr. Olshefski stated that they really have not submitted any invoices that are on the schedule for this month except for the \$1,200.00 that Cornerstone was off from last month. He also stated that they are basically at 85% completed on the Hydrogeological Investigations and 30% completed on the Major Modification.

Mr. Cannon stated that he likes Mr. Davenport's thought of having Mr. Swyka attend our meetings at least quarterly. Mr. Williams stated that we could have Mr. Swyka attend our December meeting. Mr. Cannon also stated that Cornerstone needs to let us know what they are going to charge us. He also stated that having a quarterly update every 90 days of letting us know what the progress is, is not asking Cornerstone too much. Mr. Davenport stated that not with this size of contract, once every 90 days is reasonable. Mr. Pryor stated that quarterly is a good proposal right now. Mr. Cannon stated to have Mr. Swyka attend our December meeting as a start.

Mr. Cannon questioned Mr. Williams if the actual preliminary grading of the operational berm and intermediate landfill grades have started as reported in the summary? Mr. Williams replied with there is no grading being performed on-site. The grading is within Cornerstone's CAD system.

Mr. Davenport stated that in the Tetra Tech report (figure 1) Edison Road is running into East Quarry Road. He stated that this is not Edison Road. Mr. Williams stated that it turned from Quarry into Edison, then Edison Road originally came through the landfill. Mr. Davenport stated that Edison had nothing to do with Quarry Road but actually Mt. Pisgah. Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Swyka should look into the maps from Tetra Tech (figure 1) for next month's meeting. Mr. Davenport stated that his concern on the roads is that the real Edison Road runs through our property and he does not want any confusion on where Edison Road was.

Mr. Williams presented A-4 which is the bids for grass mowing. He stated that five companies picked up bids, three bids came back. After review by counsel, it was determined that none of the three bidders supplied the proper insurance documents as required by the bid. He also stated that we need to reject these bids and put it out for bid again.

Mr. Cannon questioned where we advertise? Mr. Williams replied that we advertise on our website. Mr. Cannon stated that we should advertise on the County website as well. He stated that the County website gets a lot more feedback and the pattern of just our website, he doesn't think is producing enough results. Mr. Cannon stated that all the things that the County are sending out to bid, they are getting twenty and thirty bidders on a single item and we are getting one, two, and three. Mr. Williams stated that we can advertise on the County website. Mr. Cannon stated that the County seems to get results. Mr. Davenport stated that we should be consistent and always advertise on the County website as well as the PCFA website. Mr. Williams stated that for all of our advertisements, we will advertise on the County website and the PCFA website. Mr. Pryor stated that with his experience, the larger contractors generally subscribe to a service where it is picked up and then it gets to them. He is not sure what the service looks at, but he does not know if they look at our website. He thinks that contractors would certainly look at the County's website.

Mr. Cannon questioned if all the bid specs are standard or do they follow the same bid guideline as the County? Mr. Williams thinks that we do not put these bids so tight that they are limited to a small group of people. If anything, he stated that they are lenient to who could bid on these. He also stated that we use all the identical forms that the County uses in theirs. Mr. Tipton stated that when he came on board here a few years back, he and Mr. Williams made a lot of changes. He stated that the insurance issue gave them another idea. We are going to make the insurance requirement, required to be submitted within seven days of the awarded contract. He also stated that the language will make it easier for bidders but still give us the protection that we need. Mr. Tipton stated that we are trying to have standard forms but also make them specific to the task at hand. He thinks the bids as they are, are wide open and he does not think that we are casting a narrow net.

Mr. Cannon would like to make a motion that all future advertisements that were previously only on the PCFA website will now be also offered on the Warren County website. Mr. Davenport stated that this is a good idea but not the right wording. Mr. Cannon suggested that Mr. Tipton make up a resolution for the Board to approve officially next month. Mr. Tipton will do that.

