

POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY
OF WARREN COUNTY

MINUTES OF REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING

February 26, 2018

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

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

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

Also present: James Williams, Director of Operations; Freeholder Director, Ed Smith; Brian Tipton, General Counsel; Steve Donati, CP Engineers; BJ Wauhup, PRMUA Consultant; Jamie Banghart, Administrative Supervisor; Crystal Gild, Recording Secretary.

Mr. Cannon stated that there is a new PCFA Board Member and welcomed Mr. Urfer to the PCFA Board. Mr. Urfer thanked Mr. Cannon for welcoming him to the board.

OATH OF OFFICE

Mr. Cannon directed Mr. Tipton to lead Mr. Mach and Mr. Urfer in their Oaths of Office.

Mr. Tipton congratulated Mr. Mach and Mr. Urfer and Mr. Mach and Mr. Urfer both thanked Mr. Tipton.

Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Urfer to introduce himself and to tell us a little bit about himself.

Mr. Urfer stated that his name is Terry Urfer and that he is from Hope, NJ and that he is the Councilman for Hope. Mr. Urfer stated that he is a member of the Warren County Agriculture Board and the Warren County Economic Development Committee. Mr. Urfer stated that he has an extensive business background and noted that currently he is semi-retired and that he does do farming in Hope. Mr. Urfer also stated that he “robs banks”, meaning that he buys bank foreclosures and flips the houses and then sells them. Mr. Urfer stated that he is a member of the PCFA Board because Freeholder Director Ed Smith thought that it might be advantageous for him to be on the board.

Mr. Cannon wished Mr. Urfer good luck. Mr. Williams and the PCFA Board Members welcomed Mr. Urfer to the PCFA Board.

Mr. Cannon asked Ms. Crystal Gild if she would take an official role call with the sworn in members?
Ms. Gild called the roll.

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

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Cannon.

Mr. Cannon read the following statement: “Adequate notice of this meeting of January 26, 2018 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 Meeting Agenda is subject to change and that the order of the Agenda will change today to accommodate the representatives from the PRMUA because they have another meeting to attend today.

ANNUAL REORGANIZATION OF THE AUTHORITY

Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Williams would begin the Annual Reorganization of the Authority.

Mr. Williams assumed the Chair for Nomination(s) and Election of the Chairperson.

Mr. Williams stated that at this time he would like to open up the floor for nominations for Chairperson of the Board.

Mr. Pryor nominated Mr. Cannon for Chairperson of the Board and Mr. Allen seconded the nomination of Mr. Cannon for Chairperson of the Board.

Mr. Williams asked if there were any other nominations for Chairperson of the Board?

Mr. Williams stated that with hearing no other nominations that the nominations for Chairperson of the Board were closed.

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

Mr. Cannon thanked the board for electing him as Chairperson of the Board.

Mr. Cannon assumed the Chair as the elected Chairperson for the remainder of the meeting.

Mr. Cannon called for a nomination for Vice Chairperson of the Board.

Mr. Allen nominated Mr. Mach for Vice Chairperson of the Board and Mr. Pryor seconded the nomination of Mr. Mach for Vice Chairperson of the Board.

Mr. Mach stated that he kindly appreciates the nomination to be elected Vice Chairperson of the Board but that he respectfully declines the nomination. Mr. Mach thanked the Board.

Mr. Pryor stated that given Mr. Mach's decline of his nomination that he would like to nominate Commissioner Allen for Vice Chairperson of the Board. Mr. Mach seconded the nomination of Commissioner Allen for Vice Chair Person of the Board.

Mr. Cannon asked if there were any other questions?

Mr. Pryor asked if there was a second made for the nomination? Mr. Williams and Mr. Cannon both answered yes and stated that Mr. Mach had seconded the nomination.

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

Mr. Cannon called for a nomination for Secretary of the Board.

Mr. Allen nominated Mr. Mach for Secretary of the board and Mr. Cannon seconded the nomination of Mr. Mach for Secretary of the Board.

Mr. Cannon asked if there were any questions?

There were no questions asked.

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

Mr. Cannon called for a nomination for Treasurer of the Board.

Mr. Cannon nominated Mr. Pryor for Treasurer of the Board and Mr. Allen seconded the nomination of Mr. Pryor for Treasurer of the Board.

Mr. Cannon asked if there were any questions?

There were no questions asked.

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

MINUTES

Mr. Cannon presented (M-1) the regular monthly meeting minutes from January 22, 2018.

Mr. Cannon asked if anyone had any comments regarding the Regular Monthly Meeting Minutes from January 22, 2018?

Mr. Allen stated that on page 11, paragraph 1, that the first sentence should end at somebody and that the rest of the sentence should be removed.

Mr. Pryor stated that on page 11, paragraph 4, 4th line down, that “if the criteria was met” should be changed to “if the criteria were met” because the word criteria is plural.

Mr. Pryor stated that on page 3, second to last paragraph, that it reads “Bern Design Report” but that it should read “Berm Design Report”. Mr. Pryor suggests using the find and replace feature to correct this mistake because it carries on in other places. Mr. Cannon agreed.

Mr. Pryor stated that on page 3, in the very last sentence, that it reads: “Mr. Pryor stated that yes, it was an open issue in the letter from the DEP, but that Cornerstone was going to follow up with the DEP with a phone call hopefully either today or tomorrow.” Mr. Pryor state that he does not believe that he made this statement and that he believes that someone else made the statement. Mr. Williams stated that the recording would be checked to see who made the statement. Mr. Cannon stated that he believes that he was the one who had made the statement in question.

Mr. Pryor stated that on page 23, last paragraph, first sentence, that it reads “Mr. Pryor stated that what he just stated” and said that “he” should be changed to “Mr. Smith”.

Mr. Pryor made a motion to approve the amended Regular Monthly Meeting Minutes from January 22, 2018 as presented, seconded by **Mr. Allen**.

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

Mr. Cannon presented (M-2) the Executive Session minutes from January 22, 2018.

Mr. Allen made a motion to approve the Executive Session Minutes from January 22, 2018, seconded by **Mr. Pryor**.

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

PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Cannon stated that we are going to have the PRMUAs presentation take place now before moving forward with the PCFAs Annual Resolutions. Mr. Cannon noted that none of our Annual Resolutions effect the PRMUA.

Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Steve Donati, CP Engineers and Mr. BJ Wauhoh, PRMUA Consultant to come up to the front row and begin their presentation.

Mr. Williams stated that the PRMUA passed a revised resolution and noted that there have been emails regarding this going back and forth. Mr. Williams stated that in the emails it was asked if the revised resolution was in addition to the first resolution or if this resolution is the governing resolution. Mr. Williams stated that Ms. Patricia Kaspereen did eventually get back to him and stated that the revised resolution is the new resolution and that the old resolution is obsolete. Mr. Donati and Mr. Wauhoh both agreed. Mr. Williams stated that he is addressing this because there was a lot of language within the original resolution that provided the PCFA with protection and that the language is now gone in the revised resolution.

Mr. Donati stated that he is hesitating answering this question because he does not know the legalities of the situation. Mr. Donati stated that the revised resolution does not state that it replaces the original resolution and noted that he is not sure if it does. Mr. Donati stated that he feels that the intent of the revised resolution is such that it opens back up to the discussion between the PCFA and the PRMUA, refining the details of the study and all of the protections that were included in the original resolution. Mr. Donati stated that the new resolution does replace the original resolution but that he does not know if it formally replaces the original resolution because it does not state that it does in the new resolution.

Mr. Williams agreed that the new resolution does not state that it replaces the original resolution and noted that this is why he was inquiring about it.

Mr. Donati stated that at the time the new resolution was being put together that the PRMUA had not even thought of whether or not the language regarding the new resolution replacing the old resolution should be included in the new resolution.

Mr. Cannon stated that to his knowledge we have not gotten to the point of putting together an agreement between the PCFA and the PRMUA and that we understand that all of the protections for the PCFA would be included in the official agreement. Mr. Cannon stated that it is obviously our permit that will be amended and submitted to the DEP and that a resolution from the PCFA Board would be needed to approve an agreement between the PCFA and the PRMUA.

Mr. Wauhop explained that the resolution that the PRMUA first passed with the protection for the PCFA is essentially the PRMUAs thinking in their proposal. Mr. Wauhop noted that despite this in order to present a resolution to the PCFA that can be included with the permit renewal application the new resolution would perform this function. Mr. Wauhop stated that the protections and anything that we had discussed and agreed to prior to the new resolution is still the PRMUAs position. Mr. Wauhop stated that what the PRMUA is looking for the PCFA to pass the new resolution and submit it with our permit renewal. After this is done Mr. Wauhop stated that the PRMUA would be looking to have some meetings with some representatives of the PRMUA Board, representatives of the PCFA board and the professionals so that we could resolve any issues such as future costs and leachate volume. Mr. Wauhop stated that after these meetings take place a formal agreement could be made.

Mr. Cannon stated to reinforce what Mr. Williams had stated and what he thinks as well is that the PCFA would not present the PRMUAs resolution as part of our permit renewal. Mr. Cannon stated that the PRMUA could have a resolution and noted that the PCFA would have to have a resolution that would be for our permit only and approving the pilot study. Mr. Cannon stated that saying we can talk about the formal agreement later will not work and that he feels that we need to have an agreement in place before submitting our permit to the DEP. Mr. Cannon also stated that he is afraid that the DEP may kick the permit back because of other issues and then we would have to start the process all over again.

Mr. Cannon stated that the PCFA has discussed this with Mr. Tipton and that we are going out to bid for Special Counsel to put this agreement together. Mr. Cannon noted that Mr. Tipton had also stated that he does not want to represent the PRMUA in terms of an agreement with the PCFA either. Mr. Cannon stated that we would have to have an independent agreement established before the PCFA would feel comfortable submitting anything to the DEP. Mr. Cannon noted that he believes that this is what Mr. Williams was trying to convey as well.

Mr. Donati stated that this would affect the overall timing. Mr. Donati explained that the PRMUA has already provided the Work Plan and an informational email stating what the PRMUA wants to do to the DEP. Mr. Donati stated that the DEP reviewed the documents and replied to the PRMUA stating that everything was fine. Mr. Donati noted that he thinks that the DEP recognized the conservative approach that the DEP took with the plans for the pilot study. Mr. Donati also noted that the DEP had asked the PRMUA to add a few other parameters to the pilot study such as monitoring arsenic levels. Mr. Donati stated that the DEP had told the PRMUA that in order to move forward and to move forward quickly that the PCFA would need to submit the PRMUAs Work Plan and a request to modify our existing renewal permit. Mr. Donati explained that what the DEP is saying is that they can hold off on issuing the renewal permit so that the pilot study can be incorporated into it. Mr. Donati explained that if the PCFA wants to hold off and wait to submit the pilot study as an addition to our permit renewal that the DEP will be forced to issue the permit renewal with the pilot study and that the process would have to start over from the beginning. Mr. Donati noted that this would be a long process because the PCFA would have to go back into a permit modification cycle which takes time.

Mr. Cannon stated that he understands and that he just wants to be clear that he and Mr. Williams were afraid that something was being submitted to the DEP that was put together by the PRMUA that the PCFA would be required to adhere to and that we are not going to allow that to happen.

Mr. Donati stated that we should all recognize that the intent here is to modify the PCFAs SIU permit. Mr. Donati explained that all this does is give the PCFA the opportunity to send raw leachate to the PRMUA. Mr. Donati also explained that the permit modification does not mean that the PCFA is obligated to do anything and noted that the PCFA could still send all of our leachate to Passaic

Valley. Mr. Donati reiterated that all the permit modification does is provide the PCFA the opportunity to agree to do the pilot study at a later date.

Mr. Donati stated that he would recommend or rather the PRMUA would recommend that the PCFA proceeds with the modification to the SIU permit and then work out the details at a later date while the DEP is going through their process.

Mr. Williams asked if the PCFA actually needs a resolution if they are going to be submitting the pilot study to the DEP? Mr. Williams asked if a cover letter asking for permit modification would be sufficient? Mr. Donati stated that he thinks that submitting a cover letter to the DEP asking for permit modification is all that the PCFA needs to do. Mr. Donati explained that the PRMUA needs to pass a resolution because what the DEP told them is that by the PCFA requesting a modification to our SIU permit renewal that the PCFA is stating their intentions to allow the pilot study. Mr. Donati explained that the PRMUA needs to pass a resolution stating that they are also on board with the pilot study. Mr. Williams stated that he was satisfied with this explanation. Mr. Cannon stated that this was also the PCFAs understanding, but that he had just wanted to make sure that we were all on the same page.

Mr. Donati explained that the PRMUA was very careful to word their resolution to say that the pilot study would be based on further discussions and an agreement between the PCFA and the PRMUA. Mr. Donati noted that this resolution does not commit either entity to anything. Mr. Cannon stated that he believes that the DEP knows that this is the case as well.

Mr. Pryor stated that one of the recitals that was made was that this pilot study would be mutually beneficial. Mr. Pryor stated that he is not sure if we have come to that conclusion yet. Mr. Pryor noted that after today's discussion that some details still need to be worked out. Mr. Pryor stated that he is not sure if the plan is mutually beneficial.

Mr. Donati stated that he feels that the plan would have to be mutually beneficial because in order for the PCFA to decide to send leachate to the PRMUA that it would have to be beneficial to us. Mr. Donati referred to what Mr. Wauhop was saying before and explained that the discussions and the costs going down the road are going to have to be beneficial to the PCFA, otherwise there would be no reason for the PCFA to agree to the pilot study.

Mr. Pryor stated that he is aware that the PRMUA has a presentation to give and noted that he does not want to disrupt that, but that he would like to get some of his views out front before the presentation.

Mr. Cannon stated that he does not want to stop Mr. Pryor, but that he wanted to state that the part in the Work Plan that states that it would be beneficial to both entities is where it states "it is expected that a portion of leachate can be accepted at a lower overall cost per gallon (hauling and disposal) than would be paid to dispose of it at the PVSC facility." Mr. Cannon stated that if this statement comes to be true then it would be mutually beneficial to both entities. Mr. Pryor stated that he does not know if this has been proven and Mr. Cannon agreed but he noted that it is in the Work Plan. Mr. Cannon stated that if this ends up not being the case, then the pilot study would not necessarily be beneficial to the PCFA.

Mr. Donati stated that he feels that the statement in the Work Plan that Mr. Cannon had referenced demonstrates the PRMUAs commitment. Mr. Donati stated that obviously the PRMUA is not in a position to strong arm the PCFA into anything anyway and noted that it is not the PRMUAs intention to only have the pilot study be beneficial to themselves only. Mr. Donati explained that the PRMUAs

intention is that if the pilot study works out that the results would be beneficial to both entities by lowering costs for the PCFA and generating revenue for the PRMUA.

Mr. Pryor stated that whether or not it ends up being cheaper depends on some of the items within the Work Plan. Mr. Pryor stated that he would like to finish his thoughts that he began stating before.

Mr. Pryor stated that it is his understanding that the reason we are discussing going ahead with this pilot study is because it was brought up that if the PCFA would stop sending leachate to the PRMUA that it would have a negative financial impact on the PRMUA. Mr. Pryor noted that he recognizes this and that the PCFA does not want to destroy the economics of a local Authority, but that as he looks into this more and after running some calculations of his own that we are discussing sending 10,000 gallons of leachate to the PRMUA per day. Mr. Pryor stated that he believes that between their two plants the PRMUA is bringing in a total of 550,000 gallons of leachate per day. Mr. Pryor stated that 10,000 gallons would only make up about 8% of the flow going to the PRMUA's plants. Mr. Pryor noted that he is assuming that the industrial rate may be a little higher, but that if he takes 10% of the PRMUAs revenues in their budget that we are only discussing \$40,000.00. Mr. Pryor asked if it is really worth going through all of this for \$40,000.00 when 80% of the PCFAs flow is going to go elsewhere anyway and at a very reasonable price?

Mr. Pryor stated that looking forward one year the PRMUAs total interest payments drop by approximately \$40,000.00 going into the next year and stated that the loss of the PCFAs business would be offset in almost one year. Mr. Pryor stated that he recognizes that this is "back of the napkin analysis", but that by just looking at the PRMUAs debt service that their principals would stay constant the way he sees it. Mr. Pryor stated that the impact of the PCFA not sending leachate to the PRMUA does not seem all that significant and that it may just make sense for the PCFA to send all the leachate to Passaic Valley. Mr. Pryor stated that these are his observations and noted that the board has not discussed this. Mr. Pryor reiterated that these are only his observations.

Mr. Cannon stated that the numbers do not lie and we will all know what the numbers are ahead of time. Mr. Cannon stated if you go back to the statement he quoted from the Work Plan earlier that if there is a possibility of a savings for the PCFA that it would be fine with him, but that this has not been demonstrated to him either. Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Pryor is significantly knowledgeable in this area.

Mr. Pryor stated that he feels that one of the problems that exacerbates the whole economics is that the PRMUA is only using approximately 55% of their total plant capacity. Mr. Pryor noted that obviously the PRMUA has a lot of excess capacity and that he understands that the PRMUA wants to do something with that excess capacity, but if it only results in 10,000 gallons that it is not really a significant solution to the overall problem.

Mr. Wauhop asked if Mr. Pryor was using 10,000 gallons per day to come up with his assessment? Mr. Pryor answered, yes and explained that 10,000 gallons per day were the preliminary calculations presented by the PRMUA.

Mr. Donati stated that one of the things that the PRMUA wants to find out by performing the pilot study is if they can accept 10,000 gallons per day, 15,000 gallons per day or even 20,000 gallons per day. Mr. Donati stated that it is not a significant amount of leachate and that it does not "make or break" anything regarding the PRMUA if we do not send them leachate. Mr. Donati explained that he is here to represent the PRMUA regarding the technical aspects of the pilot study and that the cost and

benefit factor would be a higher level, political discussion. Mr. Cannon stated that in theory we do not even know if 10,000 gallons would make a difference and Mr. Donati agreed.

Mr. Donati stated that he and Mr. Wauhoh do not have a presentation to give and noted that they came to today's meeting to have a discussion.

Mr. Donati explained that the way the PRMUA sees it, is that there is very little risk on the PCFA's part because he would expect that we would pay less to haul the leachate to the PRMUA than we do to haul leachate to Passaic Valley. Mr. Donati noted that he does not know the costs for each of these and that we have not got into it, but that the thought is that it is not a big expense for the PCFA to do this and that essentially the expenses fall under the responsibility of the PRMUA. Mr. Donati stated that it is his assumption that the PRMUA was hoping that the PCFA would simply say that it would cost us the same or maybe even less to do the pilot study and that we could accommodate the PRMUA to see what happens and then go from there. Mr. Donati stated that whether or not the pilot study will work out remains to be seen.

Mr. Pryor stated that he does not have our cost analysis sheet in front of him, but noted that Passaic Valley takes things from all over and that it is easy for them to dispose of it and that we have a very favorable price with them. Mr. Pryor asked if our price this year is even lower than the price last year? Mr. Williams answered, yes and stated that our hauling cost to Passaic Valley is \$00.04 per gallon. Mr. Donati stated that this is a very good price. Mr. Donati stated that the PCFA is in great shape and noted that everyone acknowledges that. Mr. Donati also stated that the PCFA has good costs on both ends and that he understands that there is very little motivation on our end because of this.

Mr. Cannon stated that the reason we are discussing going down this road is to see if there is something mutually beneficial that we can come up with and that if that is the case then that is the case. Mr. Cannon stated that if it is not mutually beneficial that we cannot do it and obviously if there is no mutual benefit that it would not work out for either entity. Mr. Cannon stated that we have not crossed that bridge yet.

Mr. Urfer asked Mr. Williams if the cost from Passaic Valley of \$00.04 per gallon would change if we sent less leachate to them and if we get a volume-based discount? Mr. Williams answered, no. Mr. Urfer asked if it would matter if we sent less leachate to Passaic Valley? Mr. Williams answered, no.

Mr. Wauhoh stated that the savings opportunity comes after the pilot study and if the results show that the PCFA can send the leachate directly to the PRMUA instead of trucking it to them. Mr. Wauhoh explained that the trucking issue only comes into play during the pilot study. Mr. Wauhoh explained that the pilot study would tell the PRMUA internally whether they are happy with the leachate and whether the PCFA can see a savings that would make it beneficial for the PCFA to send the leachate directly to the PRMUA. Mr. Cannon stated his understanding regarding this.

Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Pryor if he had anything else to add? Mr. Pryor answered, no.

Mr. Cannon stated that he knows that we have received a few different versions of the Work Plan. He asked which version is going to be used? Mr. Donati stated that the January 2018 Work Plan is updated per DEP comments and is ready to go if we decide to proceed. Mr. Cannon asked if this is Agenda Item A-2 for today? Mr. Williams answered, yes. Mr. Cannon stated for the PCFA Board's knowledge that Agenda Item A-2 is the most up-to-date copy of the PRMUA's Work Plan. Mr. Cannon explained that he had made notes on the previous versions and that he is sure that Mr. Pryor had as well. Mr. Cannon stated that he has not compared the current version of the Work Plan to the

previous versions to see what the differences are. Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Donati if the only changes made to the Work Plan were the changes recommended by the DEP? Mr. Donati answered, yes and noted that the changes recommended by the DEP were minimal. Mr. Donati explained that the DEP had concerns regarding arsenic levels because arsenic levels are creeping up in the Authority's sludge and that obviously there is arsenic in the leachate as well. Mr. Donati also explained that the DEP wanted monitoring of the arsenic and that the PRMUA only added 1 or 2 little things to the Work Plan to account for this.

Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Williams if these were the changes to the Work Plan that he saw or if he saw any other differences? Mr. Williams stated that he did not see any other changes other than the ones that Mr. Donati had mentioned already.

Mr. Donati stated that Mr. Williams had forwarded the minutes from the PCFA's last meeting to the PRMUA and thanked Mr. Williams for doing so. Mr. Donati stated that after going through the minutes he saw that one of the PCFAs main concern was regarding that after the 6-month period the PRMUA would let the PCFA know whether or not the pilot study should be extended. Mr. Donati explained that the concept regarding this is that the PRMUA set the minimum intake of leachate at 10,000 gallons per day and the maximum at 12,000 gallons per day. Mr. Donati further explained that if we reach that point and everything is working smoothly and the PRMUA would like to take the next step of adding additional gallons per day that they would like to be able to do so. Mr. Donati stated that obviously this would be dependent on whether or not the PCFA is okay with everything and if the hauling contract would allow more gallons to be sent over. Mr. Cannon stated that paragraph 5 was not mutually advantageous and noted that it was rather one-sided. Mr. Donati stated that he could see why it sounded one-sided, but that this was not the PRMUA's intention. Mr. Donati explained that the PRMUA was just looking to be able to extend the pilot study if things were going well. Mr. Donati stated that the more leachate that could be sent from the PCFA to the PRMUA would determine how economically feasible the process would end up being. Mr. Cannon stated that he understands this.

Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Williams if he had anything else to add? Mr. Williams answered, no. Mr. Williams stated that the only thing he can think of is simply just a question. Mr. Williams asked that if the PCFA Board agrees to this today if the PRMUA would draft a cover letter for the PCFA to use to submit with our permit renewal? Mr. Donati answered, yes. Mr. Williams asked if Mr. Joe Mikulka, CP Engineers, has been handling most of the discussions with the DEP? Mr. Donati answered, yes. Mr. Williams asked if the DEP had given them any indication regarding a timeline? Mr. Donati stated that he had just called before the meeting and that the DEP's intent is to issue the PCFA's renewal permit and that they are holding back on doing so because they are waiting for the decision regarding the pilot study. Mr. Williams explained that he is asking this because the PCFA will have to go out to bid again for a hauler during this period of time because our current contract is for hauling to Passaic Valley Directly. Mr. Donati stated that he understands this. Mr. Donati stated that he believes that even if the DEP issues the renewal permit with the pilot study included it just gives us the capability to perform the pilot study and that it does not mean that we have to start it right away. Mr. Donati stated that he knows that both the PCFA and the PRMUA would have some things to figure out before beginning the pilot study.

Mr. Williams asked if the pilot study would start early in the summer? Mr. Donati stated that ultimately the PRMUA would like to start the pilot study mid-April so that spring, summer and fall flows could be captured. Mr. Donati stated that the timeframe in which the pilot study begins is what it is.

Mr. Williams stated that he remembers that last time we had talked about this Mr. Donati had said that the PRMUA wanted our leachate plant shut down and for us not to send anything through the pipeline in addition to what was being trucked. Mr. Williams asked if this still the case? Mr. Wauhop said that it is flexible. Mr. Donati stated that he does not think what we send to the PRMUA treated is going to impact the pilot study regarding the raw leachate much. Mr. Williams stated that he was only asking because it was mentioned previously and we would have had to look into decommissioning our treatment plant if we could not send any treated leachate through the pipeline. Mr. Cannon agreed. Mr. Cannon stated that the pilot study now shows that we can still continue sending treated leachate through the pipeline and then haul the raw leachate to the PRMUA. Mr. Cannon also stated that there will be a cost determined from the pilot study that the PRMUA will be willing to offer us. Mr. Donati agreed. Mr. Donati stated that the PRMUA has been accepting the treated leachate for a while now and they have the baseline cost of that and that they are going to use the baseline to figure out the cost of accepting the raw leachate.

Mr. Pryor stated that he was doing some brainstorming and that we could probably shut the treatment plant down because we have the ability to recycle the leachate. Mr. Pryor stated that we would have time to regrow the bugs and everything if we wanted to or we could recycle now and the PRMUA could take the leachate from the head of the plant. Mr. Pryor asked if this idea was feasible? Mr. Williams stated that per some discussions he has had with Mott MacDonald regarding shutting down the treatment plant and then going through the process of restarting the plant again, that Mott MacDonald figured that it could take anywhere from 2 to 6 weeks to restart the treatment plant.

Mr. Pryor stated that we do have the ability to truck, so we could do all that without harming anything. Mr. Williams stated that he is not sure how long the bugs (bacteria) will last in our system for the biological process to maintain itself and noted that his expertise is not in treatment. Mr. Pryor stated that we would have to restart with new bacteria. Mr. Williams stated that this is what he is talking about, the restarting process. Mr. Pryor stated that he does not want to get hung-up on this topic, but if the PRMUA could get better results if we did not send them any treated leachate that we could explore this. Mr. Pryor suggested that we could keep the treatment plant operating and withdraw the leachate from the lagoons ahead of the plant. Mr. Williams stated that this is what we would do to send the leachate to the PRMUA. Mr. Pryor stated that then we would not be sending any treated effluent to them. Mr. Williams agreed.

Mr. Cannon stated that we could recycle our normal amount. Mr. Pryor asked if we could recycle the leachate that we would send through the pipeline? Mr. Williams stated that the only place that we could recycle the leachate back to would be the tank that the raw leachate is stored in which he believes would flaw the pilot study. Mr. Cannon agreed. Mr. Pryor asked if we could recycle the leachate into the lagoons? Mr. Williams answered, no and reiterated that the leachate would have to go back into the main holding tank. Mr. Williams stated that the lagoons are only in place for overflow protection or surge protection from storms. Mr. Williams explained that all of the leachate goes to the main tank and then from there it spills into the lagoons. Mr. Williams stated that he is sure that there are piping configurations that could be done. Mr. Pryor agreed and stated that there may be other temporary options, but that he does not want to get into a discussion about that right now. Mr. Pryor stated that what he is trying to convey is that if the PRMUA feels that the results of the pilot study would be better without the treated leachate being sent over to them, that he is sure that there is a solution. Mr. Williams agreed and stated that there would be a solution if needed.

Mr. Pryor stated that he feels if we had to shut down the treatment plant and it ended up taking 6 weeks to get it going again that we would have the capability to get rid of the leachate via trucking during that time.

Mr. Pryor stated that he is fine with whatever is best for the PRMUA regarding test results of the pilot study. Mr. Cannon stated that we are not at that point yet. Mr. Pryor agreed.

Mr. Cannon asked if there were any other questions? Hearing none, Mr. Cannon stated that we will leave this discussion at the point where the PRMUA will be providing us with a draft cover letter that can be submitted with our permit renewal to the DEP. Mr. Williams stated that he will send the letter to the Board once he receives it and the Board can respond with their questions and comments via email and that he would forward them to Mr. Donati to take a look at. Mr. Williams stated that if everyone is in agreement with the draft letter after any changes that the PCFA Board asked for are made, that we could review the letter one last time and then get it sent to the DEP. Mr. Cannon agreed.

Mr. Donati and Mr. Wauhopp thanked the PCFA Board for their time.

Mr. Cannon thanked Mr. Donati and Mr. Wauhopp for attending today's meeting.

Mr. Williams thanked Mr. Donati and Mr. Wauhopp as well.

Mr. Cannon stated that we would now resume the meeting in normal order of the Agenda.

ANNUAL RESOLUTIONS

Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Williams if any of the Annual Resolutions need to be approved separately or if they could all be approved together? Mr. Williams answered, no.

Mr. Cannon asked if anyone has any questions regarding any of the annual resolutions? Mr. Cannon stated that he does not see any reason why we would have to approve them individually, but if anyone would like to we are more than welcome to.

Mr. Williams stated that he wanted to bring everyone's attention to Agenda Item A-1 (2018 PCFA Draft Meeting Schedule) because there are a couple of meetings that do not fall on the 4th Monday of the month. Mr. Williams stated that the May meeting will be on Thursday, May 17, 2018. Mr. Williams also stated that both the November and the December meetings will be moved up 1 week due to the Holidays. The November meeting will be on Monday, November 19, 2018 and the December meeting will be on Monday, December 17, 2018.

Mr. Cannon stated that if anyone has any questions about any of the individual Annual Resolutions that they can be addressed and that he does not want to group all of the resolutions together for approval if someone has questions regarding any of the resolutions.

Mr. Mach stated that as usual he would like for Mr. Cannon to pull Resolution R-02-09-18 (Resolution Designating The Express-Times as the Official Newspaper for Advertising Public Notices) from the group of resolutions to discuss separately.

Mr. Cannon stated that Resolution R-02-09-18 (Resolution Designating The Express-Times as the Official Newspaper for Advertising Public Notices) would be approved separately from the other resolutions.

Mr. Williams stated that he just wanted to point a few minor changes regarding title changes from previous resolutions. Mr. Williams stated that in Resolution R-02-02-18 (Resolution Authorizing the Administrative Supervisor's Office to Maintain a Petty Cash Fund in the Amount of \$100.00 for Fiscal Year 2018) and Resolution R-02-03-18 (Resolution Authorizing the Administrative Supervisor's Office to Maintain a Petty Cash Fund in the Amount of \$200.00 for Sale House Use for Fiscal Year 2018) the language was changed from the CFO being in charge of the Petty Cash to the Administrative Supervisor being in charge of the Petty Cash. Mr. Williams stated that other than that no other changes have been made to the resolutions.

Mr. Urfer asked if Mr. Cannon would like a motion to pass all of the Annual Resolutions in bulk with the exception of Resolution R-02-09-18? Mr. Cannon answered, yes.

On a motion made by, **Mr. Urfer**, seconded by, **Mr. Pryor**, the PCFA Board approved the following Resolutions: R-02-01-18 (Resolution Authorizing Signatures Fiscal Year 2018), R-02-02-18 (Resolution Authorizing the Administrative Supervisor's Office to Maintain a Petty Cash Fund in the Amount of \$100.00 for Fiscal Year 2018), R-02-03-18 (Resolution Authorizing the Administrative Supervisor's Office to Maintain a Petty Cash Fund in the Amount of \$200.00 for Sale House Use for Fiscal Year 2018), R-02-04-18 (Resolution Designating a Public Agency Compliance Officer), R-02-05-18 (Resolution Designating Custodian of Records), R-02-06-18 (Resolution to Participate in the State of New Jersey's Distribution and Support Service for Fiscal Year 2018), R-02-07-18 (Resolution Adopting the 2018 Cash Management Plan), R-02-08-18 (Resolution Adopting Identity Theft Policy) and R-02-10-18 (Resolution Approving the 2018 PCFA Regular Meeting Schedule).

On a motion by **Mr. Urfer**, seconded by, **Mr. Pryor**, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *February 26, 2018*.

RESOLUTION
R-02-01-18
AUTHORIZING SIGNATURES
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

BE IT RESOLVED, by Authority of the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County that the following are hereby authorized to sign checks or withdrawal slips where a combination of two signatures is required and;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that where two signatures are required, one of the signatures must be the Chairperson or Treasurer and the second signature must be the Director of Operations or the Administrative Supervisor;

CHAIRPERSON
TREASURER
DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS
ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERVISOR

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that signature cards with the signatures of the persons authorized to sign be forwarded to all Depositories.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Allen - Yes
 Mr. Pryor - Yes
 Mr. Urfer - 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.

Crystal Gild
Recording Secretary

Dated: 02/26/2018

On a motion by *Mr. Urfer*, seconded by, *Mr. Pryor*, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *February 26, 2018*.

R E S O L U T I O N
R-02-02-18

**AUTHORIZING ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERVISOR'S OFFICE
TO MAINTAIN A PETTY CASH FUND IN THE AMOUNT OF \$100.00
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018**

WHEREAS, N.J.S.A. 40A:5-21 authorizes the establishment of a Petty Cash Fund for the Administrative Supervisor's office for the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County; and

WHEREAS, said Petty Cash Fund was established by resolution dated February 2, 1994, by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County; and

WHEREAS, said Petty Cash Fund received approval from the Director of Local Government Services; and

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved on this **Twenty sixth** day of **February, 2018**, by the members of the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County, that;

1. During the year 2018, the Administrative Supervisor, be and is hereby authorized and permitted to establish a Petty Cash Fund in the amount not to exceed \$100.00 pursuant to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 40A:5-21. Said Petty Cash Fund will be used by such office or department to pay claims for small miscellaneous expenses.
2. The Administrative Supervisor, having been bonded, will have custody of the Petty Cash Fund in accordance with the laws and regulations governing its operation.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Allen - Yes
 Mr. Pryor - Yes
 Mr. Urfer - 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.

Crystal Gild
Recording Secretary

Dated: 02/26/2018

On a motion by *Mr. Urfer*, seconded by, *Mr. Pryor*, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *February 26, 2018*.

**RESOLUTION
R-02-03-18**

**AUTHORIZING THE ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERVISOR’S OFFICE
TO MAINTAIN A PETTY CASH FUND
DESIGNATED FOR SCALE HOUSE USE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018**

WHEREAS, N.J.S.A. 40A:5-21 designated a Petty Cash Fund for the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County for Scale House use; and

WHEREAS, said Petty Cash Fund was established by resolution dated February 2, 1994, by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County and approved by the Director of Local Government Services; and

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved on the **Twenty sixth** day of **February 2018** by the members of the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County, that;

1. During the year 2018, the Administrative Supervisor be, and is, hereby authorized and permitted to maintain the current Petty Cash Fund at the scale House in the amount not to exceed \$200.00 pursuant to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 40A:5-21. Said Scale House Petty Cash Fund is designated for use by the Scale House operator to make change for residents using the convenience center.
2. The Administrative Supervisor, having been bonded will have custody of the Petty Cash Fund in accordance with the laws and regulations governing its operation.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Allen - Yes
 Mr. Pryor - Yes
 Mr. Urfer - 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.

Crystal Gild
Recording Secretary

Dated: 02/26/2018

On a motion by *Mr. Urfer*, seconded by, *Mr. Pryor*, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *February 26, 2018*.

R E S O L U T I O N

R-02-04-18

DESIGNATING A PUBLIC AGENCY COMPLIANCE OFFICER (P.A.C.O.)

WHEREAS, there exists a need for a designated public agency compliance officer (P.A.C.O.) for the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County in order to meet its responsibilities under the law;

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County that the Authority's Director of Operations, **James Williams**, be appointed as the designated Public Agency Compliance Officer (P.A.C.O.) to insure that all contracts have Affirmative Action language incorporated.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Allen - Yes
 Mr. Pryor - Yes
 Mr. Urfer - 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.

Crystal Gild
Recording Secretary

Date: 02/26/2018

On a motion by **Mr. Urfer**, seconded by **Mr. Pryor**, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *February 26, 2018*.

RESOLUTION

R-02-05-18

DESIGNATING A CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS

WHEREAS, there exists a need for a designated Custodian of Records for the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County in order to meet its responsibilities under the law;

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County that the Authority's Director of Operations, **James Williams**, be appointed as the designated Custodian of Records in accordance with the Open Public Records Act (OPRA) (P.L. 2001, c. 404).

ROLL CALL: Mr. Allen - Yes
Mr. Pryor - Yes
Mr. Urfer - 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.

Crystal Gild
Recording Secretary

Date: 02/26/2018

On a motion by *Mr. Urfer*, seconded by, *Mr. Pryor*, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *February 26, 2018*.

RESOLUTION
R-02-06-18

**TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY'S
DISTRIBUTION AND SUPPORT SERVICE
FISCAL YEAR 2018**

WHEREAS, in the past, the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County has availed itself to the right to purchase materials, supplies and equipment under contracts for such materials, supplies and equipment entered into on behalf of the State of New Jersey by the Division of Purchase and Property in the Department of the Treasury pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A:11-12; and

WHEREAS, it is contemplated that it will be necessary or desirable to obtain materials, supplies or equipment under such contract or contracts entered into on behalf of the State of New Jersey by said Division during the year 2018;

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County, that it is hereby authorized to purchase such materials, supplies and equipment from the Division of Purchase and Property in the Department of the Treasury, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A:11-12 and N.J.S.A. 40A:11-3, as it may from time to time deem necessary or desirable.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Allen - Yes
 Mr. Pryor - Yes
 Mr. Urfer - 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.

Crystal Gild
Recording Secretary

Dated: 02/26/2018

**POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY
OF WARREN COUNTY**

R-02-07-18

**RESOLUTION ADOPTING A CASH MANAGEMENT PLAN DESIGNATING
OFFICIALS AUTHORIZED TO INVEST AND DISBURSE FUNDS, AUTHORIZED
DEPOSITORIES, PERMITTED INVESTMENTS AND REPORTING
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING
AUTHORITY OF WARREN COUNTY**

BE IT RESOLVED, by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County that from February 26, 2018 the following shall serve as the cash management plan.

The Administrative Supervisor is directed to use this cash management plan as the guide in depositing and investing the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County's funds.

CASH MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY OF WARREN COUNTY

I. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

This Cash Management Plan (the "Plan") is prepared pursuant to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 40A:5-14 in order to set forth the basis for the deposits ("Deposits") and investments ("Permitted Investments"), pursuant to NJSA 40A:5-15.1, of certain public funds of the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County (PCFAWC), pending the use of such funds for the intended purposes. The plan is intended to assure that all public funds identified herein are deposited in interest bearing deposits, to the extent practicable, or otherwise invested in investments hereinafter referred to. The intent of the Plan is to provide that the decisions made with regard to the Deposits and the Permitted Investments will be done so to insure the safety, the liquidity (regarding its availability for the intended purposes), and the maximum investment return within such limits. The Plan is intended to insure that any Deposit or Permitted Investment matures within the time period that approximates the prospective need for the funds deposited or invested and to minimize the risk to the market value of such Deposits or Permitted Investments. All investments shall be made on a competitive basis insofar as practicable.

II. IDENTIFICATION OF FUNDS AND ACCOUNTS TO BE COVERED BY THE PLAN AND OFFICIAL DEPOSITORIES.

The Plan is intended to cover the deposit and/or investment of authority owned funds of the PCFAWC in authorized institutions which are GUDPA certified pursuant to the provisions of NJSA 17:9-44; (the "Official Depositories").

The following banks and financial institutions and / or their successors are hereby designated as Official Depositories for the deposit of all public funds, including any certificates of deposit, referred to in the plan which are not otherwise invested in Permitted Investments as provided for in this plan: Bank of America, TD Bank, First Hope Bank, IRCO Credit Union, Morgan Stanley Smith Barney, Investors Bank, Lakeland Bank, Public Financial Management (PFM), PNC Bank, Fulton Bank of NJ/Fulton Financial, Santander Bank, Provident Bank, Visions Federal Credit Union, Valley National Bank, Unity Bank, and Wells Fargo.

All such depositories shall acknowledge in written receipt of this Plan by sending a copy of such acknowledgement to the Chief Financial Officer.

Additionally, pursuant to NJSA 40A:5-14g, any official involved in the designation of depositories or in the authorization for investments as permitted pursuant to section 8 of PL 1977, c396 (C.40A:5-15.1), or any combination of the preceding, or the selection of an entity seeking to sell and investment to the Authority who has a material business or personal relationship with that organization shall disclose that relationship to the governing body of the Authority.

III. DESIGNATION OF OFFICIALS OF THE PCFAWC AUTHORIZED TO MAKE DEPOSITS AND INVESTMENTS UNDER THE PLAN.

Upon consultation with the Finance Committee members and Director of Operations, the Chief Financial Officer (the Designated Official) of the PCFAWC is hereby authorized and directed to deposit and/or invest the funds referred to in the Plan. Prior to making any such Deposits or any Permitted Investments, such officials of the PCFAWC are directed to supply to all depositories or any other parties with whom the Deposits or Permitted Investments are made a written copy of this Plan which shall be acknowledged in writing by such parties and a copy of such acknowledgment kept on file with such officials.

IV. DESIGNATION OF BROKERAGE FIRMS AND DEALERS WITH WHOM THE DESIGNATED OFFICIAL MAY DEAL.

The following brokerage firms and/or dealers and other institutions and / or their successors are hereby designated as firms with whom the Chief Financial Officer of the PCFAWC may deal for the purposes of buying and selling securities identified in this Plan as Permitted Investments or otherwise providing for Deposits: TD Bank NA, First Bank, First Hope Bank, Provident Bank, Lakeland Bank, Valley National Bank, PNC Bank, Fulton Bank of NJ, Santander Bank, Investors Savings Bank, Unity Bank, PPFM Asset Management LLC, Visions Federal Credit Union and IRCO Credit Union.

All such brokerage firms and/or dealers shall acknowledge in writing the receipt of this Plan by sending a copy of such acknowledgment to the Chief Financial Officer.

Pursuant to NJSA 40A:5-15.1 and as disclosed in Section V below, the securities dealers' retained by the Authority will comply with said statute and Section V when acting on behalf of the Authority in any and all financial transactions.

V. AUTHORIZED INVESTMENTS.

Except as otherwise specifically provided for herein, the Chief Financial Officer, upon consultation with the Finance Committee and Director of Operations of the PCFAWC, is hereby authorized to invest the public funds covered by this Plan, to the extent not otherwise held in Deposits, in the following Permitted Investments:

- A. Bonds or other obligations of the United States of America or obligations guaranteed by the United States of America;
- B. Government Money Market Mutual Funds;
- C. Any obligation that a federal agency or a federal instrumentality has issued in accordance with an act of Congress, which has a maturity date not greater than 397 days from the date of purchase, provided that such obligation bears a fixed rate of interest not dependent on any index or other external factor;
- D. Bonds or other obligations of the Authority;
- E. Bonds or other obligations, having a maturity date not more than 397 days from the date of purchase, approved by the Division of Investment of the Department of the Treasury for investment by Local Units;
- F. Local Government Investment Pools;
- G. Deposits with the State of New Jersey Cash Management Fund established pursuant to section 1 of P.L. 1977, c.281(C.52 : 18A-90.4); or
- H. Agreements for the repurchase of fully collateralized securities if:
 - 1. the underlying securities are permitted investments pursuant to paragraphs 1 and 3 of this subsection a;
 - 2. the custody of collateral is transferred to a third party;
 - 3. the maturity of the agreement is not more than 30 days;
 - 4. the underlying securities are purchased through a public depository as defined in section 1 of P.L. 1970, c.236 (C.17: 9 - 41); and
 - 5. a master repurchase agreement providing for the custody and security of collateral is executed.
- I. Any investment instruments in which the security is not physically held by the Authority shall be covered by a third party custodial agreement which shall provide for the designation of such investments in the name of the Authority and prevent unauthorized use of such investments;
- J. Purchase of investment securities shall be executed by the "delivery versus payment" method to ensure that the securities are either received by the Authority or a third party custodian prior to or upon release of the Authority's funds;

- K. Any investments not purchased and redeemed directly from the issuer, government money market mutual fund, local government investment pool, or the State of New Jersey Cash Management Fund, shall be purchased and redeemed through the use of a nation or State bank located within the State or through a broker/dealer which, at the time of purchase or redemption, has been registered continuously for a period of at least two years pursuant to section 9 of P.L. 1967, c. 93 (C.49:3-56) and has at least \$25 million in capital stock (or equivalent capitalization if not a corporation), surplus reserves for contingencies and undivided profits, or through a securities dealer who makes primary markets in U.S. Government securities and reports daily to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York its position in and borrowing on such U.S. Government securities.

For purposes of the above language, the terms “government money market mutual fund” and “local government investment pool” shall have the following definitions:

Government Money Market Mutual Fund. An investment company or investment trust:

- a. which is registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission under the “Investment Company Act of 1940,” 15 U.S.C. sec. 80a-1 et seq., and operated in accordance with 17 C.F.R. sec. 270.2a-7;
- b. the portfolio of which is limited to U.S. Government securities that meet the definition of any eligible security pursuant to 17 C.F.R. sec. 270.2a-7 and repurchase agreements that are collateralized by such U.S. Government securities; and
- c. which has:
 - i. attained the highest ranking or the highest letter and numerical rating of a nationally recognized statistical rating organization; or
 - ii. retained an investment advisor registered or exempt from registration with the Securities and Exchange Commission pursuant to the “Investment Advisors Act of 1940,” 15 U.S.C. sec. 80b-1 et seq., with experience investing in U.S. Government securities for at least the past 60 months and with assets under management in excess of \$500 million.

Local Government Investment Pool. An investment pool:

- a. which has managed in accordance with 17 C.F.R. sec. 270.2a-7;
- b. which is rated in the highest category by a nationally recognized statistical rating organization;
- c. which is limited to U.S. Government securities that meet the definition of an eligible security pursuant to 17 C.F.R. sec. 270.2a-7 and repurchase agreements that are collateralized by such U.S. Government securities;
- d. which is in compliance with rules adopted pursuant to the “Administrative Procedure Act,” P.L. 1968, c.410 (c.52: 14b-1 et seq.) by the Local Finance Board of the Division of Local Government Services in the Department of Community Affairs, which rules shall provide for the disclosure and reporting requirements, and other provisions deemed necessary by the board to provide for the safety, liquidity and yield of investments;

- e. which does not permit investments in instruments that: are subject to high price volatility with changing market conditions; cannot reasonably be expected, at the time of interest rate adjustment, to have a market value that approximates their par value; or utilize an index that does not support a stable net asset value; and
- f. which purchases and redeems investments directly from the issuer, government money market mutual fund, or the State of New Jersey Cash Management Fund, or through the use of a State or national bank located within this State, or through a broker/dealer which, at the time of purchase or redemption, has been registered continuously for a period of at least two years pursuant to section 9 of P.L. 1967 c.9 (C.49 : 3-56) and has at least \$25 million in capital stock (or equivalent capitalization if not a corporation), surplus reserves for contingencies and undivided profits, or through a securities dealer who makes primary markets in U.S. Government securities and reports daily to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York its position in and borrowing on such U.S. Government securities.

IV. SAFEKEEPING CUSTODY PAYMENT AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT OF PLAN.

To the extent that any Deposit or Permitted Investment involves a document or security which is not physically held by the PCFAWC, then such instrument or security shall be covered by a custodial agreement with an independent third party, which shall be a bank or financial institution in the State of New Jersey. Such institution shall provide for the designation of such investments in the name of the PCFAWC to assure that there is no unauthorized use of the funds or the Permitted Investments or Deposits. Purchase of any Permitted Investments that involve securities shall be executed by a "delivery versus payment" method to ensure that such Permitted Investments are either received by the PCFAWC or by a third party custodian prior to or upon the release of the PCFAWC's funds.

Pursuant to NJSA 40A:5-15, all Authority funds shall be deposited within 48 hours of receipt.

To assure that all parties with whom the PCFAWC deals either by way of Deposits or Permitted Investments are aware of the authority and the limits set forth in this Plan, all such parties shall be supplied with a copy of this Plan in writing and all such parties shall acknowledge the receipt of that Plan in writing, a copy of which shall be on file with the Chief Financial Officer.

VII. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

The Chief Financial Officer shall supply to the governing body of the PCFAWC a written report each month listing all Deposits or Permitted Investments made pursuant to this Plan, which shall include, at a minimum, the following information:

- A. The name of any institution holding funds of the PCFAWC as a Deposit or Permitted Investment.
- B. The type and amount of securities or certificates of deposit purchased or sold during the immediately preceding month.
- C. The book value at month end of such Deposits or Permitted Investments.
- D. The earned income on such Deposits or Permitted Investments. To the extent that such amounts are actually earned at maturity.
- E. The fees incurred to undertake such Deposits or Permitted Investments.
- F. All other information which may be deemed reasonable from time to time by the governing body of the PCFAWC.

VIII. TERM OF PLAN

This plan shall be in effect from February 27, 2017 until such time as it is amended or superseded by a subsequent plan. Attached to this Plan is a resolution of the governing body of the PCFAWC approving the Plan.

IX. INVESTMENT STRATEGIES

In order to ensure liquidity to meet the Authority's daily, ongoing cash needs as well as allow longer term investments to gain enhanced returns on our monies the following strategies will be employed. Additionally, all invested funds must be maintained to comply with the provisions of NJSA 40A:5-15.1 ("Securities which may be purchased by local units").

The Chief Financial Officer of the PCFA of Warren County will implement the following procedures on behalf of the PCFA:

- A. In order for the PCFAWC to meet all of its operational obligations including payroll, accounts payable and pension contributions, a minimum of 10% of the current fiscal year's adopted budget will be reserved to meet the operational cash flow requirements. These funds must provide sufficient liquidity for the daily operations of the Authority.
- B. A Capital & Construction account shall be maintained to segregate and reserve funds needed to meet the financial requirements of large scale capital improvement and/or construction projects. Typically these expenditures are large scale, non-recurring projects that have a useful life of greater than one year. The balance maintained in the account will be determined by the five year capital improvement plan included in the Authority's Annual Budget submitted to the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs, Division of Local Government Services. The balance in this account shall be sufficient to meet the projected expenditures incurred during the current fiscal year and to minimize the need to issue debt to finance future year capital projects.
- C. A Haulers account shall be maintained at an amount equal to or greater than 25% of the operating budget. This account will be used to retain funds to insure sufficient finances exist if a drastic change in the solid waste disposal market should occur. Specifically, this account will provide a safety net should there be a shortfall in revenue that would materially impair the Authority's ability to operate on a daily basis. If

operations at the Authority cease, any remaining funds in this account will be transferred to the Supplementary Closure Account.

D. State law requires the creation of a trust fund specifically dedicated to the maintenance of the Warren County District Landfill Closure and Post-Closure care. The estimate for the closure/post-closure maintenance of the landfill is contained in the most recent Closure/Post-Closure Maintenance Plan approved by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. There are currently two funds in existence, the Warren County Landfill Closure Escrow Trust Fund and the Warren County Landfill Alternate Closure Escrow Trust Fund. Both funds are controlled by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. The Closure/Post-Closure Maintenance Plan must be updated bi-annually, all changes in anticipated costs associated with the closure are reviewed and the funding level in the closure investments is adjusted to reflect these changes. Investments in the Funds are administered in accordance with NJSA 7:26-2A.9(b) and the NJDEP standard escrow agreements which permits investments up to 10 years in duration.

E. The Authority Board authorized a third closure trust fund called the Supplementary Closure Account to be used for the Warren County District Landfill Closure and Post-Closure care. These funds are maintained in a separate account under the control of the Authority and will be used to supplement the Landfill Closure Escrow Trust Fund and the Landfill Alternate Closure Escrow Trust Fund. Investments in the Funds are administered in accordance with NJSA 7:26-2A.9(b) and the NJDEP standard escrow agreements which permits investments up to 10 years in duration. The funds may be used to finance improvements in connection with the Landfill Closure and Post-Closure care at the Authority Board's discretion.

On motion by *Mr. Urfer*, seconded by *Mr. Pryor*, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County on **February 26, 2018**.

Richard Mach, Secretary

02/26/2018
Date

ROLL CALL: Mr. Allen - Yes
Mr. Pryor - Yes
Mr. Urfer - 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 indicated.

Crystal Gild
Recording Secretary

**CASH MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE
POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY
OF WARREN COUNTY, NEW JERSEY**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I hereby declare that I have received a copy of the CASH MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY OF WARREN COUNTY, NEW JERSEY or amendment thereto and that I have reviewed the document and understand the terms and conditions stated therein.

Institution:

Signature:

Title:

Date:

COUNTY OF WARREN, NJ
Depository Contact People

Ms. Lisa Semple
c/o TD Bank NA
One Royal Road
Flemington, NJ 08822
908-237-4713
lisa.semple@td.com

Mr. Brent Cronnell
First Bank
334 Route 31
Flemington, NJ 08822
908-751-0320
brent.cronnell@firstbanknj.com

Mr. Lewis Beatty
c/o First Hope Bank
1301 Hope-Bridgeville Road
Hope, NJ 07844
908-459-4121
lbeatty@firsthope.com

Ms. Melissa Hammer
c/o Provident Bank
190 Roseberry Street
Phillipsburg, NJ 08865
908-235-4703
melissa.hammer@providentnj.com

Ms. Pat Rosenberg
Mr. Jeffrey J. Buonforte
c/o Lakeland Bank
395 Route 94
Fredon, NJ 07860
973-579-2775
prosenberg@lakelandbank.com
jbuonforte@lakelandback.com

Mr. Salvatore Cicalese
Mr. Ronald Fraser
c/o Valley National Bank
540 County Route 519, Suite 9
Belvidere, NJ 07823
1-800-522-4100 ext. 7994
scicalese@valleynationalbank.com
rfraser@valleynationalbank.com

Ms. Mary Lou Unangst
c/o PNC Bank
Two Tower Center Boulevard
East Brunswick, NJ 08816
908-213-6426
mary.unangst@PNC.com

Mr. Steve Schreiber
c/o Fulton Bank of NJ
425 Main Street
Chester, NJ 07930
908-955-8063
sschreiber@fult.com

Frank T. Cosentino, Senior VP
c/o Santander Bank
Government Banking Division
Mail Code: NJ1-6514-AB3
200 Park Avenue, Suite 100
Florham Park, NJ 07932
Tel: 973-924-2072 (47-2072) / Cell: 732-580-4099
FCosenti@santander.us

Mr. Brian Turano
c/o Investors Savings Bank
101 JFK Parkway
Short Hills, NJ 07078
973-766-2424
bturano@myinvestorsbank.com

Ms. Tracy Tortorello
Unity Bank
5 East Asbury Anderson Road
Washington, NJ 07882
908-537-0150
Tracy.Tortorello@unitybank.com

COUNTY OF WARREN, NJ
Depository Contact People

Mr. Steve Faber
c/o PFM Asset Management LLC
Princeton Metro Center
821 Alexander Road, Suite 110
Princeton, NJ 08540
609-452-0263 ex3081
fabers@pfm.com

Ms. Elizabeth McDonough
c/o Visions Federal Credit Union
1240 Sussex Turnpike
Randolph, NJ 07869
973-895-6761
emcdonough@visionsfcu.org

Mr. Gregory J Collins
c/o IRCO Credit Union
450 Hillcrest Blvd
Phillipsburg, NJ 08865
908-859-1811 x250
gcollins@ircocu.com

On a motion by *Mr. Urfer*, seconded by, *Mr. Pryor*, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *February 26, 2018*.

**RESOLUTION
R-02-08-18**

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING AN IDENTITY THEFT POLICY

WHEREAS, the Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act of 2003, an amendment to the Fair Credit Reporting Act, required rules regarding identity theft protection to be promulgated; and

WHEREAS, those rules became effective December 31, 2010, and require municipal utilities to implement an identity theft program and policy, and

WHEREAS, the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County in the county of Warren has determined that the following policy is in the best interest of the Authority and its citizens.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County that the Authority's Administrative Supervisor be appointed as the designated administrator of the Identity Theft Policy annexed hereto and hereby approved:

This resolution will take effect immediately upon its passage, the public welfare requiring it.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Allen	-	Yes
	Mr. Pryor	-	Yes
	Mr. Urfer	-	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.

Crystal Gild
Recording Secretary

Date: 02/26/2018

Identity Theft Policy of the POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY OF WARREN COUNTY

SECTION 1: BACKGROUND

The risk to the Authority, its employees and customers from data loss and identity theft is of significant concern to the Authority and can be reduced only through the combined efforts of every employee and contractor.

SECTION 2: PURPOSE

The Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County adopts this sensitive information policy to help protect employees, customers, contractors and the Authority from damages related to the loss or misuse of sensitive information.

This policy will:

1. Define sensitive information;
2. Describe the physical security of data when it is printed on paper;
3. Describe the electronic security of data when stored and distributed; and
4. Place the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County in compliance with state and federal law regarding identity theft protection.

This policy enables the Authority to protect existing customers, reducing risk from identity fraud, and minimize potential damage to the Authority from fraudulent new accounts. The program will help the Authority:

1. Identify risks that signify potentially fraudulent activity within new or existing covered accounts;
2. Detect risks when they occur in covered accounts;
3. Respond to risks to determine if fraudulent activity has occurred and act if fraud has been attempted or committed; and
4. Update the program periodically, including reviewing the accounts that are covered and the identified risks that are part of the program.

SECTION 3: SCOPE

This policy and protection program applies to employees, contractors, consultants, temporary workers, and other workers at the Authority, including all personnel affiliated with third parties.

SECTION 4: POLICY

4.A: Sensitive Information Policy

4.A.1: Definition of Sensitive Information

Sensitive information includes the following items whether stored in electronic or printed format:

4.A.1.a: Tax identification numbers, including:

1. Social Security number
2. Business identification number
3. Employer identification numbers

4.A.1.b: Payroll information, including, among other information:

1. Paychecks
2. Pay stubs

4.A.1.c: Medical information for any employee, including but not limited to:

1. Doctor names and claims
2. Insurance claims
3. Prescriptions
4. Any related personal medical information

4.A.1.d: Other personal information belonging to any customer, employee or contractor, examples of which include:

1. Names
2. Address
3. Customer number
4. Phone numbers
5. Maiden name
6. Date of birth

4.A.1.e: Authority personnel are encouraged to use common sense judgment in securing confidential information to the proper extent. Furthermore, this section should be read in conjunction with the Open Public Records Act. If an employee is uncertain of the sensitivity of a particular piece of information, the employee should contact their supervisor. In the event that the Authority cannot resolve a conflict between this policy and the Open Public Records Act, the Authority will contact the Government Records Counsel.

4.A.2: Hard Copy Distribution

Each employee and contractor performing work for the Authority will comply with the following policies:

1. File cabinets, desk drawers, overhead cabinets, and any other storage space containing documents with sensitive information will be locked when not in use.
2. Storage rooms containing documents with sensitive information and record retention areas will be locked at the end of each workday or when unsupervised.
3. Desks, workstations, work areas, printers and fax machines, and common shared work areas will be cleared of all documents containing sensitive information when not in use.
4. Whiteboards, dry-erase boards, writing tablets, etc. in common shared work areas will be erased, removed, or shredded when not in use.

5. When documents containing sensitive information are discarded they will be placed inside a locked shred bin or immediately shredded using a mechanical cross cut or Department of Defense (DOD)-approved shredding device. Locked shred bins are labeled “*Confidential paper shredding and recycling.*” Authority records, however, may only be destroyed in accordance with the Authority’s records retention policy.

4.A.3: Electronic Distribution

Each employee and contractor performing work for the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County will comply with the following policies:

1. Internally, sensitive information may be transmitted using approved e-mail. All sensitive information must be encrypted when stored in an electronic format.
2. Any sensitive information sent externally must be encrypted and password protected and only to approved recipients. Additionally, a statement such as this should be included in the e-mail: “*This message may contain confidential and/or proprietary information and is intended for the person/entity to whom it was originally addressed. Any use by others is strictly prohibited.*”

SECTION 5: ADDITIONAL IDENTITY THEFT PREVENTION PROGRAM

If the Authority maintains certain covered accounts pursuant to federal legislation, the Authority may include the additional program details.

5.A: Covered Accounts

A covered account includes any account that involves or is designed to permit multiple payments or transactions. Every new and existing customer account that meets the following criteria is covered by this program:

1. Business, personal and household accounts for which there is a reasonably foreseeable risk of identity theft; or
2. Business, personal and household accounts for which there is a reasonably foreseeable risk to the safety or soundness of the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County from identity theft, including financial, operational, compliance, reputation, or litigation risks.

5.B: Red Flags

5.B.1: The following red flags are potential indicators of fraud. Any time a red flag, or a situation closely resembling a red flag, is apparent, it should be investigated for verification.

1. Alerts, notifications or warnings from a consumer reporting agency;
2. A fraud or active duty alert included with a consumer report;
3. A notice of credit freeze from a consumer reporting agency in response to a request for a consumer report; or
4. A notice of address discrepancy from a consumer reporting agency as defined in § 334.82(b) of the Fairness and Accuracy in Credit Transactions Act.

5.B.2: Red flags also include consumer reports that indicate a pattern of activity inconsistent with the history and usual pattern of activity of an applicant or customer, such as:

- A recent and significant increase in the volume of inquiries;
- An unusual number of recently established credit relationships;
- A material change in the use of credit, especially with respect to recently established credit relationships; or

- An account that was closed for cause or identified for abuse of account privileges by a financial institution or creditor.

5.C: Suspicious Documents

5.C.1: Documents provided for identification that appear to have been altered or forged.

5.C.2: The photograph or physical description on the identification is not consistent with the appearance of the applicant or customer presenting the identification.

5.C.3: Other information on the identification is not consistent with information provided by the person opening a new covered account or customer presenting the identification.

5.C.4: Other information on the identification is not consistent with readily accessible information that is on file with the Authority, such as a signature card or a recent check.

5.C.5: An application appears to have been altered or forged, or gives the appearance of having been destroyed and reassembled.

5.D: Suspicious Personal Identifying Information

5.D.1: Personal identifying information provided is inconsistent when compared against external information sources used by the Authority. For example:

- The address does not match any address in the consumer report;
- The Social Security Number (SSN) has not been issued or is listed on the Social Security Administration's Death Master File; or
- Personal identifying information provided by the customer is not consistent with other personal identifying information provided by the customer. For example, there is a lack of correlation between the SSN range and date of birth.

5.D.2: Personal identifying information provided is associated with known fraudulent activity as indicated by internal or third-party sources used by the Authority. For example, the address on an application is the same as the address provided on a fraudulent application.

5.D.3: Personal identifying information provided is of a type commonly associated with fraudulent activity as indicated by internal or third-party sources used by the Authority. For example:

- The address on an application is fictitious, a mail drop, or a prison; or
- The phone number is invalid or is associated with a pager or answering service.

5.D.4: The SSN provided is the same as that submitted by other persons opening an account or other customers.

5.D.5: The address or telephone number provided is the same as or similar to the address or telephone number submitted by an unusually large number of other customers or other persons opening accounts.

5.D.6: The customer or the person opening the covered account fails to provide all required personal identifying information on an application or in response to notification that the application is incomplete.

5.D.7: Personal identifying information provided is not consistent with personal identifying information that is on file with the Authority.

5.D.8: When using security questions (mother's maiden name, pet's name, etc.), the person opening the covered account or the customer cannot provide authenticating information beyond that which generally would be available from a wallet or consumer report.

5.E: Unusual use of, or suspicious activity related to, the covered account

5.E.1: Shortly following the notice of a change of address for a covered account, the Authority receives a request for new, additional, or replacement goods or services, or for the addition of authorized users on the account.

5.E.2: A new revolving credit account is used in a manner commonly associated with known patterns of fraud patterns. For example, the customer fails to make the first payment or makes an initial payment but no subsequent payments.

5.E.3: A covered account is used in a manner that is not consistent with established patterns of activity on the account. There is, for example:

- Nonpayment when there is no history of late or missed payments;
- A material change in purchasing or usage patterns.

5.E.4: A covered account that has been inactive for a reasonably lengthy period of time is used (taking into consideration the type of account, the expected pattern of usage and other relevant factors).

5.E.5: Mail sent to the customer is returned repeatedly as undeliverable although transactions continue to be conducted in connection with the customer's covered account.

5.E.6: The Authority is notified that the customer is not receiving paper account statements.

5.E.7: The Authority is notified of unauthorized charges or transactions in connection with a customer's covered account.

5.E.8: The Authority receives notice from customers, victims of identity theft, law enforcement authorities, or other persons regarding possible identity theft in connection with covered accounts held by the Authority.

5.E.9: The Authority is notified by a customer, a victim of identity theft, a law enforcement authority, or any other person that it has opened a fraudulent account for a person engaged in identity theft.

SECTION 6: RESPONDING TO RED FLAGS

6.A: Once potentially fraudulent activity is detected, an employee must act quickly as a rapid appropriate response can protect customers and the Authority from damages and loss.

6.A.1: Once potentially fraudulent activity is detected, gather all related documentation and write a description of the situation. Present this information to the designated authority for determination.

6.A.2: The designated authority will complete additional authentication to determine whether the attempted transaction was fraudulent or authentic.

6.B: If a transaction is determined to be fraudulent, appropriate actions must be taken immediately. Actions may include:

1. Canceling the transaction;
2. Notifying and cooperating with appropriate law enforcement;
3. Determining the extent of liability of the Authority; and
4. Notifying the actual customer that fraud has been attempted.

SECTION 7: PERIODIC UPDATES TO PLAN

7.A: At periodic intervals established in the program, or as required, the program will be re-evaluated to determine whether all aspects of the program are up to date and applicable in the current business environment.

7.B: Periodic reviews will include an assessment of which accounts are covered by the program.

7.C: As part of the review, red flags may be revised, replaced or eliminated. Defining new red flags may also be appropriate.

7.D: Actions to take in the event that fraudulent activity is discovered may also require revision to reduce damage to the Authority and its customers.

SECTION 8: PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

8.A: Involvement of management

1. The Identity Theft Prevention Program shall not be operated as an extension to existing fraud prevention programs, and its importance warrants the highest level of attention.
2. The Identity Theft Prevention Program is the responsibility of the governing body. Approval of the initial plan must be appropriately documented and maintained.
3. Operational responsibility of the program is delegated to the **Administrative Supervisor**.

8.B: Staff training

1. Staff training shall be conducted for all employees, officials and contractors for whom it is reasonably foreseeable that they may come into contact with accounts or personally identifiable information that may constitute a risk to the Authority or its customers.
2. **The Administrative Supervisor** is responsible for ensuring identity theft training for all requisite employees and contractors.
3. Employees must receive annual training in all elements of this policy.
4. To ensure maximum effectiveness, employees may continue to receive additional training as changes to the program are made.

8.C: Oversight of service provider arrangements

1. It is the responsibility of the Authority to ensure that the activities of all service providers are conducted in accordance with reasonable policies and procedures designed to detect, prevent, and mitigate the risk of identity theft.
2. A service provider that maintains its own identity theft prevention program, consistent with the guidance of the red flag rules and validated by appropriate due diligence, may be considered to be meeting these requirements.
3. Any specific requirements should be specifically addressed in the appropriate contract arrangements.

On a motion by *Mr. Urfer*, seconded by, *Mr. Pryor*, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *February 26, 2018*.

RESOLUTION

R-02-10-18

ADOPT THE 2018 POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY OF WARREN COUNTY MONTHLY MEETING SCHEDULE

WHEREAS, this Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County Monthly Meeting Schedule is prepared pursuant to the direction of the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County (PCFAWC) (the “Authority”);

WHEREAS, the attached Monthly Meeting Schedule is published and posted, to inform the public as to when the monthly meeting will be schedule for the year 2018;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the governing body of the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County, at an open public meeting held on February 26, 2018, the 2018 Monthly Meeting Schedule (attached) is hereby adopted.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Allen	-	Yes
	Mr. Pryor	-	Yes
	Mr. Urfer	-	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.

Crystal Gild
Recording Secretary

Dated: 02/26/2018

**POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY
OF WARREN COUNTY**

500 MT. PISGAH AVENUE
P.O. BOX 587
OXFORD, NEW JERSEY 07863-0587

James J. Williams
Director

908-453-2174
Fax: 908-453-4241
www.pcfawc.com

2018 MEETING SCHEDULE

January 22 nd	9:30 AM	July 23 rd	9:30 AM
February 26 th	9:30 AM	August 27 th	9:30 AM
March 26 th	9:30 AM	September 24 th	9:30 AM
April 23 rd	9:30 AM	October 22 nd	9:30 AM
*May 17 th	9:30 AM	**November 19 th	9:30 AM
June 25 th	9:30 AM	**December 17 th	9:30AM

2019

<i>January 28, 2019</i>	9:30 AM	<i>February 25, 2019</i>	9:30 AM
-------------------------	---------	--------------------------	---------

Regular meetings will be held
the fourth Monday of the Month,
unless noted by * above, at the
PCFA Administration Building
Lower Level Meeting Room
500 Mt. Pisgah Avenue
Oxford, New Jersey 07863-0587

* May 17th meeting will be on the 3rd Thursday

** November 19th and December 17th meetings will be on the
3rd Monday

(If additional meetings or changes are necessary, notification will be forthcoming).

Mr. Cannon gave the floor to Mr. Mach to discuss Resolution R-02-09-18 (Resolution Designating The Express-Times as the Official Newspaper for Advertising Public Notices)

On a motion for the purposes of discussion made by, *Mr. Mach*, seconded by, *Mr. Pryor*, the PCFA Board entered into a discussion to change The Express-Times as the official newspaper to The Star-Ledger.

Mr. Mach stated that we have had this discussion before, but to reiterate it, he does not feel that we get our bang for the buck out of The Express-Times. Mr. Mach stated that he knows that there has been an argument that has been stated in the past that The Express-Times is less costly than The Star-Ledger. Mr. Mach stated that The Star-Ledger has circulation throughout the State of New Jersey and whenever we go out for a bid or publish any notice that we certainly want as much coverage as possible for the newspaper dollars that we are spending. Mr. Mach stated that he feels that we would get better coverage with The Star-Ledger.

Mr. Pryor stated that he feels that most of the bidders subscribe to services that notify them of the bids as soon as they come out and that the newspaper notices are immaterial in his experience. Mr. Pryor stated that there is no newspaper coverage of our meetings so he does not think that it would make a difference. Mr. Pryor asked what the difference in costs of an advertisement is between The Express-Times and The Star-Ledger?

Mr. Williams stated that advertising in The Star-Ledger costs much more than advertising in The Express-Times. Mr. Pryor stated that this was his experience when he was in business as well. Mr. Williams stated that he does not know the exact dollar figure of the difference in costs. Mr. Pryor asked if it costs hundreds of dollars for an advertisement in The Star-Ledger? Mr. Williams stated that it has been a while since we have advertised with The Star-Ledger, so he does not have the exact figure.

Mr. Pryor stated that there is no question that The Star-Ledger gets statewide coverage and reaches more people. Mr. Pryor stated that if the majority of the Board felt more comfortable making The Star-Ledger the official newspaper that he would not be opposed to it.

Mr. Urfer asked what the total cost that we are spending on advertising with The Express-Times? He asked for a ballpark figure? Mr. Williams asked Mrs. Jamie Banghart if there was any information regarding this on the bill list? Mrs. Banghart answered, no. Mr. Urfer asked if we were talking about \$10.00 per year, 1,000.00 per year or even \$10,000.00 per year? Mr. Williams stated that it depends on when we start going out for bids and putting advertisements out for the bids.

Mr. Williams stated that we are going to be putting a couple of advertisements out in The Express-Times hopefully in the near future after our discussion regarding the Electronics Recycling Program. Mr. Williams surmised that we pay between \$150.00 to 200.00 per advertisement. Ms. Gild stated that these costs are about in the range of what we pay per advertisement and noted that some advertisements cost even less. Ms. Gild stated that the total costs for the 2017 advertisements would have been in the financial report for December 2017. Mrs. Banghart agreed and noted that the financial report, we have today only covers the expenses for January of 2018.

Mr. Cannon stated that in general he believes that The Star-Ledger costs 200% to 300% more than The Express-Times.

Mr. Williams stated that he believes that we spent several thousand dollars on advertising in 2017.

Mr. Mach stated that the important factor is how much did we spend on advertising and how much of a cost impact would there be if we used The Star-Ledger instead of The Express-Times.

Mr. Cannon stated that he agrees with Mr. Mach, but that if we cut out the professional services that we advertise for bidding that the majority of the bidders receive the notices from other services. Mr. Cannon estimated that 80% of our advertising expenses comes from notices to bidders. Mr. Williams agreed with his estimation. Mr. Cannon noted that the balance of our advertising expenses is most likely reimbursed from the State Grant for advertisements regarding our recycling events. Mr. Cannon reiterated that the bulk of our advertising expenses are for notice to bidders which most bidders receive through a service anyway and that it would simply cost more to advertise the notice to bidders in The Star-Ledger.

Mr. Urfer asked if we name The Express-Times as our official newspaper for advertising if it precludes us from advertising certain items that we felt needed to reach more people in The Star-Ledger? Mr. Urfer stated that we are not precluded from doing this? Mr. Cannon stated that this was correct. Mr. Urfer stated that 90% of what we do would not matter, Mr. Williams agreed, and Mr. Urfer continued to state that the advertisements that we think need to reach more people we could try advertising them in The Star-Ledger. Mr. Williams agreed. Mr. Urfer stated that this would allow us to compare the differences in exposure between The Express-Times and The Star-Ledger. Mr. Cannon stated that at any time we could advertise in The Star-Ledger if we chose to do so. Mr. Urfer stated that he feels that if we take the approach of keeping The Express-Times the official newspaper and running certain advertisements in The Star-Ledger this year, then we would be able to have a better cost analysis for next year's discussion regarding this. Mr. Urfer addressed Mr. Mach and stated that he was in no way trying to undercut him and noted that his idea is just a thought.

Mr. Allen stated that he is not opposed to changing the official newspaper to The Star-Ledger.

Mr. Pryor stated that he feels that it will be hard to quantify the cost differences at this point.

Mr. Williams suggested changing the wording in the resolution to state that we would use The Express-Times and/or The Star-Ledger for advertising. Mr. Pryor stated that he is not sure if we can legally do that.

Mr. Urfer addressed Mr. Tipton on an aside and asked him if this is something we could do?

Mr. Pryor and Mr. Cannon both stated that one newspaper would have to be chosen as the designated newspaper for advertising, but that it does not limit us from advertising in another newspaper.

Mr. Allen asked if Mr. Tipton has an opinion regarding this? Mr. Allen asked Mr. Urfer if he had just asked Mr. Tipton about this? Mr. Tipton stated that we would need to choose 1 designated newspaper, but that it does not preclude us from using another newspaper for advertising as has been said before.

Mr. Allen stated that he likes the idea that Mr. Urfer had presented earlier in the discussion.

Mr. Urfer stated that we would not have to state "and/or" and that we could simply designate The Express-Times as our official newspaper and then if we decide that we want to run something specific in The Star-Ledger, then we can do so. Mr. Allen agreed. Mr. Cannon agreed as well. Mr. Mach stated that he feels that this is a reasonable decision.

Mr. Mach withdrew his motion to discuss changing the official newspaper to The Star-Ledger and Mr. Pryor withdrew his second to Mr. Mach's motion.

On a motion by, *Mr. Allen*, seconded by, *Mr. Urfer*, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *February 26, 2018*.

R E S O L U T I O N
R-02-09-18

**DESIGNATING THE EXPRESS TIMES
AS THE OFFICIAL NEWSPAPER
FOR ADVERTISING PUBLIC NOTICES - 2018**

WHEREAS, there exists a need for the advertising of Public Notices for the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County in order to meet its responsibilities under the law;

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County that the **EXPRESS TIMES** is hereby designated as the official newspaper of the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County for all Public Notices.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Allen	-	Yes
	Mr. Pryor	-	Yes
	Mr. Urfer	-	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.

Crystal Gild
Recording Secretary

Dated: 02/26/2018

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Cannon asked if there was any correspondence? Mr. Williams stated that there was none.

PUBLIC COMMENTS (AGENDA ITEMS ONLY)

None.

FINANCE

Mr. Williams stated that this was our first attempt of doing the financial report in house. Mr. Williams stated that in his opinion everyone involved in putting it together did a great job.

Mr. Cannon stated that before we review the financial report he wants to know if we have any updates regarding the figures in the aging report included in the financial report. Mrs. Banghart stated that all of the figures in the aging report change because the aging report included in the financial report is as of January 31, 2018. Mrs. Banghart stated that Covanta was in the 60 days column of the aging report and noted that she had heard back from them and that Covanta is sending out a check for both of their past due payments. Mrs. Banghart noted that Covanta had sent the payment to the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Camden instead of to us.

Mr. Cannon asked if Gaeta was the only hauler in the 90-day column of the aging report? Mrs. Banghart stated that both Gaeta and Lovenberg are in the 90-day column of the aging report. Mrs. Banghart stated that she prepared a handout for the Board regarding Gaeta and Lovenberg and distributed it to the Board at the beginning of today's meeting.

Mr. Cannon stated that some of the other haulers that were on the 60-day column of the aging report could have moved to the 90-day column since the report was prepared. He asked if any of them had? Mrs. Banghart answered, no.

Mr. Williams reiterated that this was our first in house attempt of putting together the finance report. Mr. Williams stated that in his opinion the financial report was put together very well. Mr. Williams stated that all of the items needed for the financial report appear to be in place. Mr. Williams congratulated the staff on putting together the financial report and doing a good job doing so. Mr. Williams stated that we had the County staff take a look at the financial report to make sure that everything was in place.

Mr. Williams stated that there were a couple of things that we were not aware of during the process and that we became aware of them after the fact. Mr. Williams stated that we got all of those issues straightened out, but that he feels that we will probably run into this again as we continue to move forward. Mr. Williams stated that he feels that we have a pretty good handle on everything that needs to be done.

Mr. Williams stated that we will go through another month of the financial report and see how things go.

Mr. Williams explained that one of the difficult things regarding the finances is getting through the 13th month. Mr. Williams explained that the 13th month has bills coming in from December and sometimes

even January that should be accrued for the prior month. Mr. Williams stated that he believes that we are through that now. Ms. Gild stated that the 13th month has been wrapped up. Mr. Williams stated that he believes that things should go smoothly now that we have made it through some of the obstacles and the things that we were not aware of.

Mr. Williams stated that on the bottom of page 2 of the financial report and to look at the profit and loss from operations that you will see a loss in parentheses. Mr. Williams stated that the reason that we were at a loss in January is because we paid all of our insurance policies upfront for the year in January. Mr. Cannon stated that this is why the expense percentages are so high as well. Mr. Cannon stated that this also explains the 59% expended for Administration Operating Expenses and the 35% expended for the Total Administrative Expenses. Mr. Williams stated that the insurance payments were in excess of \$200,000.00. Mr. Williams stated that this will eventually decrease and go away.

Mr. Williams asked if anyone has any questions regarding the financial report?

Mr. Pryor stated that he has 1 question. Mr. Pryor asked what happens when a hauler hits 60-days past due on their invoices? Mr. Williams stated that the hauler gets cut off at 60 days past due. Mr. Pryor stated that the other Gaeta is in the 31-60-day column of the aging report and owes \$75,000.00 and that they owe \$101,000.00 in the 0-30-day column. Mrs. Banghart stated that Gaeta pays right at the last possible point before hitting 60 days past due, typically at 55 days past due. Mr. Williams stated that this is correct. Mrs. Banghart stated that Gaeta gets an arrears letter every 45 days. Mr. Pryor stated that he is fine with this if it is the routine. Mr. Williams stated that he is sure that some of the numbers in the aging report that is being presented today have already changed since it was printed on January 31, 2018.

Mr. Cannon asked if National Transfer falls under the same sort of payment schedule that Gaeta makes? Mrs. Banghart stated that National Transfer also gets an arrears letter every 45 days but they usually pay before 50 days past due. Mr. Cannon asked what Pinto's situation is? Mrs. Banghart stated that Pinto is the same. Mr. Cannon stated that he is surmising that payments have already been paid towards these accounts. Mrs. Banghart stated that this is correct.

Mr. Allen asked if the haulers only get an arrears notice at 45 days past due? Mrs. Banghart stated that the arrears notice goes out at 45 days past due and that the haulers get cut off at 60 days past due.

Mr. Urfer asked when we start charging the haulers interest for past due payments. Mrs. Banghart stated that we begin charging interest when invoices reach 60 days past due. Mr. Urfer asked what the interest rate is? Mrs. Banghart stated that the interest rate is 1.5%. Mr. Urfer asked if this is per month? Mrs. Banghart stated that the 1.5% interest rate is charged every 30 days that the haulers' invoice is past due.

Mr. Pryor asked if Gaeta pays us the interest? Mr. Williams stated that we do not start collecting interest until 60 days past due. Mr. Cannon agreed that this is correct. Mr. Urfer stated that most entities begin charging interest at 30 days past due. Mr. Urfer stated that we do not have to do it today, but that we may want to review that policy because haulers are taking advantage of us. Mrs. Banghart stated that this was discussed a few years ago. Mr. Williams stated that we have had quite a few round table discussions regarding this. Mr. Cannon and Mr. Williams stated that we can revisit the topic again. Mr. Urfer stated that he feels that we should revisit the topic. Mr. Urfer stated that if everyone waited until the very last possible day to pay us, we would have a bigger problem.

Mr. Cannon stated that the issue is the monthly meetings versus when the bills are due and paid. Mr. Cannon stated that this leads us to not always having accurate information regarding who owes what and how far past due they actually are at the time of the meeting. Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Williams had mentioned that Mr. Urfer had reviewed some of our past meeting minutes and that he was not sure if Mr.

Urfer had seen some of the discussions regarding this. Mr. Cannon stated that we have had several discussions regarding moving the cutoff date to 45 days past due but because of the timing of the billing and then when we actually get to a meeting to take any action that the days past due have already changed, which is a big issue when discussing changing the policy.

Mr. Allen asked why the decision to take action has to be part of a meeting and why it cannot be automatic? Mr. Cannon stated that he believes that legally the Board needs to take action to do anything if they go past 61 days past due. Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Tipton if this is correct? Mr. Tipton stated that this is true if you wanted to take legal action. Mr. Urfer stated that his point is that if we send out an invoice and it is not paid within 30 days that we should begin charging the 1.5% interest then. Mr. Urfer stated that we would not need a meeting for this.

Mr. Williams explained that some of the haulers work for municipalities who only pay their bills to the haulers once per month.

Mr. Urfer stated that his bank wants him to pay his mortgage even if he does not collect rent from his tenants. He asked if we wanted to hear his Grandmother's problems too? Mr. Urfer stated that it is what it is and that these are business expenses and that the haulers can borrow money from other people. Mr. Urfer stated that in his opinion, we are turning ourselves into a bank. Mr. Urfer also stated that if other haulers start to find out that we allow the invoices to run beyond 30 days past due that they will end up starting to follow suit, which result in a serious financial impact for us if we none of the money owed to us was paid until 60 days past due. Mr. Urfer stated that this is a conversation for another day and that he does not mean to drag it out today.

Mr. Allen asked Mr. Tipton if there is language in our contracts with the haulers that this would be dependent on? Mr. Tipton stated that the language in our contracts with the haulers would need to be changed. Mr. Cannon and Mr. Allen asked if we would need to change the contracts? Mr. Tipton answered, yes and explained that there is a paragraph within our contracts that notes when interest is triggered.

Mr. Cannon stated that he sees Mr. Urfer's point. Mr. Allen stated that we have not had much of a problem with the exception of a few haulers. Mr. Williams stated that Mr. Allen is correct.

Mr. Cannon asked what the expense for Digout was for? Mr. Williams stated that this expense is for Frozen Load Digouts. Mr. Williams explained that we charge haulers during the winter months for us to have an excavator on site to dig out the frozen loads that are in their roll-off boxes. Mr. Cannon asked if we had any issues with this? Mr. Williams stated that the haulers pay us for this with no issues.

Mr. Allen stated that he as a question regarding procedures. Mr. Allen asked that now that the financial report is being prepared in house if the reports are formatted within the software that we use? Mrs. Banghart stated that Ms. Gild prepares the entire finance report. Mr. Williams stated that the answer is yes.

Mr. Allen asked that if we wanted to produce the report for page 1 of the financial report if the system automatically generates the report. Mr. Williams explained that a lot of other figures need to be put in before these numbers come together. Mr. Williams stated that page 1 of the report is essentially the end product of the entire finance report. Mr. Williams explained that there are a lot of internal spreadsheets that need to be completed before the financial report can be put together.

Mr. Allen asked what the biggest problem has been with the financial report and the finances now that we have taken them over in house? Ms. Gild stated that she feels that the biggest problems that we have

come across are things that we were not made aware of. Mrs. Banghart agreed. Ms. Gild stated that one of the other issues has been changing how we do payroll and the accounts that the payroll comes out of. Ms. Gild noted that one of the biggest issues was having to tweak some of the reports based on the payroll account being used now as opposed to how the County used to run the payroll. Ms. Gild stated that once we put our heads together we figured it out and that it should be smooth sailing from here on out. Mr. Allen asked if this was due to information that the County did not make us aware of? Ms. Gild answered, yes.

Mr. Williams explained that there are a lot of moving parts regarding the finances and the financial report and that we are still creating our internal schedules as to what needs to be done and what day of the week or month that it needs to be done. Mr. Williams stated that he feels that we almost have this completed, but that every time we think we have it completed a new issue arises that needs to be added to our list of things to do. Mr. Williams stated that things are evolving, but that he thinks that things need to evolve a little bit more. Mr. Williams stated that by our next meeting we should have this all ready to go and then he is going to present to the Board what we have put together internally. Mr. Williams explained that if none of us were here and someone needed to come in and jump in our shoes that they would be able to look off these sheets to see what needs to be done on a specific day, such as paying health care benefits, submitting payroll, making journal entries and so on and so forth.

Mr. Cannon asked if once this is completed next month if we will be able to start incorporating these tasks into the new job descriptions? Mr. Williams answered, yes.

Mr. Pryor asked that if a transaction is entered and coded correctly, are the reports automatically generated? Ms. Gild answered, no. Ms. Gild explained that there are some reports within the financial report that come directly from the system such as the Material Analysis Report. Ms. Gild explained that the information from the system generated reports are used to work on the spreadsheets, which make up the rest of the financial report. Mr. Pryor asked if you use the reports from the system and then take that information and input it into a spreadsheet that you manipulate? Ms. Gild answered, yes.

Mr. Allen asked if we were doing our own internal accounting of things before? Mr. Williams answered, yes. Mr. Allen explained that Accounts Payable and Accounts Receivable were being processed here. He asked how that information would get to the County for them to put together the financial report for us? Mr. Williams explained that we would either send them the system reports via email or inter-office mail. Mr. Allen asked if the software we were using here was an augment of what the County was using? Mrs. Banghart stated that we use the County's Pentamation software. Mr. Williams stated that we use the same software that the County does. Mr. Allen stated that we were using the same software, but prior to now we did not have access to the big picture. Mr. Williams and Mrs. Banghart agreed. Mr. Williams stated that we now have access to everything.

Mr. Allen stated from an auditing perspective and noted that it is not that he does not trust any of the employees, but from the standpoint of an audit his biggest concern is the checks and balances. Mr. Williams agreed. Mr. Williams stated that this is going to be covered in the segregation of duties within the new job descriptions. Mr. Williams explained that we cannot have the person collecting the cash making the bank deposits and reconciling their own work. Mr. Williams stated that this is where the checks and balances come into play. Mr. Allen stated that all of those tasks cannot be performed by the same person. Mr. Williams stated that Mr. Allen was correct. Mr. Williams explained that this is why all of the work will be divided up properly throughout the new job descriptions. Mr. Urfer stated that we also have an auditor who is going to review this process and make sure that the checks and balances are being done properly. Mr. Williams stated that this was correct. Mr. Williams stated that we have been

keeping the auditor in the loop in terms of how we are doing things because we all are aware of what has happened in the past and we do not want a recurrence of that to happen. Mr. Allen agreed.

Mr. Cannon stated that he had a few more questions regarding the bills. Mr. Cannon asked what we paid S&L for? Mr. Williams asked Mr. Cannon to provide him with the page number of the financial report that he was referring to. Mr. Cannon stated that he is referring to page 31 of the financial report and the payment was for \$1,526.41. Mr. Williams that this charge could be for the excavator that we used for the frozen load dig outs. Mr. Cannon asked if this expense was passed on to the haulers? Mr. Williams answered, yes. Mr. Williams stated that the money we collect for the dig outs pays for the cost of having the excavator on site.

Mr. Cannon asked if we owe Cornerstone any money currently? Mr. Williams stated that no invoices have come in from Cornerstone for the Landfill Expansion. Mr. Williams stated that the invoices we did pay to Cornerstone were in regards to our Air Permit and what Cornerstone completes for us regarding the reporting we need for the Air Permit. Mr. Allen asked if this was separate from the expansion? Mr. Williams answered, yes.

Mr. Allen asked if we completed the contract with Cornerstone regarding the Landfill Expansion? Mr. Cannon answered, yes, as did Mr. Williams.

Mr. Cannon asked if this is what we paid Cornerstone for the entire year for their work regarding the Air Permit? Mr. Cannon stated that he was referring to page 33 of the financial report and that he sees a total of 3 invoices totaling \$32,006.06. Mr. Williams stated that he believes that the budgeted amount for the Air Permit is \$78,000.00. Mr. Cannon asked if we pay them twice a year and why these invoices ended up being for so much money? Mr. Williams reminded the Board of Mr. Matt Bebee's situation regarding his wife. Mr. Williams explained that Mr. Bebee had an outstanding invoice sitting on his desk when he was in the midst of his personal issues and Cornerstone found the invoice and submitted it to us. Mr. Williams stated that the invoice went back to last year. Mr. Cannon asked if part of this payment is going to be credited against 2017's budget? Mr. Williams stated that this is correct. Mr. Cannon stated that we are not at 50% expended for 2018 already. Mr. Williams assured him that we were not. Mr. Cannon asked if we were going to put this invoice into 2017 or if we had done so already? Mr. Williams stated that we are going to see if we can do that, but noted that he is not sure if it can be done now. Mr. Williams stated that we will talk to the auditor about it. Mr. Cannon asked if this was the largest of the 3 invoices? Mr. Williams stated that he believes that the invoice was from August and Mrs. Banghart agreed.

Mr. Urfer stated that he would like to ask a couple of questions if he could. Mr. Cannon stated that he was more than welcome to do so.

Mr. Urfer asked regarding page 2 of the financial report regarding Landfill Operations Other Personnel Costs why it is at 19% when only 8.3% of the year has elapsed? Mr. Urfer also asked why Pretreatment Other Personnel Costs are at 17%? Mr. Williams asked Mrs. Banghart if this is due to paying the insurances as well? Mrs. Banghart answered, yes. Mrs. Banghart that the insurances are split out between the 3 different categories.

Mr. Urfer referred to page 21 of the financial report and asked if the budget on the first line for salaries in the amount of \$213,500.00 is the budget for the entire year? Mr. Williams answered, yes and explained that this is the budget for the salaries for the administrative personnel only. Mr. Cannon agreed. Mr. Urfer stated that the year to date expense is \$17,100.36. Mr. Urfer asked if this is good or bad or if we should have the percentages shown so that we can see what percent of the annual budget has

been used. Mr. Williams stated that the percentages are shown on page 2 of the financial report. Mr. Cannon agreed. Mr. Williams explained that the expenses are split into 3 different categories, which are administration, landfill operations and pre-treatment. Mr. Williams further explained that these 3 expense categories are then broken down by salaries, operating expenses and then other personnel costs. Mr. Williams stated that as you can see on page 2 the salaries for the administrative employees are at 8% for the year. Mr. Cannon stated that this report was configured a few years ago to show the percentages.

Mr. Cannon stated that the report shown on page 21 of the financial report that Mr. Urfer had referred to comes directly from the system and that it would not be able to be changed to show percentages. Mr. Urfer stated that he understands this and now he knows where the percentages are shown.

Mr. Cannon asked if anyone else had any other questions regarding the bills for the month ending January 31, 2018?

Mr. Cannon called for a motion to approve Resolution R-02-11-18 to pay the bills in the amount of \$372,993.64.

On a motion by, *Mr. Allen*, seconded by, *Mr. Urfer*, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *February 26th, 2018*.

R E S O L U T I O N
R-02-11-18
To Pay Bills – February 26, 2018

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

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

See Attached

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

We hereby certify Resolution to Pay Bills in the amount of **\$372,993.64** to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County on the *26th day of February, 2018*.

Crystal Gild
Recording Secretary

James Williams
Director of Operations

Dated: 02/26/2018

Mr. Williams stated that on the top of page 2 of the financial report you will see the date the report was prepared and then the financial position as of a certain date. Mr. Williams stated that all of the financial reports in the past have always run into the next month and do not end at the end of the month that is being reported on.

Mr. Williams stated that he and the staff had been discussing this internally and that he wanted to make the Board aware of our thoughts. Mr. Williams asked the Board if they would mind if we tried preparing the financial report based only on the month we are reporting on and not rolling over 2 weeks into the next month?

Mr. Cannon answered, yes and explained that initially this was our goal, but that the County lagged which was part of the issue.

Mr. Williams explained that if we gave this a try and see how it goes that it would make it easier on the staff internally because when we are ready to send out the Agenda Packets that we could send the financial report and the bill resolution along with it. Mr. Cannon stated that this would give us a crystal-clear picture as to exactly how the month went financially.

Mr. Allen asked if we have always done the financial report the way it is being done. Mr. Williams stated that it has been being done this way for quite a while and noted that Mr. Olshefski had actually shortened up the timeframe by one week at some point. Mr. Cannon agreed. Mr. Allen asked that since we are preparing the financial report internally if it would be possible to do it the way that Mr. Williams has proposed? Ms. Gild answered, yes. Mr. Williams also answered, yes and explained that the only thing that would not be shown are the bills that are paid between the end of the month and the meeting.

Mr. Pryor stated that on the private side that you close the month, so he does not see why we cannot do that here as well.

Mr. Cannon stated that up to this point we did not have control over the process because we had to go with whatever the County was doing.

Mr. Williams stated that the County was trying to give us up to the minute information which is a good thing. Mr. Cannon stated that it is nice to incorporate as much information as you can up to the meeting. Mr. Williams agreed.

Mr. Cannon asked if everyone found Mr. Williams proposal regarding changing the financial report to only reflect the month being reported on? There were no objections. Mr. Cannon stated that we could prepare the financial report both ways for comparison. Mr. Williams stated that he was not sure if we could do that. Mr. Williams asked Ms. Gild if we could do that? Ms. Gild stated that the only portion of the financial report that would change is the bill schedule because all of the other reports are based on the totals for the month being reported on. Ms. Gild stated that she could put together an additional page for any bills that came in from the end of the month up until the day of the meeting. Mr. Williams instructed Ms. Gild to do so for the next financial report. Mr. Cannon stated that this was a good idea. Ms. Gild stated that she could put together the additional page for the report and distribute it at the meeting. Mr. Williams said that we could try it. Ms. Gild asked if this would be okay with everyone? Mrs. Banghart stated that she thinks that it is a good idea and agrees that it is the only thing that is going to change. Ms. Gild reiterated that the bill schedule is the only thing that would change within the finance report. Mr. Cannon stated that he found making this change acceptable.

PERSONNEL

Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Williams if he had any personnel issues to report? Mr. Williams answered, no.

REPORTS

None.

FACILITIES/RECYCLING

Mr. Williams stated that there is really nothing to add to the Treatment Plant Operations. Mr. Williams stated that we are still sending 6,000 to 7,000 gallons of diluted leachate to the PRMUA daily. Mr. Williams also stated that we are still hauling leachate to Passaic Valley as well.

Mr. Williams stated that Landfill Operations are going well and that there are no issues. Mr. Williams stated that there are no issues with any of the equipment.

Mr. Williams stated that he would like to provide the Board with an update regarding the new scale installation. Mr. Williams stated that last Friday Atlantic Scale was on site and that we were on the phone with WasteWorks. Mr. Williams stated that the scale is now operational and that the computers in the scale house are communicating properly to each other and also to the office. Mr. Williams explained that we are just waiting for Sans Construction to install the safety railing that goes along the walkway along the scale. Mr. Williams noted that the walkway is in and that we do not want anyone to use it yet because the walkway is approximately 2.5 feet off the ground and we would not want someone to fall off of it. Mr. Williams stated that the railing is currently being fabricated and should hopefully be installed pretty quickly. Mr. Williams stated that once the railing is installed that we will begin to operate both scales.

Mr. Williams stated that he had discussed this next item with the Mr. Cannon earlier. Mr. Williams stated that once the new scale is completed that we are then going to operate both scales simultaneously for at least a good month to make sure that there are no issues. Mr. William stated that after this we get to the time of year when the Township Cleanups begin and noted that they occur during the months of April and May. Mr. Williams explained that there will be a lot of heavy traffic coming in from the local municipalities that are holding their cleanups.

Mr. Williams stated that if the Board does not have an issue with it that he would like to ask the contractor if he can hold off on repairing the existing scale until June. Mr. Williams explained that the contractor would be replacing the concrete aprons on both ends of the existing scale. Mr. Williams stated that if we wait until June to do these repairs that we would get through the heavy traffic periods.

Mr. Allen asked that when the repair is being done on the old scale how is the traffic flow going to be affected since the new scale is on the exit side? Mr. Williams stated that this is one of the reasons that he wanted to get through the Township Cleanups before beginning the repairs. Mr. Williams explained that when these repairs begin we will have to station an employee out by the main gate to direct traffic. Mr. Williams stated that when we will only be using the new scale only that a lot of the tractor trailers that are going in and out of the landfill would only be able to pull straight on the new scale because there will not be a big enough loop for them to go all the way out to the end and try to get back on the scale. Mr.

Williams stated that we will definitely need to have an employee stationed outside the gates to direct traffic while the repairs are being completed.

Mr. Cannon asked if when we get to this point if we should send a letter out to the haulers to let them know what is going on. Mr. Williams stated that, yes, we would put all of the haulers on notice as to what is happening. Mr. Williams stated that all of the haulers have seen the construction, so they are aware that there are changes coming. Mr. Williams stated that we tried out operating both scales on Friday and the few companies that got to try it out were very happy with it.

Mr. Allen asked if we would only be using 1 operator even though we are running 2 scales? Mr. Williams answered, yes. Mr. Williams stated that if it gets extremely busy that 2 people could operate the scales. Mr. Cannon stated that when something comes up such as the Township Cleanups that we could have 2 operators in the scale. Mr. Urfer stated that during the Township Cleanups you only go on the scale once to get in and then you can just exit without going on the scale again. Mr. Williams explained that the issue with the Township Cleanups is that anyone coming in for the cleanup needs to turn in a voucher, so every single person that comes in for the cleanup needs to go on the scale. Mr. Williams explained that this backs up the flow of traffic and that he thinks that the busiest day for this is Saturday.

Mr. Williams stated that if the Board approves, he will talk with the contractor and see if he can wait until June to do the repairs.

Mr. Williams stated that we are going to discuss the Landfill expansion during Executive Session. Mr. Cannon agreed. Mr. Williams stated that Mr. Smith has some additional information regarding this that he will present during Executive Session.

Mr. Williams stated that there is nothing to report regarding the H2S Removal System. Mr. Williams stated that everything is running smoothly and that we are still at approximately at 0-1 ppm coming out of that as far as Hydrogen-Sulfide.

Mr. Williams stated that there is no update on the Solar Panel Project.

Mr. Williams stated that regarding Waste Disposal Contracts that we have 1 to be approved today and that the contract is with All American Carting.

Mr. Williams stated that pretty much all of the haulers have renewed their contracts except for National Transfer, Gaeta and Sanico. Mr. Williams stated that he has a call into Sanico because there was an oversight on his part, and they will be getting their contract to us. Mr. Cannon asked when the contracts expire? He asked if they expire on Wednesday? Mr. Williams stated that they expire at the end of the month. Mrs. Banghart stated that the contracts expire on Wednesday. Mr. Cannon stated that National Transfer and Gaeta would no longer be doing business with us come Thursday if we do not receive their contracts. Mr. Williams stated that this is correct. Mrs. Banghart stated that she called National Transfer and asked them if they are sending in a contract and that she was told that his cousin was going to sign the contract. Mr. Williams stated that we will have to wait and see if they send the contract in or not. Mr. Williams stated that if the companies do not renew their contracts that it would be a savings for us for air space until the expansion is completed. Mr. Cannon asked if we were anticipating both of the haulers to not sign contracts? Mr. Williams stated that we picked up LMR disposal which will cover some loss of waste if these haulers do not sign.

Mr. Williams stated that he needs approval to enter into a Waste Disposal agreement for 2018 with All American Carting. Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Williams if a motion needed to be made for this. Mr. Williams answered, yes. Mr. Urfer asked if they were going to pay \$78.00 per ton? Mr. Williams answered yes

On a motion made by, Mr. Urfer, seconded by, Mr. Mach, the PCFA entered into a Waste Disposal Contract with All American Carting for 2018.

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

Mr. Williams asked if we could discuss the Electronics Recycling during Open Session? Mr. Tipton stated that it should be discussed during Executive Session first because it is a contractual matter and that Mr. Tipton has some comments to make regarding the contract itself.

GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT

Mr. Tipton had no report for open session.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Williams stated that Mrs. Banghart had provided everyone with a copy of the Annual Recycling report for 2017. Mr. Williams stated that this gets sent out to all of the municipal recycling coordinators and that he just wanted the Board to be aware that this has been completed for 2017.

Mr. Urfer asked what the source is for the figures in this report? Mr. Williams stated that the report is based on what comes across our scale. Mr. Williams stated that this report only covers the items that we collect on site. Mr. Urfer stated that when he comes in and dumps recyclables from Hope that we do not actually know his weight. Mr. Williams explained that there is a daily headcount totaling how many people brought in recycling from each municipality. Mr. Williams also explained that when the recycler comes and picks up the container we then get the physical weight of the recyclables that were brought in and divide it amongst the municipalities based on the Census numbers. Mr. Williams stated that the reason that we do not weigh in recycling is because our scale will not pick up anything that weighs under 20 pounds and that the recyclables do not usually weigh this much. Mr. Williams also noted that this frees up our scale as well.

Mr. Allen asked if the figure for the total residential deliveries for White Township is all from one carrier. Mrs. Banghart stated that this is every person that came in in 2017 that said they had recycling from White Township. Mrs. Banghart stated that we have 15,211 Warren County residents that brought recycling in during 2017. Mr. Williams stated that 2,880 of those residents were from White Township.

Mrs. Banghart explained that any business or County that came in and had their recyclables weighed are included in the report as well.

Mr. Allen asked that if Sanico is collecting recycling in Brookfield and they come in as a carrier, how would we account for that? Mr. Williams stated that they do not come in and noted that they have their own facility off of Route 519. Mr. Allen asked where Sanico brings their recycling? Mr. Williams stated

that he is not sure and noted that we do not accept recycling from haulers such as Sanico or Waste Management. Mr. Williams noted that our recycling is strictly residential and municipal. Mrs. Banghart noted that we have a few small local businesses that bring in recycling.

Mr. Pryor asked how we know if someone is dumping something in the recycling bin that contaminates the whole load? Mr. Williams stated that we monitor the recycling that is coming in. Mr. Williams stated that our single-stream recycling goes down to Colgate in New Brunswick and they put it all on an assembly line where it then becomes separated.

Mr. Cannon stated that the recycling numbers are usually accurate. Mr. Williams agreed that they are and noted that we get the weight directly from our scale. Mr. Williams explained that when the empty container comes in we weigh it and then we weigh it out when it is picked up when it is full.

Mr. Cannon asked if there were any other questions regarding the recycling report? There were no questions.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

CLOSING PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Smith stated that on behalf of the Freeholder Board that he wanted to thank Mr. Mach for re-upping his term and that he wanted to welcome Mr. Urfer to the Board.

PRESS COMMENTS & QUESTIONS

None.

Mr. Cannon stated that there would be a 5-minute break before entering into Executive Session.

On a motion made by, **Mr. Pryor**, and seconded, by **Mr. Allen**, a 5-minute break was taken before resuming the meeting to enter into Executive Session.

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

The break began at 10:52 am and ended at 11:01 am.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Executive Session was entered at 11:01 am.

RESOLUTION

R-02-12-18

AUTHORIZING EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

Contracts and Negotiations

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

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

Moved By: ***Mr. Pryor***

Seconded By: ***Mr. Allen***

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Allen	-	Yes
	Mr. Pryor	-	Yes
	Mr. Urfer	-	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.

Crystal Gild
Recording Secretary

Dated: 02/26/18

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

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

Executive session ended at 12:01 pm.

Regular session resumed at 12:02 pm.

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

Mr. Tipton stated that action needs to be taken regarding the Electronics Recycling contract.

Mr. Cannon called for a motion stating that the Board has directed Counsel to make amendments and/or changes to the contract for Electronic Recycling.

On a motion made by, **Mr. Urfer**, seconded by, **Mr. Allen**, the Board directed Counsel to make amendments and/or changes to the contract for the Electronic Recycling Program and then the contract would be accepted with the amendments and/or changes.

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

ADJOURNMENT

With no other business to discuss, **Mr. Urfer** motioned to Adjourn, seconded by **Mr. Allen**, at 12:02 pm.

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

Respectfully submitted by:
Crystal Gild
Recording Secretary

Approved: 03/26/2018