

POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY
OF WARREN COUNTY

MINUTES OF Workshop MEETING

May 6, 2016

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

Authority Members present: James Cannon, Richard Mach, Bud Allen, Joseph Pryor, 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; Jamie Banghart, Recording Secretary

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Cannon.

Mr. Cannon read the following statement: “Adequate notice of this workshop meeting of May 6, 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”.

REVIEW/DISCUSS TDS EVALUATION PROPOSALS

Mr. Cannon stated that he asked Mr. Williams to have both RFP’s available to Board members. After going through the pile of reports, he stated that they tailored their proposals to the RFP but he thought there was a couple of items in the RFP for the engineering proposal that he was not too happy about. He would like to go over these. He also stated that the other RFP is the Traffic Study that he would like to go over for anyone that may have any questions or issues. From here on out, he is going to request Mr. Tipton and Mr. Williams to have all of the RFP/Bids sent to Board Members so that the Board can read them as opposed to just receiving the resolution. The Board can then go through these a little bit more accurately.

Mr. Cannon stated that he would first like to go over the Traffic Study and try to be clear with what the Board really wants to do with this study, and what we discussed in Executive Session at the last meeting. He would like to basically overlay everything that we have from Tilcon, the County and Mr. Williams’ stuff. He stated that we have one submission from Tilcon. Mr. Williams stated that one is the 2013 Traffic Study that they gave to us approximately a year or two ago. He also stated that the speed limit study information he has not received yet.

Mr. Williams reported that we have our data from the scale system. Mr. Cannon stated that he wants the engineers to know that we are just looking at putting this all together. He has some suggestions from the Freeholders so that we do not go crazy with the traffic study. He stated that he told the Freeholders that this was not the Board's intent. He suggested that we put a not to exceed of \$5,000.00 on this because we are not going out to spend a bunch of money by putting strips in the road and counting traffic because we already have that theoretically with the scale. He questioned the Board if anyone has any questions or input on the RFP?

Mr. Pasquini stated that he apologizes for having to leave early from the last meeting due to a town meeting and he knows he missed a lot. He also stated that he is a new member to this Board and is trying to get clarification on what he does not understand. Mr. Cannon stated that for the future, if Mr. Pasquini would like to call him or email him on something he has a question, he can contact him anytime. Mr. Pasquini stated that as the Mayor of Oxford, he has been aware of Tilcon's idea and what they are doing. He questioned why are we conducting a study?

Mr. Cannon replied with to give Mr. Pasquini the full picture, three years ago Tilcon was in front of White Township Planning Board and made a presentation that basically looked at them no longer pumping the water out of the quarry.

Mr. Cannon stated that Tilcon made the presentation as to passing this off to the County and or the town or anyone else who wanted it as a recreation area. They had a drawings with boats all around it and car parking because the amount of money to reclaim the quarry is to make sure the quarry goes back to its natural preexisting status. He stated that this presentation was quite an eye opener.

Mr. Cannon stated that Tilcon had not really had anything about how they are going to go across the street or what they were going to do. Mr. Cannon stated that at this time the road was not titled correctly. Mr. Williams stated that a lot of the property lines needed to be tweaked and realigned. Mr. Cannon stated that there was a host of issues and frankly a lot of questions.

Mr. Cannon stated that White Township's Planning Board and their lack of wisdom, basically kicked the can down the road and said if the County's going to approve this then we will go with whatever the County has to say. He also stated that over the years as with what they have planned has changed.

Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Williams has requested information a number of times from Tilcon with no response, no cooperation, or not even an answer when he would send an email. He also stated that we found out that the guys from Tilcon that were in charge of the project as of December 30, 2015 retired and they were putting new people on the project. He further stated that this was a great opportunity when he took over the chairmanship that we bring in the new people and see if we can discuss this because of the previous total lack of communication.

Mr. Cannon stated that they had a meeting with Tilcon and their understanding was that the previous gentleman had been in complete communication with us. They represented to us that the lack of communication was unknown to them. He stated that he then asked when everyone was at the table to discuss some of the options because we have not received anything back from them. He then stated that Tilcon came here and we tried to think outside of the box with what other ideas have they come up with besides the cheapest and the easiest for Tilcon to go across the road with their trucks.

Mr. Cannon stated that they shot around different ideas and they said they would look at those and he guesses that they did to a degree but he does not know. He stated that Tilcon was going to attend our March meeting, but at the last minute they called Mr. Williams and said they could not make the March meeting and could they attend the April meeting? They attended the April meeting. He stated that up to the April meeting, this should bring Mr. Pasquini in the loop.

Mr. Cannon stated that the same is pretty much true with the County where we did not get any communication, and Mr. Williams has talked with Bill (County Engineer), but they did not have much

information from Tilcon so they did not have much to pass on to us. Mr. Williams said this is correct. Mr. Cannon stated that basically we were not getting any information.

Mr. Allen stated that they did not have enough information. He stated that they have not had a project to the planning board. He also stated that nothing has been submitted to the County Planning Board.

Mr. Allen commented, that we did not know this until Freeholder Smith stated at our last meeting that the reason that we have not received anything was because Tilcon has not come in with a plan to the County. An additional concern by Mr. Allen is nobody had told us that Tilcon did not produce anything. They are telling us that the County produced a traffic study and how could the County produce a traffic study if they have not received a plan from Tilcon?

Mr. Pasquini questioned so we do not have a traffic study from the County? Mr. Allen stated that they have come back and said you are not going to get a traffic study because we have not done one yet. Mr. Allen stated that the County admitted that they have a traffic study.

Mr. Williams stated that two studies were completed. He stated that one was the 2013 study that was through the County where they hired an outside traffic study engineering firm on behalf of the County. This is the County's report according to Mr. Gleba that he then gave to Tilcon.

Mr. Allen questioned what precipitated them to do this? Mr. Williams stated that this occurred when Tilcon approached the County about the road crossing. Mr. Allen questioned why would the County go out and spend money for a traffic study if they have not even seen the plan that Tilcon is coming in with yet? Mr. Williams replied that he did not know. Mr. Allen stated that he has a real problem with this as a tax payer, unless somebody is in bed with Tilcon at the County level he doesn't understand this.

Mr. Pasquini questioned "Is the concern the money spent on the County side without the plan?" Mr. Allen stated that when Mr. Pasquini asked about what precipitated this, it is our concern for the safety of the people coming in and out of the landfill to dump garbage. He also stated that the crossroad that they are proposing is going to cut right through all of the traffic that comes in to the landfill. Out of concern for the people that are using the landfill, Mr. Allen stated that we want to make sure the utmost safety is taken care of.

Mr. Allen also stated that we have not seen a traffic study yet and we have a right to see one. Mr. Pasquini questioned if we have seen the 2013 study? Mr. Williams replies with yes we have and this was distributed to the Board a long time ago. Mr. Cannon stated that he has seen the study and it is not even clear to him, and he also has the question to as to why the County paid for it.

Mr. Cannon commented that it was not said if it was done for the County or Tilcon. He also questioned that with no application into the County, the County paid for a traffic study and gave it to Tilcon?

Mr. Pasquini questioned "Is the issue we have is that they took the steps to do this traffic study without the plan? Mr. Cannon stated that he thinks that the other overlayment of that, going back to the 2013 study, was in the beginning of that year, expansion here was still highly in doubt. He stated that the possibility existed that Tilcon believed that the landfill was going to close up. At this time, there was a strong possibility that the landfill would be closing. This is the timeframe of when Tilcon had the ideas of crossing over Mt. Pisgah. The traffic study was not as important for them at this time because the thought process was maybe that traffic would not be going up and down Mt. Pisgah for another thirty years, it may have been going up and down that road for another thirty months.

Mr. Williams provided the Board with copies of the 2013 study.

Mr. Allen stated that the issue is, is that it sounds like to him, having spoken with Freeholder Smith, that it is almost a foregone that the County is going to approve this. This makes no sense to him without our involvement. He stated that it was nice of Tilcon to come and give us an explanation as to what they are doing, but the County has not even received a plan before the Planning Board yet and they are talking

like it is already approved. He also stated that we are talking 100 ton trucks coming through a stop sign with traffic coming in and out.

Mr. Allen stated that he has been here using the landfill before where there were trucks backed up waiting to get into the landfill beyond the point where they are talking about the crossing. Mr. Pryor stated that this question was asked at the last meeting and they said no problem.

Mr. Cannon stated that he assumed up and until that meeting that the application was in front of the Warren County Engineers Office/Planning Board and everybody else that this was the give and take once an application is in.

Mr. Cannon questioned “are we going to go to DOT standards now because the landfill is expanding, or are we going to go to our County’s standard because the landfill was going to be closed soon?” He stated that this was an eye opener to him when Freeholder Smith said there was not even an application in yet.

Mr. Allen stated that we as a Board should be concerned about this. If this goes through without any of our input or without our due diligence in trying to understand how it is going to affect the people coming in and out of the landfill, then we might have some liability issues with it if somebody gets killed, he stated.

Mr. Pasquini questioned who owns the road? Mr. Cannon replied that the County does now. Mr. Pasquini also questioned that this was the title issue that came up? Mr. Williams stated that three different agencies were assumed owners of different portions of the road. This was straightened out.

Mr. Williams stated that the portion that was owned by Oxford, was from the intersection up to Quarry Road, was signed over to the County. The portion that was owned by White Township, was Quarry Road to PCFA property, was also signed over to the County. Mr. Williams stated that then there was a question of “Does the PCFA own the landfill road or is it the County’s road?” Since it is the County’s property, the County has the ultimate responsibility.

Mr. Cannon stated that this is just to say let us see everything that they have and can somebody produce a piece of paper to us that has the proper traffic count, has what Tilcon is proposing because last month in their presentation they proposed having 100 ton trucks and now they stated that they will not be using 100 ton trucks it will be less.

Mr. Pasquini questioned who is not going to use the 100 ton trucks? Mr. Cannon replied that in Tilcon’s presentation last month there was a key box which had the speed with 50 ton, 80 ton and 100 ton trucks. Mr. Pasquini stated that Tilcon stated during their presentation that they were only going to use 50 ton trucks. Mr. Cannon stated that is correct but why would Tilcon put something in the report saying that they were timing 100 ton trucks, but now Tilcon is telling us that they are not going to use them. This seems misrepresentational.

Mr. Cannon stated that this is where we are at with Tilcon. Mr. Mach stated that Mr. Cannon covered Tilcon’s background well.

Mr. Pasquini stated that the question he is asking on the RFP is why are we are doing another RFP? Why are we spending our tax payer’s money to do this? What do we want to gain from this? Do we want to prove the County wrong? Do we want to say the traffic study is wrong? Mr. Cannon replied with no and it sounds like Mr. Pasquini has received some information from the County Freeholders. He stated that this is not the intentions what so ever. The intention is that we have no axe to grind, no dog in this race except the 125,000 people that will be on that road every year. Mr. Cannon stated that someone should be looking out for their interest.

Mr. Pasquini questioned “Is this is for safety?” Mr. Cannon stated that frankly he has not seen anyone doing this and his conscience bothers him to the point of he thinks we could at least expound some

monies that we are generating from the landfill fees to think about the safety of those people on that road five days a week.

Mr. Pasquini stated that he is for safety but he is fiscally concerned when it comes to spending money. He also stated that we are concerned about safety and how is this RFP going to give us a direction towards safety?

Mr. Pryor stated that we do not have jurisdiction here and ultimately the approval is going to be given by someone else, but we are a stake holder. He also stated that this does affect our operations and as a layman he does not think we have any liability here, but we do have an interest because it does affect our operations.

Mr. Pryor also stated that anyone that has been on a planning board, it is not unusual for a local business to retain their own expert and represent their interest in an application. He does not see this as a big ticket item. We need the expertise to review what is going on. He sees this as a constructive thing, a cooperative thing, where someone tells us these were not addressed and these are proper questions, and/or the data has gaps in it. Mr. Pryor just sees this as a cooperative thing.

Mr. Pryor questioned if we had a budget in mind? Mr. Cannon suggested not to exceed \$5,000.00. Mr. Pryor stated that he thinks that is appropriate for someone to come in and review what is there and they tell us that this is valid or we need more work here. This is the way he sees it and he can support that budget for the RFP.

Mr. Pasquini questioned what Mr. Pryor stated regarding the statement that ultimately we have no jurisdiction, "Do we have jurisdiction?" Mr. Pryor replied that we do not grant the approval but as a stake holder we have a right to testify and a right to raise issues. Mr. Mach stated that this is a County road so the County has jurisdiction.

Mr. Allen stated that we are the only stake holder in this that has property and a vested interest in the people that are coming here to our facility. There is no one else to speak up for them except us, the Board. This is an issue that is not going to go to the people in the County. He also stated that they are never going to know that this issue is going on unless they attend the County Planning Board meetings. He thinks that we have an interest in making sure that we have something to do with this. He does not think that \$5,000.00 is too much to spend.

Mr. Allen questioned if our own scale numbers were used in producing this report? Mr. Williams replied with he does not know what numbers were used but it was not ours. Mr. Allen stated that we have the most accurate data. Mr. Mach stated that if he remembers correctly that this was done with someone sitting outside watching things coming in and out. Mr. Allen stated that we know exactly how many people come in and out of here based by the receipts in the scale.

Mr. Pasquini questioned how does the scale number differ from the report we received? Mr. Allen stated that we could produce numbers pretty quickly and let whoever will respond to this RFP look at their numbers, or numbers and collaborate and see if there is an agreement. Mr. Pryor stated that he wants to stress that collaboration, he does not see this as adversarial thing. It is collaboration, cooperative, and constructive and if that is the mode that we would want to pursue, he does not have a problem with it. Mr. Allen stated that the motivation is not CYA for us, it is really the safety of the people that are coming in here.

Mr. Pasquini questioned why do we have somebody else doing this? Why don't we do this? Mr. Mach replied that we do not have the expertise.

Mr. Pasquini questioned what expertise are we looking at? Mr. Mach replied with people that know how to do a traffic study.

Mr. Pasquini questioned so this is because we have not received the traffic study from anybody else? Mr. Allen stated that he does not think Tilcon or the County would really put much faith in anything.

Mr. Cannon stated that in Tilcon's presentation last month, Tilcon stated that they did an additional study in October, and they did an additional study in January. He stated that we asked them that day again, after repeated requests, could we have a copy of your studies? Tilcon's engineer stated that he is sure they could get that to us. Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Williams if he has received the copies from Tilcon? Mr. Williams replied with the answer no.

Mr. Cannon stated that we are going to move on and does anyone have any questions on the RFP itself? Mr. Mach questioned how Mr. Cannon came up with the \$5,000.00 number? Mr. Cannon replied with Freeholder Sarnoski called him and suggested that if we could keep it at \$5,000.00. This is where the number came from.

Mr. Pryor stated that for example, if a guy came in at \$125.00 an hour it would be 40 hours and for review, this is a good starting point. Mr. Cannon stated that he thinks that Freeholder Sarnoski spoke with their engineer and got some ideas. Mr. Mach stated that it is nice to have Freeholder Sarnoski's input but it is this Board's responsibility. Mr. Cannon stated that he agrees and this was made pretty clear with a couple phone calls he has made over the last couple weeks. He is sure some other members have had some phone calls, but he represented that very clearly that the autonomy of the PCFA and everybody else is that we have to do what we have to do.

Mr. Pasquini stated that he does understand from a safety prospective.

Mr. Cannon questioned Mr. Mach if he was finished with his questions on the RFP itself? Mr. Mach replied he just had questions on the number and is finished. Mr. Cannon questioned if anyone else had any questions on the RFP itself. Mr. Pryor stated that looking at the writing of the scope, where it states advising the Authority, providing written comments, attending the meetings, this is good and this is what we are looking for. He thinks this is sufficient.

Mr. Williams stated that if we are going to move forward with this we need to set dates. How long are we going to put this out there for? Mr. Cannon suggested thirty days. Mr. Pryor stated that we probably do not even need thirty days for something like this, but it depends on the schedule. He also stated that there does not seem to be anything immanence of thirty days. Mr. Cannon stated that if there is we do not know about it. Mr. Pryor stated that thirty days is more than enough for somebody to see it and respond.

Mr. Williams stated that the reason he asked for dates is because if we put it out there for the thirty days we would miss the May meeting anyway. He also stated that this would not come up again for approval until our June meeting. Mr. Cannon stated that and/or if we call something else and we get a June schedule out, then we will see what is available and if we need to do that sooner than we can do that. We will get the opportunity to look at what comes back and we could certainly do something in a call in meeting just to approve somebody and go from there, but we will cross that bridge when it comes.

Mr. Williams stated that regarding the \$5,000.00 cap, he spoke with Mr. Tipton about this and Mr. Cannon's concern about putting that in. He stated that Mr. Tipton's suggestion leaving this out and when we call the engineer in then put the cap on it at that time. Mr. Mach stated that if we put the number out there it is going to be that number. Mr. Cannon stated that he will defer to the Board consensus.

Mr. Mach suggested that let them submit it without a number. Mr. Williams stated that by placing a number in the RFP, and if they could do it for \$2,000.00, then they will charge \$5,000.00. Mr. Cannon stated that this is what Mr. Mach's point is. Mr. Mach replied exactly. Mr. Cannon thinks that it is fair.

Mr. Cannon suggested if there are some more items that need to be performed then we would do that separately, but for this he thinks the Board is in agreement that we are not going to exceed it and we are not going to put it on the paperwork. Mr. Mach questioned why would we have to put a number out there? Mr. Pryor stated that it is always helpful for the guy that is responding. His suggestion would be to ask for a rate schedule. Mr. Williams stated that we are asking for hourly rates.

Mr. Pryor stated that we are asking for hourly rates and we say that we have a budget of \$5,000.00. Mr. Mach stated that he still has a problem with giving them the number. Mr. Pryor stated yes but he is doing it based on hourly rates. Mr. Williams stated that he does not have say in this but he agrees with Mr. Mach about not putting a number out there. Mr. Cannon stated that this is fine with him.

Mr. Cannon stated that he thinks that a fair understanding is that the Board has a consensus that we will not write any checks that will exceed \$5,000.00. Is that where we are at? Mr. Allen stated that he likes the suggestion that we tell them that when they come in. Mr. Cannon replied ok then that is fine.

Mr. Cannon questioned if anyone had any other questions about the RFP itself? Mr. Pasquini had some questions regarding the scope of the assignment under special provisions.

Mr. Pasquini questioned the assignments, are they going to review the traffic impact studies and up to this point? Mr. Cannon questioned where Mr. Pasquini was in the RFP? Mr. Pasquini replied with section 2.0.

Mr. Pasquini stated that, for clarification, we have one traffic study, and only one traffic study from 2013, we have nothing from Tilcon, and by doing this it kind of forces the hand? Mr. Cannon stated that we have asked for it and they said they would give it us but no one has actually given it to us. Mr. Williams stated to Mr. Pasquini that right now, what we have is that traffic study he just gave to the Board and our scale data. That is it.

Mr. Cannon stated that we also have what Tilcon submitted in their table. Mr. Pasquini questioned the scale receipts versus this traffic study? Mr. Williams stated that they are pretty close. He also stated that it is how theirs are presented, you literally have to sit down and start crunching numbers to come up with what our scale says.

Mr. Cannon stated that Tilcon halved them in their presentation. Mr. Cannon stated that they did not include north and south. Mr. Williams stated that when you add them together as we have done, they are really close to what our scale tickets say.

Mr. Pasquini questioned what our hours of operation are here? Mr. Williams replied with our hours of operation are 7:00 am to 2:30 pm Monday through Friday. He stated that during the winter months Tilcon shuts down.

Mr. Pasquini stated so the 125,000 number, it does not look like it is 10,000 a month, but it could be 20,000 to 30,000 during the summer? Mr. Cannon stated that our traffic count does not change.

Mr. Pasquini would like to know what their number is because they never presented that. Mr. Allen stated that from talking to Freeholder Smith yesterday, unless he misunderstood him, he understood him to saying that the County did a traffic study. He asked him how they did that. Did they lay tapes down? He said Freeholder Smith said yes, both the speed and the count. Mr. Williams stated that it was a speed study which we have not seen yet. Mr. Cannon stated that we have not seen this which is another piece of the puzzle. Mr. Allen stated that we have asked for it but they have not given it to us.

Mr. Cannon stated that we basically want to have them put all of these pieces together and spit out something on the end and we can tell what that widget looks like as opposed to trying to nail Jell-O on the wall. He also stated that after requests upon requests, and not receiving responses, all we are getting are happy faces at the meetings and "Yes we will get that to you." He stated that he sat here in that meeting with the same two representatives from Tilcon approximately two and a half months ago and requested them then. He was assured that they would give them to us tomorrow. Tomorrow has come and gone.

Mr. Pasquini questioned the Board, "How do we show this in writing that it is the safety of the 125,000 that do drive into landfill?" How do we portray that? He can see it from the County's perspective that we are the gnat at the picnic that is just bugging them. We have to show them that our concern is the safety. Mr. Cannon questioned Mr. Pasquini who is them? Mr. Pasquini replied with whoever is

looking at this RFP. Mr. Mach stated that he thinks it is actually our responsibility to glean the safety factor from the information that they provide. Mr. Cannon stated that he thinks this is the point. He thinks that we have not gotten to the point where we can be “safety number one” without all the information.

Mr. Allen stated that we are looking for them to do another traffic study, correct? And compare that traffic study to. Mr. Williams stated that he really does not know and he is not sure what we are trying to get out of this. Mr. Cannon replied with no that is not necessary to do a full blown traffic study because we have the numbers. He thinks what we want to do is take what we have, because those numbers are not going to get any better than everything across the scale house.

Mr. Cannon stated that we do not want them to go reinvent the wheel. Mr. Mach stated that what he would like to see out of this is an hour by hour picture of what traffic looks like on this road because it is not the same every hour. There are times here where there is no traffic what so ever. He also stated that so the hour at which the maximum number of vehicles that are coming through here on Mt. Pisgah, he would like to see how much time there is in between traffic coming in and out and how traffic from the quarry crossing at one minute intervals because every minute there is going to be a truck crossing Mt. Pisgah as he remembers.

Mr. Pasquini questioned if our receipts are timed? Mr. Williams replied with our receipts are timed. Mr. Mach stated that our receipts are timed after they cue in the line. Mr. Allen stated that they could be standing in line for ten minutes. Mr. Mach stated so we do not know how many people came in that cue.

Mr. Cannon stated that he thinks that overlaying what we have at the scale, overlaying their proposing of crossings, he knows that Mr. Williams has done the formula and so has he, and their time of crossings do not add up. He stated that the numbers that they want to put across that road and how many of them that there is going to be, and how often they are going to be, the numbers do not add up. This is one of the biggest problems for how they presented this in their presentation.

Mr. Cannon stated that you will notice that was one of the largest things missing is the traffic study. The first version presented included the study, in the second version it was removed. Mr. Cannon stated that he did not find out that their presentation changed until Friday afternoon and did not have time to go page by page to compare the two.

Mr. Cannon stated so let’s get somebody who knows what they are doing and put a limit on them and let them tell us what they think from everything we already have. We are not looking to produce new documents or new studies. He thinks that we have enough. It is just that there has not been cooperation here when we have asked for it numerous times.

Mr. Pasquini stated so we get this answer, three months down the road, we look at it and we got an answer that says whatever. Mr. Cannon stated that we will cross that bridge when it comes.

Mr. Allen stated that at some point they will have to go to the County Planning Board and the County Planning board is the approval process to get the approval from the County to put this in on the County Road.

Mr. Allen stated that if we have a huge problem with the numbers that they are presenting, and we have a different opinion about that, then someone from this Board should attend that planning board meeting and go on record. He also stated that this is how we protect ourselves and put our interest in there for the citizens that are coming in and out of our place. This is what puts it on the record.

Mr. Pryor stated that he would hope it would not come to that. He would hope that we could collaborate and come to a consensus before that. Mr. Cannon stated that that is what we are trying to do and he agrees.

Mr. Mach stated that in order to come to that point, we have to have the information.

Mr. Allen stated that without the information we have nothing.

Mr. Mach stated that we are trying not to make this adversarial because we have a lot at stake in other ways with the relationship with Tilcon.

Mr. Pasquini stated that several years ago Tilcon was in the process of closing several of their quarries, and they had. He stated that he does not want to have another business, another opportunity, and another job leave the County.

Mr. Mach stated that we are talking about dollars and cents here. He questioned Mr. Williams, we are going to get the over burden from this, right? Mr. Williams replied that they have not said that lately so he does not want to go on record saying that they are going to still continue to do that.

Mr. Mach stated that Tilcon said that at the last meeting.

Mr. Allen stated that it was in their report. Mr. Williams questioned that it was in their report? Mr. Mach stated that he does not remember it in their report. Mr. Allen stated that they never got to the last page of their slide presentation but it was on the last slide of their slide presentation including a couple of other things that he never got a chance to ask about. He stated that if you go back and look at the bottom line on the last page of what they are willing to do.

Mr. Williams asked Mr. Cannon if he had the presentation with him and can he see it?

Mr. Mach questioned Mr. Williams how much over burden will we get from this. Mr. Williams replied with that he does not know. He knows that years ago they had talked three or four thousand cubic yards.

Mr. Cannon stated let's talk about the numbers that we do know. One cell, how many millions of dollars in rocks do we buy from these guys? Mr. Williams stated let's do it this way, the thirty four acre build out we will spend about, in 2012 numbers, \$4,000,000.00 in stone purchases.

Mr. Cannon stated that we are a good customer of theirs, a little cooperation is all we are looking for and we really have not had any.

Mr. Mach stated that on the other side when we have to cap this thing, in 2030, what is it going to cost us to cap it? Mr. Williams stated that the material will not come from there because Tilcon does not have that material. Mr. Mach questioned what is the benefit of the material that they do have? Mr. Williams replied with "daily cover material". He stated that if for some reason, we ever run out of daily cover material, then that is the benefit. We currently use ash, but if that were to ever dry up, we would have to purchase the dirt. We are not in a very good situation if we have to start purchasing dirt.

Mr. Allen stated that based on the plan that they presented to us, he does not foresee them wanting to close up. Mr. Cannon stated that they are not closing up and we are a good customer. For how much money we spend over the years with them, we are the least overhead for them to drive it down the street. He does not believe that we ever got a break on the prices.

Mr. Cannon stated a motion is needed to approve RFP.

Mr. Mach stated that on the same page we were looking at, under special provisions item A-3, it is in the middle of the page, it states attending authority meetings as needed. He thinks we ought to specify a minimum number of meetings that we want to have with them, like three. Mr. Cannon thinks that two meetings would be enough. Mr. Pryor stated that we are driving this whole thing, to him, if we wanted to say as needed or as requested by the Authority as needed that will be sufficient. Mr. Mach stated that how about as requested by the Authority. Mr. Cannon stated ok.

Mr. Allen questioned that we are not providing a number but we are just asking for hourly? Mr. Cannon replied correct that there is no number in this currently and we are not going to.

Mr. Mach stated that he would like to see an hour by hour tally of what is coming up that road, is that specified in the RFP? Mr. Cannon stated that he does not want to get into what the guy is going to do. Mr. Mach stated that we want results.

Mr. Pryor stated that usually when you take counts, this gets downloaded to some sort of digital device and fed to a computer and then they get an hourly histogram. The report would generate showing hourly results. He does not know what the County did, at this point if that information is not there, they would have to come back and say we have to do more traffic counts. Mr. Cannon stated what is produced then they may want more. Mr. Allen stated that this would be an interesting result, Mr. Pryor, if they came back and said this. Mr. Pryor stated that now we are getting input and we go from there. This is an icebreaker. Mr. Cannon agrees.

Mr. Cannon questioned do we have a motion to approve the RFP A-1?

Mr. Allen made a motion to approve the RFP for Traffic Study A-1 with the amendments as suggested, seconded by **Mr. Pryor**.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Allen	-	Yes
	Mr. Pasquini	-	No
	Mr. Pryor	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Yes
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes

Mr. Cannon presented the next RFP that we have produced a pile of documents from. He would like to indulge the Board for a few moments on some beautiful artwork that he will produce for the Board for the best analogy that he could come up with. He demonstrated on the white board a cell of the landfill. The top of the cell is where we have leachate coming out. The leachate that we are producing monies for to service the sludge are approximately \$150,000.00 dollars per year. The leachate treatment is approximately \$500,000.00 dollars per year. Mr. Williams stated that this is our number.

Mr. Cannon stated that we are going out to two different entities, one being PRMUA which is approximately \$500,000.00 dollars annual and the other being Passaic trucking which Mr. Williams stated is approximately \$600,000.00 dollars per year.

Mr. Williams stated that just for clarification, these are estimated numbers and to not take these as hard numbers. Mr. Cannon stated these numbers are strictly ballpark.

Mr. Cannon stated that annually the leachate that is being produced from a cell is approximately \$1.75 million dollar annual cost to the PCFA. He also stated that right now we are projecting the landfill expansion to go approximately thirty more years.

Mr. Mach stated that this is approximately \$50 million dollars. Mr. Cannon stated that we all know that prices go up every year on everything we all buy. So let us get a ballpark figure on thinking 10% minimum as costs probably go up on chemicals and everything else, maybe more.

For demonstration purposes, Mr. Cannon added another \$5 million dollars to it. He stated that we are at \$55 million dollars to treat all this leachate coming out of the landfill. He also stated that looking at these RFP's, before we go into the detail on them, he wanted the Board to have a real eye popper to see what we are looking at. We all know with sludge issues that we can have problems internally. We are not talking about any new facilities, new generators, anything where we have to put some capital expenses to fix and/or repair something but this is probably low ball because you can add capital expenses to this over the course of thirty years and who knows what infrastructure may need repair.

Mr. Cannon stated that looking at these RFP's what he would like to see in our thought process, in the RFP's, is that we should look at the leachate that is being generated from the cells, since this is \$55 million dollars in costs. We have an "x" amount of money here to treat it.

Mr. Cannon stated that one of the RFP's has heat in it, as far as heating the sludge and getting the liquid out of it. If we could get to the point where a residue is left, we could put it back into the landfill, then we would not have to get a permit for this because anything that is generated in the landfill site itself can stay in the landfill. He also stated that what the costs of these may be are unknown.

Mr. Cannon stated that he hates to throw a number out there because all of a sudden he gets a phone call about it, but let us say we spent \$20 million dollars on an infrastructure to be able to treat this leachate properly and send it back in after we heat it, burn it, and produce residual bio solids in a dry form. If it is dry, then we could put this back in the landfill. He also stated that this is an astronomical difference.

Mr. Cannon stated that whatever contaminants that are still within the leachate are not going to the Pequest River, not going back to the Delaware, and not going back into the environment. This would be a closed loop system. He stated that he really thinks that looking at these RFP's we should try looking at the cutting edge to look at the big picture. These costs are not changing but going up. This is our largest expense by far that the PCFA has to pay every year and not knowing what the future holds as far as waste and so on and so forth, this has got to be the most environmentally friendly option.

Mr. Cannon stated there may be a possibility that \$40 million dollars could be saved by this Authority over thirty years. He doesn't think any of us in any of the businesses or town planning or properties or whatever the case may be, would not say wow that is an eye opener.

Mr. Pasquini stated that he does not want Mr. Cannon to think of him as adversarial, but he thinks this is brilliant. He also questioned if anyone does this? Mr. Allen stated that at prior meetings, Covanta is doing a test of burning leachate. Mr. Pasquini stated that they are also burning birds. Mr. Allen stated that in fact it is an eye opener to us when they even propose that that's what Covanta was going to do and one of the things that we talked about was if we could do this ourselves.

Mr. Pasquini questioned if anyone else does this? Mr. Allen stated that Covanta is doing it. Mr. Pasquini stated his question with what he means is does any landfill and/or authority do something like this? Mr. Allen stated that our RFP did not ask for it.

Mr. Pryor stated recirculation has been around for a long time, Gloucester County landfill where he used to work with the GCUA, which was a private landfill, they recirculated but they did not treat the loop. They just recirculated and the excess was sent to GCUA. He also stated that we are going to have an additional input there because it is not internally closed, due to rainfall over time. It is likely that you never have a closed loop because there is always an excess but recirculation is an option. He thinks that two people mention this in the RFP. Mr. Cannon replied with yes.

Mr. Pryor stated that he was a little surprised that more people did not. He stated that this is talking the bigger picture. Mr. Cannon stated that it was mentioned somewhere that they are working on that now, and currently trying to get to as closed as you possibly can. He did not want us to get buried in these RFP's, if they just want to make this a better system for us to spend more money, which is what he thinks is in three of the RFP's. He also stated that these three RFP's are not even thinking out of the box. They were just strictly like ok let us add some more money in here and lets put some more treatment in.

Mr. Cannon stated that they were only adding to the \$55 million dollars, which was three out of the five we received that were adding costs. None of them are looking at the \$55 million dollars as being less in those three. He stated that the RFP's were just saying that we will need another facility to treat it and the R.O. system in those was the big thing. He also stated none of them were looking at where is this going to save us money.

Mr. Williams stated that to answer Mr. Pasquini's question regarding if any other landfill is doing this, the answer is yes and it is Cumberland County. They have gone to a closed loop system. He also stated that for this landfill it is not going to work because of the incinerator ash. The ash is impervious. So what we will end up having, which we looked at this years ago here, is the incinerator ash is an

impervious surface which we will end up with leachate outbreaks. We do not have the right material to do leachate recirculation back into the landfill as far as our waste types go.

Mr. Williams also stated that to get back to Mr. Cannon's point and what Mr. Pryor touched on, we cannot go completely to a closed loop but we could cut a lot of these numbers out. He stated one is the sludge, which is being done in Cumberland as we speak, they are pumping it right back into the landfill. They are dewatering it and putting it back into the landfill so this cost would go away. He also stated that once we do something with our leachate treatment system, the Passaic Valley number goes away. Then we are left with our treatment cost and the PRMUA cost. He said can this be worked on, probably to cut this way down.

Mr. Williams stated that we do have an opportunity because it is being done. Mr. Cannon stated that this is not looking at a burn system. One of these has the heat system and the residual ones that are not being done right now at other places which could also be reduced if we had a heat system and a burn system. He means there is always going to be something but if we had to spend \$200,000.00 dollars a year to take out the final liquid that we could not put back in the landfill then this will change our numbers drastically.

Mr. Williams stated that 1/5 of our budget is the leachate costs which is a big number. Mr. Cannon stated that this is only going to go up.

Mr. Pasquini stated that with Mr. Cannon's presentation and the review of all the RFP's, are we going to send this out and try to do something different? Mr. Cannon stated that he thinks there are a couple of these RFP's that are more interested in the cutting edge. They are not ones that we do business with he does not think, but he thinks the ones we do business with and have done business with in the past, are just going to keep that loop going.

Mr. Cannon also stated that the leachate quality or the lack of quality with it is going to change but we are still doing that same stream going out of the top as opposed to the two of them thinking maybe we could put some heat in here or maybe we could put another facility in down there that we could treat most of this and maybe take 80% of that number.

Mr. Cannon stated could we save 80% of that number and keep it self-contained? Mr. Pasquini stated that is a lot. He questioned what are we doing and why are we presenting this? Mr. Cannon stated that he wanted to say this up front so that we did not get stuck in the 2 ½ hours of talking about RFP's that frankly he thinks are not looking forward enough.

Mr. Cannon stated he was hoping that we would have some sort of consensus to say it might be a good idea if we could save \$40 million dollars over the next thirty years. Mr. Mach stated that this is only the thirty year picture but what about the rest of the landfill life? He also stated that there is going to be leachate coming out this landfill forever. Mr. Williams stated that this is not necessarily true because once the landfill is closed, it will get capped and then it will become a dry entombed landfill. Mr. Mach stated that after it drains completely. Mr. Williams stated that this usually takes about two to three years for this to occur once the capping is finalized. Are we still going to have some residual leachate coming out, will there breaches in the cap? He stated of course, this is going to happen. Mr. Cannon stated that he thinks that the argument here is that the number is going to be higher.

Mr. Williams stated that something else we could consider when we are talking about these RFP's, is if we move forward with bringing engineers in, we could always say that we want you to look at the broader picture. Mr. Cannon stated that this is big thinking and a lot of money, do we want to recast the RFP with that intention because the numbers on the RFP's are all over the place?

Mr. Cannon stated that he thinks that this is an exercise for us where we were not really sure, we were trying to throw as much out there on the wall to a degree, and see what sticks. He thinks now if we can, since we have looked at these and we have all gotten some more knowledge than probably we will ever need. If this is the way the Board wants to go, then his suggestion would be to recast the RFP in that

regard as our intentions. He stated that if our intentions are to save \$40 million dollars for this Board over the next thirty years for this Authority, then he thinks this is what we should do. He is more than welcome to listen to everybody and other ideas but he does not see the bulk of these that are not thinking outside the box. They are just greasing that line a little bit better frankly for some of the end users.

Mr. Cannon stated that the other part of this RFP, that he has a problem with, is he does not think that the PCFA should be expending monies to represent PRMUA at Delaware River Commission meetings and/or studies for PRMUA, because the PRMUA has their own budget. Mr. Mach agrees.

Mr. Cannon stated that PRMUA's job is their job and not ours. Mr. Mach stated that being good neighbors is one thing. Mr. Pasquini stated could he ask, he is not aware of that but he is very interested in it, we are doing things for PRMUA? Mr. Cannon stated that we are not but in some of these proposals they contemplate that.

Mr. Pasquini questioned who asked for that? Mr. Cannon stated well we have some lack of clarity there. He stated that Mr. Tipton is not here and he is not going to give him the business while he is not, let me finish, but we do have an issue that has been brought up before. He stated that Mr. Tipton is counsel for PRMUA and counsel for PCFA. He also stated that PRMUA makes a lot of money off of the PCFA.

Mr. Cannon stated that frankly some of these proposals take into account PRMUA's concerns more than PCFA's concerns. He would interpret some of that to say that he thinks this a fair statement that he will stand behind this in front of anybody. He thinks that our concerns are with the PCFA and frankly he is not too impressed by what PRMUA's been able to do with past performances, current performances, and future performances. He stated that their expansion has been a question mark and there are a lot of issues there.

Mr. Pasquini questioned if anyone pays sewer bills to them? Mr. Cannon replied no. Mr. Pasquini stated that he is getting rocked by them. Mr. Mach stated that this is discounted because we are sending them money. Mr. Pasquini stated that he does not see this discount. Mr. Mach replied no you do not.

Mr. Cannon questioned how many town people in Oxford are on the system? 50%? Mr. Pasquini replied it is approximately 60-65%, 850 homes. Mr. Cannon questioned Mr. Pasquini if he is the Mayor of Oxford. Mr. Pasquini replied with yes he is. Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Pasquini should take a look at the budget for PRMUA one time.

Mr. Mach stated that the PRMUA issue is this. Our TDS (Total Dissolved Solids) level is set by the amount of TDS that they can put in is the focus of this RFP. The amount of the TDS that they can put into the Pequest River that then dumps into the Delaware River. He stated that we have to design around their abilities to put out whatever they can discharge to the Delaware River and live with that somehow.

Mr. Cannon stated that this can change as mentioned in here and is well known that when their renewal comes up this year. Mr. Mach stated that it could get worse. Mr. Cannon stated it could get worse, and could have many implications and to a degree we have the cart leading the horse a little bit to adhere. He thinks we need to get away from that. This is going to be taken as adversarial probably by some too, but he thinks our concern is the PCFA. Mr. Pasquini stated that it is fiscal.

Mr. Cannon stated that his thought process is, and he does not want to shorten the fact that he is sure that everybody put time into these, that he does not know if the Board has a feeling of what we should be looking at more so as opposed to what we have received. Mr. Mach stated that Mr. Cannon has kind of said it but really has not said it in his mind, that there are only two out of the five that come close to presenting a program. They are expensive but they present a process that he thinks is acceptable and worthy of merit. He stated that the other ones we will be wasting our time on.

Mr. Cannon stated that to be fair to the other ones, his concern was that the way the RFP is set up, they address the RFP properly as to what we had in that RFP. He does not want to cut our selections down.

Mr. Allen stated that the very first sentence under the objectives states that the primary objective of this project is to evaluate the Authority's options to maximize the volume of treated leachate to be discharged to PRMUA. Mr. Cannon stated now to be fair to the newer members, he does not remember anybody on this Authority ever saying that, to be fair.

Mr. Williams stated that he has to say regarding this, this RFP went out as a draft to this Board in December. The RFP then went to a final version and was approved by this Board in January. This Board saw all the writing that was presented. He hopes that everybody read it, but it almost appears like a lot of people did not read this RFP. He stated that this Board voted on and approved this language. Mr. Cannon stated correct and 1000% agrees.

Mr. Mach stated that he wants to understand the concerns, that the concern is the responses that we got to the RFP do not match that sentence? Mr. Allen replied no they do, only two of them came in with other options besides that. Mr. Mach questioned why is that a problem? Mr. Allen replied that he does not think he said it is a problem. Mr. Mach stated that we asked them for a RFP and they are being creative. He questioned again what is wrong with that? He stated that the submittals were creative.

Mr. Cannon stated that his thought process was that we were throwing everything out and he was looking for, on Mr. Mach's line there, that he didn't want to scale it down any way shape or form. Here you are, come back with what you can and whatever you want to do. He agrees and he would not have included that sentence if he was thinking clearer at that time. He stated that it seems like the thrust of the three that do not take into account any type of forward thinking, and takes into account somebody else's interest more than our interest.

Mr. Cannon stated that this is the problem of where he is at, should we recast an RFP which states our objective more clearly, ideas? Is this unfair to the two that thought outside of the box and we did not give that thrust to the other three?

Mr. Williams stated kudos to the people who thought outside of the box. He stated that they all responded as we asked but two went outside of the box. He also stated that this is not saying that we cannot talk to another third one or fourth one and ask them to look outside of the box too. Whether they will fit in the budget that they proposed, that is another story.

Mr. Pryor stated that he never worries about the budget because you are going to negotiate that later. He also stated that we look at those numbers, and if we spend an extra \$10,000.00 dollars on the study or \$20,000.00 dollars and get a better solution looking at those numbers that is well invested. He also stated that as a guy that has responded to a lot of these things, he said it is not unusual for somebody to say, hey I am responding to what you asked for but you might think about this. People do that and he gives credit to those who did. Mr. Mach stated exactly and the business he was in that if somebody threw an extra bone in there on a quote, and he got shafted as a result of it, kudos to them for thinking outside of the box. Mr. Pryor stated that this is a great idea and in the end it may or may not be feasible. Then we may be back to cleaning up what we got.

Mr. Pryor stated that he found one of the RFP's particularly disappointing. It was pretty much a generic response. Another one he also found was close to a generic response. Mr. Pasquini questioned which one is that in Mr. Pryor's opinion? Mr. Pryor responded that he thinks that Cornerstone, for all they know and all of their time here, it was a pretty generic response. Mr. Cannon stated that he was shocked. Mr. Mach stated that it was not the bottom for him but it was next to the bottom. Mr. Cannon stated that he thought it showed lack of interest frankly. Mr. Pryor questioned Mr. Mach on who was his bottom one? Mr. Mach replied that it was Marcolini. Mr. Pryor replied that with her RFP it was a little narrower. This is a new firm and a small firm.

Mr. Pryor stated that there are things we may want to consider, but in terms of the treatment aspects, he stated that hers was pretty well thought out. Her response was narrow but thorough. Mr. Mach stated that the staff was limited. Mr. Pryor stated that those are all other things, and he is agreeing with Mr.

Mach, but he is saying that looking at the work plan is not a bad work. Mr. Pryor stated that he thought Earth Res was kind of a generic response. Mr. Mach agreed. He stated that he looked at the qualifications. Mr. Pryor stated that is legitimate. It is a new firm and it is a smaller firm and we take a risk when we do that but in terms of Marcolini's project, it is not a bad look. He stated that the other two are a little outside of the box. Hatch Mott is splitting up. Mr. Williams stated that it is now Mott MacDonald.

Mr. Cannon questioned Mr. Pryor how long he has been licensed? Mr. Pryor stated since 1974. Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Pryor has had forty two years of experience.

Mr. Pasquini stated that he thinks that the Board is an agreement with the RFP. He questioned is it the direction of the scope or where we go if we include all or some? Mr. Cannon stated that this is where we are at. Mr. Pasquini stated that he thinks the Board has come to an agreement that who the good ones are and some fall. It is nature. Do we do that? Mr. Allen stated that after thinking it over, he does not think we need to redo the RFP. He agrees with Mr. Mach with kudos to the guys that did come in with those suggestions and we can maybe inquire the other ones if we want to go that far. He also stated that within the RFP itself, there are two items under the scope that need to be deleted or he is not sure how we handle them with the PRMUA issue.

Mr. Cannon stated that regarding the RFP, which that cork is out of the bottle for right now. Mr. Mach stated that we can limit the scope. Mr. Allen stated that in the cost of his proposal, it does say in the cost to perform all services with the exception of Task 4.

Mr. Cannon stated that he can give assurance at least from his viewpoint that he is not signing anything that is going to be spent on PRMUA's behalf. Mr. Williams stated that we could eliminate that piece of it out of it. Mr. Cannon stated that whichever engineer that we chose, we will be very clear.

Mr. Cannon stated that regarding the interviews, he thinks that we all have the consensus on two that we would like to throw onto the dogpile. Would this be fair to say that with Cornerstone's proposal that we should not be talking about it after today? Mr. Pryor stated that he thought for all of their experience here, it was pretty bland. Mr. Pasquini questioned if Cornerstone was our incumbent? Mr. Williams stated that the RFP is from Tetra Tech, not Cornerstone.

Mr. Mach stated that his choices would be Hatch Mott MacDonald and T&M Associates. Mr. Cannon stated that if we could do three, what do you all think? Mr. Mach stated to throw in Marcolini. Mr. Pryor stated that our concerns are very valid and they can be discussed with her, but if we just look at her work plan, she put some work into it.

Mr. Cannon stated that regarding Tetra Tech, the Board seems to be ok with getting rid of that. How about Hatch Mott MacDonald? Mr. Mach stated that he thinks that they are in. Mr. Pryor stated that he liked their proposal.

Mr. Cannon questioned the Board about Earth Res? Mr. Pryor stated that he thought their proposal was generic, and they did have some good clients. Mr. Williams stated out with Earth Res.

Mr. Cannon stated that we are down to three; Hatch Mott MacDonald, Laura Marcolini, and T&M. Mr. Pryor agreed. Mr. Cannon stated that we want to bring them in and that is when we will have that discussion and purpose in person. Mr. Pryor stated that he would give them a heads up in our interview. He also stated to not be afraid to discuss looking outside of the box.

Mr. Williams stated that it is official that we picked these three; Marcolini, Hatch Mott and T&M. He also stated that it would be best to do another workshop meeting specifically for interviews for these three or does the Board want to have them attend the May meeting, which will be a long meeting?

Mr. Williams suggested to have a special meeting where we just conduct interviews with the three and give them each about an hour.

Mr. Cannon stated that he finds personally that having them all at the same time, can be a little awkward and brain consuming because we are sort of overlapping on each one. He would prefer to have them separately.

Mr. Williams agreed with Mr. Cannon and he did not mean to bring them all in at one time. Mr. Cannon stated that he does not want them the same day. He is saying that we are not going to have a Thursday meeting where we are going to have one come in then the next one come in. He thinks we are much better digesting each one separately then having them all on the same day. He stated that this is not something that we are talking about for tomorrow, we are talking about probably an investment of monies and time. He thinks to give them the heads up first that we would like to talk to them further with what Mr. Mach and Mr. Pryor said that we are interested in looking outside of the box and letting them know so that maybe they come with some other stuff as far as giving them an idea at least that is where our direction may be headed so that they know this ahead of time so that they come in here and when we are talking to them, they will be geared more towards that. Mr. Cannon questioned if this was a clear way to say? Mr. Williams replied with that it is perfect.

Mr. Cannon stated that even if all members do not or cannot attend and he knows that this will be three different meetings, maybe we could get one in our May meeting, and then maybe we would only have two separate ones. Mr. Williams stated that we could check.

Mr. Cannon stated that we could have one in May, one June, and one separate. Mr. Williams stated that by looking at everybody's schedule for May, everyone is pretty much unavailable. Mr. Cannon stated well May will be gone in five minutes the way it is going around here. Mr. Williams stated that we will be looking at June. Mr. Cannon stated that he understands but he thinks that we could get one into the May meeting, which would be great. He also stated that if any of them agree to, we could get one to the May meeting. Would everybody say that we could listen to one of them for the meeting, right?

Mr. Williams stated that because as far as the May meeting goes, of course we have the State coming in for the Avian Flu and how long that presentation will be, but the rest of the agenda is generic. Mr. Cannon stated that is correct and he thinks that he is sure one of them will be interested.

Mr. Williams stated that he thinks and believes that we could do this in Executive Session. Mr. Pryor stated that he is actually used to showing up at a meeting and the first guy gets 9:00 to 10:00 and the next guy gets 10:00 to 11:00 and so on. He stated that he never sat on the other side of that. He has been on the consultant side. Mr. Cannon stated that he thinks that there is too much here to do it that way, frankly.

Mr. Mach stated that if we stretch it out too far, then we are going to forget what went on in the first interview. Mr. Pryor agrees and that is one of the problems. Mr. Cannon stated that the last guy is going to get the "Are you done yet, we have to go." Mr. Mach stated that this is exactly what they are going to go through. Mr. Cannon stated that considering the possibility of the picture and the dollars, he thinks we really need to give each one a due diligence amount of time so that we do not feel like, oh we got three of these guys. Mr. Allen stated that it is not like we are under any deadlines. Mr. Cannon stated no, we are not in a rush.

Mr. Cannon stated that he thinks that we should respond to the three and let them know that we are interested in talking further, outside the box, and see who would be interested in coming and making a presentation and/or would we have to do this in Executive? Mr. Williams stated that this could be considered a contract, it might be better to do in Executive.

Mr. Mach stated it should be Executive Session. Mr. Williams stated that it is a contract negotiation that we are talking about here. Mr. Pryor stated that he has seen it in both ways. He would prefer it in Executive because they are giving proprietary ideas. Mr. Cannon stated that if we do not get someone in until the June meeting, they go through the minutes of the May meeting of their competition. Mr. Cannon stated so Executive Session then it should be.

Mr. Pryor stated that the other thing that is helpful to consultants when they come in, is that we give them an idea of how much time is allowed, the format if we want to give them a period for presentation, then questions and answers, the type of room where can or do they have to bring in audio visual aids. Mr. Allen stated that before we invite them in, he thinks we ought to restructure a little bit the scope of what we are asking them to do. Mr. Cannon stated that he thinks that we are going to communicate that when we respond to the three of them.

Mr. Allen stated that whether we send a letter to them or call them on the phone as a type of commitment. Mr. Williams stated that what he will do is send them an email that way it is on the record. Mr. Cannon stated that it should state that we had a workshop meeting. Mr. Williams stated that he thinks to go along with Mr. Pryor's line, that it is a good point if they provide us with a presentation, and we will give you fifteen minutes, question and answer period or whatever format that we come up with.

Mr. Allen stated that specifically we need to restructure the scope of what we are looking for to go with. He stated that the scope of what is in here is not really what we are looking for. Mr. Pryor stated that he thinks we are going to adjust the scope based on the discussions. Mr. Cannon stated that is right and he does not want to pigeon hole saying that we will put something in writing. Let us discuss with them.

Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Williams is going to give them a heads up ahead of time to say that we are looking this 70%, 80%, 60% of closed loop system or whatever we can achieve, but we are looking more outside of the box, so when you come for whatever time they are able to come, we would like you to have the thrust of their presentation in that regard. Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Williams will express this in the email. He also stated that putting out an email is fair enough and maybe one may want to take more time to put stuff together, forward thinking, then come back to us thereafter. First come, first served. We will take one in the May meeting.

Mr. Cannon stated that regarding the presentation, he stated that the last couple power points that we have had, he cannot see the board and he has great eyes. He questioned if we need a bigger projection or do we need something else? Mr. Williams stated that it was their presentation and he had said this previously to Tilcon. Mr. Cannon stated that he could not see Cornerstone's presentation either.

Mr. Pryor suggested that we may want to come to the upstairs meeting room for Executive Session. We will hear better and we will see better. That way the environment is helpful if you know what that is. Mr. Allen stated that the back lighting in the downstairs conference room is atrocious with all the windows. It takes the sun in the morning. He stated that he sits there looking at silhouettes of people in the audience because of the back lighting. Mr. Cannon stated that the two we have had with Tetra Tech and Mr. Swyka's stuff, he could barely even see what was on there when we were on the shaft thing, and Tilcon's was worse. Mr. Williams stated that he could look for better equipment. Mr. Cannon stated that he is not saying it is Mr. Williams. He does not know if it is the product that they brought in or if it is our equipment, but if we need to spend a couple of bucks on that because he thinks it needs to be clearer.

Mr. Cannon also stated that we are making decisions based on presentations. He stated that Mr. Swyka's stuff was terrible and then he put something on that easel where the quality of it was awful and he thinks he told him that. He would expect that when we are talking about this, we need to have better and yes, he thinks that the consensus is here, if we need to get a projector. With the technology today, we could get something better. He wants to see the presentation up in lights.

Mr. Williams stated that we could do the interviews in the upstairs conference room because we have a pull down screen there, as Mr. Pryor suggested. Mr. Pryor stated that the more intimate the environment, the better the discussion. Mr. Cannon stated that the location does not matter to him. Mr. Mach stated that the discussion is better held in a round table setting rather than sitting up at the Board table. Mr. Cannon stated absolutely to Mr. Mach. He also stated to Mr. Williams that if we need to get something then let us get it. He also stated that with technology today, we could come in afterwards and

watch Apocalypse Now with the new beautiful projector we have or what. Mr. Mach questioned how much is Mr. Williams authorized to spend? Mr. Cannon stated to take a look at stuff and do a little shopping.

Mr. Mach stated that back to getting them in here for interviews. He suggests one at the meeting and another meeting with two of them. Mr. Williams stated that he will try to get them scheduled close and he thinks as Mr. Mach stated that if we schedule them to far apart, we will forget what the first guys says. He stated that we will try to schedule them back to back and schedule for approximately one hour and half a piece. Mr. Cannon questioned Mr. Williams if the Board gave him clear direction? Mr. Williams replied with yes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Executive Session was not necessary.

Mr. Cannon questioned if the Board had any other business to discuss. Mr. Williams stated that the Board got a copy of the audit that is done. This is just an FYI for the Board.

ADJOURNMENT

With no other business to discuss, **Mr. Pryor** motioned to Adjourn, seconded by **Mr. Pasquini**, at 10:29 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: 06/27/16