

POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY
OF WARREN COUNTY

MINUTES OF REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING

September 23, 2024

Chairman Angelo Accetturo called the regular monthly meeting of the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County to order at approximately 9:36 am.

Authority Members present: Angelo Accetturo, Rob Larsen, Walter Orcutt, and Dan Perez.

Mr. Accetturo asked to call the roll.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Larsen	- Present
	Mr. Orcutt	- Present
	Mr. Perez	- Present
	Mr. Accetturo	- Present

Also present: Brian Tipton, General Counsel; Jonathan Knittel, Director of Operations; Jamie Banghart, Assistant Director and Mariann Cliff, Recording Secretary.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mr. Accetturo.

Mr. Accetturo read the following statement: “Adequate notice of this meeting of September 23, 2024 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 County Commissioners, 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. Accetturo asked if there was a motion to approve M-1 the Regular monthly meeting minutes and M-2 the executive minutes from August 26, 2024.

Mr. Orcutt stated that he would make the motion to approve M-1 & M-2.

Mr. Perez stated that he would second the motion.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Larsen - Abstain
 Mr. Orcutt - Yes
 Mr. Perez - Yes
 Mr. Accetturo - Yes

CORRESPONDENCE

None

PUBLIC COMMENTS (AGENDA ITEMS ONLY)

Mr. Accetturo asked if there were any public comments for agenda items only.

FINANCE

Mr. Accetturo stated that next was the finance with Mr. Knittel and Mrs. Banghart.

Mrs. Banghart stated that finances were good, as you see on page 3 of the finance report there was an additional page added to show the reimbursements for the capping project. They just received

another reimbursement on Friday for \$48,332.30 and they were still waiting for almost \$4 million back from the State in reimbursements on the capping project.

Mr. Knittel stated that it shows all nine of them to date. The three from last year have been approved. The first two for this year have been approved. They have two outstanding. The third one was also outstanding. The last one on the list for \$1,490,000.00 they would be turning in today to the State.

So, they were in a little better shape but they still have \$3,100,000.00 outstanding for closure. They knew that they would be floating a couple of months. They were ok with that, not really comfortable but they were meeting with the DEP on Wednesday at 10:00 they were coming here for a formal site visit, inspection and also a sit down to talk about things like this and how the capping was going.

There was a quick discussion with the Board regarding the timeliness of the DEP reimbursing the PCFA with the closure funds for the capping project. How long it was actually taking versus what the DEP told us that it would be, and how we were doing financially at this point.

Mr. Knittel stated that also with the finance, they had A-2, which was the draft 2025 budget he did make a few changes in it. They went through budget lines from last year and this year to see how they were doing on certain things. For example, the medical costs, they verified what the increase was going to be for State Health Benefits for medical, it was 16%. There were increases on some of the line items. He tried to highlight all of those with yellow for anything that increased or decreased. It would be in red ink if it was an increase and black ink if it was a decrease. There were several lines that decreased, like the engineering solid waste would be down because they did not have any other projects other than the closure project. They did increase a brand-new line item in dark blue 5533 leachate treatment plant, they budgeted money for that from the leachate savings that they anticipate from the capping project. They kept the savings from leachate directly in that group of dark blue ink

in the middle of the page. So, the savings goes right back to upgrading, evaluating and running the water treatment plant. They do have a leachate contract that runs through October of next year, so at that point they would have to evaluate the situation. They still would need an emergency hauler even if they had a plant running. So, they would just need to keep an eye on what they think trucking charges could be, and they do understand that they would be higher.

So, the operations of the leachate treatment plant are a key item for next year and hence there was a substantial budget proposed for that.

Mr. Knittel stated that they do have a line item for non-operating appropriations on the bottom of A-2. That non-operating expense, they were proposing a cell-6 construction fund. To be PCFA controlled by the Board and to have cash placed in Valley Bank to be separate account than our daily checking and savings account. What they would like to do next year is fund that account with \$40,000.00 per month for a total of \$480,000.00. What they would like to start doing over the next three years is putting some cash each month from our regular operations back into a bank account. And make this account 100% accessible while trying to build up a cell-6 cash account.

There was a detailed discussion regarding this new account and the subject of funding for a new cell-6A. How the account should be set up according to the NJDEP, and why it would, or would not be a capital fund. How the transfer to the account would work, if it were capital and that it would need a Board approval for every transfer/deposit. Also discussed was the subject of the PCFA being a non-profit and the need to build a balanced budget.

Mr. Knittel stated that balancing this budget with leachate savings, they have some cash coming into revenue next year that would be in excess of what we're spending, however they had done nothing to start paying for cell 6-A which could be in as little as three years. If they do nothing now, they would be at the mercy of a high interest loan or the IBank or something similar.

Therefore, putting money away, in the interest of funding cell-6A does help balance the budget.

Mr. Orcutt stated that we carry a surplus on our capital accounts now that was a pretty good number.

Mr. Knittel replied that we do bring in more money than we spend yes, but it was a very small percentage of the budget in the last few years. It was increasing now a little bit more with leachate savings because of the capping project. This was the way we would appropriate those savings that they normally had expenses for: The two things that they did was, that they propose to put \$480,000 into a capital account on a yearly basis, and as you see the leachate treatment plant has a budget of \$600,000.00 and that plus the \$480,000.00 was \$1,080,000.00. that million dollars was being appropriated to either the treatment plant or to the capital savings.

Mr. Knittel stated that, the capital savings in the past, had been whenever they had more revenue than expenses, it would go back into our bank account.

Mr. Orcutt stated that that was just a function of planning in the budget process. Mrs. Banghart stated it hit the whole budget with borrowing our own cash for cell 7, and then, we were not allowed to have any capital at that time.

There was a long discussion about the troubles that they had with getting the money to build cell-7, even though they had enough for the project in the closure accounts. This included the IBank and its

lack of communication with us. And borrowing from closure funds and paying it back was just as difficult. At that point they also discussed the option of bringing in more trash to pay for cell-6, and what the repercussions of that would be, with our yearly goal being 200,000 cubic yards. If they brought in more, they could pay for it quicker but they also would need to build it sooner. It was also discussed that there were no regulatory mandates for how much waste comes in per year, but the County plan has the PCFA lasting until 2062, which they were on pace for. They actually have an additional year due to delays in construction and the benefit of recovering airspace.

Mr. Knittel stated that, they were good for the County plan, they could go 200,000, they could go 400,000 if they wanted to double the revenue, and people would give us trash as long as the price was right, it's just a matter of then you were bumping up construction by a full year on cell 6-A right now they were looking at the summer of 2027 which was 3 years from now.

Another discussion ensued with the Board members going over the number's different ways.

Mr. Knittel stated that what they were trying to do was have half the cash on hand when it was time for that cell 6 project.

Mr. Orcutt stated that largely speaking, if we doubled our intake, they almost pay for the whole cell.

Mr. Accetturo replied but then, they would shorten the life of the landfill.

The discussion continued with talk about how much trash would actually be from Warren County and how much from out of County, and if any came from out of State. Then the discussion once again turned to if the PCFA took in more trash over the next few years they could pay for cell 6-A in its entirety. But cell 7 would fill soon and the construction would have to start early.

Mr. Accetturo asked how many cells can they fit in the property that they own. Mr. Knittel answered That the next two, 6-A and 6B will increase the 32 years and it gives access to the last several years of the current cell 7. See, Cell-7 is an 8-year cell but it is really six years accessible by itself because of the way it has been built. So, when you build cell 6-A it would give you access to the couple of years that was left on cell 7. This would add 32-34 years goes into effect on top of the current cell when they go into construction with cell 6-A and B.

They would start with 6-A, and B would follow probably 15 or 20 years later.

Mr. Orcutt stated he does not want to get bogged down in a long-term discussion but at some point, in the future it's going to make more sense to be putting trash in that ravine out there as opposed to the power lines.

Mr. Knittel stated that that was a very good engineering point and that could be negotiated with JCP&L.

There was some discussion on the use of that land for trash and what it would take to move high tension wires and put trash into the ravine. Also, how much time it would buy us and what it would cost to move the wires.

Mr. Orcutt stated that they were going start on the bills next, but he had one question before they start.

Mr. Accetturo replied, go ahead.

Mr. Orcutt asked about the D-6, give us a little run down on that, they were spending a lot of (stupid) money on it.

There was a spirited discussion that followed about the money spent on D6 repairs. Noted was the fact that the PCFA does not have a diesel repair mechanic on-site, because of the cost associated with hiring a diesel mechanic was extremely high.

But at this point the budget for maintenance was getting higher and higher, so the argument for getting a mechanic was a valid point. Also noted was that they had 2 - D6's plus a rental.

At the end of the discussion, Mr. Knittel was asked to get some numbers on the money spent on the 2 D-6's to get an idea of how much of this maintenance budget was going to those 2 machines.

Mr. Orcutt stated that diesel mechanics were not necessarily transmission guys.

Mr. Larsen also stated that Foley mechanics were getting \$180.00 per hour.

The discussion continued revolving around transmissions and undercarriages and the money that they had to pay for them. Also discussed were the age of the machines, and it was brought up that a landfill was the harshest of environments to run a machine.

Mr. Knittel stated that one of the ways around that was to go to a larger machine a D7 or D8 so they don't work as hard, you use less rpm less wear and tear. The D8's are enormous and it was harder for visibility and maneuverability but we have the space now.

Mr. Orcutt replied that you get more compaction with a D8.

Mr. Knittel replied yes by far, and an D8 can push a full truck where a D6 struggles and he believes that they were using the smallest machine that can push the trash, while doing side slopes and steep slopes. They were finally in an area where they have a 6-acre plateau where it is flat every day, which is perfect.

Mr. Orcutt asked if it was counterproductive for cover? Mr. Knittel replied, yes that it was too big and bulky for that.

Mr. Knittel stated that the equipment choices go back almost five years, the previous five to ten years, the Board, the former director, and the staff had no idea if the landfill was closing or expanding. With that in mind there was decisions made to purchase smaller machines, such as the Hyundai loader for example was undersized, the D6's were technically on the smaller size. Those were economical decisions because they could have been closed by 2020.

But then they did build cell 7 and cell 6-A was fully permitted and already started so a lot of the infrastructure was already installed. Now that they know they were going to be here for forty years, he would love to have a more detailed discussion in capital or heavy equipment, about how do they properly size equipment now that they know they would be here for the next four decades.

Mrs. Banghart stated that Mrs. Cliff has a break-down of all machines and their service, and maintenance cost.

Another quick discussion was had on the D6's and associated costs.

It was also brought up that these are the workhorses of the landfill and that's what pushes 9 million dollars' worth of trash every year. It was said that no other machine works as hard. They also spoke about the Volvo that had finally been repaired and was back in service.

Mr. Accetturo stated that they need a resolution to pay bills.

Mr. Orcutt stated that he would make a motion to approve R-09-01-24 Resolution to pay bills.

Mr. Perez stated that he would second the motion.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Larsen	- Yes
	Mr. Orcutt	- Yes
	Mr. Perez	- Yes
	Mr. Accetturo	- Yes

On a motion by **Mr. Orcutt**, seconded by **Mr. Perez**, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *September 23, 2024*.

R E S O L U T I O N

R-09-01-24

To Pay Bills – September 23, 2024

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. Larsen	- Yes
	Mr. Orcutt	- Yes
	Mr. Perez	- Yes
	Mr. Accetturo	- Yes

We hereby certify Resolution to Pay Bills in the amount of **\$2,260,714.10** to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County on the 23rd day of September, 2024.