Mr. Allen stated that the packet came with a resolution to approve this and he does not know when we found out that the insurance was not available for any of the bidders. Mr. Williams stated that we found out after the packets were sent out. Mr. Allen has a problem looking at this resolution as Board members because we are asked to approve a company without having seen the bids. He stated that it appears that we received three bids, counsel and Mr. Williams selected the lowest bidder but the Board never got to see the other bids. He also stated that he would not vote on this personally, he would abstain. Mr. Williams stated that in the future if the Board wants all of these bids in their packets instead of the low bid, then he would be more than happy to supply the Board with all the papers. Mr. Pryor stated that we are subject to the local public contracts law, so it is not like we can read them all and just pick a guy. He also stated that there are certain constraints. The practice that he has seen is that he would usually get a summary that says there were six bidders and here is the tabulation and the lowest bidder was responsive and responsible. This was usually sufficient. Mr. Cannon stated that the wording in the resolution to say that three bids were received and were evaluated by staff and counsel. He stated that it is obvious that Counsel determined that the insurance was not. Mr. Tipton stated that with the timing issue, he was on vacation from Thursday to Wednesday of last week. By the time he got back from vacation, the agenda packages had gone out. He stated that at that time he was looking at the issue for a variety of matters that they had to prepare for today. This is why the Board received the packets before he was able to inform Mr. Williams that there was a problem. Mr. Tipton stated that he agrees with having the summary and he could do a one page chart. Mr. Cannon stated that he does not want all the bid packs in his mail, Mr. Pryor agreed. Mr. Allen stated that he is

not questioning Mr. Tipton or Mr. Williams' judgement in the process. It just seems to him that we as a Board, make these decisions, then we should be making these decisions with input. Mr. Allen stated that a summary would be ok. Mr. Cannon stated that having in the summary as to why certain bids were not eligible, not long winded.

Mr. Williams asked the Board if they were comfortable rejecting the three bids that we received and we will go out for bid again through the PCFA and the County websites? The Board agreed.

Mr. Williams presented A5, which is the transportation and marketing of recyclables. He stated that we received one bid from Colgate. Mr. Davenport questioned if this is the same company that we have now. Mr. Williams replied with yes. Mr. Davenport stated that again, why is there only one bid? Is there not too many people that do this? Mr. Williams replied with most of these companies have gone out of business, but Waste Management did pick up a bid. They did not respond with a bid.

Mr. Cannon questioned if it would harm us to rebid/re-advertise this through the County website? Mr. Allen questioned when the current contract expires? Mr. Williams stated that the contract expires at the end of March 2016. Mr. Allen stated that we have time if we want to rebid it. Mr. Tipton stated that we would have to reject this bid and then Colgate would have to resubmit. He also stated that one negative side of when we are rejecting all bids, it does create in the market place a little bit of lack of credibility if we do it too often. It sends a bad message to bidders who are putting their best foot forward and their lowest bid. He also stated that we have reason to reject the bids on the grass mowing, and the reasoning here on the transportation and marketing would be that we would like to cast a larger net. Mr. Tipton stated that we do have the right to reject all bids.

Mr. Cannon questioned how much the contract for recycling transport is? Mr. Williams replied that the recycling transport is based on rental fee and a pull fee. He stated that is approximately \$20,000.00-\$25,000.00. Mr. Mach stated that there should be a total in the bills list.

Mr. Williams stated that the recycling transport is a two year contract. He also stated that Colgate's prices did go down from two years ago. The monthly rental fee for the last two years was \$440.00/month and it went down to \$300.00/month on Colgate's proposal.

Mr. Olshefski stated that Colgate had a \$3,400.00 invoice for the month of October, which could vary month to month.

Mr. Allen questioned Mr. Tipton if it was permissible to solicit a bid directly from a company as well as advertising? Mr. Tipton replied that we could let people know. He also stated that a lot of times what will be done is a notice is sent out that we have a bid out to a pool or a newsletter. Mr. Allen suggested that we look up a couple of companies for the bids or RFPs and directly submitting a bid to them. Mr. Pryor stated that the problem is then that we have to comply with the local public contracts law and there is a cut off of approximately \$36,000.00. He also stated that we are in a range where we could issue competitive RFP's. Mr. Tipton stated that we are close.

Mr. Cannon suggested that we reject the recycling transport bid because the contract is not up until March. He stated that to resubmit the documents for next month. He thinks that if it comes back from the County website with no additional bidders, then lesson learned. Mr. Davenport questioned if we charge a bid fee? Mr. Williams replied that our bid fee is \$100.00 non-refundable.

Mr. Cannon made a motion that we reject the bid in light of no other bidders on the recycling transport contract which is not up until March and is a two year contract, and we will redo this bid for next month, seconded by **Mr. Mach**.

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

Mr. Allen stated that we will go out and solicit bids for the landscaping directly to a couple of good sized companies? Mr. Williams questioned Mr. Tipton if there was anything that we need to be careful of legally if we solicit a specific company? Mr. Tipton stated that we have to be careful just picking one or two when we know there are a hundred out there within the County. He also stated that we are increasing our advertising across the board. Mr. Allen stated that we could call them and let them know that we are looking for companies to do this that are fully insured and capable of handing it and they can go online and check out the bid requests. Mr. Tipton stated that he cannot think of any legal issue to give a heads up to companies that the Board knows. Mr. Cannon suggested that to let companies know that a bid will be advertised on the County website or watch the website. He stated that soliciting the specific package then it looks as if we are picking winners or losers, per say, which is a slippery slope, but to make them aware of it, is fine. Mr. Williams stated that it is the RFP that will be placed on both websites which is what would get sent to them. Mr. Pryor stated that with the whole process, we cannot give an advantage to one over another. Mr. Tipton stated that it is not illegal to give out the information as to what the contract was for because this is public information. He also stated that by giving this information out is really giving an edge and he thinks that we start to get to a point from a policy stand point. Mr. Tipton stated that the goal here is to get more responses and that is enhancing the policy behind the local public contract laws. He also stated that he thinks that the Board is trying to get lower bids by getting the word out to more entities. Mr. Pryor stated that what he has seen done is where a policy is established and place on our website where the entities could be put on a bidder's list. He also stated that then everybody can get on the list where they can get a special notice. Mr. Tipton stated that he has seen this and he has also seen where people are on the list and not receive notice. Mr. Cannon stated that in conjunction with the County, this is something we can do on this. Mr. Olshefski stated that he thinks that this is something that the County sends bid packets out to specific vendors for certain types of services through a bidder's list. He will follow up on this and report to Mr. Tipton.

Mr. Williams stated that A-6 (Draft 2016 Solid Waste Disposal Pricing Schedule), A-7 (2016 Solid Waste Disposal Pricing Schedule), and (R-11-04-15) Resolution to Adopt the 2016 Solid Waste Disposal Pricing Schedule should wait until the Board goes into executive session to discuss.

FINANCE/PERSONNEL

Mr. Olshefski reported on the October monthly finance report. He stated that not much has changed since our last meeting in terms of the budget. We are on target with the budget except for the one category which we have the budget amendment resolution before us for the administrative fringe benefit category. He stated that the revenues are on target. The host fee amount for White Township was \$3.84 and is now going up to \$4.01 which is consistent with the calculations over the years. He also stated that there was a letter drafted that we will be sending to White Township so that they can use it for their budget next year.

Mr. Olshefski stated that he did check on the PNC account that was questioned at last month's meeting. He stated that this account was set up as a contingency account in case something ever happened for security. There are no charges on this account.

Mr. Olshefski reported that we have a CD that was purchased earlier in the year that is maturing at the end of the month. He stated that we had 6.5 million at .65% of 1% on that. There is enough to roll that again to see what kind of rates we get. He will report back on this next month.

Mr. Olshefski stated that the 2016 budget is at the State being reviewed. They did send a few questions that is expected. He stated that there was nothing earth shattering on the list of questions that they had. He also stated that we will respond to that and anticipate the adoption approval at next month's meeting.

Mr. Davenport stated that a motion is needed to accept Resolution (R-11-05-15) to Pay Bills.

On a motion by *Mr. Allen*, seconded by *Mr. Pryor*, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *November 16, 2015*.

R E S O L U T I O N

R-10-05-15

To Pay Bills – November 16, 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. Cannon	-	Yes
	Mr. Pryor	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Yes
	Mr. Davenport	-	Yes

We hereby certify Resolution to Pay Bills in the amount of **295,464.88** to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County on the *16th* day of *November, 2015*.

Jamie Banghart, Recording Secretary
James Williams, Director of Operations

Mr. Cannon questioned Mr. Williams regarding the Passaic Valley leachate for September and October on page 5 of the finance report because it has been so dry and he is looking at last year's. He was wondering if this was also a dry time or did we have something down at that time? He stated that the numbers for September and October seem to be plowing along as far as how much we are sending out to Passaic Valley and we had no rain. Mr. Williams stated that we had a couple of heavy events. Mr. Cannon stated that when winter comes, are we looking at bigger numbers now because it seems that the numbers should have been lower with what has been going on with the weather? Mr. Mach stated that haven't we reduced the amount of leachate that we are sending to PRMUA? Mr. Cannon replied no that that number is in the column before this which is consistent. Mr. Williams stated that we are consistent with the numbers to the PRMUA. Mr. Cannon was just wondering if there was a reason why such a high number? Mr. Williams will go back and pull all of the weather data out. He stated that he does not know where November and December will go yet. Mr. Cannon stated that a 300% increase from September to September is a huge number. Mr. Williams stated that what we have to remember what we did not do last year compared to where we are, is we opened up another section of the landfill. He will check into this. He stated that the lagoons have been dry except for rain water for most of the year and we had some leachate carry over from last year into the lagoons, but we have been pumping the rain water out of them without interacting with any of the leachate.

Mr. Cannon questioned if we are going to look at some proposals as far as covers. Mr. Williams stated that he is starting to put an RFP together for an engineer to evaluate our TDS issue. He thinks what would fall in line with the review is we should look at our system globally which would include the rain covers. He would have the engineers look at the impact of the rain covers, is there an impact if we have covers, does it help with dilution, leaving off, putting them on. Mr. Cannon questioned Mr. Williams if he is going to do an RFP to hire an engineer and then we are going to hit them up with what we are thinking about? Mr. Williams replied with yes and to include in their review of our TDS issue that we have here, tell us what we need to do. He will put the RFP together in a draft form and hand out to all Board members with a number of bullet points in there to take a look at. He stated that one would be regarding our TDS with two issues. Do we have an issue, forgetting about the PRMUA, and prior to treatment at our site here? Secondly, he stated that do we have a permit limit issue with TDS regarding the PRMUA? He also stated that we put the PRMUA issue aside and look at our own operational issues. Mr. Cannon stated that he would like to keep the RFP as generalized as possible. Mr. Williams stated that what we really need is an engineer to evaluate for us, what are the pros and cons without going into great detail? Mr. Cannon stated that there may be a lot of other things that the Board can all have input to say.

Mr. Pryor stated that he could have a great deal of input in this process. He stated that he did some research on the internet regarding Hatch Mott MacDonald where they wrote a couple articles on our facility. One article was on our plant when they started up they did treatability studies. The dilution was not really part of the initial design. He also found a paper later and it does not identify our landfill specifically but it stated it was a landfill in New Jersey, the data looks like our data. He also stated that the article said that they had a catastrophic failure in September of 2012, the plant experienced a nitrification failure which coincided with an increase in waste water TDS above 22,000. He continued that this was solved by the addition of low TDS water to the reactor and the nitrification was restored. Mr. Pryor stated that if this was our plant, which he is 99% sure it is, but that would tell him why they dilute. Mr. Cannon questioned Mr. Williams if that was us? Mr. Williams stated that he does not remember ever hearing about a catastrophic failure here. Mr. Pryor stated that the initial paper did not discuss the dilution. He also stated that if we really need the dilution, to him it does not make sense to put covers on a basin where we are getting rain water with lower TDS for free. He would like to find out a little bit more so that he can have some input to the

RFP. He stated that we are looking at an expansion, they are doing a leachate model there. He also stated that it is time to look at this globally and not just look at the TDS, look at the permit, look at the treatment, look at the storage, look at the dilution, and somebody give us a global plan.

Mr. Williams stated that the next item on the Agenda is A-8 2015 Waste Disposal Fee Schedule. He stated that there is a revised schedule in the packets. We do have one hauler that has encroached us for a contract, Junk Rx LLC. He stated that they stopped in a little over a week ago and asked for a disposal contract. Counsel reviewed this contract. He also stated that this would be in accordance with our currently approved pricing schedule 0-1,000 tons and will expire at the end of February 2016. He stated that if the Board approves, this contract would be effective tomorrow.

Mr. Cannon made a motion to approve the vendor, Junk Rx LLC on the rate 0-1,000, seconded by **Mr. Davenport**.

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

Mr. Davenport presented the next item on the Agenda, the Resolution 2015 Budget Amendment (R-11-06-15). Mr. Olshefski stated that we have the budget amendment which incorporates two line items; fringe benefit administrative and for personnel medical \$29,500.00 and the contribution to the County for \$100,000.00.

Mr. Mach questioned Mr. Olshefski regarding the \$29,500.00, is that a cost overrun? Mr. Olshefski replied with yes because employees have the option to change their medical coverage from single to family. He also stated that when they did the budget last year, a couple of employees changed their coverage upwards. Mr. Williams stated that a couple of our employees had children.

On 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 November 16, 2015.

**RESOLUTION
R-11-06-15
TO AMEND THE 2015 BUDGET FOR THE
POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY OF WARREN COUNTY,
PURSUANT TO N.J.A.C. 5:31-2.8.a.2**

FROM: NON-OPERATING REVENUES	
FUND BALANCE	\$100,000.00
OPERATING APPROPRIATIONS	
COST OF PROVIDING SERVICES-OTHER	<u>\$ 29,500.00</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$129,500.00</u>

TO: NON-OPERATING APPROPRIATIONS	
COUNTY APPROPRIATIONS	\$100,000.00

OPERATING APPROPRIATIONS	
ADMINISTRATION- FRINGE BENEFITS	<u>\$ 29,500.00</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$129,500.00</u>

WHEREAS, N.J.A.C. 5:31-2.8 provides that the Division of Local Government Services may approve the amendment of the budget of any Authority or District when there is a need to increase Anticipated Revenues and Budgeted Appropriations or when there is a need to reclassify budget amounts among expense categories; and

WHEREAS, said Director may approve the amendment of the Authority's Anticipated Revenues and Budgeted Appropriations; and

WHEREAS, the Authority is utilizing fund balance as additional revenue to offset County Appropriations; and

WHEREAS, there are excess funds appropriated for purposes in the 2015 Operating Budget that will not be needed in the current year.

NON-OPERATING REVENUES	
FUND BALANCE	\$100,000.00
OPERATING APPROPRIATIONS	
COST OF PROVIDING SERVICES-OTHER	<u>\$ 29,500.00</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$129,500.00</u>

WHEREAS, the Authority is providing an Appropriation to be utilized for a County Contributions; and

WHEREAS, the Authority is incurring expenses in excess of the amounts anticipated in various categories appropriated in the 2015 Operating Budget; and

NON-OPERATING APPROPRIATIONS	
COUNTY APPROPRIATIONS	\$100,000.00
OPERATING APPROPRIATIONS	
ADMINISTRATION- FRINGE BENEFITS	<u>\$ 29,500.00</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$129,500.00</u>
	<u>\$129,500.00</u>

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by a Majority Vote of the Board members of the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County that the Authority hereby requests the

Director of the Division of Local Government Services to approve the following amendment to the 2015 Operating and Capital Budget that the following increases in the 2015 Budget Revenues and Appropriations be made:

FROM: NON-OPERATING REVENUES	
FUND BALANCE	\$100,000.00
OPERATING APPROPRIATIONS	
COST OF PROVIDING SERVICES-OTHER	<u>\$ 29,500.00</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$129,500.00</u>

TO: NON-OPERATING APPROPRIATIONS	
COUNTY APPROPRIATIONS	\$100,000.00
OPERATING APPROPRIATIONS	
ADMINISTRATION- FRINGE BENEFITS	<u>\$ 29,500.00</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$129,500.00</u>

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

Respectively submitted by:

Jamie Banghart, Recording Secretary

Approved: November 16, 2015

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Davenport presented the revisions to the PCFA By-Laws. Mr. Tipton stated that he revised two sections of the By-Laws. He revised section 4 of the By-Laws that read “quorum”, which he retitled this to “quorum and voting” and put in the requirement for the three affirmative votes. He also revised Article XI- Parliamentary Authority sub section B to make it clear that three affirmative votes is necessary as opposed to majority vote.

Mr. Allen stated that the changes that were made thoroughly satisfy his concerns.

Mr. Tipton stated that as far as approving, if the Authority decides they want to move forward with this language/amendment, there are two ways that the amendment section reads. The section reads that we have to have been given this text at least thirty days in advance as an introduction. He stated that technically we have not had thirty days since we received them. He also stated that we cannot vote on these today, but we will be able to vote at the December 14th meeting.

GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT

Mr. Tipton reported that he did speak with Mr. Paul Sterbenz and Mr. Bill Gleba regarding Tilcon. He stated that Mr. Sterbenz stated that last he had heard, there was still all of the options that we discussed previously about the road crossing. Mr. Gleba stated that the ball is in Tilcon’s hands and he has not heard from them in at least two months. Mr. Gleba is waiting for Tilcon to come back to him with a proposal on how they are going to do this. Mr. Tipton also stated that Mr. Gleba stated that the greatest part of the delay was getting the roads in proper ownership because of the issues we had where Oxford and White had to take action to allow the County to own Mt. Pisgah Ave. and then also to deal with Edison Road. He stated that Mr. Gleba will keep us in the loop. Mr. Cannon has a concern with how the township could approve a preliminary without a major component being known. He also stated that Tilcon is doing minor work there but that is still site work. Mr. Allen questioned when the preliminary was supposedly approved? Mr. Cannon replied a long time ago and it may have expired by now. He also stated that the preliminary approval had to include some sort of plan. Mr. Allen stated that we should find out when it was approved to make sure that it has not expired. Mr. Cannon stated that he and Mr. Williams also looked into an alternative route between Rt. 31 and the incinerator using now dead end Quarry Road as to coming off that site going back up to the main entrance as opposed to making a new crossing on Mt. Pisgah Ave.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Williams stated that as we begin to get into the holiday season, he questioned the Board if they would like give turkeys and gift baskets to the staff for Christmas?

Mr. Davenport made a motion to give turkeys and gift baskets to the PCFA staff for Christmas, seconded by *Mr. Allen*.

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

CLOSING PUBLIC COMMENT

None

PRESS COMMENTS & QUESTIONS

None

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Executive Session was entered at 11:33 am for purpose of Contract Negotiations.

RESOLUTION

R-11-07-15

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. Cannon**

Seconded By: **Mr. Davenport**

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Allen	-	Yes
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes
	Mr. Pryor	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	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: 11/16/15

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

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

Regular session resumed at 11:55 am.

No action was taken in Executive Session.

Mr. Davenport stated that a motion is needed to accept A-7, the 2016 Solid Waste Disposal Pricing Schedule with revision to the 9,001 and above tons from \$35.00 to \$41.50.

Mr. Pryor made a motion to accept the 2016 Solid Waste Disposal Pricing Schedule, seconded by **Mr. Allen**.

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

ADJOURNMENT

With no other business to discuss, **Mr. Pryor** motioned to Adjourn, seconded by **Mr. Davenport**, at 11:56 am.

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

Respectfully submitted by:
Jamie Banghart, Recording Secretary

Approved: 12/14/15