

POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY
OF WARREN COUNTY

MINUTES OF REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING

February 24, 2020

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: Alex Lazorisak, James Cannon, Richard Mach and Dan Perez.

Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Tipton if he would like to swear in Mr. Angelo Accetturo.

Mr. Tipton replied yes and asked Mr. Accetturo to raise his right hand and repeat after him the following statement.

I, Angelo Accetturo , do solemnly swear that I will support the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of New Jersey; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same and to the Governments established in the United States and in this State, under the authority of the people; and that I will faithfully, impartially and justly perform all the duties of a member of the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County according to the best of my ability. So help me God.

Mr. Tipton stated congratulations. Mr. Cannon stated welcome aboard.

Mr. Cannon asked to call the Monday February 24, 2020 PCFA meeting to order, please call the roll.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Accetturo	-	Present
	Mr. Lazorisak	-	Present
	Mr. Mach	-	Present
	Mr. Perez	-	Present
	Mr. Cannon	-	Present

Also present: Angelo Accetturo, Brian Tipton, General Counsel; Vatsal Shah and Brian Henning from Mott MacDonald; Jim Smith, Sanico; James Williams, Director of Operations; Jamie Banghart, Administrative Supervisor and Mariann Cliff, Recording Secretary.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Cannon.

Mr. Cannon read the following statement: “Adequate notice of this meeting of November 18th 2020 was given in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act by forwarding a schedule of regular meetings of the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County (PCFAWC) to the Warren County Clerk, the Warren County Board of Chosen Freeholders, The Express-Times, and by posting a copy thereof on the bulletin board in the office of the PCFAWC. Formal action may be taken by the PCFAWC at this meeting. Public participation is encouraged”.

Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Williams was up next.

Mr. Williams stated that he would first like to open up the floor for nominations for Chairperson.

Mr. Lazorisak stated that he would like to nominate Mr. Accetturo as Chairperson.

Mr. Williams asked if there was a second. Mr. Mach stated that he would second.

Mr. Perez asked what that nomination was for. Mr. Williams replied that is was for Chairperson. Mr.

Perez replied that he would like to nominate Mr. Cannon. Mr. Williams asked if there was a second.

Mr. Williams stated that hearing none, roll call on the first nomination.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Accetturo	- Yes
	Mr. Lazorisak	- Yes
	Mr. Mach	- Yes
	Mr. Perez	- No
	Mr. Cannon	- Abstain

Mr. Williams stated congratulation Mr. Accetturo you are now Chairperson.

Mr. Accetturo replied thank you Mr. Williams.

Mr. Accetturo stated that he would take nominations for Vice Chair at that point.

Mr. Lazorisak stated that he would nominate Mr. Mach as Vice-Chairperson.

Mr. Accetturo stated that he would second that motion.

Mr. Accetturo asked if there were any other nominations for Vice-Chairperson, seeing none they would close that out let us make a vote on the nomination for Mr. Mach as Vice-Chairperson.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Accetturo	- Yes
	Mr. Lazorisak	- Yes
	Mr. Mach	- Yes
	Mr. Perez	- Yes
	Mr. Cannon	- Abstain

Mr. Accetturo stated congratulations Mr. Mach. Now at this point they would take nominations for secretary.

Mr. Lazorisak stated that he would nominate Mr. Cannon for secretary. Mr. Accetturo asked if he could get a second for that motion. Mr. Perez stated that he would second the motion.

Mr. Accetturo asked if there were any other nominations for secretary, seeing none could he get a roll call vote.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Accetturo - Yes
 Mr. Lazorisak - Yes
 Mr. Mach - Yes
 Mr. Perez - Yes
 Mr. Cannon - Abstain

Mr. Accetturo stated that now he would take nominations for treasurer.
Mr. Lazorisak stated that he would nominate Mr. Perez for treasurer.
Mr. Accetturo asked for a second on the motion.

Mr. Perez stated that he would decline that position. Thank you
Mr. Accetturo asked if there were any other nominations for treasurer.

Mr. Accetturo asked Mr. Lazorisak if he would be treasurer. Mr. Lazorisak replied that he was not going to nominate himself.
Mr. Accetturo stated that he would nominate Mr. Lazorisak, could he get a second on the nomination.
Mr. Perez stated that he would second the motion. Mr. Accetturo asked if there were any other nominations for treasurer. Mr. Accetturo stated that seeing no other nominations for treasurer could he have a roll call vote on the nomination of Mr. Lazorisak as treasurer.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Accetturo - Yes
 Mr. Lazorisak - Yes
 Mr. Mach - Yes
 Mr. Perez - Yes
 Mr. Cannon - Abstain

MINUTES M-1

Mr. Accetturo stated that they have the minutes from the regular monthly meeting minutes – January 27, 2020. Does he have a motion on the minutes?

Mr. Williams stated that he would like to make a quick statement regarding these as, Mr. Accetturo was not here but everyone else knows that the recording device was not working. He would like to make sure it was on record that these minutes were prepared by comments received back by Board members and staff and there was no recording of that January meeting.

Mr. Lazorisak stated that Mr. Williams and Mrs. Cliff did a good job putting it together.

Mr. Accetturo asked is there a motion on the regular monthly meeting minutes of January 27, 2020.

Mr. Lazorisak made a motion to approve the Regular Monthly Meeting Minutes from January 27, 2020 seconded by **Mr. Perez**.

Mr. Accetturo asked for roll.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Accetturo - Abstain
 Mr. Lazorisak - Yes

Mr. Mach - No
Mr. Perez - Yes
Mr. Cannon - Yes

Mr. Accetturo stated item M-2 was the executive session minutes from January 27, 2020 then asked was there a motion on the minutes or were there any comments.

Mr. Perez made a motion to approve the Executive Session Minutes from January 27, 2020, seconded by **Mr. Mach**.

Mr. Accetturo asked for a roll call.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Accetturo - Abstain
Mr. Lazorisak - Opposed
Mr. Mach - No
Mr. Perez - Yes
Mr. Cannon - Yes

Mr. Accetturo asked Mr. Williams if they would do the annual resolutions in a batch or one by one.

Mr. Williams stated that they could do them in a batch.

Mr. Accetturo asked if anyone needed to comment on any of the resolutions R-02-01-20 thru R-02-10-20. Then asked if there was a motion on R-02-01-20 thru R-02-10-20.

Mr. Lazorisak stated that he would make the motion.

Mr. Mach stated that he would second the motion.

Mr. Accetturo asked for a roll call.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Accetturo - Abstain
Mr. Lazorisak - Yes
Mr. Mach - Yes
Mr. Perez - Yes
Mr. Cannon - Yes

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Accetturo asked if there were any Correspondence. Mr. Williams replied none.

PUBLIC COMMENTS (AGENDA ITEMS ONLY)

Mr. Accetturo asked if there were any public comments, on agenda items only. Hearing none, they would close the public comment portion of the meeting.

Mr. Accetturo remarked that the finance committee, Mr. Williams is yours.

Mr. Williams stated that before they go there; are there any objections to go to the presentation portion? The gentlemen from Mott MacDonald have a schedule that they have to keep. If they could discuss the retaining wall.

All present agreed

PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Henning and Mr. Shah stated good morning to the Board.

Mr. Shah stated that they appreciate the opportunity to support the PCFA.

Mr. Williams invited them to sit down.

Mr. Shah stated ok, though they did not mind standing up. Then he continued that they appreciate the opportunity to support the PCFA in evaluating the retaining wall in front of the building in the parking lot. Back in December of last year, we attended the Board meeting to discuss possible remediation measures to the wall.

Mr. Shah continued, the wall is currently a two-tier wall with the bottom tier being about 12-foot-high, the second tier above it being about 4-foot-high and the bottom portion of the wall is actually leaning forward. That is a cause of concern to several of the Board members for public safety. Also, a concern for the future, understanding that Tilcon is looking to continue quarrying operations behind the hill.

Mr. Shah stated that when blasting starts, the integrity of the wall would be put into question. The wall is currently toppling and would keep moving forward and could collapse into the parking lot. So, in January of 2020 the PCFA asked Mott MacDonald to do a preliminary investigation to evaluate the wall to see what the issues were behind the wall's lean. In addition, to look at what type of remediation measures are possible, whether it is for replacement, temporary restoration, or also, if there would be a lower cost option.

Mr. Shah stated that they completed their investigation in late January of 2020, he believes that the Board has a copy of the report that has a little more detail into it. What they found was, and they completed their work in three phases. The first was a gas top evaluation, they have provided the as builds and design drawings of the wall. Right off the bat, they noticed the wall was designed as a traditional one-tier wall with a strait wall, no lean back to it. Mr. Shah stated that newer retaining walls are built with a lean backwards to relieve some of the pressure of the wall. But this wall was built straight flat, it had what is called geogrid reinforcements which allows the wall to be a thinner block wall. The wall has strands of fiber that pulls the wall back and it relies on the weight of all the soil behind the wall to keep that in place.

Mr. Shah continued that what they actually found during the review was that the wall was not built as a one-piece wall, it was built as two-tiers as we currently see today. They also found that the original design shows that the length of the geo-grid reinforcement that pulled the wall back was less than typically should be with current design standards. Therefore, it was actually under-designed for the full

length of the wall. That is typical of these wall constructions, many times during the designs of these walls you find that they may have a template for them and sometimes they have found that the walls are not designed but they are just taken out of a toolbox put into a detailed sheet and constructed as is.

Mr. Shah stated that the next step of the work was to go out and physically do an investigation to confirm was the wall built as planned. Did it have this reinforcement to it, how far was the reinforcement back. What type of soil did it have, was there backfill behind the wall to allow water to drain out or is the water pressure building up behind the wall?

Mr. Shah stated that what they found, what they are seeing today, is that the top of the wall does not have any reinforcement to it. So, from the top they augured down using hand tools to a four ½ foot depth. They found that there was gravel back behind the wall, which allowed the water to drain out and not build up water pressure behind the wall. However, it lacked any reinforcement to keep that wall pulled back.

Mr. Shah continued that typically when you have that reinforcement it prevents the wall from leaning forward. Not having that reinforcement fabric is one of the cause of issues of why the wall is currently leaning.

Mr. Shah stated that the second thing that they noticed was the reinforcements of the wall towards the bottom sees some deflection. Usually a wall when built has continuous wall face to it; you do not really see much undulation between the wall pieces and blocks. This wall has a few blocks that actually have started to bow outward causing some of the stone behind the wall to come to the front and that is more of an issue of two things. The wall is toppling which they can see, but also the base of the wall was not compacted properly. Therefore, with those two things in mind Mott MacDonald can provide three recommendations.

Mr. Shah stated that the first recommendation being to remove the wall piecemeal just the upper portion, which is currently leaning, put in the correct fabric that you are supposed to, to the correct length. It required re-compact the soil behind the wall and build the wall up.

Mr. Shah continued that the pros and cons – the pro is that it is a cheaper fix to go thru, however it is a temporary Band-Aid the bottom of the wall still remains to have that undulation to it. If the wall continues to move forward it will eventually topple years afterwards, but the cost is the cheapest. In addition, to do that top down approach you have to first remove the second wall on top to remove the pressure that is currently on the lower wall. Then rebuild the upper portion of that bottom wall so there are two steps to do that.

Mr. Shah stated that the second option recommended which is the preferred option, was to remove the wall wholesale meaning remove the wall from top down. You will have a temporary slope during that point. You will rebuild the wall using todays current design practices which was impacted base fill, putting the wall up in blocks, putting the correct length of geo-grid fabric behind it and replace the wall as most likely a one-tier wall with a set-back to it to relieve some of the pressure.

Mr. Shah continued that the third option they provided which is the lowest cost option, is to remove the wall completely, you will lose the parking spaces in front of the wall which is about 14 spaces and build the area as a flat slope wall. No wall, just a slope back fill with most likely gravel cover to provide erosion protection. The concern he understood to be from the County and the PCFA was that those parking spaces are actually used quite often, both during snow removal and meetings so removing parking spaces is not really an option for the PCFA.

Mr. Shaw then said they were focusing more on the option 2, which is removing the wall wholesale and replacing the wall. Before he moves forward to the next steps Mr. Shah asked if there were any questions on the evaluation or on what they found and/or on the recommendations for the wall replacement.

Mr. Accetturo asked how deep they had dug. Mr. Shah replied four feet. Mr. Lazorisak asked if they hit any geo-grid. Mr. Shah replied that they did hit fabric, the fabric was not connected to the wall, typically when you put geo-grid you will actually link it to the wall, using pins. You would put the fabric over and you pull it back so when the wall wants to move forward it is connected mechanically to the actual wall face. What they found was a separation fabric you might use it around your home placing it beneath topsoil to prevent the topsoil from mixing with the material beneath it. There is a layer of clay on top of the wall that prevents water from getting in, then a filter fabric so that water can pass through but that fabric was not connected to the wall.

Mr. Lazorisak stated so there was no reinforcement. Mr. Shah stated that the design drawing that they were given did not show any reinforcement fabric in the top four ½ feet of the wall. This is where you see the movement.

Mr. Lazorisak stated that Mr. Shah, in your opinion you talked about reusing the block and you would think that would be the way to go. However, in your experience would it cost more in the labor to retain that block? Obviously the PCFA could dispose of it here at no cost so the question is moving forward do we look at reusing that or getting new, which may have cost savings in labor vs what the actual block is. Mr. Lazorisak asked Mr. Shah what his opinion was on that.

Mr. Shah replied that is a good point it would really depend on the contractor. Certain times you may have to do construction in the fall season, labor is usually a shortage if you do it in the early spring season, labor is at a higher quantity so you could get it for cheaper.

Mr. Shah stated that he mentioned to Mr. Williams earlier that by keeping the existing wall blocks, the wall face would obviously have to be power washed because of the black moisture stains on it. The blocks generally for the most part look to be in good shape. There was really no damage to them.

Mr. Shah stated that they could design the entire wall using full replacement, which would minimize the cost of new blocks being brought to the site.

Mr. Shah stated that as you mentioned they have larger blocks that the industry uses instead of the small blocks, which takes more labor to place because it requires more men to place the blocks and pieces. Larger blocks that are 8-foot-wide by 2-foot-tall, now while they will not give you the same aesthetics as with the smaller landscape block that usually looks nicer but they would be more of a massive look. They are also placed by cranes. The same sort of fabric we put in place behind them that process is usually shortened because of the blocks being larger. You place the blocks in these 2-foot layers, place the soil behind, compact the soil. Then you build up faster, but you might find that the labor shortage or cost of the blocks is cheaper. The recommendation that they would probably have would be to reuse the existing blocks as is, even without disposal costs and leave it in the specifications of the contract that they propose the value option if they find the larger blocks easier to come by.

Mr. Shah stated that some contractors also have their own blocks that they will either build or get at certain discount so depending on the contractor that you select they may have other options that would change the design slightly. Mott MacDonald would create the design with the blocks reused.

Mr. Lazorisak asked that, if they bid an alternate does that mean Mott MacDonald would have to redesign or engineer what the contractor is proposing.

Mr. Shah replied yes, most times when a contractor brings in an alternate it provides signed, sealed, alternate designs. So what we had provide typical of our work or our design prints here, the wall has to be X high, the wall has rock behind the wall, the wall has backfill, if the proposal alternative, the alternative has to consider the cost of engineering that they've done to show their block wall will meet our design criteria.

Mr. Lazorisak stated so how does your proposal for doing this work actually set them up with that variable in it.

Mr. Shah replied that the proposal actually includes a shop drawing review, so typically if a contractor were to follow our design, they still would submit a shop drawing. Say they see your design is X, Y, Z, and they would implement it as requested and they would be using this for labor, this for block, etc.

This is our procedure that we are looking for, that is the standard procedure. The contractor that would vary from that would submit a shop drawing saying that they would do a value option with no cost change or reduction in cost savings and here is their replacement design. So, they have time in our proposal and leave up to 8 hours to review the shop drawings that are coming in for acceptance of the design or to provide an alternative design.

Mr. Shah stated that the time is in there to review our design or an alternative.

Mr. Mach asked Mr. Shah, those large blocks that you talked about, what material are they made out of?

Mr. Shah replied that they are made of concrete. Mr. Mach asked if there was any kind of texturing or surface finish on them. Mr. Shah replied that you can have either or, you mentioned a cost issue so the cheaper options are plain industrial type blocks. But you will notice the industry if you have driven down Route 18 in New Brunswick, you see that red facing looks like shot rock. It is actually a wall that was built and they created the face using concrete facing and it looks like a big rock cut, like a red shale rock cut. So you can get as nice as you want to with a nice wall face that matches the color and scheme of the rock that you have in the area or you can get industrial size blocks.

Mr. Shah stated that the current industrial size blocks also could have the blocks with a stamped pattern on the front that would look like landscaping. It may not have actual grooves there but it would have a block pattern.

Mr. Mach asked just for curiosity and he hates to ask the question but are the blocks laid 8 feet front to back, perpendicular to the wall that is there right now? Would you be seeing the 2-foot front?

Mr. Shah replied that you would actually see the 8-foot wide block and it would be 2-foot deep, 2-foot tall. Mr. Shah also stated that the blocks might vary you might find a contractor that has different size blocks. If that is a sticking point for the PCFA say maybe you want smaller block vs a big massive size we could put that in the specifications.

Mr. Shah stated that part of the concerns would be bringing a crane up here because that is actually a crane operation versus being hand carried and placed.

Mr. Perez asked if they had an idea on how much it would cost. Mr. Shah replied that he had not prepared a construction cost as yet but given the size of the wall he would imagine between \$200,000.00 or \$300,000.00.

Mr. Perez asked that is with the second option. Mr. Shah replied that is correct. The full replacement of the wall. That is a high level and just based on his experience but things would change based on labor and such.

Mr. Accetturo stated that he had never walked up on top of that hill, does it peak 20 or 30 feet beyond the top of the wall? Is it on the other side of that peak that the quarry would be working?

Mr. Williams replied that there is a fence line there now. That is the beginning of the quarry.

Mr. Shah stated so what you currently see is a wall that is 12-foot-high then you have a 4-foot setback with a 1-foot rise in that setback. A 4-foot high wall then you have roughly a 12 foot until the fence line and it rises to that apex point that you are mentioning, which is 6-foot above the back wall.

Mr. Accetturo replied and the other side of that point it goes down? Mr. Shah replied that it undulates and starts going down in a moderate slope. Mr. Accetturo asked does it go down before it hits the property line?

Mr. Shah replied that actually the fence line, which is the property line for the PCFA is slightly before the apex. So, if you look at that you will see the fence line then it goes up another foot or 2 then it starts undulating downwards.

Mr. Accetturo asked would it make any sense to just knock that hill down? Mr. Williams replied that that was his original thought also just to wipe it out. Mr. Accetturo stated that he was looking at the map in the back and maybe he was over simplifying it, but plus it is cover so you could use the material, it would not cost anything to get rid of it. He does not know if it would open them up to a large ugly view of the quarry at that point. He does not know if that would be an issue or not, just knock the hill down. Mr. Williams stated that you could not knock the whole hill down, only this side of it as the other side belongs to Tilcon.

Mr. Accetturo stated that is what he was asking does it peak on our property? Mr. Williams replied no, it peaks beyond the fence.

Mr. Shah stated that is also option three if you knock the hill down you would want just a faced slope. He believes the reason why the wall was built the way it is, is that during construction they may have come across rock ledges and if you happen to have a rock ledge you may not put that fabric the full length. Typically and they will have it in their design if you find rock you are supposed to wrap it around a stake and pin it to the rock that is the way to correctly do it, tie it to the rock so it cannot move forward. So what you might find when you knock the hill down is that we have a rock nob behind the hill, now you either have to move that nob or blast. You have the building nearby you have pavement which could crack. There could be some ancillary costs that may not have been considered in the original design. That is why if they found there was a rock nob, they would actually move the parking space and make it a flat slope. Mr. Shah stated that he understood the points about using the fill.

Mr. Shah stated that Mr. Williams had a question earlier, if they build this new wall would it be blast proof for the future of the quarry operations. The new wall, when designed will have design considerations for withstanding vibrations caused by blasting. There will be some seismic forces added to the wall.

Mr. Perez asked have they done blasting here before? Mr. Mach stated that it happens occasionally. Mr. Cannon replied nothing really close this would be the closest ever.

Mr. Perez asked if the building was ever looked at as far as blasting goes. Mr. Mach replied probably not, Mr. Williams could answer that better than he.

Mr. Perez asked Mr. Williams if the building was ever tested for blasting.

Mr. Williams replied that every time that Tilcon blasts there is a seismograph set up, they monitor every blast. There is actually a permanent one set up at the scale house, right now that is the closest blasting that would occur and Tilcon voluntarily put that one in. Mr. Williams continued that once they start back here that is something we could also ask Tilcon to do. See if they would set one up on this side but that is probably years down the road. They might want to finish over there first before they move over.

Mr. Shaw stated to Mr. Perez that in his experience blasting near buildings is done quite a bit. The typical process if they blast they would do a pre-construction inspection on the building to look for any cracking, doors out of plumb and if there are any glaring structural issues. The state actually has legal requirements for if you have blasting, any offsite property from that blasting location has to have a seismograph Mr. Williams did mention and stay within a certain threshold for blast vibration. The threshold for vibration is 2 inches per second. The US bureau of mines who has been doing blast analysis for coal mining created that. That 2 inch per second is actually built for wood on plastic construction he is assuming that the building is concrete foundation with at least wood, possibly steel columns across the board.

Mr. Shah continued that you typically would not have issues with it from off-site blasting but the seismograph and the pre-construction inspection would be two things that you would need to have done before blasting were to start. Mr. Perez replied ok thank you.

Mr. Lazorisak stated that he was inclined, his position would be to do option 2 the full replacement. If they were going to spend the money he thinks that they should do it right. Mr. Mach stated he is in agreement with option 2 but he would like to see the cost of the block that you are going to reuse or a new block replacement. Mr. Shah replied sure.

Mr. Mach stated that he would also like to see a cost comparison of the 2x8 blocks that you spoke of. Mr. Shah answered sure. Mr. Mach stated deep inside he feels that mass is better, a big heavy block is better than a bunch of hand carried cement blocks. In addition, maybe you could bring up some examples of what that block would look like. So we are not looking at a stark monstrosity. Mr. Shah replied that he could bring up some pictures.

Mr. Lazorisak asked if those blocks are designed to go that high. Mr. Shah asked the existing blocks, yes they can be. What happens if you go too high is the blocks actually have too much pressure and they would crush each other.

Mr. Shah stated that in option 2 because it was the preferred option Mott MacDonald prepared a proposal for it which is the next item on your agenda. That proposal was for both design services which would include the design of the wall, contract documents, drawing specifications for the bid purposes, bidding support as we are currently doing now for cell 7 and then construction oversight. You may also see in your packet that we have proposals for that work. We suggested full time oversight for the actual construction duration. The perks of that is twofold one is to make sure that the wall is being built as planned. The wall duration is probably around 2 to 3 weeks with the construction and during that time if they happen to find a rock ledge there would be an engineer on site to observe, make comments and keep records for. If in the future the PCFA decides to change the wall or expand the property you will have appropriate documentation for that wall. Other than that, the proposal includes general engineering, design documents.

Mr. Lazorisak asked Mr. Mach tying in to what he was saying does he think that they should move with Task-1 then on the wall design and see these options. Mr. Mach replied yes.

Mr. Lazorisak stated that surveying is part of the design task and that is going to take some time for you to get out, start that.

Mr. Shah stated that they have in-house surveyors that would come up here and shoot the grades for them, it will be a one tier wall.

Mr. Lazorisak stated that is all in Task-1 correct. Mr. Shah stated that just to make sure that he understood them correctly they would like him to look at the two options for reusing the existing blocks

that they have and then estimating the cost for using the larger block wall. Then present a couple of visuals on what that would look like. Mr. Mach replied that is correct.

Mr. Lazorisak asked if they worked with any contractors that Mr. Shah could maybe get some hard numbers from them, throw the options out at them. Mr. Shah replied that absolutely they did and what they would like to do is correspond with Mr. Williams and have a contractor come out here and see the site for access to bring a crane in, over clearance issues. Generally stockpiling supplies, he is assuming that the PCFA would be open to allowing the backside of the parking lot to be closed during construction. They would utilize that space for the wall block and supplies. The first question that they will ask is where they could lay down equipment. If they have to store it somewhere else it raises the cost, if they could keep it right out front that is a plus.

Mr. Williams stated that he thinks that we could even alternate our parking to the back completely and we would stay out of the way during the process. If it is only going to be a few weeks, it will not be too much of an inconvenience for us. Mr. Shah stated that he would say a three to four-week period but he would probably budget six weeks for other things, a couple of rain days, days to get equipment and supplies in etc.

Mr. Shah stated plan on six weeks but he would imagine the wall would take about 3 to 4 weeks to tear down and build back up again.

Mr. Cannon stated that when Mr. Shah and Mr. Williams were talking this morning about the construction oversight you mentioned that there could be some tweaking that could happen there, was that based on the short-term weeks or for the possible long-term weeks. What were you looking at? In your proposal, you have nine weeks.

Mr. Shah replied yes the full amount, tearing the wall down doing the physical construction of the wall plus close up at the end. Now they have actually put down longer than they expect to go, because they know that time might be delayed. We do not want to come back to the PCFA Board for an extension at that point or keep asking for extensions along the way. He does know that their contractors are time and material based whatever time is not used on the site is not billed for. Mr. Shah continued that they are seeking the full authorization to make sure that the cap was there to do the work required without having to have breaks to ask for additional funding. It also depends on what contractor you use, if the contractor is reputable, they may have someone come out only on alternating days to make sure that the work is being moved forward. Or it could be a part time observation, they would come at the compaction of the base to make sure the wall base is constructed correctly then they could come out doing spot inspection to make sure that the wall grid goes in correctly. Then they would be there once or twice a week.

Mr. Shah stated that he does know that Mr. Henning lives close also so if they needed to have spot checks Mr. Henning would be able to come out once or twice during that work also which would help economize the cost. What you have seen is the cost they propose for the full work including any contingency that might be required along the way.

Mr. Perez stated that Mr. Shah just made a statement that the contractor is reputable, so who oversees who the contractor is going to be. Would that be Mott MacDonald or would it be the PCFA?

Mr. Williams replied that it would be the engineer. Mr. Shah replied right, what we typically would do is they would bid the work as a fair open process bid, sent to all contractors. They would submit their bids and during the bidding process, they would level the bid tabs at the end. Say we use the bids from A,B,C,D,E, vendors here is the cost, here is the cost to the PCFA. Mott MacDonald will run a check on references for the lowest two bidders. Then they will make a recommendation to the lowest responsible bidder to the Board saying here is who we would recommend as lowest responsible bidder. Then the Board may elect to say that they actually have a lower bidder than that who is cheaper and you may want to choose that cheaper contractor because the price quote. The difference between the lowest responsible

bidder and the cheapest bidder is when you would need the full time construction oversight. Mr. Perez stated that this where the reputable part would come in. Mr. Shah replied correct.

Mr. Shah stated that they have a list of contractors that they use for walls and they would be glad to provide the documents to those bidders at the end when they get to the bidding process. Mr. Shah stated that Mr. Henning and he would recommend that they could pull the oversight down to less frequent with these contractors because they know the quality of their work and they communicate well with them throughout the process.

Mr. Cannon stated that is the oversight number that you are talking about, right? Mr. Shah replied correct.

Mr. Cannon stated that normally the PCFA Counsel goes over the bids and does all that. Is there some way that we could integrate some of that? We are basically subbing all of that out. Generally, all of our bidding goes through Counsel to see that they meet all of our boilerplate options as far as proposals but since we have Counsel to do that he is not sure if they need to sub that all out to Mott MacDonald. They are starting to talk about a quarter of a million dollars here, would we be able to integrate that somehow with PCFA Counsel doing the bidding. Mr. Shah stated that there was not much time in there for the bidding it was pretty itemized for each point. He thinks that their bid assistance is no more than eight or twelve hours and the reason for that is they know during the bidding process there may be questions from the bidders so that just covers that bucket. At the end, they will run a reference check on them, which would probably be several hours. We can look at that number for the Board and see if they can economize some of that time that they would spend looking at the contractors; it is approximately several hours. Therefore, you would probably be looking at a couple hundred-dollars in savings. It may not make a substantial difference, but if the Board would like we could look at the proposal. Mr. Cannon asked Mr. Shah that is in Task-2 right? Mr. Shah stated yes that is the bidding process. Mr. Cannon stated that general construction assistance with the bidders. Mr. Shah replied correct.

Mr. Lazorisak stated honestly a \$100,000.00 for all three tasks seems extremely high to him. If that wall comes in at \$250,000.00 or \$300,000.00 and Mott MacDonald's professional costs are 25% of the entire job unless you are seeing something that he is not, it just seems like a lot of money for one wall.

Mr. Shah replied that he understood, if they look at the proposal, he thinks that the bulk of the cost also is in the construction oversight. The design including the survey is typical of their work, the bid process, preparations also typical work that they do. The real number comes in during the construction oversight, so if they have to have full time construction oversight they want to provide the Board the fullest option that they thought possible for this work. Contingent on having this conversation if the Board would like us to do part-time observation, they would be glad to do that. Now if the Board has some eyes and ears if Mr. Williams could be on-site here and if Mr. Henning could come up once in a while during the work, that might bring the number down substantially also.

Mr. Lazorisak stated that he is not looking to cut corners, but look at your construction oversight, you are saying six weeks, that is almost \$7,500.00 a week. Is that one person or two people? Mr. Shah replied that is one person on site.

Mr. Accetturo stated that is a large hourly wage.

Mr. Lazorisak asked Mr. Shah, your as-built drawings what task is that in? Mr. Shah replied that he did not bring his proposal he would have to bring up a copy. Mr. Cannon asked would that be in Task-1?

Mr. Lazorisak replied that is why he is asking if it is in Task-1. If it is in Task-3 it just might justify that number a little bit.

Mr. Shah replied that the surveying costs he believe is in task-1 to do the design work. The as-built costs are simply the construction costs, but he can go back and look at that number again and see if the costs are in that number. Most likely they would be included in the third cost, which is, as the construction is done our surveyor will come back up and take up the actual locations and the as built design.

Mr. Lazorisak stated again he is not looking to cut the oversight because he does agree that if someone is not our there you are not getting the geo-grid installed properly and then we are right back to where we started. He just thinks it is a high number, he has built salt-sheds for this amount of money, so he had to ask. Mr. Shah replied that he understood.

Mr. Lazorisak stated that he has never done a wall this big so maybe that is why he is having difficulty with the numbers.

Mr. Shah stated that he wanted to bring to the Board the purpose of that full time inspection. We mentioned the word reputable; we mentioned things that could go wrong on the process. It is his opinion that you could go with less than full time observation contingent on someone being out here every couple of days and making sure the contractor is communicating with us. For example letting us know that they are going to put grid down next week on Tuesday, be out there on Tuesday.

Mr. Shah continued by asking, do they have to be out here when they put down stone and compact it with a roller? Typically, it is a mind-numbing process, you do not need to have someone out here to watch them roll a compactor back and forth. Therefore, what he would suggest if the Board is open to it is bring it from full time down to part time observation with an idea of at least two days a week observation, which brings the cost down approximately 60% construction oversight.

Mr. Lazorisak stated how about we do this, we are actually talking about two different walls, what if you come back, take a look at your proposal or submit another proposal maybe with some information on the block that Mr. Mach and the Board is looking for, and try to get some hard numbers from contractors using our block and this new block. Again, if you go with the larger block he would think that your oversight would be a little bit less because you are not dealing with little blocks. Mr. Cannon interjected that it might be more with the crane and equipment needed. Mr. Lazorisak replied that could be, that is why he is saying if we know a bit more then, we would be able to give Mott MacDonald more information to hone in Task-2 and 3 a little bit more. Mr. Shah replied ok sure.

Mr. Cannon stated that he agrees with Mr. Lazorisak that \$100,000.00 on a \$200,000.00 wall is a big number. We have in-house where Mr. Williams has overseen projects and we have other people that can oversee projects, we have Counsel who can oversee bids. Mr. Cannon believes that they have the personnel on-site that would be able to get deeply involved on overseeing this project in one way or another that would save us quite a bit. Now getting the wall done correctly is not a question. However, some of these other things we could do in-house.

Mr. Shaw replied that they wanted to bring a comprehensive proposal but he does understand and they would gladly look at the numbers and see what they could come up with.

Mr. Lazorisak stated that in the options perhaps, you could share both options and this Board may agree to go with the one option, and this way it would be a lot cleaner when you do your bid documents. You are not putting an alternate in and you are not dealing with having to review shop drawings that were not something you designed, to put out the bid because that would be additional costs.

Mr. Accetturo asked if everyone was in agreement with Mr. Lazorisak. Board members agreed.

Mr. Accetturo stated that it looks like they are all on the same page, so that would be your instructions, to come back.

Mr. Shah stated that so he understands Task-1, which is the survey and the evaluation of the two wall types, is what the PCFA wants to move forward with, now we would come back with a proposal for that.

Mr. Lazorisak replied look at your proposal again, come back with some information on the larger block that you were talking about. Try to hone in some costs / numbers, we will not hold you to those numbers obviously but if you could narrow down the order of magnitude. Then we could go from there.

Mr. Cannon replied and find out if that was including the finals in Task-1 that you were unsure of.

Mr. Lazorisak stated thank you.

Mr. Accetturo stated thank you for your time.

Mr. Williams stated thanks gentlemen.

Mr. Henning and Mr. Shah replied thank you, any time.

**** Mr. Henning and Mr. Shah left the Boardroom at approximately 10:15**

Mr. Accetturo stated that Mr. Williams pointed out that we need to go back to one of the resolutions, the resolution R-02-10-20 reads May 25 for the meeting but that is a holiday so it should be May 18th.

Mr. Accetturo stated that he would make a motion on the correction to the 18th of May.

Mr. Lazorisak stated that he would second the motion.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Accetturo	-	Yes
	Mr. Lazorisak	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Yes
	Mr. Perez	-	Yes
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes

FINANCE

Mr. Accetturo asked Mr. Williams if they could move on to finance.

Mr. Williams stated that A-2 the monthly Finance report, there was nothing out of the normal there. The Board will see on page 2 that of course the profit/loss is high due to the upfront payments in January of all the insurances. Mr. Lazorisak replied that they spoke about that last month.

Mr. Williams replied that this will slowly go down over time and it usually takes almost until the end of the year before that negative becomes a positive, as it did last year.

Mr. Williams replied that other than that, everything is in order then asked Mrs. Banghart if she had anything out of order. Mrs. Banghart replied no.

Mr. Williams stated that all of the haulers appeared to be current. So, if there are no further questions there is a resolution to pay the bills.

Mr. Accetturo asked is there a motion on Resolution R-02-11-20 to pay bills.

Mr. Lazorisak stated that he would make the motion.

Mr. Mach stated that he would second the motion.

Mr. Accetturo asked for a roll.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Accetturo	-	Yes
	Mr. Lazorisak	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Yes
	Mr. Perez	-	Yes
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes

On a motion by *Mr. Lazorisak*, seconded by *Mr. Mach*, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *February 24, 2020*.

RESOLUTION

R-02-11-20

To Pay Bills – February 24, 2020

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. Accetturo	-	Yes
	Mr. Lazorisak	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Yes
	Mr. Perez	-	Yes
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes

We hereby certify Resolution to Pay Bills in the amount of **\$362,059.17** to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County on the *24th day* of February, *2020*.

Mariann Cliff
Recording Secretary

James Williams
Director of Operations

Approved: February 24, 2020

PERSONNEL

Mr. Accetturo asked Mr. Williams to give the Personnel report.
Mr. Williams stated that there was none.

FACILITIES/RECYCLING

Mr. Accetturo stated for facilities and recycling Mr. Williams that would be you.
Mr. Williams stated that A-5 before us is the recycling enhancement act tax fund entitlement spending plan for 2019. He did go over this with Mr. Dave Dech and he had made the recommended changes to this grant to increase our recycling hauling portion which should be adequate but of course as our recycling goes up so does the hauling but he thinks that they got it and everything else is appropriate as Mr. Dech has it laid out. So if everyone is in agreement we just need to pass the resolution R-02-13-20.

Mr. Accetturo asked if anyone had any further discussion on R-02-13-20. Is there a motion on R-02-13-20 Recycling Enhancement Act Tax Fund Entitlement Spending Plan for 2019.

Mr. Cannon stated that he would make the motion.
Mr. Accetturo stated that he would second the motion and to call roll.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Accetturo	-	Yes
	Mr. Lazorisak	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Yes
	Mr. Perez	-	Yes
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes

Landfill Operations

Mr. Williams stated that the next item was Landfill operations and there was nothing further to report there and that everything is in order, no issues are going on as far as the operations go.

Cell 7 Construction

Mr. Williams stated that the Cell 7 construction he thinks they should discuss in executive session, which would be regarding the financing, which will probably lead into the contracts. So he would suggest holding off further discussion on the landfill construction along with the contract extensions until executive session regarding those matters.

Mr. Williams stated that next you will see A-7, A-8 and A-9, which is the recycling for the month of January for the electronics, tires and single stream recycling. This is more of an FYI for everyone, if there are any questions feel free.

Mr. Williams stated that the next item was A-10 Draft RFB for a Truck mounted Roll-off Style Water Distributor Tank System. It is a water tank that goes on our Roll-off truck. It is something that was budgeted in the capitol and working with Counsel, we put this RFB together so if there is no objection by the Board we would like to get this out.

Mr. Lazorisak stated that he would like to make a motion to put the Truck mounted Roll-off Style Water Distribution Tank out to bid.

Mr. Accetturo stated that he would second the motion.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Accetturo	-	Yes
	Mr. Lazorisak	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Yes
	Mr. Perez	-	Yes
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes

Mr. Williams stated that one last item; he has two bids coming in this week on the 27th one is for the grass mowing the other is for the well drilling. Then we will be able to act on them, get an attorney review.

Mr. Lazorisak asked how many bids were picked up for the well? Mr. Williams stated that it filled up a page. Mr. Lazorisak asked is that right? Mr. Williams replied yes, now 2 or 3 of them are just agencies. One of them sent an email back that they were not going to bid on it. Mr. Williams continued that we did receive one bid already from Colaluce, we will see what happens if anyone else brings one in. for the landscaping there are probably half a dozen bids that were picked up.

Mr. Lazorisak asked when is the bid? Mr. Williams replied that it was February 27, 2020 10:00am.

Mr. Williams stated that they had skipped over A-6, this was a revised waste disposal fee schedule this is just for the inter-locals municipalities. There are six of them highlighted in red. Mr. Cannon stated that this was just renewing them correct. Mr. Williams replied yes, renewing them for one year. Again this was just the inter-local municipal agreement. If there is no objection, he just needs a roll call approval on A-6 the inter-local municipal agreements highlighted in red.

Mr. Accetturo asked if he needed a motion or just a roll call. Mr. Williams replied that a motion would be good.

Mr. Accetturo asked if he could get a motion on A-6 2020 Waste Disposal Fee Schedule.

Mr. Mach stated that he would make the motion.

Mr. Accetturo stated that he would second the motion and to call roll.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Accetturo	-	Yes
	Mr. Lazorisak	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Yes
	Mr. Perez	-	Yes
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes

GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT

Mr. Accetturo stated that now we are on the general counsel's report. Mr. Tipton stated that he had nothing for public session just updates on the Sanico litigation and Covanta discussions.

OTHER

Mr. Accetturo asked if there was any New Business, Other Business.

Mr. Accetturo asked if there were any closing public comments. Then speaking to a man in the audience asked yes sir?

Mr. Smith stated that he was Jim Smith from Sanico. Then stated that about three weeks ago he had sent Mr. Williams a letter asking him about the status of the bulky waste contracts which were ending at the end of the week. Mr. Smith stated that he had not gotten a reply could someone tell him what the story was on that.

Mr. Williams replied saying that they were going to discuss that today and there would be an answer by noon today. Mr. Smith asked if he would get an answer. Mr. Williams replied oh yes. Mr. Smith replied ok, thank you.

Mr. Williams replied to Mr. Smith that he would notify him by fax. Mr. Smith replied ok great thank you.

PRESS COMMENTS & QUESTIONS

Mr. Accetturo stated press, comments or questions then stated no press.

Mr. Accetturo asked was there a motion to go into executive session.

Mr. Lazorisak stated that he would make the motion.

Mr. Mach stated that he would second the motion.

Mr. Accetturo called for roll.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Accetturo	-	Yes
	Mr. Lazorisak	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Yes
	Mr. Perez	-	Yes
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes

***Executive session started at approximately 10:26am*

Executive Session

On a motion by, **Mr. Lazorisak**, seconded by, **Mr. Mach**, the Board agreed to an Executive Session at approximately 10:26 AM to discuss Contract Negotiations, at the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *February 24, 2020*.

RESOLUTION

R-02-14-20

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 on January 27, 2019.

Moved By: **Mr. Lazorisak**

Seconded By: **Mr. Mach**

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Accetturo	-	Yes
	Mr. Lazorisak	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Yes
	Mr. Perez	-	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
Mariann Cliff

Dated: February 24, 2020

****Executive session ended approximately 11:04**

****Public session started approximately 11:04**

Mr. Lazorisak asked if they needed a motion to come out of executive session.
Mr. Accetturo replied yes.
Mr. Lazorisak stated that he would make a motion to come out of executive session.
Mr. Accetturo stated that he would second the motion then asked for roll.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Accetturo	-	Yes
	Mr. Lazorisak	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Yes
	Mr. Perez	-	Yes
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes

Mr. Lazorisak asked if they need a motion on A-12 the newest established pricing schedule.
Mr. Accetturo replied yes, and then asked Mr. Lazorisak if that was a motion?
Mr. Lazorisak replied yes it was.
Mr. Accetturo asked is there a second on the motion A-12?
Mr. Mach stated that he would second the motion.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Accetturo	-	Yes
	Mr. Lazorisak	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Yes
	Mr. Perez	-	Yes
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes

Closing Public Comments

Mr. Accetturo asked if there was anything else before they adjourn.

Mr. Perez stated that yes, there was something that he would like to say. Mr. Perez continued that first, he would like to give them a quick reason why he declined the Treasurer's job, he feels that without the proper training he was not capable to do that job with the amount of money that they were talking about. This was not a small amount of money that they are dealing with. He would like to thank Mr. Lazorisak for nominating him but that is his reason for turning it down.

Mr. Perez continued that secondly, he would just like to say that he thinks that not re-nominating Mr. Cannon as their Chairman was a mistake. Mr. Perez stated that he does not know Mr. Accetturo and he does not know what he is capable of, this is not a reflection on him. It is just that he is new person to the committee. Mr. Perez does understand that Mr. Accetturo has previous experience and relations with the committee in the past. But it sounds like it was some time ago. Now just coming in cold it is unfair to him to be put into that position, and also, he just thinks that removing Mr. Cannon as our Chairman is a

mistake, he thinks that Mr. Cannon has done an excellent job and he would have continued to do an excellent job.

Mr. Perez stated that all that being said, he does wish the best to all of the new positions that have been appointed today. He will continue to give his support. But he wanted everyone to know that he just thinks that we were being pressured by the Freeholders with the addition of Mr. Accetturo replacing Mr. Allen and then the nominations look like they were also pushed by the Freeholders. Mr. Perez stated that was all that he had to say.

Mr. Cannon replied thank you to Mr. Perez.

Mr. Accetturo stated that he has been involved in many transitions through the years, some of them go smoothly, and some of them do not. He is not here with any kind of special agenda to the Board.

Mr. Accetturo stated that he would like to thank Mr. Cannon. In spite of the circumstances, he has been very professional today, sharing his knowledge of things. Mr. Accetturo stated that he hopes that would continue because he is going to rely upon all of the Board members and especially Mr. Cannon a lot.

Mr. Accetturo stated that to keep this thing going in the right direction it sounds to him from everything that he has heard that the Authority is on a good track and the Board members stay on top of things and have worked with Mr. Cannon a long time.

Mr. Accetturo stated that he was present for Mr. Williams's transition when he became Director he has a lot of faith in Mr. Williams. Mr. Accetturo stated that he was definitely part of Mr. Williams getting that position. He has worked with Mr. Tipton numerous occasions, he appreciates Mr. Perez's thoughts and he understands where he is coming from but he will do a very good job and he hopes that Mr. Perez will communicate with him.

Mr. Accetturo stated that he would have his contact information out to everyone, he does answer his phone all the time. Mr. Accetturo stated thank you for your comments, he thinks it is important to put it out there in the open, so thank you.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Accetturo asked if anyone had anything else, hearing none was there a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Perez stated that he would make that motion.

Mr. Lazorisak stated that he would second that motion.

Mr. Accetturo replied roll.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Accetturo	-	Yes
	Mr. Lazorisak	-	Yes
	Mr. Mach	-	Yes
	Mr. Perez	-	Yes
	Mr. Cannon	-	Yes

Respectfully submitted by:

Mariann Cliff

Recording Secretary

Approved: March 23, 2020