Mariann Cliff
Recording Secretary

Jonathan Knittel
Director of Operations

Approved: 9/23/24

PERSONNEL

Mr. Accetturo asked Mr. Knittel if he had anything for personnel. Mr. Knittel replied yes, the PCFA hired two part-time workers, they were both working as apprentice operators and has been operating the roll-off truck, rock trucks and any other tasks that have been assigned.

Mr. Knittel stated that we have the consideration to include a donated leave policy into our PCFA personnel manual. Warren County was kind enough to share their donated leave policy with us for consideration. A-3 was the County policy; we have only edited it as far as Department heads and titles. If there was discussion or questions, we could do that now or in executive. If not, we would need a resolution to adopt Donated leave program from Warren County for our own use in our manual.

Mr. Orcutt stated that to be clear, it could not be used to augment disability.

This started a detailed discussion of what kind of donated pay can be used with what type of disability. Turns out that in NJ you can supplement TDI with PTO, however it is not common, some payroll companies do not know about it and only some personnel are aware of it at the State level.

Mr. Orcutt asked what the County does under their policy. Mrs. Banghart stated that they do not do that either.

Mr. Knittel replied that they give 100% pay by using donated leave.

Mr. Orcutt stated that he would let them deal with that on a case-by-case basis, as far as the overall plan, he was familiar with it and it was fully vetted from the County.

Mr. Orcutt stated that he was in favor of moving this resolution.

Mr. Accetturo stated that he would second the motion.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Larsen - Yes
 Mr. Orcutt - Yes

Mr. Perez - Yes
Mr. Accetturo - Yes

Mr. Orcutt asked, before they go on, was it Mr. Knittel's intent to hire one of the part-time employees?

Mr. Knittel replied that due to the fact that they were 2 men down, one starting out with his own business and the other out on disability. Yes, he would like to hire one of the part-time employees.

Mr. Orcutt asked in order for them to authorize it, they would need salary. Mr. Knittel stated that in the past to offer full time employment they would offer .50 more per hour.

There was a quick discussion regarding the individual and the position.

Mr. Perez stated that he would make a motion to offer full time employment to one of the part-time employees.

Mr. Larsen stated that he would second the motion.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Larsen - Yes
Mr. Orcutt - Yes
Mr. Perez - Yes
Mr. Accetturo - Yes

PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Accetturo stated that there were no presentations.

REPORTS

Mr. Accetturo stated there were no reports.

FACILITIES/RECYCLING

Mr. Accetturo asked Mr. Knittel to go on with facilities and recycling.

Mr. Knittel stated that this last Wednesday Covanta abandoned and pulled the pumps out of well #2. On the same day, we installed our own 2-horse pump, with all new wire and tubing. Mr. Knittel worked with DEP on transferring the name on the permit from Covanta back to us, that was going well. (no pun intended)

Mr. Orcutt asked if that was potable water coming. Mr. Knittel replied that yes it was potable water from well #2.

Mr. Knittel stated that they have a permit or amendment to send into the State, then it puts well #2 onto our site permit.

The DEP was delaying our stack test from October until December due to their inability to review the testing protocol in time. This should not affect anything.

Mr. Knittel stated that on-site water treatment plant evaluation has been slow going so he would be meeting with Cliff to speed that process up and get his evaluation at the end of the year at the latest, so that we know approximately how much money and time that they would need to un-mothball.

Mr. Orcutt asked what the \$600,000.00 was going to do?

Mr. Knittel replied that a full R/O system at 40,000 gallons a day might be closer to a million dollars but it would get us significantly through any upgrades, they do not know if R/O was needed or if they could meet the water quality standards of PRUMA without R/O. They do know that there was pipes and pumps that may need upgrading, so this \$600,000.00 may not be enough but we believe it to be a significant portion of our water plant upgrade.

Mr. Knittel stated that the force main by-pass had two options, one, to come around the front on Pisgah. The other to go through private property.

Mr. Orcutt asked if anyone had any discussion with the land owner? Mr. Knittel replied that there was a phone call or two informally through a third party who shared his phone number with the landowner, but a very limited exchange.

Mr. Accetturo stated that at this point he thinks that it was more their problem than ours. He would imagine that they were going to need sewer connections.

Mr. Orcutt stated that Mr. Lazorisak was not letting them run through the County property. So that if they upgrade the sewer plant they have to scramble.

Mr. Knittel stated that they do always have to have an option to come down east quarry.

There was more discussion on where the lines would run to, and how they were going to get into PRUMA and possibly even talking to the new landowners.

Mr. Knittel stated that the 20-acre cap project was going on-schedule.

Mr. Knittel stated that for the odor up-date, it was this time of year when they had the cold air coming down the mountain at night and they had not had any complaints. They have been keeping an eye on it at the fence-line. They did have improvements that were going to be installed late this fall so we were hoping to stay ahead of the odor. If they ever do have an odor develop, they have pipe and stone on-site and they would excavate in the area of the hot-spot and install a horizontal collector, at this point they have the materials ready to go.

Mr. Orcutt stated on that subject, why was in not part of the original plan in cell 7 to have any kind of vacuum installed in that could handle odor issues.

Mr. Knittel replied that he had discussed this in detail with both the DEP and the engineer. To shorten the answer, at the time the design was actually started in 2016 and 17, there was no item-10 available. So, this was going to be a C&D landfill only, including ID 27 and very limited ID 25 which was the dead animals. The amount of organics was not anticipated, now that they have 52% of the waste as item 10 with 17% organics. The gas header would have been designed if it was known. So, the change of waste type was the reason, the DEP's stance now is that no matter what type of landfill it was going to be, there will be a header designed in every future landfill. the DEP has changed their policy based on what we have endured.

Mr. Perez stated that at that time, we the PCFA still had an agreement with Covanta.

Mr. Accetturo stated that he has been smelling it more this month. Mr. Knittel replied thank you, he would take note of that.

Mr. Knittel stated that Draft Somerset Raritan Valley Sewage and Stony Brook Regional Authorities, so there were two sewer plants in the area that incinerate, and completely destroy the biological activity of their sludge that they clean out once per year from their lagoons. They amend it and it gets incinerated and then it comes here as approved daily cover. The PCFA has been bringing this in as daily cover for multiple years, it was usually a two-year contract. This is the time when we renew the two-year contract for both of those facilities. The tipping fees we are proposing to go up \$2.00 per ton on both of those facilities.

Mr. Orcutt asked if it was roughly 3,000 tons total?

Mr. Knittel replied yes, one and two respectively so, three total from both facilities. That 3,000 tons gets brought right to our working face, and used for daily cover. It's a fair price for daily cover and it works well for us, no dust or health concerns with it.

Mr. Orcutt stated that they have had this contract in place for some time. This stuff gets parked in a heap and it was only used for daily cover? It was not used until they had the test results.

Mr. Knittel stated that they do send test results up front. Its once per year that they clean out their stuff and burn it and sample it. Then it was brought here and used, we do have the ability to get test results at any time from them.

Mr. Orcutt stated that his point was, it was not getting put down without test results, then they have to deal with it if the results are bad.

Mr. Knittel stated that incinerated sewage sludge was always approved to be in a lined landfill.

Mr. Orcutt replied ok fair enough.

Mr. Knittel went on to say that human sludge incinerated or not has PFAS in it. So, humans concentrate PFAS. If someone was to say that they don't want PFAS in it, well PFAS is in everything, but it was a more concentrated form of PFAS.

Mr. Orcutt replied that as part of their agreement or contract is that we have to mix it? Why does it talk about that it was intended to be mixed, it should not be put down 100 % as cover?

Mr. Knittel replied that he would have to review that, he was not as familiar with that. when it was dumped it was mixed with ash, it gets mixed in with all the daily cover for that day. So, when they have daily cover there are generally 9 Rock trucks worth of material or 9 piles that they need every day. So, it could be any combination of material, soil, ash and incinerated sewage waste. When that is pushed as daily cover, it automatically is blended by the dozer, so he will review what Mr. Orcutt was referencing and he will get back to them.

Mr. Orcutt stated that he thought it was in the contracts, 'as part of the use of the SRVSA soil PCFA shall blend with the parameters of the lined landfill with onsite soil and ash. The percentage of onsite soil to ash mixture shall be 50 % onsite soil to 50 % ash.

Mr. Knittel replied that those requirements were always met, each time by normal daily cover activities.

Mr. Orcutt replied alright.

The subject of PFAS was discussed a bit further amongst the Board.

Mr. Knittel stated that next A-4 was pretty simple, it was our draft 2025 holiday schedule.

Mr. Perez stated that he had a question, or suggestion, you all have personal time, right? So would it be advantages for us to offer up the Friday after Christmas and the Friday after New Years but split it between the groups so that you would not be totally shut down, you would half of the people here on Christmas and the rest of the people would work on New Years. Was that something that made sense, something that we could do?

Mr. Knittel replied that could be workable, so we generally are reduced to 4 or 5 people on Saturdays from our normal 7 in the field, so we could do ½ staff on Friday the 26th then the other half of the crew would be Friday January 2nd for operations.

Mrs. Banghart asked until 11:00? Mr. Knittel replied no, for the full working day.

This started a lively discussion of how this would work, as generally after a holiday there is more material that comes in than on a normal day. Also discussed was notifying the haulers.

Mr. Perez stated that they should just look at it to see if it could work, if it can't then its ok.

Mr. Knittel stated that they would pass on any motion for A-4 for now and they'll come back to it next month.

Mrs. Banghart stated going back to Somerset Raritan Valley and Stony Brook. Were those approved to go out, or were we sitting on those for another month?

Mr. Orcutt asked if they approved the \$2.00 increase or what?

Mrs. Banghart stated that they needed a motion to approve the contracts.

Mr. Tipton stated that they needed to approve the contracts.

Mr. Orcutt stated that he would make a motion to approve the \$2.00 increase for Somerset Raritan Valley and Stony Brook's contract.

Mr. Larsen stated that he would second the motion.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Larsen	- Yes
	Mr. Orcutt	- Yes
	Mr. Perez	- Yes
	Mr. Accetturo	- Yes

Mr. Orcutt stated that they need to go back to the holiday schedule, there was only one change and it was not discussed at all.

Mr. Knittel stated that the one change on the holiday schedule was to close on Saturday April 19 which was on the Easter weekend. The number of days closed would be the same as the County they were just swapping the one in June for the one in April.

Mr. Orcutt stated that they would be aligned with the County except, they were just taking June-teenth and swapping it for Easter weekend.

Mr. Orcutt asked if they needed a motion.

Mr. Knittel replied that they could pass this as is now but he was unsure about the Christmas and New Year's proposition so that portion would have to wait until next month.

Mr. Perez stated that they should wait and see what could be done about time off at Christmas, and come back to this next month.

Mr. Knittel stated that next, he would like to group A-5 and A-6 together. There was a brief committee meeting about this. The discussion in committee was that both A-5 and A-6 were legal services that they were very happy with both of those services.

Mr. Orcutt stated that Mr. Tipton had said that every year we have gone out to bid for Legal services, when we don't need to?

Mr. Tipton replied correct, it was not necessary to bid for Legal services.

Mr. Orcutt stated that he would make a motion that they no longer have to bid for Legal and Accounting services.

Mr. Perez stated that he would second that motion.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Larsen	- Yes
	Mr. Orcutt	- Yes
	Mr. Perez	- Yes
	Mr. Accetturo	- Yes

Mr. Knittel stated that in a normal year there would also be an annual topo survey that goes out every year. That was professional services, with a licensed surveyor. The DEP has been asking us for mid-year edits to our annual survey, repeatedly. He did not have a contract in place because it was an annual lump-sum bid every January. To change that they gave me basically the same price as last year and then gave me an attachment B which was their hourly rates for any changes or edits that the DEP might request. Mr. Knittel stated that he does have a quote for 2025 services for Robenson Aerial.

