

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING
THE SOMERSET RARITAN VALLEY SEWERAGE AUTHORITY
APRIL 26, 2021**

Minute 1 - Opening of Meeting

The Board Meeting of the Somerset Raritan Valley Sewerage Authority was called to order at 7:00 P.M. by Chairman Michael Impellizeri.

Minute 2 - Open Public Meetings Announcement

The Open Public Meeting Announcement was read by the Executive Director, Ronald S. Anastasio.

Minute 3 - Roll Call

Robert Albano	Present (Teams)	Philip Petrone	Present (Teams)
Louis Esposito, Jr	Present	Spencer Pierini	Present (Teams)
Joseph Lifrieri	Present	Gail Quabeck	Present (Teams)
Edward Machala	Present	Randy Smith	Absent
Richard Mathews	Present	Peter Stires	Present (Teams)
Steven Mlenak	<i>Absent*</i>	Michael Impellizeri	Present
Michael Pappas	<i>Absent*</i> (Teams)		

*Mr. Pappas joined the meeting via Teams at 7:02 p.m.

*Mr. Mlenak joined the meeting via Teams at 7:07 p.m.

Authority Staff

Ronald Anastasio, P.E., Executive Director	Present
Sherwin Ulep, P.E., Facility Engineer	Present (Teams)
Anthony Tambasco, Plant Superintendent	<i>Absent</i>
Michael Ingenito, Chief Plant Operator	<i>Absent</i>
Dennis Smith, Supervisor Liquid Division	Present
Ellie Hoffman, P.E., Regulatory Compliance Engineer	<i>Absent</i>
Linda Hering, Human Resources Manager	Present
Peter Wozniak, Chief Financial Officer	Present (Teams)

Professional Staff

Thomas Schoettle, P.E., CDM Smith	Present
Joseph J. Maraziti, Jr., Esq., Maraziti Falcon, LLP	Present (Teams)

Minute 4 – Pledge of Allegiance

All in attendance saluted the flag.

Minute 5 – Approval of Minutes

1. Board Meeting Open Session Minutes – March 22, 2021

With the Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Mr. Lifrieri, the Minutes of the March 22, 2021 Meeting (Open Session), were approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Philip Petrone	Yes
Louis Esposito, Jr	Yes	Spencer Pierini	Yes
Joseph Lifrieri	Yes	Gail Quabeck	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Randy Smith	Absent
Richard Mathews	Yes	Peter Stires	Yes
Steven Mlenak	Absent	Michael Impellizeri	Yes
Michael Pappas	Yes		

2. Board Meeting Closed Session Minutes – March 22, 2021

With the Motion of Mr. Lifrieri, Second of Ms. Machala, the Minutes of the March 22, 2021 Meeting (Closed Session), were approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Philip Petrone	Yes
Louis Esposito, Jr	<i>Abstain</i>	Spencer Pierini	Yes
Joseph Lifrieri	Yes	Gail Quabeck	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Randy Smith	Absent
Richard Mathews	Yes	Peter Stires	Yes
Steven Mlenak	Absent	Michael Impellizeri	Yes
Michael Pappas	Yes		

Minute 6 – Public Hearing – NONE

Minute 7 – Public Participation -None Present

Minute 8 – Consent Agenda: Resolutions for Consideration and Possible Formal Action

- 1) **Res. No. 21-0426-1** – Resolution Authorizing the Administrative Termination of the Non-Domestic Wastewater Discharge Permit to LifeCell Corporation

- 2) **Res. No. 21-0426-2** - Resolution Authorizing the Connection Fee Refund to John Guastella Jr. for a Proposed Single-Family Dwelling - Block 322, Lot 1.09; Borough of Manville
- 3) **Res. No. 21-0426-3** - Resolution Authorizing Re-Approval of a Sewer Extension to Kirby Village Apartments, Block 1, Lot 4.01, Somerville Borough
- 4) **Res. No 21-0426-4** – Resolution Renewing Sludge Cake Disposal Agreement with The Stony Brook Regional Sewerage Authority
- 5) **Res. No 21-0426-5** – Resolution Authorizing the Executive Director to Execute a Release and Environmental Indemnification Agreement by and between The Somerset Raritan Valley Sewerage Authority and The County of Somerset in Connection with the Implementation of the Storm Control Treatment Facility Project
- 6) **Res. No 21-0426-6** – Resolution Authorizing Additional Funds to Kleinfelder for Additional Engineering Services During Construction for the Storm Control Treatment Facility Project
- 7) **Res. No. 21-0426-7** – Resolution Authorizing Permanent Status of Timothy Wojcicki as Liquid Division Working Leader

Mr. Pappas asked if someone could explain Resolution No. 21-0426-3. A discussion ensued between Mr. Anastasio and Mr. Pappas. Mr. Anastasio explained that instead of giving extensions to approvals for Sewer Extensions, we require what is basically a reexamination. We do this because we want to make sure the Planning Board approval is fresh, and all the approvals are fresh so that applicants and developers can't tie up capacity that way. We make them go in for a fresh review. They have two years to construct or start construction on a sewer project and if they don't do that, it expires, and they have to come for reapproval. Mr. Pappas asked when they come back for reapproval, is there a fee that they are charged from the SRVSA? Mr. Anastasio indicated just an engineering review fee in accordance with our schedule. Mr. Pappas asked if that covers the SRVSA's costs and Mr. Anastasio indicated yes, generally. Mr. Pappas asked well, it does, or it doesn't? Mr. Anastasio said yes, it covers it. Ms. Quabeck stated that if it didn't, we would be increasing our fees. Mr. Pappas asked if that includes legal review? Mr. Anastasio stated that there is no legal review. We prepare Resolutions in-house. Mr. Pappas asked our attorney, Mr. Maraziti, should the attorney be reviewing such a request? Mr. Maraziti indicated that they never have. It is a ministerial type of request and does not require any legal analysis and if there ever is a case, and he could not remember any off-hand, he would be called in. Ms. Quabeck stated that it is more a question of an engineering review than a legal review. Mr. Pappas asked again, and asked specifically of the attorney, is there any legality that should be considered by the commissioners, that is my question. Mr. Maraziti stated that he does not believe so. Mr. Pappas thanked Mr. Maraziti.

With no additional questions or comments, and upon Motion of Mr. Mathews, Second of Mr. Albano, the above Resolutions were approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Philip Petrone	Yes
Louis Esposito, Jr	Yes	Spencer Pierini	Yes
Joseph Lifrieri	Yes	Gail Quabeck	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Randy Smith	Absent
Richard Mathews	Yes	Peter Stires	Yes
Steven Mlenak	Yes**	Michael Impellizeri	Yes
Michael Pappas	Yes		

**Mr. Mlenak indicated that he had just joined the meeting and he heard the Motion and Second, but it was not articulated what the Motion was. Ms. Hering stated that the vote was for the Consent Agenda. Mr. Mlenak then stated that he reviewed the items in the Consent Agenda and votes yes.

Minute 9 – Board Committees – None

Minute 10 – Chairman – Mr. Impellizeri had no comments other than to convey his wishes for continued good health to all.

Minute 11 - Reports

A. Executive Director’s Report

1. Update on Storm Control Treatment Facility Construction Project

Mr. Anastasio indicated the construction continues to go well and we are about 86% complete now. You will remember that for months and months, we talked about the easement soils and the offsite sewer pipes that had to be installed in the easements and the County owned land. Back in the October 23, 2020 meeting, the Board approved the Resolution which granted the change order for the additional work involved with handling the contaminated soils, and we also granted a 45-day time extension with that. I just want to report that the 25 days (later corrected to 45 days) was up last Friday, April 25th and the sewer pipe installation was completed Wednesday, April 23rd which was the 43rd day. That lines up nicely that the bulk of the work got done within the 45-day time extension. I think that there was one day, today, that they were still relocating some soils from one easement area to another and there may be a residual grading left on those easements. They are basically done with that work. It is a good milestone for us, and it got done within the time that we paid for. That worked out well for us.

There are a couple other small issues we are dealing with. One being, that the primary clarifier which is the only clarifier that is at the plant site, and you’ve seen that in the overhead photos, a large round structure. The way those are constructed is that all the

structural concrete is poured in place, and then there is a thin leveling coat on the floor of the clarifier which is really like a pitched saucer, pitched to the center, and that layer is a couple of inches thick. They poured that in rather cold weather, although they went to great lengths to try to control the temperature inside. They had it covered, and they had heaters running, but it apparently was not enough. The 2" layer of concrete that they poured did not bond to the structural concrete and we're having problems with that now. There are some cracks, and we are very concerned about that. Sherwin Ulep and others went down there about a week and a half ago and did a hammer test and it appeared to sound hollow in spots, so we pulled in the structural design engineer from Kleinfelder, and we had them come down from Boston last Friday, and he did an assessment and determined that about ¾ of the coating appears to be not bonded to the structural concrete. It is an issue, and we are working through it with the contractor. We are waiting for the report to be issued from the structural engineer which should be in a day or so, and we will engage the contractor in discussions, and we'll see where that goes. They must replace it. I am sure they don't want to do it, but they have to do it. That clarifier will be covered. Right now, it is not covered, and that work is a lot easier to do without the cover on so we are catching it at the right time and hopefully can get it resolved very quickly. There are some final grading issues along the west side of the building where PSE&G is about to install the gas service and some of the levels are wrong. We had a meeting today and Sherwin is working with the contractor and CDM on that.

Overall, we are happy with the progress.

2. Update on Plantwide Electrical Rehabilitation Project

This project is also going well. Sherwin Ulep indicated that the project is about 70-75% complete. We have really gotten a lot done on that project as well. It is a complicated project with a lot of details, and we are happy with their progress. Sherwin, Tony Tambasco and CDM Smith are working very well with the contractor and Morehouse Engineering, our design engineer.

Mr. Albano had a question regarding the Storm Control Treatment Facility Project. He is looking at the report and it looks like we are at \$28,422,000 on this project. Are we going to come in under budget on this? Mr. Anastasio indicated that we should. We are not too far into the contingency money. Now you have to keep in mind that that includes all the engineering money that we spent, which is about \$5.5 million. We will see where things come out, but we have gotten very far in this project with not a lot of large change orders. The contingency under the loan was 5% so we are talking about \$1.5M or more and we are nowhere near that. We feel good about where we are at. There is not a lot of big stuff left to do, which is good. Mr. Wozniak, the CFO, stated that we bonded for \$33M and we are authorized to draw down \$32.6M. As long as we come in under \$32.6M, then we will be under budget for our financing. Mr. Albano stated that he was just concerned and make sure we hit the budget. It is a good thing that we put that contingency in. Mr. Anastasio stated that the trust makes you do it, but it is good because there are a lot of unknowns with construction.

3. Discussion of Request to Somerset County to Receive a Grant of Federal COVID-19 Relief Funds to be Used for Authority Wastewater Projects.

Mr. Anastasio stated that under the Federal COVID stimulus money, Somerset County got north of \$61 million. Some Commissioners mentioned to me after the last Board meeting, the Chairman and Vice Chairman, that maybe we should ask the County for some money. If you remember at the last Board meeting, we had a Planning Committee meeting prior to the Board meeting. We gave the Board a brief rundown of projects that should now be on our radar, now that we are finishing these other two big projects. The thought came up and if the Board is going ask for it, maybe we should talk about it formally and maybe make a Motion from the floor, once the Board decides if we should ask, and then we can put a letter together. Mr. Anastasio then handed the meeting over to Mr. Schoettle.

Before that, Mr. Pappas then referred back to Mr. Albano's question about the financing of the SCTFP, and that someone mentioned either \$32 or \$33 million, he had been under the impression that it was a \$25 or \$26 million project, so was that my misunderstanding? Mr. Anastasio said no, it was not. The construction costs were \$25,589,000. The engineering costs are roughly \$5.5 million, plus some other contingencies and administrative costs that when you borrow the loan from the New Jersey Water Bank, there are some structural build-in's that they put in the loan and that is how we got up to the \$33 million. We hope not to tap into those, and we are very far along and there is not a lot of big items left, and we feel good about where we're at as far as potential, but you never know. It's not done until it is done. Mr. Pappas then asked, so there is roughly a \$5 million engineering expense, which firm secured that contract? Mr. Anastasio stated that it is not that simple. That \$5.5 million is a basket of many things. We had to do an intensive archeological study. The engineering study was borne mostly by Kleinfelder but also CDM Smith did a portion of it. CDM Smith did the alternatives analysis. There's land acquisition in there as well. There is also environmental permitting, land cost, legal costs and I believe there are also all the Green Acres work and the financing work that went into that with CDM Smith handling that. There is a whole bevy of costs that are in that and I believe if you look at the Reports section of our Board book, towards the back of the Reports section are all Peter Wozniak's financial sheets. We have all the authorizations, and we can give you a detail of the breakdown of all the payments that have been made monthly to all the different firms. Mr. Pappas thanked Mr. Anastasio and said he would follow-up with him.

Mr. Thomas Schoettle, P.E. of CDM Smith then proceeded with a slide presentation "Update on Biden Administration Stimulus and Infrastructure Initiatives". He stated as a followed up with Mr. Anastasio said about earlier in our last meeting, I thought it would be good for us to put together a few slides and my firm has quite a few people looking into both the short-term American Recovery Act, as well as the American Jobs Act. One has been approved and the other has been proposed. A couple of data points on what that legislation consists of and where the opportunities are. We will begin by a quick

overview of the timeline. This is the Biden Administration policy making timeline since the Inauguration back in January. A good part of the early tenure was spent issuing Executive Orders and making Cabinet appointments up until about the March timeframe when COVID became a little less of a priority and the recovery kind of took over. On March 11th, the American Rescue Plan was signed and later in the month of March, the American Jobs Plan was announced. The American Rescue Plan is moving forward. The Jobs Plan is going to be subject to further Congressional debate. In April, the fiscal budget announcement was made on April 9th, and in a couple days, the President is going to be briefing Congress on the American Jobs Plan. There have been a bunch of high-profile announcements already by the Biden Administration. You may have noticed some focus on infrastructure in a recent meeting in Pittsburgh where the Biden Administration talked about lead service line replacements, which is a key component of the American Jobs Plan. I will cover a little bit more of that later on. Quite a number of large initiatives early on in this Administration as it relates to infrastructure. There are definitely some opportunities I think that SRVSA should be on the lookout for, for potential participation in some of these plans.

The first of these, the American Rescue Plan allocated \$360B for State and Local governments to recover. This is really the COVID Relief Plan if you will. One of the interesting things about the legislation, if you take a look at it, the 4th bullet refers to it. “Funds may be used to make necessary investments in water, sewer and broadband infrastructure”. The intent of this legislation is really aimed at direct COVID-19 recovery paying for the expenses related to COVID. It covers a broad array of social type of expenses but there is some language in the legislation that allows for infrastructure water and wastewater expenditures and we have some clients throughout the United States, and I will give you perfect example. The city of Rochester has decided to use a large chunk of their allocation in New York, specifically for infrastructure investments. They have some priority infrastructure projects that they need to get done, and they have decided to spend at least \$100M of their money on these infrastructure projects. This pie chart is a little tough to read, but it gives a breakdown of where the buckets of money in this legislation are. I won’t go into a whole lot of detail here, but it goes by geography and by the allocation of the buckets that the money falls into. There is quite a bit of discretion. These funds are somewhat discretionary, so when we get down a little further in the slides, I will show you the summary for the New Jersey counties. Are there any questions on this first tranche of money, the American Rescue Plan? None were stated.

The next slide is similar data and is just a breakdown by State. This is that same plan showing what the states were allocated. On the left-hand side, you can see that the State of New Jersey at \$6.4B under this tranche of money. It is not an insignificant amount of money. The larger of the two plans is the American Jobs Plan. This is proposed legislation. As proposed, it would allow for \$2.25T over 8 years. A lot of focus on transportation infrastructure and the environmental infrastructure. You can see here 4 investment buckets, transportation infrastructure \$6.21B so in a case like this, we might be able to get Sherwin’s pavement project financed under something like this because it

is a transportation job. Infrastructure at Home, R&D Workforce Development and Manufacturing, and then Caretaking Economy. It is a large chunk of money. If you look on the right-hand slide of the slide, clean drinking water is \$111B. That is where the SRVSA would fall under that tranche of money. There is also a lot of money in there, possibly \$54B of the \$111B has been earmarked right now for lead service line replacements, which is a big problem in New Jersey and a lot of northeastern and midwestern states. It would not affect us right now. Right now, our expectation is based on our folks in the industry at AWWA (American Water Works Association) and AMWA (Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies) and all the utility management agencies that we deal with. We are thinking that the \$2.25T is probably not going to get through Congress but we are thinking that half of that is a pretty good bet. We will probably see about half of that come through. If you want to scale those buckets, you figure roughly 50% would be a good go-by at this point. We are told there will be congressional earmarks associated with some of this money, there is a lot of discussion. Earmarks went away some time ago but there is some discussion that Congressional delegations are collecting, in fact I know that to be the case because we have been approaching some of our Congressional delegates with clients, to list projects on their normal annual appropriations priorities so there is some thought that those lists may in fact, turned into earmarks down the road if the legislation is improved and includes that flexibility. The Authority does have a number of fairly significant projects in the planning stages at this time so it would possibly be a good opportunity to fund some of those and if we can get them on our representatives list of projects, it wouldn't be a bad thing at this point. Again, on the Jobs Plan, just another way of looking at the data here, we talked a little bit about this, but it shows you how the breakdown of this funding is going to be used. The water infrastructure is one of these slices here and the \$111B slice on the left, is not an insignificant amount of money.

So just some general insights here, "President proposes, Congress disposes". We're definitely not going to get that \$2.25T through but a fairly significant chunk will get approved. What is interesting, is when you look at the legislation, it is unclear that there's a really good understanding about how certain members and the Legislation itself, differentiates between environmental water infrastructure and transportation infrastructure. If you saw that big bucket before, it all kind of falls out under the transportation bundle. I know the industry is looking to expand awareness of the environmental infrastructure needs in Congress so there is a lot of lobbying going on right now with professional organizations to make sure that the water sector gets their fair share of whatever funds ultimately gets appropriated here. We expect this is going to be transformational bill for our industry and we certainly think we need to take advantage of it. This, as much as the COVID Relief Act. Obviously, somebody is going to pay for this and here there is just some data. A lot of it is focused on increasing the corporate tax rate which is going to be a difficult pill to swallow for a good chunk of Congress and the Senate so there are a lot of negotiations underway now. I think we are definitely seeing a raise in the corporate tax rate to finance this, but probably not up to 28%. It is probably

going to fall somewhat short of that. It will be necessary to pay for this and in order to do that, we are going to have to make some sacrifices. Those are all to be determined.

How does it relate to the SRVSA? Again, this is a little difficult to read but if you are following along with the handout copy, you can see 4th from the bottom on the right-hand side, Somerset County. This is going back again to the COVID Relief Bill. This is the first bill I talked about. \$63.79M have been appropriated to Somerset County. Ron and I were talking earlier this week and following last month's Board meeting, I think SRVSA services 40% of the county's population, so it is a big footprint on the County as far as service to the County's population is concerned. It is only appropriate that if you don't ask, you don't get. Part of this discussion really is to begin the thought process of, do we want to approach the County and we were thinking that perhaps a letter to the County Administrator might be the way to go, maybe with a little bit of a summary of what we are doing and how the funds could be used in terms of prioritizing critical infrastructure and making a pitch for the critical nature of these projects and request some assistance given the stature of this utility within the County.

That is the summary here. It is a lot of details and I covered a lot of information in a short period of time so if there are any questions today or if you want to follow-up with any, you can certainly reach me through Ron or directly, for those of you who have my contact information.

Mr. Anastasio stated that our thinking is, bringing it to the Board formally and asking the Board, do you want us to write a letter. Mr. Machala stated it is worth a shot. If we don't ask, we are not going to get anything. Several other members of the Board agreed. Mr. Anastasio indicated that the projects we spoke about last month, I will not get into any long thing here, but our next step is that Sherwin and I will put our heads together and just come up with some ballpark costs and then sit down with the Finance Committee virtually or otherwise, and we just talk, and also with our CFO. We just take a look at this and see what we are looking at. It would be good when we send a letter, I think, to the fact that we have four projects that we really need to initiate concurrently, or roughly concurrently. Ms. Quabeck asked has the Planning Committee had a look at this yet? We talked about it at the last Board meeting about setting some priorities on these projects. Maybe we should know what our priorities are before we ask for money. Mr. Anastasio stated that we will be in touch with the Planning Committee about those priorities but the way the staff sees it, is that we see those first 4 projects that really have to be kicked off very shortly. Ms. Quabeck asked if we should go for all 4 and see what we get? Mr. Anastasio said we know what we have to do, and we should look at all 4 projects as a bundle. They have to happen, whether one happens six months ahead of the other one as far as RFP process and procurement of professional services, I would look at them as a bundle. Those 4 have to be kicked off very soon just to keep the infrastructure maintained and keep things moving. There are others that can wait 2-3 years. Ms. Quabeck stated that we must have some idea of the costs associated before you can say you are going to look at it as a bundle, right? Yes, Sherwin and I are going to work on

that and then sit down with Peter Wozniak and come up with a list of costs. Peter Wozniak commented on Gail's comments and stated that we should just indicate that we are basically asking for a grant from the County so the County would be the recipient and we would be the sub-recipient. Sometimes there is an application and, on the application, you have to indicate the project description, engineers estimates, specifics and costs. Ms. Quabeck said she understands all that and this is all preliminary and obviously there will be a regular procedure to go through with applications and the County, etc. I just want to have a general idea of what our thinking is right now at the outset. Mr. Anastasio stated that as he understands it, they are getting this money whether or not we ask for money from the county and sounds like this is going to drop in their lap. The COVID money is already underway. Mr. Schoettle stated that one of the interesting things on the COVID relief money that is coming in, a lot of the municipalities are not acting on making infrastructure investments because they don't want to spend their COVID money if they're going to get a bigger tranche of money downstream so there's a little bit of a waiting game happening right now. We are seeing that with a couple of clients. They had already made some very solid commitments to move forward with COVID money on infrastructure and then they saw the \$2.25T sitting out there, particularly the clients who have lead service lines because there is a specific earmark of \$54B. There may be a little bit of a waiting game, for instance if Somerset County has bridge or roadway jobs and they think they might be able to double-dip on this and the future program, they might wait or they might take all this money and spend it all on non-infrastructure related projects. It never hurts to ask.

Mr. Pappas commented on the COVID funds. The State has not yet issued any guidelines. The only thing that the municipalities know is that 50% of the funding that has been allocated would be available for this year and the other 50% not until next year. We've spoken to our auditor and they have not gotten any guidelines, nor has our finance office. Local finance services have not issued any guidelines yet. A lot of municipalities are contemplating what they are going to do but there is no clarity yet. We are told that there will be greater flexibility than the funding that was made available last year but still, we've been advised to wait and not make any specific decisions yet in municipalities until that guidance has been put forth. Mr. Anastasio stated that is good to know, some of the inside information as to how this is working. Mr. Pappas then went on to say for instance, someone from our auditing firm said that he thinks any of the monies that municipalities may have borrowed last year due to loss in revenue, that perhaps either this year or more likely next year's COVID relief funding would need to replenish that debt so we were advised to wait. We were told that it should come soon, I think May 11th is the date that the monies are to be distributed to the States or the communities including the County's with a population of over 50,000 and those that are under 50,000, the State has 60 days from the time they receive the funds to distribute it. It could be a couple months before we really know when the municipalities or counties have the money in their hands but may not know how it is to be utilized yet. That is all I know but thought I'd share it.

Mr. Anastasio said that it is good to know and gives us a little moment here to get our list together and draft a letter. I'm thinking that we draft a letter and then will share it with the Board, and we'll finalize it that way and when everyone is satisfied, we can send it from the Board of Commissioners, not from the Executive Director. We wanted to discuss it with the Board and get their feelings and see whether or not we should follow through with this.

Mr. Impellizeri then asked for a Motion to proceed with this initiative. Mr. Mlenak made the Motion and Mr. Esposito seconded it. Mr. Pappas then asked if it was a Motion to have a letter drafted or to draft and send? Mr. Anastasio stated draft and send. Mr. Mlenak confirmed the Motion would be for "drafted AND sent" and he's comfortable with the Board's understanding what was presented here tonight. Mr. Impellizeri then stated that of course, we will all see it before it is sent. Roll Call Vote was then taken as follows:

Robert Albano	Yes	Philip Petrone	Yes
Louis Esposito, Jr	Yes	Spencer Pierini	Yes
Joseph Lifrieri	Yes	Gail Quabeck	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Randy Smith	Absent
Richard Mathews	Yes	Peter Stires	Yes
Steven Mlenak	Yes	Michael Impellizeri	Yes
Michael Pappas	<i>Abstain</i>		

Mr. Impellizeri also thanked Mr. Schoettle for his presentation.

3. Appointment to the NJDEP Operator's Licensing Board

Mr. Anastasio stated that he wanted to Board to be aware that he was appointed to NJDEP Operator's License Board, out of the blue. He told them he would be happy and honored to serve if appointed. They changed the Board over and appointed me as well as 5 other new people. I don't expect it to have an impact on my time here at the Authority, but I think it's a good thing. Ms. Quabeck stated that it is a very good thing as they've needed new blood on that board for many years.

B. Engineer/Consultants – Mr. Schoettle indicated he had nothing further to add.

C. Attorney – Maraziti Falcon, LLP – Mr. Maraziti had nothing further to add.

D. Department Reports:

1. Operations
2. Regulatory Compliance
3. Laboratory

4. Maintenance/Electrical

E. Facility Engineer Reports:

- 1. Facility Engineer’s Monthly Report
- 2. Capacity Allocation
- 3. Capacity Assurance
- 4. Monthly Flow Report

Minute 12 – Communications – Standard monthly communication submittals to the State are in the Board book.

Minute 13 - Res. No. 21-0426-8 - Payroll

Upon Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Mr. Mathews the above Resolution was approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Philip Petrone	Yes
Louis Esposito, Jr	Yes	Spencer Pierini	Yes
Joseph Lifrieri	Yes	Gail Quabeck	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Randy Smith	Absent
Richard Mathews	Yes	Peter Stires	Yes
Steven Mlenak	Yes	Michael Impellizeri	Yes
Michael Pappas	Yes		

Minute 14 - Res. No. 21-0426-9 – Cancellation of Checks

Upon Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Mathews, the above Resolution was approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Philip Petrone	Yes
Louis Esposito, Jr	Yes	Spencer Pierini	Yes
Joseph Lifrieri	Yes	Gail Quabeck	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Randy Smith	Absent
Richard Mathews	Yes	Peter Stires	Yes

Steven Mlenak	Yes	Michael Impellizeri	Yes
Michael Pappas	Yes		

Minute 15 - Res. No. 21-0426-10 – Bills

Upon Motion of Mr. Mathews, Second of Mr. Lifrieri, the above Resolution was approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Philip Petrone	Yes
Louis Esposito, Jr	Yes	Spencer Pierini	Yes
Joseph Lifrieri	Yes	Gail Quabeck	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Randy Smith	Absent
Richard Mathews	Yes	Peter Stires	Yes
Steven Mlenak	Yes	Michael Impellizeri	Yes
Michael Pappas	Yes		

Minute 16 - Adjournment

Upon Motion of Mr. Quabeck, Second of Mr. Lifrieri, the meeting was adjourned at 7:44 p.m.

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Philip Petrone	Yes
Louis Esposito, Jr	Yes	Spencer Pierini	Yes
Joseph Lifrieri	Yes	Gail Quabeck	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Randy Smith	Absent
Richard Mathews	Yes	Peter Stires	Yes
Steven Mlenak	Yes	Michael Impellizeri	Yes
Michael Pappas	Yes		

**NEXT REGULAR BOARD MEETING WILL BE HELD ON
MAY 24, 2021**