

POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY
OF WARREN COUNTY

MINUTES OF REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING

October 28, 2024

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

Authority Members present: Angelo Accetturo, Rob Larsen, Walter Orcutt, and Dan Perez (via Google meets).

Mr. Accetturo asked to call the roll.

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

Also present: Brandon Bowers, Sanico; 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 October 28, 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 from August 26, 2024.

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

Mr. Larsen stated that he would second the motion.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Larsen - Yes
 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 doing well right now, they were still waiting on three reimbursements from the State. They should be receiving the next one soon.

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

Mr. Orcutt stated that he would make a motion to approve R-10-01-24 Resolution to pay bills.

Mr. Larsen 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. Larsen**, the following resolution was adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County at a meeting held on *October 28, 2024*.

RESOLUTION

R-10-01-24

To Pay Bills – October 28, 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 \$2,626,762.99 to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Warren County on the *28th day of October, 2024.*

Mariann Cliff
Recording Secretary

Jonathan Knittel
Director of Operations

Approved: 10/28/24

Mr. Accetturo stated next was A-2 Introduction of 2025 Budget.
Mr. Knittel replied that A-2 had three pages, the first page was expenditures, then capital was the second page and the third was revenue or income. So, for the balanced budget there were a few changes to appropriations from last month's draft budget. One of those was to increase the amount of money for operations line 5533 leachate treatment plant. The increase came from pulling money out of non-operating appropriations which was a Cell-6 construction fund. This was discussed last month but, they did not set aside what the amount would be, for Cell-6. Instead of forcing ourselves to save for Cell-6, they were keeping that extra cash in the line item for the leachate treatment plant, because it's evident to him, and the Board's position was clear, that the leachate treatment plant was one of the keys of our success over the next decade. To have the ability to treat our own leachate without the fear of trucking increases annually, and also able to contribute a few cents back to our local waste-water treatment plant. There are pros and cons with everything that we do but it seems like to get the leachate treatment plant opened and out of the moth-ball state was a key priority over the next year.

So, that was one change that they made and then they did a deep-dive into the equipment maintenance and repair budget. Most of the expense came from, a transmission and an undercarriage that had to be replaced on each Dozer. Those four repairs on the two dozers are what kicked us out of our predicted expenditures for the year. They did increase the equipment budget for next year and they noticed that the repair costs were going up on the compactor but they were going to try to get another full year out of it. There will be discussions over the next few months, to go over all the options, including replacing that compactor with the equipment and capital committees.

Mr. Orcutt stated that it could be tricky, there had to be more interaction with Foley and also to have a replacement unit on-hand for the four months that's if they were going to rebuild it. Mr. Knittel replied that yes, that was the trick, to make sure that we were not left with nothing other than dozer compaction. To not have any other compaction other than dozer on the landfill for four months does have a significant price tag associated with it by burning up air-space. Therefore, the goal would be, if they were going to re-build, they would need a loaner or rental from Foley as they rebuild ours. If we buy new, then we just trade in the old one. Over the next year they would have to decide if they would get a loaner and rebuild or buy new. They do have time for that, and he does have an opinion on it, but that would be discussed later with the committees.

Mr. Orcutt asked what the cost of a new compactor was. Mr. Knittel replied that they were close to a million dollars apiece.

Mr. Orcutt asked what the cost of a new D8 was. Mr. Knittel replied about half that, about five hundred.

Mr. Orcutt asked if the D8 was sufficient for compaction in the short window of time?

There was a discussion on the pros and cons of a D8 versus a D6 what the differences were and if they could use just a heavier dozer while waiting for a compactor rebuild or if they could do without a compactor at all. The cost, the time, the money that could be saved by not having an expensive rental. That discussion led right back into the cost of equipment maintenance.

Mr. Knittel stated that Mariann did a great job in breaking down every machine and their costs. This was just given to the Board as a handout, and it goes through each machine and what we spent this calendar year individually and all together.

Mr. Orcutt stated that it would be instructive to know what the D6 trade-in would be with Foley also. Mr. Knittel replied yes, he thinks that he would have Foley give us a live update throughout the year on that. They could probably give us a trade-in value on all of our equipment because we share our engine hours with them and they have a log of our maintenance.

Mr. Larsen asked how far over the budget they were on maintenance?

Mr. Orcutt replied that he was going to ask that also, and what did they budget for 2024?

Mr. Knittel replied that they had a budget for 2024 for \$300,000.00 for repairs on line 5517.

They spent to date \$500,000.00 and they do not expect to have any other major ones from now until the end of the year, so they were \$200,000.00 over on their budget.

Mr. Knittel stated that they increased the maintenance budget from \$300,000.00 to \$400,000.00, they went up \$100,000.00. The reason being was that they do not expect another year like this, it was the perfect storm of both machines losing their undercarriages in the same year, and both also losing a transmission. With that, he was going up only \$100,000.00, it was a possibility that they could go over but he did not want to throw too much into maintenance. Mr. Orcutt stated that it would be nice if they did not use it and it went back into Cell-6 fund.

Mr. Knittel agreed, that was the goal to build a balanced budget and at the end of the year hoping you do have a surplus that could go back into the bank for machinery replacement.

Mr. Knittel stated that the budget was balanced based on, and now he would have to jump ahead to A-10 which was the waste disposal pricing schedule. Because the budget was only balanced based on what you expect to bring in, in revenue.

Mr. Knittel stated if the Board could all jump to A-10. There were two pages, one was the proposed rates for 2025 as discussed with various Board members from the committee and the other was from last years pricing. When you compare 2024 and 2025 the two haulers that were in the tier 20,000 to 30,000 tons for proposed 2025, they would see a \$2.00 increase based on this proposed rate schedule.

The three transfer station haulers in the tier 14,000 to 20,000 tons would see a \$3.00 increase. Everything else remains the same including the tier for Phillipsburg to haul directly to us and that was in the tier 6,000 to 10,000 tons, their rate remains the same and everything above that remains the same also. Those were just a handful of much smaller haulers, and they have a much higher price per ton and would not change from 2024 to 2025.

The convenience center stays the same as does the small cars, pickups, bagged garbage etc. so the big thing was the \$2.00 increase to Sanico and LMR and the \$3.00 increase to Lemcor, Gaeta and NTI.

Mr. Orcutt asked what the revenue from the convenience center was.

Mr. Knittel replied that on A-2 on page #3 at the bottom, was the convenience center which was \$99.00 per ton at 7,500 tons comes out to \$742,500.00.

Mr. Knittel stated that 5.3% of the total volume comes in through the convenience center and it was 80% of our traffic at the scale. That was what they were here for though, was to serve Warren County residents. With that, they do get all of the recycling programs, commingled, tires, electronics and the freon.

At this point there was a discussion of all haulers, prices and tons. The five largest haulers having the most scrutiny, it was brought up that Sanico was in the room, they and LMR were the two locals that brought in a million apiece. And the three transfer stations made up most of the tonnage per year at just over a million apiece.

Mr. Orcutt asked about Phillipsburg. Mr. Knittel replied that they came in several times a week and the trash was just from Phillipsburg.

Mr. Orcutt stated that it was their trucks and their employees.

There was some discussion of how much animal waste comes in. Mrs. Banghart stated that it was on page 8 of the material analysis report material code 25.

Mr. Orcutt stated that it was just an interesting item to look at.

Mr. Larsen asked what the number was that they shoot for tonnage wise for the year. Mr. Knittel replied ton wise, 135,000 tons across the scale, not counting ash or any other daily cover that they might bring in.

A discussion ensued regarding the actual process of taking in 135,000 tons into a landfill. That led to the Board having a detailed discussion regarding the cost for the haulers to dump into our landfill rather than other landfills. What landfills seemed to be cheaper than us or more expensive taking into consideration where they were coming from.

Mr. Knittel stated that, for 2025, they had to reduce solid waste coming into the landfill just a small percentage in order to stay on track with 200,000 cubic yards of airspace consumed per year.

Another discussion started up on accepting increased tonnage from the local haulers while not accepting as much as was requested of us from the outside County haulers. It was said that this kept the PCFA above 51% of the incoming waste from Warren County.

Mr. Knittel stated that it was good that Washington Borough now has a contract with Casella and Phillipsburg was now coming here directly, those were two large towns that previously had left the County.

There was another quick conversation regarding the PCFA to look to increase the percentage of Warren County trash.

Mr. Knittel stated that the commissioners had done that in the solid waste plan. It was said that they must last until 2062 which was 38 years from today. In order to do that, they have to be at 200,000 cubic yards of air space consumed.

This was thoroughly discussed among the Board, when it was set in place, who was instrumental in monitoring it and how to achieve it. It was said that in the process of expansion the longevity was put into the solid waste plan.

Mr. Knittel stated that they could fill it in a very short period of time, but the percentage of Warren County trash would go down. There were only so many tons available in Warren County and he thinks that was mentioned in the solid waste plan.

Mr. Knittel stated that he believes that one ton of trash is generated per year, per person. He believes that the trash companies have different methods, they may do it by fluff yards in a bin. They have it down to a science, they have to know what they were picking up each week to schedule their routes. They do compact it with their truck and they dump it in the landfill and then we compact it even more so, the compaction ratio is a variable. If you can increase your

compaction ratio you then you can increase your yardage without increasing your volume budget.

Mr. Larsen asked what he sees as the average household average pick per week, for example was it three?

Mr. Accetturo asked tons per week?

Mr. Larsen replied as far as yardage.

A discussion between the Board and Mr. Bowers from Sanico landed on .5 or a half a yard per week from residents of Warren County.

Mr. Bowers stated that most residents have approximately 50 pounds per household times 52 pickups per year, was 1.25 tons per year per household.

The following discussion revolved around how many people were in Warren County and how much trash the landfill would take from the two local haulers. Because there was only so much in Warren County, the solid waste plan would accept the additional waste from out of County.

Mr. Knittel stated that yes there was not enough tonnage in the County to be appropriately sized for the equipment, and numbers of employees, the waste water treatment plant size, everything was sized around the 130,000 or 140,000 tons or that 30,000 to 40,000 gallons per day leachate. Everything was properly sized for those numbers that was why they were bringing in some transfer trucks from out of County.

Mr. Knittel asked at that time, that the price increase to the schedule at \$2.00 and \$3.00 for the two tiers was discussed, was there anymore discussion on it? Or would someone want to perhaps make a motion on A-10 or the Draft Budget.

Mr. Accetturo stated that we do not have to set the rate today.

Mrs. Banghart replied that they do have to set it, because contracts have to go out by the end of the year.

Mr. Knittel stated that they do want to get something out to the haulers, so they were not blind-sided in November or December. They need the resolution for the draft budget so they could physically send that in in draft form to the State as an introduction.

Mr. Knittel asked Mrs. Banghart to correct him if he was wrong but, if they changed something in November, and they already submitted a draft budget, was there a way to edit that?

Mrs. Banghart replied that she was not sure.

Mr. Orcutt asked what would be edited anyway, if it was introduced today what would we potentially edit?

Mr. Accetturo replied that perhaps they did not get involved enough in setting the rate.

Mr. Knittel replied that they had some idea of other landfills like, Bethlehem and Chrin, Scranton, and Keystone. But it's all vague, none of those facilities were just going to say here's our prices.

Even Chrin will have an advertised price but they would have tiered discount prices just like all the others will also for haulers.

Mr. Accetturo stated that they were more interested to know, what kind of pressure was he receiving more garbage from haulers from the eastern part of New Jersey. Are they looking to bring more garbage to this facility?

Mr. Knittel replied that their tier was 19,001 to 27,000 last year and he was reducing that tier to 14,001 to 20,000 that was because they have a fourth hauler, a transfer station, that was interested and they were trying to allow Warren County trash to be the largest percentage.

Mr. Accetturo replied that it was significant, that yet another big hauler wants to come here. That was telling him, that it was financially smarter for them to come here. He was not saying that the PCFA was giving anything away, just that if there were a visible scale of balance. If you have more and more people wanting to come here, it questions the pricing.

Mr. Knittel replied that he agreed, and then said, that the one difference though, and he would speak even though one of them was in the room, about the two local haulers. It seems like they were committed to bringing the majority of their trash here, and they sign a contract. Whereas, the transfer stations may have ten outlets, and their number one investment over the last few years in infrastructure was to build a rail connection, which they were using heavily. They also sell rail-space to other haulers.

Then, they have the incinerator which was very close, within miles of most of those transfer stations, so their preferred route, even though it was a higher price was to take it to Covanta energy for incineration. Only because there was a limit on Covanta, and there was a limit on how many bales that you can put on a train every day, they usually have 8 to 10 outlets. We are one of those.

Mr. Knittel stated that other transfer stations utilize all three landfills in Pennsylvania, the local Chrin, Bethlehem, and Scranton.

There were places like Morristown that only does transfer trucks in one facility. Morristown being an MCOA a government agency, but it seems like the transfer stations have multiple outlets whereas the local haulers may only have one outlet.

They have worked hard with the local haulers to make the price point to where they would want to keep coming here.

Mr. Larsen asked what issue do you have with this specifically?

Mr. Orcutt replied that they were leaving money on the table.

Mr. Accetturo replied that he agreed, this was straight business.

This started a lengthy discussion regarding if the \$2.00 or \$3.00 increase was enough, and if they were being competitive. They discussed if they should look at another hauler, if the existing haulers give them more pressure as they did before.

Also discussed were the nearby landfills and how large they were and much competition they were.

They spoke about fuel costs and the attractiveness of closer landfills versus further away.

Mr. Knittel stated that at the end of the day, what he did was just balance a budget based on our operating price increases. Such as healthcare, which went up along with equipment maintenance.

Mr. Accetturo stated that insurance has gone through the roof.

Mr. Knittel stated that based on the cost to do business was why he came up with the increase.

The increase was again the source of a lengthy discussion, and the Board questioned if they had priced it right. The Board also spoke about keeping the increase at the best rate for the local haulers and at the same time a fair increase to haulers outside of Warren County.

They also discussed the amount of revenue that was brought in from the other lines what percent was with each and if they should be raising them also.

It was then pointed out that 80% of the revenue was getting a raise in rates and the 20% coming from smaller haulers were not. The smaller haulers were already at a high rate. They then looked at the convenience center pricing which was all of Warren County residents. They had not had a price increase in over a decade, but they were already paying the highest cost, which was why it was not increased.

The Board continued discussing rates trying to settle on a number that was correct for each tier. They looked at expenditures that were always rising, against future costs. At the end of the conversation, it did not seem that the increase was sufficient.

Mr. Accetturo stated that he was going to be frank, after all of this discussion, he had not heard anything yet this morning, that would convince him that this was the correct price.

Mr. Orcutt asked, to put this in perspective, and to keep us moving forward, on the 14,001 to 20,000 tons what was the annual volume?

Mr. Knittel replied 60,000 tons and they may want to bring in more.

Mr. Orcutt asked, do the same thing, go down to Sanico and LMR.

Mr. Knittel replied no, the 20,001 to 30,000 tons were up to 30,000 apiece.

Mr. Orcutt stated ok call that 60,000, now go back to the 10,000 to 14,000.

Mr. Knittel replied zero

Mr. Orcutt asked 6,001 to 10,000?

Mr. Knittel replied one client 6,000.

Mr. Orcutt stated that they were talking about 120,000 tons. Each dollar in increase raises \$120,000.00 that was where he was going.

Mr. Accetturo stated that the predicament in this pricing schedule was the desire to keep the local companies at a favorable rate. They were hauling our county's residents' trash, so that was the predicament that makes the pricing so difficult. We would like to favor local companies helping local people. And at the same time, we have those companies that were paying a dollar more that were willing to bring us more trash.

Another lengthy discussion ensued, regarding raising rates more for the larger haulers from transfer stations out of County, and restricting their tonnage. Therefore, allowing room for growth with the two local haulers. During that discussion the question was asked of Counsel if the PCFA could restrict certain haulers, Counsel had replied that they could. The contracts that the PCFA gave to haulers could be accepted or rejected, that was up to the hauler. The PCFA could put whatever they wanted or needed into the contracts that was business. This discussion

continued, looking at the increase they had on the table and what the total projected expenses they had for the year.

At the end, the Board did decide on a number, and they also decided on how much waste a transfer station could bring to the landfill, thereby restricting their tonnage per year. On the other hand, the Board decided to allow the local Warren County haulers to bring in as much as they needed to as long as they were serving the residents of Warren County. It was the Directors decision to allow the locals to bring more trash in that was allowed under their contract, but that rarely happened.

Mr. Orcutt stated that if it was Warren County, they would want to take it.

Mr. Knittel stated that he does agree but, he still does have to answer every January; How they did on the 200,000-yard burn-rate. Now he knows, it was a 38-year span that they have to balance, but they do not want to get to the end of, say, 30 years and you've lost 8 years of air-space because you always went over instead of hitting the mark. That is unless we want to look at amending the Solid Waste Plan which says that we must make it until 2062 by burning 200,000 yards a year. This was why they have that survey done every year, that we send into the State.

Mr. Knittel stated that last year they burned 230,000 which is why they were reducing that for 2025.

Mr. Bowers from Sanico stated that he was going to wait for public comment but he has some thoughts on what they were discussing. Obviously, there was a great amount of self interest in this subject. He then introduced himself to the Board and stated, that he had no agenda. He just had just been anticipating that this very thing would be discussed. He stated that he wanted to see what the tone was. He could tell you from a local hauler's perspective or any hauler there was quite a bit of fatigue with increases at disposal facilities, and everything else as you guys are aware of.

Mr. Bowers stated that disposal is the single largest operating cost of any hauler or transfer station, it is typically around 30 or 40%. They had endured ten, twenty and sometimes thirty percent increases that started post covid. So, he was hoping for nothing and crossing his fingers. the \$2.00 increase that was initially proposed, he thinks was very reasonable and not something that he would argue against. It would still necessitate an increase to his customers but not as big of one that he thought it would be. He was again, hoping to avoid that.

Mr. Bowers stated that he could not help too much on the transfer station questions, they have a different business model. The key difference between local haulers like myself and Casella, if you can call them local still, and the transfer stations was that they were sending individual route trucks right to the disposal facility, whereas they were loading it onto a trailer. Once it's loaded onto a trailer, what's the difference between Warren and Chrin, or Chrin and Bethlehem it was just a different equation or different business model. They were going to look to diversify, they would not want just one-out.

Mr. Bowers stated that he could not give them the rates on Scranton, or Bethlehem, he could not give them any more information that they were not already guessing at, on where they stand competitively in their eyes.

Mr. Bowers stated that the Bethlehem landfill was looking for tonnage, and from a local standpoint that was probably the PCFA's biggest competition right now. It was not very

attractive for Sanico to send their trucks to Bethlehem. They did that for two years when Covanta shut down, and before the PCFA accepted type 10 waste. He stated that they did figure out how to make that work back then.

Mr. Bowers stated that that he was happy to see that the Board was prioritizing Warren County waste, he only comes to these meetings once or twice a year and he does appreciate that the Board does this. If they had any questions from him, he would answer to the best of his ability.

Mr. Orcutt asked if they did a \$2.00 increase what would that represent on your increase to the residents. Mr. Bowers replied \$1.00 per month

Mr. Orcutt stated, consequently if they did a \$5.00 increase, it would be a \$2.50 or so a month passed on to the customer.

This started a conversation between Mr. Bowers and the Board on increasing different amounts and how it would affect the residents at the end of the year. How much it would affect Sanico and how much Sanico would make while passing the increase on to his customers.

Mr. Accetturo asked Mr. Bowers if he was going to hit 30,000 tons this year. Mr. Bowers replied that he would just be a little under 30,000 this year and he does anticipate just above 30,000 next year. Mr. Bowers stated that they were seeing growth, they did win the contract for and were now servicing Allamuchy. There has been some growth in the commercial / industrial sectors, some new construction, and developments. It has been a busy summer and this was the first noticeable upswing since covid. So, we have been growing and they are looking to grow further in the area.

Mr. Perez asked where they were with all of this.

Mr. Knittel replied that as an example in 2022 it was at \$51.00, in 2023 it went up to \$56.00. from 2023 to 2024 it went up \$56.00 to \$60.00.

So, if you look at the \$5.00 and \$4.00 increase, it was a \$9.00 increase in the last two years. Then they were proposing instead of \$5 and \$6 they were only looking at going up \$2.00 in that category to balance the budget. This whole discussion was: is \$2.00 the right number, keeping in mind that every dollar increase does get passed on to Warren County customers. Though it may seem like its affordable, everyone is getting hit with rising costs for everything.

Mr. Knittel stated that one of the goals at the Warren County landfill from Board members and commissioners was to try to run the place as efficiently as possible and to serve Warren County. The extra tonnage coming from the transfer stations was in a separate tier, so he would suggest not to increase the last tier as hard as you would the second tier.

Mr. Knittel stated that they had to keep in mind that there was only three of them and they do talk to each other and they all have multiple outlets to receive their trash.

There was a detailed discussion revolving around the possibility of losing the transfer business and if Warren County landfill could survive on Warren County's garbage alone. It would be losing 60,000 tons which was \$4,000,000.00 in revenue, and the current budget was \$9,000,000.00.

Also discussed was raising the rest of the rates, it was made known that what was decided today would affect the whole 2025 year. The topic of setting the rates had to be done by the whole

Board. The State wants this budget resolution introduced by the Board in October and submitted by November for approval so that it could be done by January 1st.

Mr. Accetturo stated that for the record, this shouldn't be done just on finances. Just because Mr. Knittel was running a more efficient operation, doesn't mean that you should undercut yourself in the marketplace.

Mr. Knittel replied correct, because he probably should be investing more money into Cell-6, into machinery etc.

Mr. Orcutt stated that was exactly what they were saying.

Mr. Accetturo replied that the leachate should be going over the hill, it should not be going down the road. This was something that he had been bringing up for three years.

Mr. Accetturo stated that they had come to a decision. They were looking for a motion to increase the rates \$4.75 for 14,001 to 20,000 tons and \$3.75 for 20,001 to 30,000 tons.

Mr. Larsen stated that he would make that motion.

Mr. Orcutt stated that he would second the motion.

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

Mr. Accetturo stated that they still had to introduce the budget, he was sure that the previous motion was going to present budget challenges.

Mr. Knittel replied that it changes it a little, but with the Boards permission he would put it back into Cell-6 / Equipment fund to balance it. This would definitely help them to plan ahead for something that was only a couple years ahead of us. Such as the compactor and or constructing Cell-6.

Mr. Accetturo stated that he needed a motion to introduce the 2025 budget.

Mr. Larsen stated that he would make the motion to introduce the 2025 budget.

Mr. Perez stated that he would second the motion.

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

Mr. Accetturo stated that next was the Sanitary Landfill Closure Escrow Audit Report ending September 30, 2024.

Mr. Knittel replied that Mrs. Banghart and himself had looked at it, Nisivoccia performed the audit on our closure account, it was required on any closure account that had a more than \$100,000.00. Nisivoccia did not have any corrections or recommendations which you would see

on page 15 if there were any. There were many conference calls with the managing company, Fulton financial of that closure account. This was just to keep them updated that the PCFA was doing withdrawals and will have a few more this year, and a few in the spring. This was to pay for closing the 50-acre area that the Board can see in front of us. That construction was on-time and on-budget, they had 20-acres of liner down already this year. And they were currently working on putting the cover soil on. If anyone would like a tour of that construction project, he would make that available. They would be de-mobilizing mid-December and returning in the spring.

Mr. Bowers left the Board room at approximately 10:35 am

Mr. Accetturo asked what the interest rate was on that closure account.

Mr. Knittel replied that it fluctuates, because it's considered public money, and they were restricted to only government insured investments such as CD's or government bonds or cash. So the cash had done well over the past two years.

Mr. Accetturo asked what the rate was that they received last month.

Mr. Knittel replied 3.5 %, the bonds and CD's were low and the cash portion was high, around 5%.

Mr. Accetturo asked Mr. Knittel to explain the 5% cash.

Mr. Knittel replied that fixed assets versus liquid, so you could invest in cash, money markets, government CD's and government bonds. Those were the only investment opportunities. So, while the rest of the world was getting 8 & 10% interest on investments, the PCFA was generally at 1 to 3%.

This opened up a discussion about the interest percent at Valley Bank and why we could not put the closure funds into a higher percent account. It was said that the money could not be in just one account and it was run by Fulton Advisors. It was also said that the money had to be managed by an advisory group, who managed our account, not for us, but for the DEP.

Mr. Accetturo stated that there had to be a bank out there paying more than 3.5% on an account in excess of 20-million dollars.

Mr. Knittel stated but this was not a bank.

Mr. Accetturo asked if they could shop it.

Mrs. Banghart replied yes.

There was a more energetic discussion on whether or not they could shop around for a better interest rate on the closure fund account money. Also discussed was who controlled the money, the PCFA or the NJDEP. It was agreed that the PCFA was going to speak with the NJDEP.

PERSONNEL

Mr. Accetturo asked Mr. Knittel if he had anything for personnel. Mr. Knittel replied no.

Mr. Orcutt asked if they had hired anyone.

Mr. Knittel stated that they did hire one of the part-timers and he was working out well. The other part-timer chose to stay and he was doing part-time work. They would keep him on staff for the foreseeable future to fill in the gaps.

Mr. Orcutt replied that was good to know.

PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Accetturo stated that there were no presentations.

REPORTS

Mr. Accetturo asked if there were any reports.

Mr. Knittel stated that there was only one hand-out on leachate that the Board needs to look at, it shows a three-year leachate trend that was finally coming down. This was thanks to reducing open acres.

FACILITIES/RECYCLING

Mr. Knittel stated that they did run all the pumps and blowers on the on-site wastewater treatment plant over the past month. They have a list of the ones that performed very well. There were a few water leaks that they were repairable on pumps. Two of the three blowers still work, they were German-made air blowers to aerate the tanks. The tanks are in moderate condition, they need to be sanded and painted from the inside, since they were now empty. He will get a quote for that, but he is not going to do anything on the tanks until we speak about it at a Board meeting.

Mr. Knittel stated that he was starting to get prices on upgrading or repairing things that need repairs. He would then present the full evaluation of the plant in front of the Board, before spending any money on repairs.

The 20-acre side slope project was progressing as intended on schedule and on budget. They would keep working weather-dependent until mid-December, maybe a little longer because of the heat of the landfill and that it was south-facing. They were working on the south-side 10-acres first, they were hoping to get all the south-slope planted and seeded by December. They would then finish the remaining acres in the spring.

Mr. Knittel stated that for the odor update, the regular surface monitoring continues, both, the quarterly from outside companies and daily from inside. They have a gas header that will be going in late December or early January. That bidding process was still ongoing, the only delay for that was that they were waiting for the NJDEP to refund us the four-and-a-half million-dollars that was still currently out from our closure funds.

As they did talk about previously it was a very arduous process to get refunded from our own closure account that the DEP controls. As soon as any of that comes back in, they would be able to start the gas header bidding and award the project.

Mr. Knittel stated that next was A-4 the Holiday schedule, they were not going to change the Christmas and New Years Eve questions that were brought up and discussed last month. They would stay the same with December 24th and December 31st staying as half-days for this calendar year. With

next year's calendar, it will follow the County except one day that was swapped from mid-June to Easter weekend. That was the only day that they changed versus the County's schedule. They do need a motion to approve the holiday schedule unless there were any questions.

Mr. Orcutt stated that he would make a motion to approve A-4 the holiday schedule.
Mr. Larsen stated that he would second the motion.

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

Mr. Knittel stated that A-5 was the waste disposal fee schedule and there were no changes to that. Mr. Knittel stated that A-6, A-7 and A-8 were the three recycling programs, they were all running as intended.

Mr. Knittel stated that next, A-9, a small Warren County district landfill side slope capping project change order # 2. This was a very small change-order and credit that will need a Board approval to cut the payment. There was an explanation of the change-order on the first page.

There was a quick explanation and discussion of the change order.
Mr. Knittel stated that the increase was \$19,061.98 to the original contract price of \$10,670,400.00 bringing the new contract price to \$10,701,530.98. the engineers had approved it and he agreed with it.

Mr. Orcutt stated that he would approve A-9 Change Order #2.
Mr. Accetturo stated that he would second the motion.

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

GENERAL COUNSEL

Mr. Accetturo asked if there was a report from the general counsel.

Mr. Orcutt asked to hold on one second. To keep things in perspective, the rate increase was a little over like \$510,000.00. our total equipment maintenance this year was about \$550,000.00. This just keeps things in perspective.

Mr. Knittel agreed.

Mr. Accetturo asked for the general counsel report.
Mr. Tipton replied that he had nothing.

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

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 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 10:52 am***

Respectfully submitted by:

Mariann Cliff
Recording Secretary

Approved: