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

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

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

Also present: James Williams, Director of Operations; Ian Semmel, Warren County Finance Department; Katharine Fina, General Counsel; Edward Smith, Freeholder Deputy Director; John Weigold, Heartland Water Technology; Jamie Banghart, Administrative Supervisor; Crystal Gild, Recording Secretary.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Cannon.

Mr. Cannon read the following statement: “Adequate notice of this meeting of August 21, 2017 was given in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act by forwarding a schedule of regular meetings of the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County (PCFAWC) to the Warren County Clerk, the Warren County Board of Chosen Freeholders, the Express Times, and by posting a copy thereof on the bulletin board in the office of the PCFAWC. Formal action may be taken by the PCFAWC at this meeting. Public participation is encouraged”.

Mr. Cannon stated that the Agenda may change today as we do have a presentation today that we were not sure was going to take place. He noted that the order of the Agenda may flip flop around a bit today.

MINUTES
Mr. Cannon presented the regular monthly meeting minutes from July 24, 2017.

Mr. Pryor stated that on page 2 of the minutes where it states “Mr. Pryor stated that he agrees with Mr. Allen and Mr. Pryor” that Mr. Pryor should be changed to Mr. Cannon.

Mr. Pryor also stated that the words affect and effect were mixed up a few times in the minutes and suggested that Ms. Gild do a word search to correct these. He noted that the effect is the result of affecting something.
Mr. Allen made a motion to approve the revised regular monthly minutes of July 24, 2017 as presented, seconded by Mr. Pryor.

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

Mr. Cannon presented the executive session minutes from July 24, 2017.

Mr. Pryor made a motion to approve the executive session minutes of July 24, 2017 as presented, seconded by Mr. Allen.

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

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Williams presented an approval letter from Anthony Fontana, NJDEP to Covanta approving their request to increase the processing of 25,000 gallons per day of Type 72 Liquid to 32,000 gallons per day. Mr. Williams stated that the DEP has approved Covanta’s request and that this is what is reflected in the letter.

Mr. Allen asked if initially this was a trial? Mr. Williams answered that initially it started off as a research and development project but that now it is a full-fledged process. He noted that Covanta has received their permit for the increase and new process.

Mr. Williams stated that we have not seen anything out of the ordinary as far as pollutants in the ash sampling and that the new process has not caused the PCFA any hardship.

PUBLIC COMMENTS (AGENDA ITEMS ONLY)

NONE

FINANCE (Ian Semmel)

Mr. Semmel stated that 59 percent of the revenues have been realized and that only 39 percent of our expenses have been realized. He noted that we are in good shape in both of these areas.

Mr. Semmel stated that Mr. Olshefski asked him to advise the board that he has started working on the budget. He also stated that Mr. Olshefski will be getting in contact with Mr. Williams between now and the next PCFA meeting and that we should have a budget proposal to review at the next meeting.
Mr. Williams stated that once Mr. Olshefski has the budget prepared that himself, Mr. Cannon and Mr. Olshefski can meet to go over the budget. Mr. Williams noted that we always have the budget well in advance of the state having the budget forms out and ready which is a good thing. Mr. Williams stated that the board can discuss the budget at our next PCFA meeting and approve the budget internally until the state forms are available and that once the forms are available we will submit the budget to the state and go from there.

Mr. Cannon reminded the members of the PCFA board that he likes to sit down with Mr. Williams and go over every single line item in the budget. Mr. Cannon stated that if another board member is interested in going over the budget with himself and Mr. Williams that they are more than welcome to do so. Mr. Cannon noted that if there are more than two board members present at the meeting to review the budget that we would have to advertise the meeting. Mr. Cannon stated that last year he and Mr. Williams met to go through every single budget line item as well. Mr. Cannon reiterated that the other members of the board are welcome to join himself and Mr. Williams when the time comes to review the budget.

Mr. Cannon presented Resolution R-08-01-17 To Pay the Bills of August 21, 2017 in the amount of $356,510.03.

On a motion by Mr. Pryor, seconded by Mr. Allen, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on August 21, 2017.

RESOLUTION
R-08-01-17
To Pay Bills – August 21, 2017

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

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

See Attached

ROLL CALL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Pasquini</td>
<td></td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Pryor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Cannon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We hereby certify Resolution to Pay Bills in the amount of $356,510.03 to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County on the 21st day of August, 2017.

______________________________  _________________________________
Crystal Gild                             James Williams
Recording Secretary                  Director of Operations

PERSONNEL
NONE

PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Williams introduced Mr. John Weigold from Heartland Water Technology to the board and stated that he is in attendance to give a presentation to the board regarding their leachate evaporator system. Mr. Williams stated that he has been speaking with Mr. Weigold and Mr. Bernie Duesel for at least a good month regarding their leachate evaporator system. Mr. Williams stated that their system is similar to the leachate evaporator system that was presented to the board previously.

Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Weigold if he had anything to give the board before he begins his presentation. Mr. Weigold answered that he has provided the board with a handout of the slides that he will be presenting but that he has no other handouts.

Mr. Williams told Mr. Semmel that he could leave if he would like and noted that he did not need to stay for the presentation. Mr. Cannon agreed and stated that he moved the Agenda items around so that Mr. Semmel did not need to stay for the presentation before going over the finances.

Mr. Weigold began his presentation.

Mr. Weigold introduced himself to the board and stated that he does Business Development for Heartland Water Technology.

Mr. Weigold stated that Heartland has made a business out of treating incredibly difficult to treat waste waters and doing a very good quality in reduction. He stated that Heartland treats many different types of waste waters and that landfill leachate is one of the types that they treat.

Mr. Weigold stated that after having spent some time with Mr. Williams learning a little bit about the leachate at our landfill and our infrastructure that he believes that we would be a wonderful candidate for using Heartland’s leachate evaporator system.

Mr. Weigold gave a brief overview of his background.
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Agenda

• Executive Summary
• Leachate Management
• Heartland Solution
• Configurations
• Case Studies
• Commercial Options
• Additional Uses
• Conclusions / Key Takeaways
Mr. Weigold gave a brief overview of Heartland Water Technology.

**Overview**

Founded in 2008, Heartland Technology ("HT") has patented and commercialized novel technology for treating difficult-to-treat industrial waste waters.

The HT ‘Concentrator’ is a direct contact evaporator that sets new benchmarks for reliability, ease of use and cost to treat.

Proven technology with marquee customers in key application verticals attesting to technology effectiveness.

Proven Applications
- Landfill Leachate
- FGD
- Produced Water
- Enhanced Pond Evaporation
Mr. Weigold stated that Heartland was founded in 2008 but that the founding members of the company have over 100 plus years of waste water experience and approximately 75 years of evaporation experience.

Mr. Weigold stated that when the company started the organization wanted to come up with ideas that would differentiate them from traditional evaporation systems.

Mr. Weigold stated that Heartland works with customers in 3 target markets, one of which is Waste Management. He noted that for Waste Management to allow Heartland to perform any kind of work on their landfills that they had to go through a lot of due diligence. Mr. Weigold stated that Waste Management continues to be a wonderful and repeat customer of Heartland. Mr. Weigold stated that leachate is actually one of the easiest waste waters that Heartland treats.

Mr. Weigold stated that Heartland produces water from oil and gas hydraulic fracturing operations. Mr. Weigold also stated that Heartland treats flea gas desulfurization waste water (FGD waste water) from coal fired power plants and (CCR) cold combustion residual from power plants as well.

Mr. Pryor asked if Heartland is a closely held corporation? Mr. Weigold answered that Heartland is privately owned.

Mr. Pryor asked what Heartland’s typical annual revenue is? Mr. Weigold answered that they would probably bring in 2.5 million dollars this year based on their growth curve. Mr. Pryor asked if they were at the lower end of the growth curve? Mr. Weigold answered that Heartland is very well capitalized and that they have a very strong balance sheet.
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Executive Summary
Heartland offers clients:

- Proven, reliable technology in use on commercial scale.
- Years of successful operating history.
- Unmatched flexibility on thermal heat sources.
- Reliable equipment performance with high one-line %.
- Robust, durable equipment with 15 years+ useful life.
- No technology or scale-up risk.
- Experienced team focused on successful project delivery.
- Flexible commercial terms.
Mr. Weigold described what Heartland has to offer their clients and stated that Heartland uses very reliable technology on a commercial scale and has a long successful operating history.

Mr. Weigold pointed out that what Heartland does that is different from the other evaporator companies is that they have the ability to use almost any type of waste heat as thermal energy for their evaporation process. Mr. Weigold stated that at one point there were some reciprocating engines onsite at our facility that were generating electricity. He noted that one of the things that Heartland does is not cannibalize the landfill gas because they are able to use what goes up the exhaust stacks as thermal energy to use for part or all of their evaporation process. Mr. Weigold stated that the use of the landfill gas is unique, differentiated, and proprietary to Heartland and noted that Heartland has 70 patents around it and that it is a big part of their portfolio.

Mr. Weigold stated that there is no technology or scale-up risk and stated that this is something that Heartland does everyday.

Mr. Weigold stated that he typically starts is presentations by telling people “Don’t believe me” as a way to encourage people to come see Heartland in operation. Mr. Weigold stated that seeing what Heartland has to offer in operation is probably a lot better that seeing it in a PowerPoint presentation.
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Leachate Management
Mr. Weigold described some of the challenges that face the leachate management industry. Mr. Weigold stated that some of the challenges regarding leachate management are: expensive and increasing treatment costs, tough federal, state and local regulations which continue to become more stringent along with operational challenges due to limited vendor selection and transportation options.
Mr. Weigold read directly from Slide 9 and described the response that Heartland has to the aforementioned leachate management challenges. Mr. Weigold presented Heartland’s “key themes” for overcoming leachate management challenges which are shown on Slide 9.

Slide 9

**Heartland Response**

**Key Themes...**

- “Control your destiny…”
- Simple response…don’t utilize 3rd parties for discharge.
- Utilize previously “wasted” resources
- Thermal energy — LFG Flare, Turbine/Engine Exhaust
- Reduce/Eliminate 3rd party Transportation & Disposal (T&D)
- Regulatory compliance / environmental stewardship...
- Cost-effective & cost-certainty
- “Don’t believe me….” – come see Heartland in operation

**The ‘Sweet Spot’...**

- Generating leachate
- Off-site T&D
- Waste heat available
- Thermal energy — LFG Flare, Turbine/Engine Exhaust
- Increasing costs
- Regulatory pressure

Mr. Weigold asked the board if everything was resonating with them and if anyone has any questions?
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**Heartland Solution**

**Leachate Evaporation Technology**

*Low momentum, high turbulence (LM-HT) leachate concentrator*
Mr. Weigold stated that the next slides (Slides 11 & 12) are intended to show the differences between traditional evaporation systems and Heartland’s evaporation system.

Slide 11

Concept of Operation: Brine Concentration Methods

- Feed water interior to tube bundles.
- Heat transfers across tube bundles.
- Tube bundles prone to fouling, rapid corrosion.
- Requires considerable high-alloy metals.
- Requires considerable pre-treatment and highly experienced water operators.
- Requires a crystallizer to achieve ZLD.
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Heartland Concentrator

- Demonstrated ZLD process in 1 unit operation.
- Direct Contact Evaporation:
  - No heat exchangers — prevents/mitigates scaling.
  - No membranes to maintain/replace.
- Operates on waste heat or direct fired burners.
- Highly Reliable ... two moving parts.
- Saturated gas stream — precludes drying and scaling.
- Manages heavy scaling brines in continuous mode.
- Low cost materials.
- No or little pre-treatment required.
- Simple to operate.

Built by Operators for Operators ... “Heartland Tough”
Mr. Pryor asked Mr. Weigold what he means by “Direct Contact” on slide number 12? Mr. Weigold answered that Heartland takes the hot gas and waste water and puts it into a very small area. Mr. Pryor asked if the hot gas is applied directly to the waste water? Mr. Weigold answered yes and stated that this is what he means by “Direct Contact”. Mr. Weigold stated that this was a great question because it really hits on one of the key differentiators between Heartland’s evaporator system and the other evaporator systems that are available.

Mr. Mach asked if they would be using the exhaust gas from the flare? Mr. Weigold answered that they would either use the exhaust heat from the flare or using the exhaust heat from the power generation equipment, which is their specialty.

Mr. Mach asked that if we went in the direction of generating electricity if Heartland would provide us with ways in which to use the generated electricity? Mr. Weigold answered, yes and stated that we could either use the electricity on site or sell it.

Mr. Weigold stated that Heartland is looking to go in the direction of using landfill gas and supplementing with natural gas to create power and then sell off the power to make this project economically viable.

Mr. Weigold presented slide number 13 to show the process flow diagram for the Heartland concentrator.
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Mr. Allen asked how heat loss in the transport of the heat from the heat source to the evaporator will be prevented? Mr. Weigold stated that this is another great question. Mr. Weigold answered that typically the evaporator is placed pretty close to the heat source and stated that he would show some pictures. Mr. Weigold presented slide number 14 which shows some of this process.

Mr. Allen asked how heat loss in the transport of the heat from the heat source to the evaporator will be prevented? Mr. Weigold stated that this is another great question. Mr. Weigold answered that typically the evaporator is placed pretty close to the heat source and stated that he would show some pictures. Mr. Weigold presented slide number 14 which shows some of this process.
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Mr. Cannon asked if the vapor coming from the evaporator can be recaptured? Mr. Weigold answered, absolutely and stated that it can be condensed and turned into recovered water. Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Weigold if he knew how many gallons of water could be recovered? Mr. Weigold answered that it depends on how much vapor gets recovered.

Mr. Pryor asked if the recovered water could be used for desalinization? Mr. Weigold answered, no. Mr. Pryor asked if too little is being recovered? Mr. Weigold answered, yes.

Mr. Pryor asked if it would be feasible to recover about half of the vapor? Mr. Weigold answered, yes.

Mr. Mach asked what medium used is on the cooling side of the heat exchanger is? Mr. Weigold answered that this gets more into the technical process and that he did not bring any slides regarding this. Mr. Weigold stated that he would get the board more information.

Mr. Mach asked if water is used? Mr. Weigold answered that they do use water but that there is not a large influx of water used to drive the condenser. Mr. Pryor asked if this would reduce the plume? Mr. Weigold answered, yes. Mr. Weigold stated that from the one time he visited our site and looked at the area that the evaporator would be located that he would think that the plume would be inconspicuous to most.

Mr. Smith stated that ammonia is one of the largest components in our leachate and asked where the ammonia goes after the evaporation process? Mr. Weigold stated that the ammonia remains in the concentrate that comes out of the process.

Mr. Weigold presented slide number 15 which shows the different types of waste heat that Heartland uses.

Slide 15

[Image of slide 15 showing thermal energy source flexibility with images of IC Engine Exhaust, Flue Gas, Well Head Flare Gas, GT Exhaust, Electric Heater (pilot), Biogas]
Mr. Weigold presented slide number 16.

Slide 16

Intellectual Property

- Heartland maintains a comprehensive IP management program.
- Heartland currently owns 108 active US and foreign patents and patent applications, including:
  - 25 issued US patents, and
  - 26 issued foreign patents
- The HTP IP is generally directed to and covers various aspects of HTP’s technology, which includes
  - Low momentum, high temperature (LM-HT) evaporative technology, and
  - The basic configuration and construction of the LM-HT evaporator, and
  - The use of the LM-HT evaporator with different types of fuel sources and at different temperatures, including low temperatures.
- **The result:**
  - Unmatched, proprietary ability to assist clients in solving their wastewater treatment needs using a broad range of previously ‘wasted’ thermal energy sources.

Mr. Weigold presented slides 17 and 18 which show configurations.

Slide 17

Configurations
Mr. Weigold presented slides 19, 20, 21 and 22 which show some of the different locations of Heartland’s leachate evaporators.
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Case Studies
Proven Integration with Landfill Operations
Solid Waste / Landfill Leachate

VIRGINIA LANDFILL
- Capacity: 60,000 -100,000 gpd
- Water: Landfill Leachate
- Energy Source: Turbine Exhaust
- Commissioned: Jan 2013, Jan 2014, TBD 2017

NEW HAMPSHIRE LANDFILL
- Capacity: 20,000 gpd
- Water: Landfill Leachate
- Energy Source: Gas Turbine Exhaust
- Commissioned: Feb 2013

PENNSYLVANIA LANDFILL
- Capacity: 24,000 gpd
- Water: Landfill Leachate
- Energy Source: Landfill Flare
- Commissioned: Dec 2015, replacing assisting submerged combustion evaporator
- Est Cost to Treat: $0.05-$0.06/gallon

CENTRAL PENINSULA LANDFILL
- Capacity: 12,000 gpd
- Water: Landfill Leachate
- Energy Source: Natural Gas
- Commissioned: 2014
- Est. Cost to Treat: $0.075/gallon

*Not including Natural Gas
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Case Study - Turbine Exhaust System for 100% of Thermal Energy

WMI King George Landfill – Heartland Project Overview

- Existing Heartland Units: 2 X 30,000 GPD = 60,000 GPD.
- 2017: Installation of 3rd Heartland 30,000 GPD Unit.
- 100% of thermal energy supplied by Solar Centaur 40 Turbine exhaust.
- 3 separate process trains; full PLC controls.
- Consumes no LFG.
- No reduction in turbine performance.
- Installed & operating since 2012.
- Site tours available upon request.
Mr. Cannon asked if each evaporator has a maximum as to how many gallons of leachate it can process and why Waste Management is putting in 3 evaporators to only process 60,000 gallons of leachate? Mr. Weigold stated that Heartland’s equipment comes in stock sizes such as 15, 30, 50, 60 and 80 thousand gallons and stated that there really is no limit to how many gallons can be processed. Mr. Weigold explained that Waste Management had their evaporators installed in stages and began by processing 1/3 of their leachate, then 2/3 of their leachate and now they are progressing towards processing all of their leachate using evaporators. Mr. Cannon asked why they would not just put in an evaporator large enough to process all of their leachate initially? Mr. Weigold answered that Waste Management wanted to install in stages to test how the evaporator worked with their system.

Mr. Weigold stated that we could choose to only process half of our leachate in the beginning and noted that if we chose to only process half of our leachate that we should be able to do that with just using our landfill gas and not needing to supplement with natural gas.

Mr. Cannon stated that we could start with only processing part of our leachate and then later decide to process more leachate after seeing how well the system works. Mr. Weigold stated that this is true but that we would “over buy” up front because the installation would need to be completed with the consideration that we will want to increase how much leachate we process.

Mr. Pryor stated that with Waste Management having 3 evaporators processing that there is a higher reliability. Mr. Weigold agreed. Mr. Pryor asked what the out time is for scheduled maintenance and other issues when there is only one evaporator in place? Mr. Weigold stated that there is a 98 percent reliability rate.
Mr. Pryor asked if there would be a time during the year that the evaporator would be shut down for maintenance? Mr. Weigold answered, yes.

Mr. Pryor asked if the reliability of the evaporator could be increased by installing a second induced-draft fan? Mr. Weigold answered, yes.

Mr. Williams asked that if we installed a system for processing 50,000 gallons of leachate and then we decided to scale back the amount of the leachate we process if the efficiency would be the same? Mr. Weigold answered, yes and stated that the amount of leachate processed could be cut up to half and the efficiency would be the same.

Mr. Weigold presented slide 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27 which are high level process flow diagrams.

Slide 23

Warren County

Preliminary Process Flow Diagrams
Slide 26

Option C – LFG Flare w/ NG Booster

Slide 27

Option D – Combined Heat & Power
Mr. Weigold presented slides 28 and 29 which show the commercial options.
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Commercial Options
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Flexible Commercial Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option A - DBOO</th>
<th>Option B - Hybrid</th>
<th>Option C - Equipment Sale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• No Capital ($) Outlay</td>
<td>• Client Purchases</td>
<td>• Client Purchases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HT Operates</td>
<td>• HT Operates</td>
<td>• Client Operates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Processing Guarantee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentrator Equipment Package</th>
<th>HT Provides</th>
<th>Client Buys</th>
<th>Client Buys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Installation &amp; Start-Up</td>
<td>HT</td>
<td>HT</td>
<td>HT/Client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate &amp; Maintain</td>
<td>HT</td>
<td>HT</td>
<td>Client (HT Training &amp; F/Up)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing Guarantee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warranty Terms</td>
<td>Bumper-To Bumper for Contract Term</td>
<td>Bumper-To Bumper for Contract Term</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Williams asked what the system performance guarantees are? Mr. Weigold stated that system performance guarantees are available with Options A and B shown on the above slide but not with Option C. Mr. Williams asked if the system performance guarantees go away if we decide to purchase the equipment and operate it ourselves? Mr. Weigold answered, yes.

Mr. Pryor asked where the 5 percent of concentrate that is left over is used? He asked if it can be recirculated into the landfill? Mr. Weigold stated that most of their clients recirculate the concentrate back into their landfills. He also stated that the concentrate could be solidified with the ash that comes in from Covanta.

Mr. Allen referred to Mr. Smith’s previous question regarding the ammonia contained in the leachate and asked how the evaporator separates out the ammonia to allow it to only be released in the leftover concentrate? Mr. Weigold stated that Heartland has some great ways to keep the ammonia from being released with the vapor and to only go out in the concentrate.

Mr. Weigold asked what our current ammonia levels are? Mr. Williams answered that they are at about 1100 ppm. Mr. Weigold stated that Heartland deals with companies that have ammonia levels of 20,000 ppm.

Mr. Allen stated that he does not understand how the system can process the leachate in such a detailed manner that the ammonia is only released into the concentrate. Mr. Weigold stated that if we get to that stage of the conversation that he will have someone come in and give a presentation regarding this.

Mr. Williams asked if there is a strong odor that comes off of the reject (concentrate)? Mr. Weigold stated that the odor will be the same coming out as it is going in. He noted that there are things that can be done to the pollutant which can help eliminate any odors.

Mr. Pryor stated that ammonia breaks down into nitrate and noted that he was not sure how much of that breakdown occurs in the landfill itself. Mr. Weigold stated that there are better people within Heartland to answer these more technical questions.

Mr. Weigold presented slides 30, 31 and 32 which are the final slides of his presentation.

Slide 30
Conclusions / Key Takeaways

- Leachate Management is an existing and growing problem
  - Operational, Regulatory & Financial Basis
  - Particularly acute when landfills deal with 3rd party T&D

- One alternative – ‘Control Your Destiny’
  - On-site leachate management
  - Utilize previously wasted resources
  - Cost certainty
  - Environmental sustainability – Combined Heat & Power (CHP)

- Heartland Solution
  - Works – proven applications, repeat purchasers, industry leaders
  - Scalable – fits to your needs
  - Favorable economics

Thank you!

For additional information, please contact:

John Weigold
Director of Business Development
jweigold@heartlandtech.com
617-823-8097
Mr. Weigold stated that he believes that the PCFA is a good candidate for the Heartland evaporator system. He stated that Heartland is looking for the board to provide them with a roadmap for proceeding forward. He also stated that Heartland would like to know if the board is interested in their evaporator system and if they would like to visit a site with their system in place before deciding if this is the path they want to take.

Mr. Cannon asked if the numbers for supplementing with natural gas have been incorporated in their numbers? Mr. Weigold answered that yes, this number would be included in their price and that he believes that our cost per gallon for treating leachate using Heartland’s evaporator system and supplementing with natural gas will be between .05 to .08 cents per gallon.

Mr. Cannon stated that there is a large moving part of our current leachate removal process that is extremely hard to quantify. He noted that we use 3 million gallons of ground water per year to dilute our leachate. Mr. Weigold stated that this cost would go away. Mr. Cannon stated that we do not have a cost for this but his main concern is using that much water on an annual basis. Mr. Cannon stated that we do not pay for the water but noted that it is possible that some people pay for the water with their wells or in other ways.

Mr. Smith stated that we would have to get an air permit to install the evaporator. Mr. Weigold stated that he was aware that an air permit would be needed.

Mr. Weigold stated that in any place they have gone for an air permit that the air permit was granted.

Mr. Williams asked Mr. Weigold what he needs from the PCFA board for Heartland to get us our cost per gallon price? Mr. Williams asked if there needed to be an agreement between the PCFA and Heartland in place for them to get us these numbers? Mr. Williams asked if Heartland would provide the Authority with the cost per gallon pricing at no charge to the Authority? Mr. Weigold stated that he does not believe that he needs anything from the PCFA board. Mr. Williams stated that he believes that he provided Mr. Weigold with all of the information regarding all of our current costs.

Mr. Weigold stated that he wants to ask the board if the Heartland evaporator system is something that they are interested in before going any further. Mr. Weigold also stated that if this system is something that the board does want to explore further then he thinks that a great interim step would be for the board to go on a site visit to see one of Heartland’s evaporators.

Mr. Weigold stated that it would be about another 6 to 8 weeks before they could get us a reliable cost per gallon number.

Mr. Smith asked what the bottom line design is? Mr. Weigold answered that from a notice to proceed it would take 6 months or less for Heartland to get their “gear on the ground”. Mr. Weigold noted that it would be closer to the 6 months or a little longer if we went with the combined heat and power option which would involve having to get a gas line installed.

Mr. Allen asked Mr. Williams for an update regarding discussions with the gas company? Mr. Williams stated that the gas company has already given us prices and that he has already provided Heartland with the prices from the gas company as well. Mr. Williams stated that he provided Heartland with the information from the gas company several weeks ago. Mr. Weigold stated that yes, Heartland does have that information. Mr. Williams stated that this is why he asked the question
regarding the cost per gallon and that he would think that the costs could be generated quicker than 6 to 8 weeks from now.

Mr. Weigold stated that he is giving us a number when he says that he believes that the cost will be around .05 to .08 cents per gallon but that they need to do some more work to get a final number.

Mr. Weigold stated that he thinks that the cost per BTU that Elizabethtown Gas provided us with was very high. Mr. Williams stated that this was the price that we were given and noted that Elizabethtown Gas is a public entity an that they cannot give preferential rates to businesses.

Mr. Cannon asked if Heartland would negotiate with the gas company? Mr. Weigold answered yes and stated that Heartland has a lot of people with private equity experience on their team.

Mr. Cannon asked if it was out of the realm of possibility that we could get a better rate from Elizabethtown Gas? Mr. Weigold stated that he cannot speak on behalf of the gas company but that Heartland would do as much as they could to get us the best pricing.

Mr. Cannon stated that he feels that if Heartland is able to keep the cost per gallon down that it would be something that he would be looking forward to.

Mr. Weigold stated that he needs a strategic decision from the board as to whether or not they are interested in the evaporator system. Mr. Weigold reiterated that he recommends that the board go on a site visit to view an evaporator that is already installed.

Mr. Weigold thanked the board for their time and for listening to his presentation today.

Mr. Pryor stated that it is his opinion that the Heartland evaporator is “in the mix” and that he would be very interested in speaking with Waste Management regarding this system. Mr. Pryor asked Mr. Weigold to provide a hard copy of today’s PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Mach asked Mr. Weigold how many employees Heartland has? Mr. Weigold answered that he thinks there are about 25 employees.

Mr. Cannon thanked Mr. Weigold for presenting today.

Mr. Williams addressed Mr. Semmel and told him that he was free to leave and that he did not need to stay any longer.

FACILITIES/RECYCLING

Mr. Williams stated that there is nothing further to discuss regarding treatment plant operations. Mr. Williams stated that he has provided everyone with an updated version of the leachate treatment, hauling and evaporator comparison analysis. Mr. Williams stated that the updated numbers are in yellow and that they are operator fees from Mott MacDonald and the sludge hauling fees. Mr. Williams stated that this brings our total treatment cost to just over 0.115 cents per gallon. Mr. Williams stated that the other cost that has been updated is the hauling cost to the Passaic Valley Sewage Commission which has now gone down to 0.065 cents per gallon. Mr. Williams stated that the block in the center of the page shows the comparison of our treatment plant costs versus the hauling costs on a monthly basis and the yearly cost...
analysis as well. Mr. Williams stated that the monthly savings to the PCFA from direct hauling is approximately $32,500.00 and our yearly savings is $390,000.00. Mr. Williams stated that he will update this sheet when we receive evaporator figures. Mr. Williams stated that the over $300,000.00 in savings per year is substantial.

Mr. Pryor asked where our sludge goes? Mr. Williams answered that our sludge goes to Passaic Valley and noted that the Passaic Valley contract is up for renewal and that we would be discussing this shortly.

Mr. Allen asked if the monthly cost goes up and down? Mr. Williams answered that the cost only goes up and down based on how much leachate we produce. Mr. Allen stated that in this months’ bill list there was a bill for $28,665.00. Mr. Williams asked if this bill was for Passaic Valley? Mr. Allen answered, yes. Mr. Williams stated that we are hauling more leachate to Passaic Valley because it is cheaper than sending it through the leachate treatment plant.

Mr. Williams stated that 6-7 thousand gallons of leachate per day are being processed through the treatment plant and that the other 40-45 thousand gallons is being hauled by truck to Passaic Valley.

Mr. Cannon stated that he wanted the leachate evaporator presentation to be completed before Mr. Williams presented this sheet today. Mr. Cannon also stated that he would like the cost per gallon using the evaporator to be less than the cost per gallon of hauling the leachate. Mr. Williams agreed. Mr. Williams stated that our current cost for hauling leachate is 0.065 cents per gallon or 0.115 cents per gallon when using the treatment plant.

Mr. Williams presented Agenda Item A-3 to the board which is the Request for Bids for Removal and Replacement of Sidewalks/Curbing at the PCFA Administration Building. Mr. Williams stated that some of the curbing around the Administration Building, especially along the backside, is in pretty bad shape. Mr. Williams stated that he had a contractor come in about 3-4 weeks ago to give an estimate as to what it would cost to repair the sidewalk. Mr. Williams stated that he emailed everyone to tell them that the estimated cost was approximately $34,000.00. Mr. Williams stated that receiving this estimate prompted him to work with counsel to put a bid specification together to go out for bid. Mr. Williams stated that the majority of the A-3 document is our boiler plate bid document and that there are about 3 pages in the document regarding the specifications of the concrete work. Mr. Williams stated that he used the same specifications for the concrete that were used when the Administrative Building was built in 1994.

Mr. Cannon stated that he thinks that the specifications are more complicated than what we are looking for and that he is afraid that we will not get enough bidders.

Mr. Pryor stated that in his opinion it is always dangerous to use old plans. Mr. Pryor also stated that the sidewalk would need to be ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) compliant. Mr. Pryor stated that the standard specifications are that the sidewalks need to be 5ft wide or have the ability for 2 wheelchairs to be able to pass every 300ft. Mr. Pryor stated that he believes using 20 year old specifications may not comply. Mr. Pryor noted that he sees a lot of granite being used on curbs which holds up better to plowing. Mr. Pryor stated that he would feel better if someone took a look at the sidewalks and came up with new specifications based on current standards.

Mr. Smith asked if we could use asphalt for the sidewalks? Mr. Smith stated that he believes that asphalt seems to deteriorate less from salt. He also noted that asphalt is dark in color and absorbs the heat. Mr. Pryor stated that asphalt is usually used when there is not enough money to use concrete and that he could show a lot of places where asphalt does not hold up. Mr. Pryor stated that concrete would last longer. Mr. Smith asked if salt affects asphalt? Mr. Pryor stated that there are deicers available that are gentler on concrete.

Mr. Pryor reiterated that he thinks it would be worth having someone take a look at the sidewalks. Mr. Williams asked Mr. Pryor if he would like an engineer to look at the sidewalks? Mr. Pryor answered, yes. Mr. Williams asked Mr. Pryor if he had any recommendations? Mr. Pryor stated that there are lots
of people who do work for the county and that they are all good. Mr. Pryor asked if the County Engineer would be willing to look at the sidewalks? Mr. Cannon stated that this is a good idea since the Administrative Building is a shared facility between the PCFA and the county. Mr. Smith stated that if the PCFA board makes the request for the County Engineer to come look at the sidewalks that he would “run it up the flag pole”. Mr. Cannon stated that he would like the County Engineer to come look at the sidewalks. Mr. Smith asked for Mr. Williams to send him an email requesting the County Engineer to come look at the sidewalks and Mr. Williams stated that he would do so.

Mr. Williams presented Agenda Item A-4 to the board which is the Summary Electronics Recycling Bids. Mr. Williams stated that we put the electronics recycling out for bid and that 4 companies picked up bids but that not one company responded back. Mr. Williams noted that the company that was recommended by the County Recycling Coordinator, that Phillipsburg was using for their electronics recycling picked up the bid documents but did not bid.

Mr. Cannon asked if Phillipsburg has lesser requirements for their electronics recycling than we do? Mr. Williams stated that he does not know what Phillipsburg requires. Mr. Cannon stated that if Phillipsburg and other towns have events for electronics recycling that he feels that maybe there is something we are doing that is preventing companies from providing electronics recycling here. Mr. Williams stated that the one vendor that did our electronics recycling for years had stated that his company would not bid on our electronics recycling because of the bid bond.

Mr. Cannon stated that it is possible that we are setting the bar to high. Mr. Pryor stated that he believes that Mr. Camporine had stated that not only does Phillipsburg have electronics recycling events but that 6 other communities do as well. Mr. Pryor stated that there must be more than one vendor out there doing this. Mr. Pryor stated that he would be interested in finding out who those vendors are and noted that Mr. Camporine was supposed to get back to us with the vendor names. Mr. Williams stated that Mr. Camporine has only provided us with one vendor name. Mr. Williams stated that two of the other municipalities use the vendor that used to provide us with the service.

Mr. Williams noted that it was included in the bid document that the vendor can charge us for the service if they would like to do so.

Mr. Pryor stated that maybe we could reach out to the communities that hold electronics recycling events to see what kind of contract they have with their vendors. Mr. Pryor stated that the information could be acquired with an OPRA request. Mr. Mach agreed that an OPRA request could be made for the information.

Mr. Mach stated that he believes that the volume of electronics that we take in during our event is the issue. Mr. Mach stated that the vendors are most likely concerned with the volume that we are going to take in and how they are going to be able to get rid of it. Mr. Mach stated that the municipalities bring in much smaller volumes.

Mr. Williams stated that we collect 12-14 tractor trailer loads per event which the vendor needs to take back to their warehouse and unload and that a municipality would collect much less.

Mr. Smith asked if we could minimize the 12-14 tractor trailer loads going out in one day by storing the electronics here and having the vendor pick them up more frequently?

Mr. Cannon asked if we could keep a dumpster or two on site for the vendor to pick up on a more regular basis? Mr. Cannon stated that we may need to have one larger event to catch up before doing this.

Mr. Pryor suggested awarding more than one contract to spread the volume collected among 2 or 3 vendors. Mr. Mach agreed that this would be a good idea.

Mr. Pryor stated that we should have discussions with the vendors to see what we can do to get them to bid on our electronics recycling again.
Mr. Williams stated that years ago we had looked into putting in a container and collecting electronics on a daily basis. Mr. Williams stated that this is not feasible due to our landfill permits because if one of the TV picture tubes break we would then have a spill on site which we would be responsible for. Mr. Cannon asked if the break was to occur inside the container if we would still be responsible for it? Mr. Williams answered, yes. Mr. Williams also noted that the TVs would need to be stacked in the containers and questioned who would be responsible for stacking the TVs in the container. He posed the questions if our staff would be responsible? If we would have a potential workers compensation issue if one of our employees ended up getting hurt while stacking the TVs?

Mr. Pryor addressed Ms. Fina and stated that the bid bond simply means that the vendor is going to execute a contract if it is awarded and that then there is a performance bond. Mr. Pryor also stated that the termination clause could be structured in a way that does not saddle the vendor with oppressive requirements that cannot be controlled.

Ms. Fina stated that for this type of contract neither bond would be needed and that it is at the discretion of the PCFA board because it is not a construction contract in excess of $100,000.00.

Mr. Pryor stated that if the vendor does not execute the contract we are no worse off than we were before. Mr. Pryor reiterated that he still believes that the termination clause in the contract needs to be looked at.

Mr. Pryor thinks that there is a way to get someone to collect our electronics and Mr. Cannon agreed.

Mr. Smith asked how the other counties are handling the difficulties regarding electronics recycling? Mr. Williams answered that he believes that as the County Recycling Coordinator, Mr. Camporine should have this information for us. Mr. Smith stated that he was not referring to only Warren County that he was referring to the 20 other counties in New Jersey. Mr. Smith stated that there has to be a way that these counties are disposing of their electronics.

Mr. Smith asked if there was an organization that the different counties work with to converse with each other? Mr. Mach answered, yes and stated that it is ANJR (Association of New Jersey Recyclers).

Mr. Cannon suggested that Mr. Camporine could set up an electronics recycling event at the County that could be held twice a month. Mr. Smith stated that we would still have the issue as to where the electronics go after the event.

Mr. Smith stated that he agrees with what was said before, that the volume of electronics we bring in during our event could be a big part of the problem with getting a vendor to collect our electronics recycling. Mr. Cannon agreed.

Mr. Williams stated that he would reach out to our previous vendor to try to work something out.

Mr. Cannon stated that everyone is pretty smart here and that we should be able to come up with a way to solve this problem. Mr. Williams agreed and stated that we will find a way to get this worked out.

Mr. Williams stated that everything is going smoothly regarding Landfill Operations. Mr. Williams stated that there have been a couple of issues with our heavy equipment over the last month. Mr. Williams stated that the first issue was with our 730 haul truck and that the rear end gears broke apart. He noted that this piece of equipment was sent to the shop and has been repaired. Mr. Williams stated that the gears in one of the differentials of our bulldozer broke and was repaired on site. Mr. Williams also stated that the turbo charger in our loader exploded and needed to be replaced. Mr. Williams reiterated that all of the equipment has been repaired and is back on site and operational.

Mr. Williams stated that we need to look into replacing our 938 loader. He noted that it is a 2002 and stated that he has some prices that we can look at to include in our capital budget for next year.
Mr. Williams stated that the review of the Landfill Expansion Application is continuing to move forward down at the DEP. Mr. Williams stated that there was a slight glitch when they received our permit application due to Fish & Game rejecting the application. Mr. Williams explained that Fish & Game rejected the permit due to the Wildlife Mitigation section which is what they review. Mr. Williams also explained that Fish & Game did not review the document in its entirety and missed the section that proposes an alternate area for Wildlife Mitigation. Mr. Williams noted that they had gotten about 60 percent of the way through the document when they deemed it deficient and contacted Anthony Fontana of the NJDEP. Mr. Williams stated that Mr. Fontana then called him to let him know that Fish & Game was claiming that the application was deficient because the expansion is being built in the area currently set aside for Wildlife Mitigation and that an alternate area for Wildlife Mitigation was not proposed. Mr. Williams stated that he then called Fish & Game to direct them to the area of the application that includes the proposal of a new area for Wildlife Mitigation. Mr. Williams stated that Fish & Game responded by saying that they did not see it and that they were going to continue to move forward with their review of the application.

Mr. Williams stated that in the application Cornerstone had proposed a 1:1 trade of the Wildlife Mitigation area. Mr. Williams stated that he believes that it was approximately 20 acres of the Wildlife Mitigation area that would be used in the expansion and that 20 other acres would be used as a new Wildlife Mitigation area. Mr. Williams noted that he was not sure if the DEP would allow a 1:1 trade and noted that if they will not allow it that we may need to look at alternate areas for Wildlife Mitigation. Mr. Williams stated that we have not heard back yet as to whether or not a 1:1 trade would be accepted.

Mr. Cannon stated that he believes with the obvious administration change from one side to another come January that things may change. Mr. Mach noted that it may be best if our application is approved before January. Mr. Cannon and Mr. Williams agreed.

Mr. Williams stated that we are under a very tight timeline regarding the expansion as to when construction should start and when we will run out of air space. Mr. Williams stated that the board should begin discussing moving forward with the design and bid documents very soon so that come spring of next year we can begin construction. Mr. Williams stated that he is aware that the application has not been approved yet but that we are getting close to the point where we need to begin this process because it could take 5-6 months and Mr. Mach expressed his agreement. Mr. Mach stated that we saw an initial schedule of when things needed to happen and then due to issues Cornerstone provided us with a revised schedule. Mr. Mach stated that the revised schedule from Cornerstone compressed everything to the minimum amount of time allowable.

Mr. Smith stated that he believes that the DEP will still be concerned with the responsible handling of solid waste even with the changes that will most likely be coming in January.

Mr. Williams stated that at the second County Freeholder meeting there is going to be a Public Hearing for a Solid Waste Plan Amendment to update the original information that was submitted to the DEP regarding the expansion of the landfill. Mr. Williams stated that the actual cubic yardage that will be used for the height of the landfill has been added to the plan. Mr. Williams stated that the DEP had requested for these changes to be made. Mr. Smith stated that the Amendment is scheduled for SWAC approval on September 3, 2017.

Mr. Williams stated that he has nothing further to report on.

Mr. Williams asked Mr. Cannon if he would like to discuss ADP now? Mr. Cannon answered, yes.

Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Semmel is on overtime since it is past 11am and noted that he is on County time now. Mr. Williams agreed.
Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Williams if he would like to address Agenda Item A-6 which is the Release and Waiver of Liability Agreement before discussing ADP? Mr. Williams answered, yes and asked Ms. Fina for her input.

Ms. Fina stated that it was her understanding that there were going to be comments from the board based on their review of this document.

Mr. Williams asked Mr. Pryor if he had a chance to review the document? Mr. Pryor stated that he did and that he has a couple of issues regarding the wording. Mr. Pryor stated that there seems to be a mix of words naming an individual or an organization as liable. Mr. Pryor stated that the document should be worded towards the organization and not the individual signing the document. Mr. Cannon agreed.

Mr. Smith suggested using the word undersigned to address this issue.

Mr. Cannon and Mr. Pryor stated that they are satisfied with the document as long as the wording is changed to name the organization as liable and not the individual. Ms. Fina stated that she would make the requested changes.

Mr. Williams asked if we wanted to approve this document now with the changes or wait until the next meeting? Mr. Cannon asked if we had anyone looking for a charitable donation right now? Mr. Williams answered, no. Mr. Cannon stated that the Release and Waiver of Liability Agreement could wait to be approved until the next meeting.

Mr. Cannon asked Ms. Fina if she had any items for discussion during open session? Ms. Fina answered, no.

GENERAL COUNSEL’S REPORT
To be discussed during Executive Session.

OTHER BUSINESS
Mr. Pryor asked what our current status is with T & M? Mr. Williams answered that he has the same report that the board has from the last time that T & M was here. Mr. Allen asked if this was the final report? Mr. Williams answered, yes.

Mr. Williams stated that T & M had proposed doing additional bench testing at the price of one hundred thousand plus dollars and that the board was left to make a decision as to whether or not they wanted to proceed.

Mr. Allen asked if T & M had found something in their initial testing that prompted them to require additional testing? Mr. Williams answered, no. Mr. Allen stated that this does not make any sense and Mr. Williams agreed.

Mr. Pryor stated that he believes that the board had gotten the information that they needed from T & M and suggested that it was time to close our contract with them. Mr. Williams stated that T & M has already expended all of their funds that were included in the contract. Mr. Mach asked if they had been paid in full? Mr. Williams answered, yes.

Mr. Cannon stated that theoretically there is no contract left to terminate.

Mr. Pryor asked Mr. Williams to send him a copy of the final report from T & M? Mr. Williams stated that he would.

Mr. Cannon stated that there would be a two minute break before entering Executive Session.
CLOSING PUBLIC COMMENT
NONE

PRESS COMMENTS & QUESTIONS
NONE

Mr. Cannon called for a motion to enter into Executive Session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Executive Session was entered at 11:36 am to discuss contract negotiations and litigation.

RESOLUTION
R-08-03-17

AUTHORIZING EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

Contract Negotiations and Litigation

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

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

Moved By: Mr. Pryor
Seconded By: Mr. Allen

ROLL CALL:
Mr. Allen - Yes
Mr. Pasquini - Absent
Mr. Pryor - Yes
Mr. Mach - Yes
Mr. Cannon - Yes
I hereby certify the above to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County on the date above mentioned.

Recording Secretary
Crystal Gild

Dated: 08/21/2017

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

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

Regular session resumed at 12:42 pm.

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

Mr. Cannon called for a motion to approve the award of a contract to ADP for payroll services

On a motion made by Mr. Pryor, seconded by Mr. Allen a contract was awarded to ADP for payroll services, provided that the items as outlined in the email to ADP dated August 24, 2017 have been incorporated with the agreement.

ROLL CALL:  Mr. Allen - Yes
Mr. Pasquini - Absent
Mr. Pryor - Yes
Mr. Mach - Yes
Mr. Cannon - Yes
Mr. Cannon called for a motion to approve the award of a contract to the Passaic Valley Sewage Commission for sludge disposal.

On a motion made by Mr. Pryor, seconded by Mr. Allen a contract for the disposal of sludge was awarded to the Passaic Valley Sewage Commission.

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

ADJOURNMENT

With no other business to discuss, Mr. Pryor motioned to Adjourn, seconded by Mr. Cannon at 12:45 am.

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

Respectfully submitted by:
Crystal Gild
Recording Secretary

Approved: 09/25/17