

POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY
OF WARREN COUNTY

MINUTES OF REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING

April 23, 2018

Chairman James Cannon called the regular monthly meeting of the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County to order at approximately 9:32 am.

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

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

Also present: James Williams, Director of Operations; Freeholder Director, Ed Smith; Mark Peck, General Counsel; Jamie Banghart, Administrative Supervisor; Crystal Gild, Recording Secretary.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Cannon.

Mr. Cannon stated that PCFA Board Member, Mr. Terry Urfer, resigned as of this morning.

Mr. Cannon read the following statement: "Adequate notice of this meeting of April 23, 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".

MINUTES

Mr. Cannon presented (M-1) the regular monthly meeting minutes from March 26, 2018.

Mr. Pryor stated that the word "sore" on page 3, paragraph 1 of the minutes should be changed to the word "sewer". Mr. Pryor also stated that on page 3, paragraph 4 of the minutes that the paragraph that reads "Mr. Pryor stated that the PRMUA thinks that if the odor and corrosion concerns become a problem that it can be dealt with" should be changed to read: "Mr. Pryor stated that if the PRMUA thinks that the odor and corrosion concerns become a problem, then it can be dealt with." Mr. Pryor

stated that on page 4, paragraph 4 of the minutes should be stricken because it does not clearly convey what he was trying to explain.

Mr. Mach made a motion to approve the amended Regular Monthly Meeting Minutes from March 26, 2018 as presented, seconded by **Mr. Pryor**.

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

Mr. Cannon presented (M-2) the Executive Session minutes from March 26, 2018.

Mr. Allen made a motion to approve the Executive Session Minutes from March 26, 2018, seconded by **Mr. Pryor**.

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

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Williams to go over the correspondence regarding the Relay For Life.

Mr. Williams stated that there is a request from Relay For Life, which is the same as the request that they made last year. Mr. Williams explained that the Relay For Life holds a cleanup once per year and noted that the cleanup would be held on May 21, 2018 this year. Mr. Williams stated that the Relay for Life is asking us to waive their disposal fee for this cleanup. Mr. Williams stated that the PCFA had accommodated them last year and waived their fee. He noted that last year, the Relay For Life brought in approximately ¼ ton of waste, which we waived the fee. Mr. Williams noted that this equated to 500 pounds of debris that we allowed them to dispose of for free. Mr. Williams reiterated that the Relay For Life is asking for the same consideration this year.

Mr. Mach asked what the dollar value was that we waived last year? He asked if it was \$45.00? Mr. Williams stated that we waived approximately \$25.00 last year and noted that we charge \$00.05 per pound for disposal.

Mr. Pryor stated that he recalls that we had adopted a policy regarding fee waiver requests. Mr. Pryor noted that the requesting entity needed to primarily benefit Warren County. Mr. Pryor noted that, the way the correspondence reads is that the American Cancer Society of Phillipsburg is requesting the fee waiver. Mr. Pryor stated that it would be his assumption that this qualifies as primarily benefitting Warren County.

Mr. Cannon stated that he agrees and noted that he only has one question. Mr. Cannon asked if with the new policy, the requester is required to fill out paperwork, which was not required before?

Mr. Williams answered yes, and explained that this only comes into play if the requester was bringing the waste in them self. Mr. Williams stated that one of our current haulers, Gary Gray, is going to be bringing in the waste. Mr. Cannon asked if Gary Gray's insurance would be used in the event that anything were to happen? Mr. Williams answered, yes.

Mr. Cannon called for a motion to approve waiving fees, in accordance with the PCFA's policy for fee waivers, for waste to be brought to the PCFA for disposal by Gary Gray for the American Cancer Society's Relay For Life, which will be held in Phillipsburg NJ.

On a motion made by, **Mr. Mach**, seconded by, **Mr. Pryor** the PCFA Board agreed to waive fees, in accordance with the PCFA's policy for fee waivers, for waste to be brought to the PCFA for disposal by Gary Gray for the American Cancer Society's Relay For Life, which will be held in Phillipsburg NJ.

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

Mr. Williams stated that there is one more correspondence and that came in late, which is why it is not listed on the Agenda for today's meeting. Mr. Williams stated that the correspondence is in the packet that he distributed this morning. Mr. Williams explained that the correspondence is a letter from the DEP regarding the Draft Solid Waste Facility Permit Major Modification for Covanta. Mr. Williams noted that he had received this letter on Friday, April 20, 2018. Mr. Williams stated that he has not reviewed the letter, but that he believes that it is regarding an increase to Covanta's incineration of liquid materials at their facility.

Mr. Allen and Mr. Pryor both stated that they had read an article in the newspaper regarding this.

Mr. Cannon stated that he had seen the article in the newspaper as well. Mr. Cannon stated that he thinks that it is a shame that we do not currently have an Oxford resident on the board because this increase to liquid materials acceptance may change the computing for the host agreement fee between Covanta and Oxford Township. Mr. Cannon noted that Oxford Township might want to look into this because he believes that in the end, the charges for the quantity of waste coming in would theoretically reduce, because Covanta is looking to extract the liquid from it. Mr. Cannon noted that maybe Oxford should be receiving a host fee based on the liquid as well. Mr. Cannon stated that essentially, what he took from the article was that Covanta could theoretically move more material, but the host fee may not account for the liquid material being processed.

Mr. Cannon asked if anyone had any other questions or comments regarding this?

Mr. Pryor stated that he has no objection on a technical basis. Mr. Pryor stated that Covanta ran the pilot program and now they are getting the permit to process the liquid material. Mr. Pryor stated regarding the host community fee, that it would be up to Oxford Township to inquire about it. Mr. Cannon agreed.

Mr. Cannon noted that it was cited in the article that Covanta has been processing the liquid material for a decade at three of their other facilities. Mr. Pryor agreed. Mr. Cannon noted that he is not sure why the Covanta facility in Oxford did not start doing this sooner.

Freeholder Director Ed Smith stated that his understanding is that the tonnage amounts coming into Covanta will go up, because the liquids cool their burner down, which keeps them within their BTU output allowed in their Permit. Mr. Cannon stated that Covanta has a ceiling as to how much tonnage they can accept. Mr. Smith agreed. Mr. Smith stated that the host fee is based on the tonnage that goes into the burner and noted that this tonnage amount should increase, because they are able to cool down the burner with the liquid and reduce the amount of steam being created. Mr. Smith stated that this is what he was told. Mr. Cannon stated that this does not make sense to him. Mr. Smith explained that the processing of the liquid cuts the heat down. Mr. Cannon stated that if Covanta brings in more truckloads of liquid that their tonnage would increase as well. Mr. Smith agreed and explained that the tonnage of waste would increase as well because of the burner temperature being kept down. Mr. Pryor stated that there is a tonnage assigned to the liquid waste as well. Mr. Cannon and Mr. Williams both agreed. Mr. Smith agreed as well and explained that the liquid tonnage is in addition to the increase of solid waste tonnage that would be coming in.

Mr. Cannon stated that it is his understanding that Covanta has already reached their ceiling and that they are already processing as much waste as they can. Mr. Smith asked if Mr. Cannon was referring to the tonnage amount of solid waste being processed at Covanta? Mr. Cannon answered, yes. Mr. Smith explained that Covanta could accept more tonnage of solid waste if they increase the amount of liquid material they process.

Mr. Cannon asked if anyone else had any questions. Mr. Cannon asked if we are required to provide a response regarding this? Mr. Williams answered, no.

Mr. Smith asked if this letter was copied to SWAC (Solid Waste Advisory Committee)? Mr. Smith noted that this would need to go through SWAC. Mr. Cannon stated that the answer to Mr. Smith's question is that we do not know whether SWAC was given a copy of this letter.

PUBLIC COMMENTS (AGENDA ITEMS ONLY)

None.

FINANCE

Mr. Cannon stated that we would be using some of the revised portions of the Finance Report today.

Mr. Williams stated that the initial Finance Report that was sent out with the Agenda is for the entire month of March. Mr. Williams stated that the revised sheets cover April 1, 2018 through April 18, 2018.

Mr. Cannon asked how it was possible that we had three more weeks' worth of figures if we had prepared one report on April 13, 2018 and the other on April 19, 2018? Mrs. Banghart explained that the initial report only covered the dates of March 1, 2018 through March 31, 2018. Mr. Cannon stated that this clarifies things for him. Mrs. Banghart stated that the revision to the bill schedule for March payments was the annual PERS payment.

Mr. Williams stated that there is nothing unusual regarding Accounts Receivables.

Mr. Williams noted that there is a Capital Expenditure within the bill schedule, which is for the new scale construction. Mr. Williams stated that we still owe approximately \$97,000.00 for the new scale construction. Mr. Williams stated that this payment is for \$90,000.00 of the \$97,000.00 because some seeding needs to be done around the new scale. Mr. Williams explained that we are holding \$7,000.00 in payments for the new scale until this is completed.

Mr. Williams stated that we have been using the new scale for approximately 3 weeks now. Mr. Williams stated that everything is going well as far as the scale goes. He noted that there were some glitches with the software and further noted that this has nothing to do with the scale installation. Mr. Williams stated that the software issues have been rectified. Mr. Williams stated that we are currently using both scales and that the process is going well.

Mr. Cannon asked what the service deal is regarding the Software? Mr. Williams stated that the software is through WasteWorks and explained that we have an annual service agreement with them. Mr. Williams noted that we pay approximately \$400.00 per year for the service agreement.

Mr. Williams stated that some of the software glitches had to do with the fact that there are now two computers in the scale house running on the software. Mr. Cannon asked if both of the scales and both of the computers are now communicating with each other properly? Mr. Williams answered, yes. Mr. Williams stated that the issue was that when one of the computers would be shut off, and then restarted, it would not establish the proper connection. Mr. Williams stated that this has been corrected and that he is hopeful that it stays that way. The computers have been running smoothly since the fix. Mrs. Banghart agreed.

Mr. Williams stated that a number of the Landfill Staff have come up and learned how to run the scale. Mr. Williams stated that he feels that this has been covered fairly well and noted that the Board will see this within the new job descriptions. Mr. Williams stated that we will not be discussing the new job descriptions today and noted that we would be discussing them during the May meeting. Mr. Williams stated that all of the revisions have been made to the job descriptions and that they have been distributed to the board for their review. Mr. Williams reiterated that we would not be discussing this today.

Mr. Cannon asked if Mr. Williams was happy with the work that was done during the new scale construction? Mr. Williams expressed great satisfaction regarding the new scale construction. Mr. Williams noted that, of course, there were some issues because of the snow during March, but putting that aside, he feels that the construction company did a very good job.

Mr. Williams stated that the construction company has agreed to hold off on construction activities with the old scale until June, when the township cleanups have finished in the spring.

Mr. Cannon asked if the construction company has stayed within the budget of their bid amount? Mr. Williams answered, yes. Mr. Cannon asked if the cost of the repairs to the old scale are going to change from the bid amount? Mr. Williams answered, no. Mr. Williams stated that the construction company has stayed exactly within their bid amounts.

Mr. Williams stated that when it comes time for the landscaping to be completed, that there will be a small payment due.

Mr. Williams stated that the other large expenditure this month was the annual payment to PERS (Public Employees Retirement System). Mr. Williams stated that this bill was for \$80,222.85. Mrs. Banghart agreed. Mr. Williams stated that this payment is only made once per year.

Mr. Williams stated that everything else is going well financially.

Mr. Williams stated that all of the paperwork has been signed for the new CD at Provident Bank.

Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Williams to go over the process regarding opening the new CD with the Board.

Mr. Williams explained that Lakeland Bank wire transferred the funds from the CD that came due to Provident Bank. Mr. Williams explained that all the paperwork was completed and then he and Mrs. Banghart went to Provident Bank to sign all of the signature cards that needed to be signed. Mr. Cannon stated for the record that Provident Bank had offered us the highest interest rate, coming in with an interest rate of 2.1%. Mr. Williams and Mrs. Banghart agreed.

Mr. Williams explained that one thing that did come up when the wire transfer was made was that we had \$3,534,350.50 dollars in the CD at Lakeland Bank. He explained that \$3,500,000.00 of that money was transferred to the CD at Provident Bank and that the other \$34,350.50 was transferred to our Money Market Account at Provident Bank. Mr. Williams stated that with the Board's permission, he would like to take the \$35,000.00 from the Money Market Account and put it into another CD. Mr. Williams noted that he feels that we would get a better return by doing this. Mr. Williams stated that he would like to put the money into a six-month or nine-month CD to gain a little bit more interest. Mr. Williams noted that this is not something that needs to be discussed today. Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Williams if he knew what the interest rate is for the Money Market Account? Mr. Williams stated that the interest rate is very low and that he thinks that it is less than 1%. Mr. Pryor stated that most banks have an interest rate of under 1% for Money Market Accounts. Mr. Williams stated that if we could open another CD with the funds at an interest rate of around 2% that we could accumulate more interest. Mr. Cannon stated that he would prefer doing a 6-month CD because the CD interest rates are continuing to increase. Mr. Williams stated that the bank said that the longer the CD terms are, the higher the interest rate is. Mr. Cannon stated that on \$35,000.00 it would not make much of a difference. Mr. Williams agreed. Mr. Cannon directed Mr. Williams to follow the same procedure to open the CD that was used to open the new CD at Provident Bank. Mr. Cannon explained that he had received an email from Mr. Williams and then came in and signed the necessary documents. Mr. Cannon noted that four people were involved in the process, so there was transparency.

Mr. Pryor stated that he is fine with this as long as we have enough available funds. Mr. Williams noted that he believes that we need to keep 3 months' worth of funds in liquid funds. Mr. Williams stated that we have enough liquid funds.

Mr. Williams stated that there is something to think about later on, which is that these are the funds for the new cell construction. He explained that this is why we are only doing 6 month CDs. Mr. Williams stated that when the time comes to start paying for the new cell construction that the funds from the CDs will be transferred over into our Money Market Accounts. Mr. Williams noted that this would not need to be done until sometime next year.

Mr. Williams reiterated that financially, we are doing well.

Mr. Pryor stated that he had a couple of quick questions or rather observations, regarding the finances. Mr. Pryor stated that ¼ of the year has elapsed. Mr. Pryor noted that we are down over 42% in waste intake, but that we are only down 13% in revenues. Mr. Pryor noted that this seems decent. Mr. Pryor stated that we show a loss of \$252,926.00. He stated that he knows that we paid some expenses for the entire year up front. Mr. Pryor asked if the loss amount is higher or lower than last month? Mr. Williams stated that if he recalls correctly, last month showed a loss of approximately the same amount. Mr. Williams noted that he does not have the figures from last month in front of him so that he can be certain. Mr. Williams explained that there is a Capital Expenditure of \$96,190.00 as well as the \$80,222.85 for the PERS payment, which are both incorporated as part of the loss amount.

Mr. Williams stated that we should start seeing the loss come down and begin seeing a profit. Mr. Williams explained that March was a slow month because of the snow and that as the weather starts to break we should see an increase in business. Mr. Pryor stated that he would like to see when we start turning a profit.

Mr. Pryor stated regarding the leachate costs, that we are currently way under budget. He noted that currently we have only used 16% of our budget for the leachate, which is very good. Mr. Williams explained that this is because we had snow instead of rain. Mr. Williams stated that rainfall is going to begin to increase and that he thinks that we will see an increase in the leachate costs for next month's bills. Mr. Williams that the leachate tanks are currently pretty full.

Mr. Williams stated that he feels that overall everything is balancing out well.

Mr. Allen stated that he recalls that Mr. Mach had pointed out a discrepancy in the average fee per ton during last month's meeting. Mr. Williams stated that this was correct and that the issue has since been corrected. Mr. Allen asked what the cause of the discrepancy was? Mr. Williams asked Ms. Gild to explain what had happened. Ms. Gild asked the board to look at page 6 of the financial report. Ms. Gild stated that there is a highlighted number in green, which reflects the current year to date revenue. Ms. Gild explained that she made a mistake by not changing this figure for last month's report. Ms. Gild stated that because she did not update this figure that the year to date revenue for last month's report had only showed revenue from January. Ms. Gild explained that she added the lower section of the Excel Worksheet to this page of the report going forward so that the year to date revenue is clearly shown.

Mr. Cannon stated that now that this error has been corrected the trend of the average fee per solid waste is correct and in good standing. Mr. Williams stated that these are really good numbers to see.

Mr. Cannon directed Mr. Williams to give the board an update regarding the outstanding balances of the two haulers, Lovenberg and Gaeta Interior.

Mr. Williams stated that Lovenberg made their interest payment to us in the amount of \$2,760.84. Mr. Williams explained that Lovenberg had based this payment on an invoice that Mrs. Banghart had sent to them in December of 2017. Mr. Williams further explained that Mrs. Banghart has since contacted Lovenberg and notified them that their interest payment was short \$264.16. Mr. Williams stated that Mrs. Banghart sent an email to Lovenberg notifying them of the past due amount of \$264.16 and noted that we received the payment in full on Friday, April 20, 2018. Mr. Williams stated that Lovenberg is now paid in full and no longer owes us any money.

Mr. Williams stated that Gaeta Interior still has an outstanding balance with us. Mr. Williams stated that he had spoken with Mr. Tipton on Friday, April 20, 2018 and that Mr. Tipton had notified him that the

paperwork has been submitted and now we are waiting for the courts to make their ruling. Mr. Williams asked Mr. Mark Peck (General Counsel sitting in for Mr. Tipton) if this was correct? Mr. Peck stated that he believes that the complaint was filed with the courts last week and that it will take some time before we hear anything back. Mr. Peck explained that once a file copy comes back to the law firm, the firm will serve Gaeta Interior with the complaint and that Gaeta Interior then has 35 days to file their answer to the complaint.

Mr. Williams explained that Mr. Peck is, Mark Peck, from Mr. Tipton's office and that he is sitting in for Mr. Tipton today. Mr. Peck thanked Mr. Williams for the introduction.

Mr. Cannon stated that last month the Board had directed Mr. Tipton to only proceed with filing the initial complaint for now, because we will wait to see if we get a response from Gaeta Interior before we continue to chase them down.

Mr. Williams stated that the only hauler that has an outstanding balance with us is Gaeta Interior and noted that all of the other haulers are in good standing.

Mr. Cannon stated that we did not have any comments or complaints regarding the increases to the pricing structure. Mr. Williams stated that we did have one minor complaint.

Mr. Cannon asked if there were any questions regarding the bills? Mr. Cannon stated that we have two large payments going out in this Bill Resolution. Mr. Cannon stated that we are paying \$90,090.00 for the new scale construction, \$6,100 for steps to the new scale and \$80,222.85 to for the annual PERS payment.

Mr. Cannon stated that he likes the way the new number is regarding the year to date revenue from waste brought in, because it is easy to go back and refer to. Mr. Cannon asked if there were any more questions?

Mr. Pryor asked what CP Engineers does for us? Mr. Williams stated that CP Engineers does the reporting and analysis of our groundwater for us. Mr. Pryor asked if this is something that occurs regularly? Mr. Williams answered, yes.

Mr. Cannon called for a motion to approve Resolution R-04-01-18 to pay the bills in the amount of \$411,545.02.

On a motion by, **Mr. Allen**, seconded by, **Mr. Pryor**, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *April 23rd, 2018*.

RESOLUTION

R-04-01-18

To Pay Bills

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. Mach	-	Yes
	Mr. Pryor	-	Yes
	Mr. Urfer	-	Absent
	Mr. Allen	-	Yes
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes

We hereby certify Resolution to Pay Bills in the amount of **\$411,545.02** to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County on the *23rd day of April, 2018.*

Crystal Gild
Recording Secretary

James Williams
Director of Operations

Dated: 04/23/2018

Mr. Williams presented the Amended 2018 Cash Management Plan to the Board.

Mr. Williams stated that as was discussed last month, the 2018 Cash Management Plan still referenced the CFO (Chief Financial Officer). Mr. Williams stated that any reference to the CFO throughout the document has been changed to read Director of Operations and/or Administrative Supervisor. Mr. Williams stated that he had forwarded an amended copy of the 2018 Cash Management Plan to the Board quite some time ago.

Mr. Williams explained that the Cash Management Plan has stayed consistent with the way that it always was and that prior to anything being changed or modified the Board must approve it.

Mr. Williams presented Resolution R-04-02-18 (Resolution To Amend The 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) to the Board for their approval.

Mr. Cannon stated that the changes that were made reflects the practices that we are currently using and noted that we simply had not changed the paperwork to reflect the current practices.

Mr. Cannon asked if anyone had any questions or comments?

Mr. Cannon called for a motion to approve Resolution R-04-02-18 Resolution To Amend The 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.

**POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY
OF WARREN COUNTY**

R-04-02-18

**RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE 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 April 23, 2018 the following shall serve as the cash management plan.

The Director of Operations and/or 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 Director of Operations and/or Administrative Supervisor.

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 PCFAWC Board Members, the Director of Operations and/or Administrative Supervisor (the Designated Officials) of the PCFAWC are 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 Director of Operations and/or Administrative Supervisor 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 Director of Operations and/or Administrative Supervisor.

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 Director of Operations and/or Administrative Supervisor, upon consultation with the PCFAWC Board Members, are 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 Administrative Supervisor.

VII. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

The Director of Operations and/or Administrative Supervisor 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 April 23, 2018 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 Director of Operations and/or Administrative Supervisor 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. Pryor*, seconded by *Mr. Allen*, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County on **April 23, 2018**.

Richard Mach, Secretary

April 23, 2018
Date

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

Dated: 04/23/2018

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

PERSONNEL

Mr. Williams presented Agenda Items A-2 (Amended Personnel Policy Manual, 2018 PCFA Organization Chart) and A-3 (Personnel Policy Manual, Section 8, Hours of Work) to the Board. Mr. Williams noted that the Organization Chart will need to be amended again to remove Mr. Urfer's name. He stated that we would make this amendment once a new Member is appointed to the Board. Mr. Cannon agreed.

Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Pryor for his opinion regarding the Amended Organization Chart. Mr. Pryor stated that he looked through several different Organization Charts on the internet and he found that they all cause some sort of confusion along the way. Mr. Pryor stated that what is being presented today is probably as good as it gets. Mr. Cannon agreed. Mr. Pryor stated that he has no objections to the Amended Organization Chart. Mr. Cannon agreed.

Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Allen for his opinion regarding the Amended Organization Chart. Mr. Allen stated that he is satisfied with it.

Mr. Allen asked Mr. Mach for his opinion regarding the Amended Organization Chart. Mr. Mach stated that the Organization Chart now reflects the way that business flows through the PCFA. Mr. Mach stated that he is satisfied with it as well.

Mr. Williams explained that Agenda Item A-3 was presented to the Board last month and that no changes have been made to it since. Mr. Williams stated that A-3 updates Section 8 of the PCFA Personnel Manual regarding hours of work. Mr. Williams explained that A-3 reflects the current practices regarding hours of work and lunch breaks for all PCFA staff. Mr. Williams stated that we have been adhering to these schedules, but that they had not been added to the PCFA Personnel Manual until now.

Mr. Cannon stated that this update to the PCFA Personnel Manual is important going forward because of the updated job descriptions that will be put into place once they are approved. Mr. Cannon noted that this also helps with some parts of the PCFA Merit Bonus Policy that is set to be approved. Mr. Cannon stated that with all of this combined, employees would understand what their jobs are and what is required of them.

Mr. Allen asked Mr. Williams if this was something that he found while going through the job descriptions? Mr. Allen stated that he does not remember previously discussing this. Mr. Williams stated that we had a discussion regarding this during the March meeting and that we held off on approving it until the Organization Chart was amended.

Mr. Williams presented Resolution R-04-03-18 (Resolution to Amend the PCFAWC Personnel Policy Manual) to the Board for their approval.

Mr. Cannon called for a motion to approve Resolution R-04-03-18, Resolution to Amend the PCFAWC Personnel Policy Manual as presented in A-2 (Amended Personnel Policy Manual, 2018 PCFA Organization Chart) and A-3 (Personnel Policy Manual, Section 8, Hours of Work).

On a motion by, **Mr. Pryor**, seconded by, **Mr. Mach**, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *April 23rd, 2018*.

R E S O L U T I O N

R-04-03-18

Amendments to the PCFAWC Personnel Policy Manual

WHEREAS, the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County (the “Authority”) has a need to amend the Personnel Policy Manual; and

WHEREAS, Section 2. Organization of Authority and Staff, subsection B. Organization Chart, as amended and referred to as A-3, and Section 8. Hours of Work, as amended and referred to as A-4, and attached hereto will be the official documents of the Authority; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Authority that the above referenced documents become the official documents of the Authority until further amended by resolution of the Authority.

ROLL CALL:

Mr. Mach	-	Yes
Mr. Pryor	-	Yes
Mr. Urfer	-	Absent
Mr. Allen	-	Yes
Mr. Cannon	-	Yes

I hereby certify the above to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County on the date above mentioned.

Recording Secretary
Crystal Gild

Dated: 04/23/2018

Mr. Williams presented Agenda Item A-4 (Merit Bonus Policy) to the Board. Mr. Williams noted that we had discussed this last month and had decided to table it for this month.

Mr. Williams stated that Mr. Allen had drafted this Merit Bonus Policy for the PCFA.

Mr. Allen stated regarding the percentage figures used to calculate the bonus amount, that he just threw those numbers in there and that they can be modified.

Mr. Pryor stated that he had some thoughts regarding the bonus amounts. He noted that his opinion regarding this may not be popular amongst the Board. Mr. Pryor proposed throwing a fixed number in for the bonus amount instead of using salary percentages. Mr. Pryor suggested a fixed amount for employees who are rated "very good" of \$1,500.00 and a fixed amount of \$2,500.00 for employees who are rated "outstanding". Mr. Pryor stated that this would allow for equal bonuses for the employees as opposed to the "rich getting richer".

Mr. Pryor stated that he considers Mr. Williams to be part of management and that he would like to break him out from the policy. Mr. Pryor stated that the amount of the bonus for Mr. Williams and whether or not he receives a bonus should be at the discretion of the Board. Mr. Allen stated that he feels that all of the bonuses would be based on the discretion of the Board. Mr. Pryor explained that the policy states whether or not we give a bonus, but that he thinks that it is always good business practice to separate out management. Mr. Pryor stated that Mr. Williams should have input on all of the other staff's reviews and bonuses.

Mr. Peck stated that before the Board continues to discuss the Merit Bonus Policy, that his firm did review this policy and found one inconsistency that they felt the Board needs to rationalize. Mr. Peck stated that if you look at the second paragraph of the policy, that it makes it clear that it is up to the complete discretion of the Board as to whether to award a bonus, the amount, timing of the bonus and whom to award the bonuses too. Mr. Peck stated that this paragraph also makes it clear that there is no guarantee of any Merit Bonus.

Mr. Peck stated that if you look under the Bonus Criteria section of the policy, that it discusses the two-tiered bonus system and states that "A two-tier bonus system shall be applied as follows:". Mr. Peck continued, stating that the policy continues on to say that "Employees who are rated "outstanding" in three or more review categories qualify for an annual merit bonus award of four percent of their annual wage/salary".

Mr. Peck stated that these two areas of the Merit Bonus Policy seem to contradict each other, because on one hand you are saying that the bonus is completely at the discretion of the Board and then within the Bonus Criteria section it almost looks like the bonuses are an absolute based on the ranking of employees within the review categories. Mr. Peck recommended that additional language be added to the Bonus Criteria section of the PCFA Merit Bonus Policy.

Mr. Pryor stated that he is in complete agreement with Mr. Peck. Mr. Pryor noted that he might have not seen the problem quite like Mr. Peck had. Mr. Pryor stated that the way he views it, is that if we are having a bad year, there may be a bonus or there may not be any bonuses at all for anyone, but if any bonuses are given this is the policy that the bonuses will be based upon. Mr. Pryor noted that this was his interpretation when reading the policy in its entirety. Mr. Peck stated that he believes that this is the spirit of the policy, but that he feels that adding a sentence under Bonus Criteria would make sure that things were entirely clear. Mr. Peck suggested adding the statement "If the Board determines

to award bonuses, this is the criteria by which the bonuses shall be awarded". Mr. Pryor stated that he agrees 100% with this.

Mr. Allen stated that the very first sentence of the Merit Bonus Policy states that bonuses will only be awarded if the Board decides to do so. Mr. Allen quoted the section of the Merit Bonus Policy that reads, "The PCFA Board of Directors annually pays a merit bonus to eligible employees based on the PCFA's financial performance." Mr. Peck stated that his firm believes that the policy would be cleaner if we stipulate something similar to this under the Bonus Criteria section of the Merit Bonus Policy. Mr. Cannon asked if we should simply just repeat the first sentence of the PCFA Merit Bonus Policy in the Bonus Criteria section of the policy? Mr. Peck stated that he would prefer to see something along the lines of "If the Board of Directors decides to award bonuses, this is the criteria that must be met in order to receive a bonus." Mr. Cannon stated that this sounds good to him.

Mr. Pryor stated that he could see how someone could interpret the policy in the way that Mr. Peck and his firm had. Mr. Pryor stated that once a Merit Bonus Policy is set, it is clearly laid out as to who is and is not eligible for a bonus. Mr. Allen stated that he is a bit confused. Mr. Pryor stated that if the PCFA chooses to have or not to have a bonus for any given year, then the criteria for receiving a bonus is clearly laid out. Mr. Pryor noted that if we have a lousy year, that there will not be any bonuses and no one will get a bonus. Mr. Pryor stated that if it were determined that bonuses would be given for a particular year that the bonuses will be distributed in accordance with this policy. Mr. Cannon agreed. Mr. Pryor stated that there are no exceptions to this policy and that we cannot deviate from this policy and pick and choose who does and does not receive a bonus. Mr. Cannon and Mr. Allen both agreed.

Mr. Pryor stated that the only other point that he is trying to make is that Mr. Williams is part of management and that he would like to see him removed from the employees that get bonuses based on the criteria set forth in this policy. Mr. Pryor stated that he would like bonuses for Mr. Williams be based on criteria set forth by the Board for him specifically and based on the total discretion of the Board. Mr. Cannon stated that he does not have a problem with this.

Mr. Cannon stated that he does have a problem with placing a specified monetary amount for the bonuses within the policy. Mr. Cannon stated that this theoretically sets a basement number for the bonuses. Mr. Pryor explained that the policy currently determines the bonus amount based on a fixed percentage of an employee's wage/salary. Mr. Pryor explained that if you look at the salaries of all of the employees that the bonus amounts would certainly vary. Mr. Allen stated that he had thought about having a fixed figure for the bonuses when he initially began drafting this policy. Mr. Pryor stated that he does not feel strongly about this and noted that the figures of \$1,500.00 and \$2,500.00 that he had suggested were based upon his review of the salaries of all the employees. Mr. Allen noted that when he drafted this policy, he did not have access to the salaries of the employees. Mr. Cannon and Mr. Pryor both affirmed that they were aware of this. Mr. Pryor stated that if the Board would prefer to leave the percentages in the policy, that he does not have a problem with it.

Mr. Allen stated that he would like to take a look at the employee salaries and see what kind of numbers the Board can come up with. Mr. Pryor agreed. Mr. Pryor stated that the trouble with using percentages for bonuses is that, the rich get richer. Mr. Allen stated that he feels that the bonus amounts should be a fixed number and not a percentage. Mr. Cannon agreed.

Mr. Cannon stated that he does not want to have a minimum bonus amount. Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Pryor had suggested some figures, but that he does not feel that we should set a minimum bonus

amount. Mr. Williams stated that he agrees. Mr. Cannon stated that the Board might want to give a \$500.00 bonus to someone for some reason. Mr. Pryor stated that this is not what the policy says currently. Mr. Pryor noted that within the current proposed policy that the bonuses are based on a fixed percentage. Mr. Cannon stated that he understands this. Mr. Cannon explained that if we chose to base bonuses upon a dollar figure rather than a fixed percentage he does not want a minimum bonus amount set.

Mr. Williams stated that the awarding of bonuses would begin with how the employee evaluations go. Mr. Williams stated that if the evaluation were below “very good” or “outstanding”, then no bonuses would be awarded to employees that have not been ranked in these categories. Mr. Cannon agreed. Mr. Cannon stated that this is not the issue at hand. Mr. Allen stated that we are trying to determine what bonus amounts to give to an employee if they are evaluated as “very good” or “outstanding”. Mr. Allen stated that currently the policy states that the bonus amount will be based on a fixed percentage of an employee’s salary. Mr. Cannon stated that he understands this. Mr. Allen stated that he is not sure why you would want to deviate from this. Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Pryor had suggested not using percentages to determine the bonus amounts, but rather using dollar figures instead. Mr. Cannon stated that if we decide to base bonus amounts on dollar figures that he does not want a minimum bonus amount set within the policy. Mr. Cannon explained that he does not want the situation to be that if an employee qualifies for a bonus that they are required to receive a bonus of \$1,500.00, \$2,000.00 or whatever the amount may be.

Mr. Allen stated that the bonus for an employee could either be based on a percentage of the employee’s salary or a fixed amount. Mr. Allen stated that there is no possible deviation from this. Mr. Cannon stated that now Mr. Allen is stating that bonuses can be based on either a salary percentage or a fixed amount. Mr. Allen agreed.

Mr. Pryor stated that some employees would receive \$1,000.00 based on a percentage and others would receive more money. Mr. Allen stated that if we want to consider basing the bonus amounts on a set figure, the Board would need to review the salaries of each employee and determine a fair amount. Mr. Cannon stated that he prefers using percentages for the bonus calculations. Mr. Pryor explained that two employees may be ranked with the same performance and one would get less money and one would get more, because one employee has a greater salary than the other does.

Mr. Allen stated that he agrees with the points that Mr. Pryor had made and that he feels that it may be appropriate separate the Administrator from the other employees.

Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Peck if the Board could exceed the bonus amounts laid out in the Merit Bonus Policy if they wanted to? Mr. Cannon asked if an employee met all of the criteria in both tiers of the bonus criteria, if they could only be awarded the set bonus percentage amount or if the Board could choose to award the employee more? Mr. Williams suggested removing the percentages and replacing them with the wording “bonus amounts will be determined and awarded at the discretion of the Board.” Mr. Cannon, Mr. Pryor and Mr. Allen stated that doing this would be deviating from the system entirely.

Mr. Allen asked Mr. Peck for his thoughts regarding separating the Administrator from the other employees? Mr. Peck stated that he is not “a labor guy” and that he would hate to “punt” on this, so he would say that this is a policy question. Mr. Peck stated that he does not know how someone in that position would typically be treated in this position. Mr. Peck noted that this is not something that

he has ever considered or come across. Mr. Peck stated that he thinks that it is a policy decision that is up to the Board.

Mr. Pryor stated that he would like to explain why he wants to do this. Mr. Pryor noted that it might have been better to discuss this during Executive Session.

Mr. Pryor stated that we have a Manager; the Board is not going to be filling out evaluation forms regarding his performance. Mr. Pryor stated that the bonus for the Manager could be determined on a different basis. Mr. Pryor provided an example, saying that if this expansion goes well, the Manager will be given a lot of the credit and if the expansion goes badly, the manager would be given a lot of the blame and the Manager's bonus would dependent this. Mr. Pryor stated that he would rather do this, than add up a bunch of evaluation forms.

Mr. Pryor stated that he feels that the goals of the Manager should be different and bigger than the goals of the day-to-day employees.

Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Smith has something to add regarding this. Mr. Smith stated that he feels that the categories for "outstanding" are based upon an employee review. Mr. Smith stated that unless the Board is going to do a review for the manager, they do not have any criteria set as a basis for a bonus. Mr. Smith stated that this is why he feels that the Board may want to state in the Merit Bonus Policy that the Board may decide to award a bonus based upon the year's performance. Mr. Smith stated that unless the Board completes an Executive Director review determining if the criteria of the Bonus Policy was met, there is no basis for awarding a bonus to the Executive Director.

Mr. Allen stated his agreement. Mr. Pryor stated that he believes that the Board is going to review the Executive Director's performance, but that the review is going to be qualitative. Mr. Peck stated that within the Bonus Criteria, it discusses the evaluations which are to be performed by the Director of Operations. Mr. Peck suggested adding another item after item number three, which could read as follows, "A merit bonus for the Director of Operations shall be independently determined by the Board." Mr. Allen, Mr. Mach and Mr. Pryor all stated that they like Mr. Peck's suggestion. Mr. Peck asked who is going to evaluate the Director? Everyone answered, the Board. Mr. Allen stated that he feels the performance criteria applied to the Executive Director is going to be different, which is why he suggested this in the first place.

Mr. Smith stated that the Executive Director's review would have to be completed during the Executive Session, which would mean that the Board would have to provide a Rice Notice to the Executive Director. Mr. Pryor stated that this is okay.

Mr. Cannon stated that there seems to be a consensus amongst the Board to add a number four to the bonus criteria as discussed above.

Mr. Cannon asked if there are actual percentage amounts noted in the draft PCFA Merit Bonus Policy. Mr. Mach, Mr. Williams and Mr. Pryor all answered, yes. Mr. Mach stated that number two states a percentage amount of 2% and number 3 states a percentage amount of 4%.

Mr. Mach asked if we needed to clarify that this is a bonus and that it is in addition to the annual salary increase. Mr. Pryor, Mr. Allen and Mr. Cannon stated that this is a separate bonus, which does not add to the employees' base salary. Mr. Cannon stated that this is not a convolution of the annual raise and noted that the bonus and the annual raise have nothing to do with each other.

Mr. Cannon stated that most bonuses are given in March and noted that most corporations give bonuses out in March. Mr. Mach agreed.

Mr. Mach asked if the PCFA Board is a Board of Directors or a Board of Commissioners? Mr. Mach stated that he was referring to the first line in the draft Merit Bonus Policy. Mr. Williams stated that he has heard both terms used in reference to the PCFA Board. Mr. Pryor stated that we should go with whatever it states in the Statute. Mr. Peck stated that he had the same question and that he referenced the flow chart, which offered no help. Mr. Pryor noted that the Board might simply be members and nothing else. Mr. Williams stated that he believes that at a minimum, it is members, but many different words have been used. Mr. Williams stated that he would prefer using the term, Board Members and noted that he does not mean that in a negative way. Mr. Pryor stated that the Statute should be referenced to determine the proper title. Mr. Mach asked if this was a commission? Mr. Williams and Mr. Pryor both answered, no and stated that this is an Authority. Mr. Williams noted that the PCFA is an Authority with members.

Mr. Cannon stated that he believes that we have cleaned up all of the issues regarding the PCFA Merit Bonus Policy. Mr. Cannon stated that we should clear up what Counsel had suggested, so that we are categorically clear with the bonus procedure. Mr. Cannon stated that he is aware that the first sentence states that “The PCFA Board of Directors annually pays a merit bonus to eligible employees based on the PCFA’s financial performance.”, but that he thinks that this sentence should be repeated under the Bonus Criteria section. Mr. Allen agreed.

Mr. Mach stated that he feels that first sentence of the policy should be changed to read as follows, “The PCFA Board of Directors may annually pay a merit bonus to eligible employees based on the PCFA’s financial performance.” Mr. Allen and Mr. Pryor agreed. Mr. Cannon agreed as well. Mr. Peck stated that doing this makes a lot of sense. Mr. Peck stated that if the first sentence of the policy says, “The PCFA Board of Directors may annually pay a merit bonus to eligible employees based on the PCFA’s financial performance.” then a sentence should be inserted under the Bonus Criteria that reads “If the PCFA Board decides to pay merit bonuses, the following criteria must be met.” Mr. Cannon and Mr. Pryor both agreed with Mr. Peck’s suggestion.

Mr. Allen asked Mr. Peck if he would add the fourth number regarding the Executive Director to the policy, under the Bonus Criteria section? Mr. Peck answered, yes and stated that number four would read, “Any merit bonus for the Director of Operations shall be independently determined by the PCFA Board.” Mr. Allen asked Mr. Peck if he would handle making all of the proposed amendments to the policy? Mr. Peck stated that he would do this afternoon if he were sent a copy of the policy as a Word Document. Mr. Williams stated that he would send Mr. Peck a copy of the policy.

Mr. Allen asked if we should vote on the PCFA Merit Bonus Policy, with the amendments that were discussed, today? Mr. Peck stated that the Board could vote on it as amended or we could wait and vote on it during the meeting next month. Mr. Cannon stated that he would go along with the opinion of the rest of the Board. Mr. Pryor stated that it might be better to wait until next month to vote on this, so that the language of the document is in front of the Board. Mr. Mach agreed.

Mr. Pryor stated, regarding the percentages, that he is not going to argue about it. Mr. Mach stated that there is not an urgency to approve the PCFA Merit Bonus Policy.

Mr. Cannon stated that Resolution R-04-04-18 (Resolution to Adopt the PCFA Merit Bonus Policy) would be tabled until the meeting next month. Mr. Pryor agreed. Mr. Pryor stated, regarding the timing of when to give the bonuses, which he will go along with what the Board decides.

Mr. Cannon stated that Counsel would make the changes to the draft PCFA Merit Bonus Policy as discussed today. Mr. Cannon stated that upon review of the amended policy the Board would approve the policy next month.

PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Cannon stated that there are no presentations today.

Mr. Cannon stated that while we are on the presentations, he would like to discuss something that would eventually end up being a presentation.

Mr. Cannon stated that last week he had a discussion with Mr. Williams regarding what was discussed in depth last month concerning hiring an overseer for the Landfill Expansion Construction, which will be coming up. Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Williams had informed him that it would take Cornerstone approximately four to five months to complete the Construction Plans. Mr. Williams agreed.

Mr. Cannon noted that meetings are going to be a bit funky, because we are down to only four Board members.

Mr. Cannon stated that his suggestion is for Mr. Williams to informally call some of the companies that we feel would be either best or eligible to bid on becoming an overseer to the construction. Mr. Cannon stated that he would like to possibly have these companies come in during the May and June meetings to present to the Board. Mr. Cannon stated that we would clearly convey to the companies exactly what we are looking for. Mr. Cannon noted that this would fall under Mr. Pryor's expertise. Mr. Cannon also noted that he would hate for us to be in the position come June, that we have just received bids back and we are blindly choosing a company based on the bids alone.

Mr. Cannon stated that he wanted to discuss this today, because we have a light meeting agenda. Mr. Cannon stated that he would like to discuss what we could accomplish ahead of time to be proactive, by reaching out to some companies. Mr. Cannon noted that Mr. Pryor and Mr. Williams most likely have the best ideas as to which companies to reach out to. Mr. Cannon stated that he wants to find out if any of these companies would be interested in bidding for the overseer position and if they would like to make a presentation to the Board.

Mr. Allen stated that he feels that this is a good idea.

Mr. Williams stated that included in the handouts that he had distributed to the Board earlier, is a draft letter that was composed to be sent out to firms that we had decided to choose. Mr. Williams stated that the QA/QC (Quality Assurance/Quality Control) proposals are included in the packet as well, for when the time comes. Mr. Williams noted that the proposal depicts what we would be asking the Engineers to do for us. Mr. Williams stated that at this time, the proposals are just for the Board to review. Mr. Williams stated that his initial thought, after speaking to Mr. Cannon last week, was having firms come in and give a presentation to the Board, the drafted letter in your handouts

this morning may be the letter that we send out to the firms. Mr. Williams stated that we are not looking for any answers for this today, since the information was only given to the board today. Mr. Williams asked the Board to review the letter that he drafted.

Mr. Cannon stated that the draft letter seems a bit long-winded to him. Mr. Cannon noted that he believes that Mr. Pryor had said that he would be on a sub-committee with Mr. Williams regarding this. Mr. Pryor stated that he does not feel that the draft letter is long-winded. Mr. Pryor noted that we would reword paragraph two slightly and make a couple other minor changes. Mr. Williams stated that this draft letter was put together with very short notice and that it is up for review.

Mr. Pryor stated that he believes that we would need to have a PE (Professional Engineer) involved, which would make this a professional service and give us a lot more flexibility. Mr. Pryor stated that he likes that this is called a letter of interest and qualifications. Mr. Pryor stated that we would be able to hear some different opinions from the firms and that they may be apples and oranges, but maybe the apple is the wrong approach and the orange is what we are looking for.

Mr. Pryor stated that the firms would be able to provide us with input and that we would be able to tell which firms have done a job like this before and who has not.

Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Pryor to provide Mr. Williams with the changes to the letter that he proposes. Mr. Pryor stated that he would do so. Mr. Cannon stated that he would like to get the letter sent out soon. Mr. Cannon stated that this should help eliminate some of the past problems that we had discussed last month.

Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Mach for his opinion. Mr. Mach stated his agreement.

Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Allen for his opinion. Mr. Allen stated his agreement. Mr. Allen noted that Mr. Cannon has been saying that we are looking for an overseer, but what we should be calling it is an Independent Project Manager. Mr. Cannon agreed and noted that he is not an official title kind of person. Mr. Allen stated that Mr. Smith had mentioned last month, someone who he had thought had done a great job on a project. Mr. Allen asked Mr. Smith what this project was? Mr. Smith stated that he was referring to the expansion of the college. Mr. Smith stated that he is not sure that the person he is referring to is a PE, but that he is very well versed in the components of construction. Mr. Smith stated that the person in reference had done a very good job of overseeing that the work being done was consistent with the plans. Mr. Allen stated that it would be nice to have someone with this type of experience under his belt. Mr. Allen noted that a college expansion is different from what we are doing here.

Mr. Williams stated that we would need a licensed PE to be the Independent Project Manager of the Landfill Expansion Construction. Mr. Pryor stated that he agrees with Mr. Williams. Mr. Cannon agreed as well. Mr. Williams stated that our project is a massive project. Mr. Cannon stated that he agrees.

Mr. Williams stated that the Quality Control piece of our project is going to cost anywhere from \$300,000.00 to \$500,000.00. Mr. Williams stated that these prices are based on his previous experience.

Mr. Pryor asked what the cost of the first phase of construction is? Mr. Williams answered that we could be looking at a cost of approximately \$8,000,000.00 for the first phase of construction. Mr.

Williams stated that this is because there is a lot of infrastructure, such as the MSE Berm and so on. Mr. Pryor stated that the Quality Control could cost more than \$500,000.00 depending on this.

Mr. Cannon asked if Mr. Pryor was good to go with this? Mr. Pryor answered, yes and stated that he would give Mr. Williams his input regarding this. Mr. Williams asked if the Board would like to have a final look at this letter before it goes out, after changes are made? Mr. Cannon stated that he would like to review the letter at the May meeting, especially because the May meeting was moved up and is only 3 weeks away. Mr. Pryor stated that he agrees with this and noted that there will be plenty of time to review any changes that he asks to be made to the letter. Mr. Cannon stated that he does not think that we will get any better expertise regarding this, than that of Mr. Pryor. Mr. Cannon stated that he is 100% fine with whatever Mr. Williams and Mr. Pryor decide on for the language of the letter. Mr. Cannon stated that he wants to get the letter sent out as soon as possible and that maybe there will be an eager beaver who would like to come and present to us at the May meeting.

Mr. Cannon stated that he would like to spread the presentations out over a couple of months, so that we can do a thorough comparison of the presented information.

Mr. Williams stated that he would work with Mr. Pryor to get the letter out as soon as possible.

Mr. Smith stated that we might want to include in the letter that the Board will entertain a performance bonus for early completion of the job and/or coming in under budget on the job. Mr. Smith stated that we might want to offer this type of flexibility while asking firms for their bids. Mr. Smith stated that the County did this on the college job and that the job was completed ahead of schedule and under the bid price. Mr. Cannon stated that we would put something like this with the bid when we advertise it and that he did not think it was something to include in the letter of interest and qualifications. Mr. Smith asked if we are doing an RFP and not a bid at this time?

Mr. Pryor stated that typically a clause like the one that Mr. Smith suggested, is often included in the Construction Contract. Mr. Williams agreed. Mr. Pryor stated that he is aware that Mr. Smith gives a lot of credit to the construction manager to get the results that he did. Mr. Pryor stated that if the contractor is unwilling to come in under budget or complete the job early, he is going to use his entire contract period to complete the job. Mr. Pryor stated that this could be discussed later. Mr. Cannon stated that he does not think that this should be done now. Mr. Pryor agreed.

REPORTS

None.

FACILITIES/RECYCLING

Mr. Williams stated that there is nothing further to discuss regarding Treatment Plant Operations. Mr. Williams stated that we have not heard anything back from the DEP regarding the Pilot Study with the PRMUA. Mr. Williams stated that it is his understanding that this is still under review.

Mr. Williams stated regarding Landfill Operations that everything seems to be running smooth and that there are currently no issues.

Mr. Williams stated regarding the Landfill Expansion Application that all of the paperwork has been submitted to the DEP and that the DEP has received it. Mr. Williams stated that all three parties, Warren County, the PCFA and the State of New Jersey, signed the paperwork.

Mr. Williams stated that the last discussion he had with Cornerstone was a couple of weeks ago. Mr. Williams stated that Cornerstone had been given a little bit of a timeline from either Mr. Anthony Fontana or Ms. Mary Jo Aiello of the NJDEP. Mr. Williams stated that the DEP had told Cornerstone that they did have all of the paperwork and that it would take them approximately two weeks to get an advertisement put together, stating that a draft permit is going to be issued. Mr. Williams stated that the advertisement needs to be made available for two weeks and then the draft permit would be issued and then made available for public comment for 30 days. Mr. Williams also stated that there would be a 15-day public comment period after this and then after this time the DEP would issue the final permit. Mr. Williams stated that we are approximately six to eight weeks from receiving our draft/final permit from the DEP. Mr. Williams noted that we could receive our draft/final permit either the beginning of June or the end of June, depending on public comments.

Mr. Allen asked if there is a public event for public comment? Mr. Williams explained that there may be a public hearing and noted that there had been public hearings in the past regarding other projects that we have done here. Mr. Williams also noted that when the project being done was a major modification, there was no public hearing. Mr. Williams stated that he believes that it is at the DEP's discretion to determine whether there will be a public hearing. Mr. Williams stated that a public hearing had been held in the PCFA meeting room years ago regarding to a major expansion that we were doing. Mr. Williams stated that the PCFA is not involved in the public hearing and noted that the State had used our building for the hearing and allowed the public to come. Mr. Williams noted that he does not believe that many people showed up for the hearing. Mr. Williams stated that this occurred many years ago.

Mr. Smith stated as an FYI, that the County's position is that they are not going to complete any surveying or subdivision work until the permit is approved. Mr. Smith noted that this was one of the contingencies of the agreement. Mr. Smith stated that if the permit is not granted, the County is not giving up the property. Mr. Cannon stated that since the PCFA is paying for the surveying and subdivision work, the PCFA would decide on when this would be done. He asked Mr. Smith if this was correct. Mr. Smith stated that Mr. Cannon was right, but explained that the County or the PCFA is not taking any action until the permit is issued. Mr. Allen asked if the State had agreed to this? Mr. Smith answered, yes. Mr. Smith emphasized that the agreed upon arrangement is contingent upon the permit being granted. Mr. Cannon agreed.

Mr. Allen asked if the permit would delineate any of the subdivision requirements? Mr. Smith stated that the Solid Waste Management Plan needs to be amended to redescribe the footprint of the Landfill. Mr. Smith stated that there are many steps that need to be taken for us to get to that point. Mr. Smith stated that we cannot describe what the Landfill footprint is going to be until the surveying and subdivisions are done, so that we have the amended blocks and lots. Mr. Smith stated that this is why we had and M.O.A. put into place.

Mr. Williams stated that it is his understanding in regards to the way that the permit will be issued, is that the State will refer back to the documents regarding the items that need to be addressed as part of a condition for the issuing of the permit.

Mr. Williams stated that we had received the results from our Topographic Survey last week. Mr. Williams stated that the results from the survey tell us how much air space we used last year. Mr. Williams noted that we used a lot of air space last year. Mr. Williams stated that based on the results from the Topographic Survey and if we continued our waste intake in the same amounts that we did last year, we would be out of air space come December of 2020. Mr. Williams noted that we did cut back how much waste we would be accepting from our haulers this year. Mr. Williams stated that since we did reduce our waste intake for this year, we will take a look at the Topographic Survey next year to see if we need to reduce our intake even more next year. Mr. Williams stated that the decision would also factor in how we get through the winter months and what happens in the spring in regards to getting a contractor on board to begin construction.

Mr. Cannon stated that we are at where we thought we would be. Mr. Williams agreed.

Mr. Allen asked if Mr. Williams is saying that we have less than 24 months before we run out of air space? Mr. Williams answered, yes.

Mr. Mach asked Mr. Williams how many cubic yards of air space we used last year. Mr. Williams stated that he does not recall the exact amount, but that he knows that it was over 200,000 cubic yards. Mr. Mach asked if this includes cover material as well? Mr. Williams answered, yes.

Mr. Williams stated that when it came time to renew the hauler contracts this year, that we did scale back how much waste they could bring in for the year. Mr. Williams noted that we should see a pretty significant reduction in the amount of air space that we use this year. Mr. Cannon stated that the amount of air space used last year was expected. Mr. Williams agreed and noted that we knew that this was coming.

Mr. Williams stated that we need to make a decision regarding what we are going to do for the design and bid documents. Mr. Williams stated that we need to decide whom we are going to use to put these documents together. Mr. Williams stated that he is aware that we had discussed this during Executive Session last month. Mr. Williams stated that we are getting to the point that if we are going to use Cornerstone to put together the design and the bid documents, that we need to make a decision in regards to asking them to give us a price for this. Mr. Williams stated that this needs to be done relatively quickly, so that Cornerstone can begin with the process before the permit is issued.

Mr. Cannon asked if Mr. Pryor would like to discuss this during Executive Session? Mr. Pryor stated that we should probably discuss this during Executive Session. Mr. Cannon agreed. Mr. Allen asked Mr. Pryor if this is something that a Project Engineer would be of value to help us with? Mr. Pryor answered, yes. Mr. Pryor stated that the Engineer would be involved in the bid process, but we need the design and bid documents first. Mr. Pryor stated that we would discuss this further during Executive Session.

There were no updates regarding the H2S Removal System or the Solar Panel Project.

Mr. Williams presented Agenda Item A-5 (2018 Waste Disposal Fee Schedule) to the Board.

Mr. Williams stated that there are two contracts that need to be approved today.

Mr. Williams stated that as discussed during last month's meeting the requested changes had been made to the D&N Animal Recovery contract by Counsel.

Mr. Williams stated that contracts need to be approved for 2018 for the following haulers: D&N Animal Recovery and Hardwick Township.

Mr. Williams asked the Board to approve these contracts today.

Mr. Allen asked if D&N's contract had been revised? Mr. Williams answered, yes.

Mr. Cannon stated that the changes that were made to the contract ease any concerns that he had.

Mr. Pryor asked if number seven within the contract is the only change? Mr. Williams answered, yes. Mr. Pryor stated that the changes to the contract satisfy his concerns as well.

Mr. Cannon called for a motion to approve 2018 Waste Disposal contracts between the Pollution Control Financing Authority and the following haulers: D&N Animal Recovery and Hardwick Township.

On a motion by **Mr. Mach**, seconded by, **Mr. Pryor**, the Pollution Control Financing Authority entered into a contract with the following haulers: D&N Animal Recovery and Hardwick Township at a meeting held on *April 23rd, 2018*.

ROLL CALL:

Mr. Mach	-	Yes
Mr. Pryor	-	Yes
Mr. Urfer	-	Absent
Mr. Allen	-	Yes
Mr. Cannon	-	Yes

Mr. Williams stated that he has two final items to go over and noted that these items were included in the handouts that he had distributed today.

Mr. Williams stated that he has provided the Board with the revised employee job descriptions for them to review. Mr. Williams stated that the revised job descriptions include all of the different cross training that has been completed.

Mr. Cannon stated that since the Board had only received these job descriptions today, that they are for the Board to review. Mr. Cannon asked if Counsel had been provided with these as well? Mr. Peck answered, no. Mr. Williams stated that he had spoken with Mr. Tipton and that Mr. Tipton had said that he did not need copies of the job descriptions. Mr. Williams stated that he would be happy to provide them to council anyway. Mr. Cannon stated that he would like Counsel to have a copy of the job descriptions and that he would like Counsel to review them and make sure that there is nothing included in the job descriptions, which should not be there. Mr. Cannon asked Counsel to review the job descriptions at their leisure and to get back to us if they have any comments or concerns. Mr.

Cannon stated that he is certain that we will receive feedback from counsel. Mr. Cannon stated that the Board should review the job descriptions and provide Mr. Williams with any comments or concerns that they may have.

Mr. Cannon stated that the job descriptions will be discussed during next month's meeting and noted that the discussion may need to be held during Executive Session.

Mr. Williams stated that he also provided the Board with information regarding the Electronics Recycling Event that had been held at the PCFA on Sunday, April 15, 2018.

Mr. Williams stated that he had sent the Board an email notifying them that we had over 850 vehicles come to the event. Mr. Williams stated that the event was very well attended as he had noted in his email. Mr. Williams stated that we had to stay open for an additional hour and a half because of the amount of residents in line. Mr. Cannon stated that 17 trailer loads of electronics had been collected. Mr. Williams stated that we were working at a rate of two and a half cars per minute during the event and noted that this is extraordinary. Mr. Williams stated that he believes that there are two trailer loads yet to be accounted for. Mr. Williams stated that 16 to 18, 53-foot tractor-trailer loads of electronics were collected during the event.

Mr. Williams stated that he and Mr. Cannon had discussed speaking with the vendor and see if we can get another event setup towards the end of the summer or early fall. Mr. Williams stated that they want to do this before having any discussions with the any vendor regarding putting a permanent collection location at our facility. Mr. Williams explained that this would allow us to see how many electronics are still out there, that need to be disposed of.

Mr. Williams stated that we had expected to have many electronics brought in during the April 15, 2018 event.

Mr. Williams stated that for the most part there were no issues, but noted that there were maybe six to ten individuals who were disgruntled. Mr. Cannon stated that considering how busy it was that this is a very small percentage of unhappy residents. Mr. Williams agreed. Mr. Williams stated that for the most part the residents were very happy that we had the event, did not mind the long wait and were hopeful that we would be holding another collection event or establishing a permanent drop off location.

Mr. Pryor stated that he came to the event and left. He noted that he did not leave disgruntled, but that he sized up the situation and decided to leave.

Mr. Pryor stated that one observation, he had was, that he came down Mt Pisgah Ave and noted that most residents were coming in from the access road. Mr. Pryor stated that there is a stop sign at the end of the access road, so it was literally, as though people could come down Mr. Pisgah Ave, gridlock the intersection and not let anyone coming from the access road line. Mr. Pryor stated that if a situation like this occurs again, where we are going to have such massively attended event, that we could probably use some sort of traffic control.

Mr. Cannon asked if there was a stop sign at the end of Mt Pisgah Ave previously? Mr. Williams and Mr. Pryor both answered, no. Mr. Allen asked if there is a stop sign there now? Everyone answered, no. Mr. Cannon stated that he had witnessed a near accident at this intersection, just this morning. Mr.

Cannon stated that the County might want to look into putting a stop sign at the end of Mt. Pisgah, just before the access road.

Mr. Allen stated that maybe traffic control would have helped with the length of the line and noted that we could have possibly formed two lines. Mr. Williams stated that there were two lines going. Mrs. Banghart agreed and stated that it was a very busy event.

Mr. Cannon stated that since the opportunity for a state funded program is currently available to us, he would like to get another event scheduled for people who had left due to how busy it was, as Mr. Pryor had. Mr. Cannon stated that he would prefer to hold one more big collection event before establishing a permanent drop off location at our facility. Mr. Cannon stated that he had suggested holding the second event in September or October once the temperatures come down a bit. Mr. Cannon stated that it sounds like the vendor would be willing to hold another event. Mr. Williams agreed.

Mr. Allen asked why we would establish a drop-off location at our facility, which would result in us needing to use our own labor to monitor what is being dropped off? Mr. Allen noted that he does not understand why we would do this, when we had a vendor that came in and held the event for no cost to us. Mr. Williams stated that we still would not get charged for the electronics. Mr. Williams explained that the only expense would be whatever labor costs we would have at our facility and noted that this expense would be covered under the recycling grant. Mr. Williams explained that the vendor would drop-off a closed top container to our facility and have bins inside of the container. Mr. Williams further explained that whomever we chose from our staff would direct the customers on where to put their electronics. Mr. Williams stated, for example, that we would possibly offer electronics drop-offs on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays from 8am until 12pm. Mr. Williams stated that our staff would direct the customers to unload their vehicles and tell the customers, which bins to place the items in. Mr. Williams stated that when the bins become full, the vendor would come and empty out the bins.

Mr. Cannon told Mr. Allen that he had brought up the same point to Mr. Williams. Mr. Cannon stated that the container might need to be constantly monitored during the drop-off times. Mr. Cannon stated that he had also asked if we had the staff to take someone away from their current job for the four-hour periods. Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Williams had been contemplating ways that we could make this happen. Mr. Williams stated that he had been told that we could hire a part time employee, specifically for the electronics drop-off times and that we could use grant money to pay this employee's salary. Mr. Williams stated that this would eliminate the need for taking our existing staff away from the work that they need to be doing. Mr. Williams stated that this is an option that can be discussed when we get to this point. Mr. Cannon agreed. Mr. Allen asked if there is grant money available for electronics? Mr. Williams answered, yes. Mr. Allen stated that he thought the reason that it had been so long since we held an electronics recycling event was because the grant money could not be used to pay for it. Mr. Williams explained that the reason we have not been having these events is that we could not get a vendor to bid on the event. Mr. Williams stated that now that the event has been scaled back to only accept "covered electronics", and the vendor is a state approved vendor, that the vendor is now able to get reimbursed through the state, rather than us needing to pay them for their services.

Mr. Smith stated that during the Warren County Recycling Breakfast, there was a representative from the DEP that discussed the contamination of recycling, which is something that we have discussed before. Mr. Smith stated that he feels that if we made a proposal to have an overseer or a manager to

ensure that there is no contamination from the recycling that the cost for this may be recoverable from the recycling grant money. Mr. Smith stated that if we are collecting recyclables that are intermixed with light plastic bags and other items such as that, the entire recycling load is ruined. Mr. Cannon agreed. Mr. Smith explained that this is a broad problem and does not only reflect the electronics component that causes issues. Mr. Smith stated that they are looking into how stringent the inspections of the recycling loads have become. Mr. Smith stated that hiring someone to manage the recycling might be a cost that can be covered by the grant and noted that this is something that can be discussed with Mr. Dave Dech. Mr. Williams stated that he had spoken with Mr. Dech regarding this last week. Mr. Cannon stated that he feels that we will definitely need to have someone overseeing this.

Mr. Williams stated that Mr. Smith had made some valid points. Mr. Williams noted that we have situations here where as soon as no one is looking, they just dump everything in the recycling. Mr. Cannon stated that this is just simply human nature. Mr. Williams stated that someone would have to be there overseeing the electronics recycling at all times.

Mr. Cannon reiterated that he would like to hold another large event before establishing a drop-off location at our facility. Mr. Williams agreed. Mr. Cannon stated that the event might not be as big as the April event.

Mr. Williams stated that this Sunday, April 29, 2018 is our Household Hazardous Waste Collection Event. He noted that we do not expect as large as a turnout as there was for the Electronics Recycling Event. Mr. Williams stated that the typical wait time during the Household Hazardous Waste Collection Event is approximately 15 to 30 minutes. He also stated that approximately 250 to 350 cars come to this event. Mr. Cannon asked if a lot of paint is collected during this event? Mr. Williams answered, yes and noted that we also collect many fluorescent light bulbs during this event. Mr. Williams noted that many of the fluorescent light bulbs come from schools that are doing their relamping.

Mr. Williams stated that he did not have anything further to report.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

CLOSING PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

PRESS COMMENTS & QUESTIONS

None.

Mr. Cannon stated that we would have a brief Executive Session.
Mr. Cannon called for a motion to enter into Executive Session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Executive Session was entered at 10:38 am.

RESOLUTION

R-04-05-18

AUTHORIZING EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

Contracts.

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. Mach	-	Yes
	Mr. Pryor	-	Yes
	Mr. Urfer	-	Absent
	Mr. Allen	-	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:

Executive session ended at 11:13 am.

Regular session resumed at 11:13 am.

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

Mr. Cannon noted that the May meeting had been moved up. Mr. Pryor asked what the date of the May meeting is? Mr. Cannon stated that he believes that the May meeting is scheduled for May 17, 2018. Ms. Gild agreed. Mr. Williams agreed. Mr. Cannon confirmed that the May meeting would be held on May 17, 2018.

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

Respectfully submitted by:
Crystal Gild
Recording Secretary

Approved: 05/17/2018