Mr. Orcutt stated we used them, they understand our landfill, coupled by the fact that they were under the bid threshold anyway. Its \$11,000.00 or something but as licensed professionals they come under the professional services realm anyway.

Mr. Tipton replied correct.

Mr. Orcutt stated that he would make a motion to consider them under the professional services umbrella and award them as director sees fit.

Mr. Perez stated that he would second the motion.

ROLL CALL:	Mr. Larsen	- Yes
	Mr. Orcutt	- Yes
	Mr. Perez	- Yes
	Mr. Accetturo	- Yes

Mr. Knittel replied thank you, and Mrs. Banghart would add them to the Web Page for the list of Professionals.

Mr. Knittel stated that A-7 was our waste disposal fee schedule, there were no changes.

Mr. Knittel stated that A-8, A-9 and A-10 were our three recycling programs. Electronics, Tires, and Single Stream. All of those recycling programs were running as expected. They do have a committee meeting tomorrow with Mr. Dave Dech on the regional recycling counsel and he would like Mrs.

Banghart and myself to participate and update them on our three programs and how they are going. Any trends, pros, and cons.

Mr. Knittel stated that was it for him, and that brings us to the General counsel.

GENERAL COUNSEL

Mr. Tipton stated that they did the agreement and the donated leave, he does not think they need to talk about the injury that occurred by the subcontractor.

The only other thing that came up was that Mrs. Connors asked him about the thirty or so boxes of litigation files that they were holding there in the building. This goes back to the litigation of Somerset and Hunterdon Counties 25 years ago. Some of those may have historical docs in them. That discovery included a collection of a lot of stuff, going back to the beginning of the landfill. You can throw it all out because it was litigation and it's been well older than 7 years which was the standard to maintain files.

She did forward to me some sort of government retention, but he does not see how that would change litigation files. Normally those files would be in a law firm not in the PCFA itself. So you could just throw them all out just to get rid of them or you could go through them to see if there was anything in there that they should keep, possible historic documents.

Mr. Orcutt asked if this discussed material was here? Mr. Knittel replied no they were with Access, we could get them here if needed.

Mr. Knittel stated that he would propose to bring all of Somerset back in house because we were not legally required to preserve it.

This led into a detailed discussion on how many boxes of records were off site with Access that we were paying for each month and how we could reduce that number. PCFA was paying currently \$1500.00 per month for roughly 2 thousand boxes.

Every scale ticket and every meeting agenda since 1989 is off site, it was decided that it was time to go through them and see what we could get rid of.

They would have to look at the options for getting rid of the materials and may have to take advantage of shredding events over the next few years, or some of it may go into the recycle bin or even the landfill.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Accetturo asked if there were any other business.

CLOSING PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Accetturo asked if there were any closing public comments.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Accetturo stated that there was no need for executive session

Seconded By:

ROLL CALL: Mr. Larsen -
 Mr. Orcutt -
 Mr. Perez -
 Mr. Accetturo -

PRESS COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Mr. Accetturo asked if there were any press questions or comments.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Mr. Orcutt asked if Passaic Valley the \$55,000.00 that's one month worth of leachate or what?

Mrs. Banghart asked what he was looking at.

Mr. Knittel replied that they generally were \$100,000.00 per month but we had a low Month.

Mr. Orcutt replied ok that is a low month.

Mr. Knittel stated that our leachate was \$3,000,000.00 per year. We were cutting that way down with capping.

Mr. Accetturo stated that they need to get way down.

Mr. Orcutt stated that he would make a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Accetturo stated that he would second the motion.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Larsen - Yes
 Mr. Orcutt - Yes
 Mr. Perez - Yes
 Mr. Accetturo - Yes

*****Meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:34 am***

Respectfully submitted by:

Mariann Cliff
Recording Secretary

Approved: