

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING
THE SOMERSET RARITAN VALLEY SEWERAGE AUTHORITY
APRIL 25, 2022**

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	Philip Petrone	<i>Absent</i>
Louis Esposito, Jr	<i>Absent</i>	Reinhard Pratt	Present**
Joseph Lifrieri	Present	Gail Quabeck	Present (Teams)
Edward Machala	Present	Randy Smith	Present
Richard Mathews	Present	Peter Stires	Present
Michael Pappas	Present (Teams)	Michael Impellizeri	Present

**Mr. Pratt joined the meeting at 7:02 p.m.

Authority Staff

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

Professional Staff

Thomas Schoettle, P.E., CDM Smith	Present
Brad Carney, Esq., Maraziti Falcon, LLP	Present (Teams)
James Cosgrove, Jr., P.E., Kleinfelder	Present (Teams)
Paola Toro, Esq., Maraziti Falcon, LLP	Present (Teams)

Minute 4 – Pledge of Allegiance

All in attendance saluted the flag.

Minute 5 – Oath of Office – Commissioner

a. Richard Mathews – Somerville Borough - for a term to expire 02/07/2027

Mr. Mathews has been reappointed for another five (5) year term and was sworn in by Mr. Carney.

Minute 6 - Approval of Minutes

1. Board Meeting Open Session Minutes – March 28, 2022

With the Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Mr. Stires, the Minutes of the March 28, 2022 Meeting (Open Session), were approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Philip Petrone	Absent
Louis Esposito, Jr	Absent	Reinhard Pratt	Yes
Joseph Lifrieri	Yes	Gail Quabeck	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Randy Smith	Yes
Richard Mathews	Yes	Peter Stires	Yes
Michael Pappas	Abstain	Michael Impellizeri	Abstain

Minute 7 – Public Hearing – Mr. Carney wanted it on the record that one of his associates, Paola Toro, Esq. is also in attendance via Teams. He felt she would benefit from Mr. Cosgrove’s presentation this evening on PFAS. He jokingly commented that only one of them will be billing for tonight’s meeting.

Minute 8 – Public Participation: No public present.

Minute 9 – Consent Agenda: Resolutions for Consideration and Possible Formal Action

Mr. Impellizeri asked if there were any questions or comments with any of the Resolutions. There were none.

1. **Res. No. 22-0425-1** – Permanent Status of Brandon Sigarroa
2. **Res. No. 22-0425-2** – Resolution Authorizing the Modification of Non-Domestic Wastewater Discharge Permit 28G Issued to Roche Molecular Systems, Inc.
3. **Res. No. 22-0425-3** – Resolution Renewing a Liquid Sludge Disposal Agreement with The Passaic Valley Sewerage Commission

4. **Res. No. 22-0425-4** – Resolution Authorizing the Plant Superintendent, Chief Plant Operator, Manager of Engineering, Assistant Chief Plant Operator, Maintenance Supervisor, Staff Engineer and One Commissioner to Attend the 107th New Jersey Water Environment Association (NJWEA) Annual Conference in Atlantic City, NJ to be held on May 9-13, 2022

5. **Res. No. 22-0425-5** - Resolution Memorializing Rejection of All Electric Power Supply Bids Received on April 7, 2022 and Providing that the Existing Request for Bids Shall Remain Open for 120 Days to Prequalified Bidders

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

Roll Call Vote:

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

Minute 10 – Board Committees

A. Finance Committee: (QUABECK) Machala, Albano, Mathews, Impellizeri

1. Report on 2020 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report & Audit (see front cover pocket)

Ms. Quabeck stated that we all received copies of the Annual Audit and Financial Report from 2020, a little late from the State. She has reviewed it and it appears no one had any questions that were directed to her. We are in order to approve it and sign that we reviewed it. In addition, she would like to thank Peter Wozniak for preparing a very thorough Financial Report for the year ending December 31, 2021. It gives us a little more up to date information than the official Audit Report. It was a good idea that he did that and the effort is appreciated. Asking if anyone had any questions, and there were none. Ms. Quabeck then entered the resolution accepting the Fiscal Year 2020 Comprehensive Annual Audit Report.

2. **Res. No. 22-0425-6** – Resolution Accepting the FY 2020 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report and Year End Audit

With no further questions or comments, and upon Motion of Ms. Quabeck, Second of Mr. Albano, the above Resolution was approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

Mr. Anastasio then indicated he was going to distribute the Audit Review Certificate for all of the Commissioners to sign. He would then bring the Certificate to Ms. Quabeck and Mr. Pappas for their signatures and will then forward it onto the State.

B. Planning Committee: (MACHALA) Lifrieri, Impellizeri, Smith, Stires

Mr. Machala stated that the Planning Committee met prior to this evenings Board Meeting, mostly working on the report on the 1958 Main Interceptor Pipe and the various options that we were weighing regarding that. We've narrowed it down to two and are recommending one which we will forward to the Finance Committee for their review. Mr. Anastasio will elaborate further on this subject.

1. Report on 1958 Main Interceptor Pipe – CDM Smith Condition Assessment Report

Mr. Anastasio indicated that we have several good options that the Planning Committee has reviewed for the replacement or rehabilitation of the pipe and they have narrowed it down to two. Some members have expressed holding off making the recommendation tonight until we delve more into the seconded bulleted point below, which is the scope of work for the proposed Plantwide Mechanical Rehabilitation Project, thinking about the cost impacts of that. We do have two good options that the Planning Committee is satisfied with, which is in a nutshell, either lining the pipe or replacing 60% of it with a slightly larger pipe and lining the remaining 40%. Either option provides a good value and would secure the pipeline from further deterioration and would be a good option going into the future. We will pick this up in May and then probably the Planning Committee should be able to recommend to the Finance Committee at that time. If not, it will wait until June but we have a lot to talk about with the Plantwide Mechanical Upgrade Project.

Ms. Quabeck asked if we would attempt to give everyone an estimate of the cost before a decision is made. Mr. Machala and Mr. Anastasio stated that is correct. We will hold off tonight but will give that information at the time of the recommendation. The Planning Committee really wants to discuss the Plantwide Mechanical Upgrade Project and the items contained within it. Again, we will push this off until May. The Planning Committee really did all of their homework on the 1958 Interceptor Pipe. They are satisfied with two options and we'll talk more about it next month when they are ready to make a recommendation on the other project and we'll talk about costs for all of it. Then it will go to the Finance Committee.

Minute 11 – Chairman – Mr. Impellizeri had nothing else to add.

Minute 12 - Reports

A. Executive Director's Report

A. Executive Director's Report

1. PFAS Overview and Discussion – Presentation by Engineer James Cosgrove (virtual) (See PowerPoint presentation in Reports section)

Mr. Anastasio stated that some you have not been attending AEA, a few members do to, but the topic of this PFAS is basically a family of compounds which is about 9,000 different ones, that are a hot topic of discussion in the environmental world, and we will talk a little more about what that all is and what we should sampling we should do. Our Engineer, James Cosgrove is on Teams and in your books is a PowerPoint presentation he has put together and he will display that on the screens and will take us through that. Those at home, you have that in the front of the Report section of your books.

Mr. Cosgrove stated he wants to give us a quick overview on PFAS. When I was in Atlantic City as the last two AEA Conferences and I gave presentations on this subject, PFAS is being dealt with at DEP in a rapid fashion. It like a freight train coming at us but we don't know exactly where it's coming from. We have gotten some additional clarify recently and I will share that with you tonight and the news is good.

Let me start with a quick introduction on PFAS. As Mr. Anastasio just stated, PFAS is a large group of chemicals which are per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances. The most common thing that you are likely familiar with is Teflon, the non-stick coating. The PFAS chemicals were used to make Teflon. It is also common in firefighting foam, stain resistant coatings, metal plating and finishing. The chemicals have been found to have adverse health impacts. Different studies you read will identify different impacts but certainly there are impacts that have been observed. The argument is really over what concentration you need before you start seeing those impacts. What most people don't realize is that often you see data for a few of the PFAS chemicals, and I listed them on the slide: PFNA, PFOA and PFOS. But there are actually thousands of different PFAS chemicals. We use just a few of them as an indicator of what is present in either water, soil or air. The other thing that you have probably read is how PFAS chemicals are found all over the world. You can go to one of the most rural places across the globe and still find PFAS measured in air, water and soil and in people's blood. It is really amazing how ubiquitous it is. Some of the major sources are identified on this slide and I put them here for a reason. Every graphic I would find that defines the sources of PFAS in drinking water always show wastewater treatment plants. So here at the bottom of the slide you can see it identifies wastewater containing PFAS. You are not generating that PFAS, you are receiving that PFAS and it might be coming from industry in the service area, or from homes in the service area. And it may be coming from both. The PFAS that SRVSA has is a result of what is being discharged to it. You also see this in military bases and airports due to firefighting foam. We've seen some very high concentrations

of PFAS in landfill leachate . SRVSA is not accepting landfill leachate, but I have other clients that are and this is a big issue because they are getting very high concentrations from landfills. Then you get air emissions from manufacturing facilities and incinerators and things like that. They get into the air and end up falling down on to the ground and then washed off in runoff. Another thing you are going to hear about often in the news is that farms that have been shown to be contaminated with PFAS because they were using wastewater sludge, the biosolids from wastewater, as fertilizer so you end up with farms being contaminated too. I read an article this week about a farm in rural Maine that they are not using this growing season because of PFAS contamination.

There is a lot of research that is still going on. Anyone who tells you they know everything about PFAS is lying. There is a tremendous amount to be learned still. There is research being completed locally, nationally and worldwide. The research that they are doing to try and get a better handle on things, is related to how to detect and measure it in all the media: air, water, soil, fish and wildlife better and more efficiently. The level and extent of human exposure and the concentrations that are harmful and then how to effectively remove it, get it out of the environment. In New Jersey, DEP has now established drinking water and groundwater quality standards. For PFOA, both standards are 14 parts per trillion, that is nanograms per liter, very very low concentration. For PFOS, it is 13 parts per trillion and for PFNA it is 13 parts per trillion. Recently they just adopted a groundwater interim standard of two for a parameter called Chloroperfluoropolyether Carboxylates (CIPFPECA). I really wish they would come up with a better abbreviation for that, but that it is what it is. That is 2 parts per trillion. You'll notice something very glaring missing from this slide, is that there is no column for surface water and that is where SRVSA is going to be heavily impacted. DEP is working on a stream standard right now. They were originally supposed to propose it this month. Luckily, I think we've had some success in convincing them not to rush with this and to consider looking at some other things first. So, I am quite confident that in the next few months, that we will see surface water quality standards proposed but so far there are none.

What are some of the concerning issues for WWTP's? First of all, don't even think about treating for PFAS. There is very little experience with treating wastewater for PFAS. Most of the experience is on the drinking water side which, frankly, is easier to complete and less expensive. It is still very expensive, but it would certainly be less than wastewater treatment. The other thing that is interesting, where a lot of testing has been done, we found that wastewater treatment can actually break down polyfluorinated compounds into perfluorinated compounds. What that means is that you can have low PFOA or PFOS coming into the plant, and it actually increases through the plant because there are other compounds, other PFOS chemicals that are in the wastewater coming in, but then PFOA and PFOS are generated within the treatment process. That is a weird thing that you wouldn't expect necessarily to see, that there are higher concentrations coming out than coming in.

Disposals of residuals, this is a big issue because DEP is now talking about classifying PFAS chemicals as hazardous substances under the Superfund regulations. That is going to be very ugly if they do that but today, I was on a call with the EPA, and they announced that they are working on a waiver for wastewater treatment plants. So even if PFAS is declared a hazardous

substance under CIRCLA, that would not apply to wastewater treatment plants. That is not adopted at this point, but I found it interesting that the EPA raised that in a presentation today.

The other issue that would be important for all treatment plants but especially SRVSA, because you have an incinerator, is air emissions. This is not just about water. You could be sending it up the stack if you are not burning high enough temperatures to destroy the PFAS chemicals. What has DEP done? In 2021, DEP sent requests for information to basically, two groups of industrial NJPDES permit holders. Not the wastewater treatment plant holders like municipal systems, but the purely industrial NJPDES permit holders. They asked them to complete a survey about PFAS use and also requested 2 sampling requests be completed. They also sent requests for information from significant indirect users, those are the industries that discharge to wastewater treatment plants. They said that was to those that were discharging to non-delegated local agencies, so these were the industries that went generally to the smaller treatment plants. SRVSA is a delegated local agency, so they received a request to complete a survey. DEP now is requesting voluntary sampling of influent and industrial users. They have realized that if treatment plants have to treat for PFAS, you are talking about tens of millions of dollars at treatment plants the size of SRVSA and you're talking about a situation that needs to be corrected prior to the wastewater getting to SRVSA. It took a long time, but I really do believe that DEP now realizes that the key here, is to remove the PFAS before it gets to wastewater treatment plants. Another key is that we want to identify any major sources of PFAS coming in to SRVSA before DEP adopts stream standards. Once they adopt stream standards, DEP will be required to set effluent standards to meet those standards, so we definitely want to understand this and take action as soon as possible. DEP has admitted that they are ultimately going to require all treatment plants to sample for PFAS. They have also admitted that they will have to set effluent limits once stream standards are adopted.

I want to mention the results of the survey that SRVSA did on your industrial users. So SRVSA has 35 industrial dischargers. Of that group, eighteen of them came in as a very low risk for discharging PFAS to you. Nine came in as a medium risk. A medium risk is basically entities that might store fire foam or might possibly have PFAS onsite for another reason. It doesn't mean they are discharging it; it just means they have the potential to discharge it. Then there are eight in the higher risk category. These are places that are known to have contamination or suspected to have contamination on site or known or suspected to have used fire fighting foam or have produced or used products containing PFAS. I listed the companies that are in the group on the slide but the one I want to focus on for a minute is Pfizer, the old American Cyanamid property just next door to SRVSA. Their groundwater data was very high for PFAS so I think it would be very important for SRVSA to better understand what is being discharged to SRVSA's facility from Pfizer because it might be high in PFAS.

One of the big issues with PFAS is that it sounds really easy to go out and take a sample but analyzing for it is not necessarily so easy. Until recently, there wasn't even an approved analytical method for wastewater. There were analytical methods approved for potable water but not for wastewater. In September of 2021, the EPA proposed a test method for PFAS, which is called Method 1663. That has not been adopted yet. However, NJDEP has certified labs to use a method, it is called Method 533 or 537, to analyze for PFAS in non-potable water. So, there are now about a dozen labs certified. Only one of them is physically based in New Jersey. The rest

of them are out-of-state but there is one lab certified that is physically here in New Jersey so you can use those methods to analyze for PFAS now. Also, DEP has received certification requests from labs in New Jersey for this new Method 1663. Once that method is adopted, that will sort of be the gold standard. As soon as DEP adopts those methods, that 1663 method, that will be the one you are going to use.

To wrap it up with next steps and recommendations, DEP has requested that all of the NJPDES discharge to surface water permit holders sample their influent and their industrial uses to determine presence. I agree that that is a good idea because anything we can do to get that out is a good thing. I am glad you have legal council on the call today because they might disagree with me. They may be concerned about a risk of monitoring, so I want to have that discussion. But from a scientific perspective, I would say that it would be to SRVSA's advantage to get some understanding of whether you have high concentrations coming into the plant and if you do, check the industrial users to see if you can identify where it is coming from. Pfizer, given its very high groundwater concentrations, I would monitor soon, as soon as possible. If you do identify large sources of PFAS, through the industrial pretreatment program that you operate, you would want to require removal of the PFAS chemicals or stop the use of PFAS chemicals before they are discharged to SRVSA. There is absolutely no question in my mind, if you have high PFAS coming into the plant you are going to end up effluent limits or PFAS, which is not where you want to be. The other thing I think is very important is we've spent a lot of time working with DEP to steer the process. The change of attitude down there is huge over the last six months so I really do believe participating with DEP in the process is valuable. We are sharing information with them, we're sharing our concerns, we're making it clear to them that if they just start regulating through effluent limits, we'd be in deep trouble.

Let me stop there and hopefully you are somewhat awake, and we can talk about any questions or discussions. Ms. Quabeck said it was a very good presentation. A few questions were raised. Do we take anything from Prizer any longer? Mr. Anastasio answered: We do. We used to take the pumped deep groundwater wells that was the 650,000 gallons per day that we talked about for so many years, which has ceased. That goes to their own on-site treatment plant which they discharge to groundwater. However, there is still a little bit of residual shallow groundwater and also stormwater that is collected in an internal collection system and a pump station and comes over to our plant. Once Pfizer was taking the flow away, we thought we would get almost nothing but actually in dry times it can be 50,000/day or in wet times it can be 250,000/day. A majority of it is rainwater but it is something that we're aware of and on Wednesday, Ellie, Jim and I have a call with Pfizer to discuss doing sampling on their samples. We're dipping our toes into this starting with Pfizer then we plan to start reaching out to the other high risks industries.

Another question: The amount coming from New Jersey American Water, being released to the public, how much of that is what we get here? Mr. Cosgrove answered: the good news is that most of NJAW is supplied by surface water and surface water generally speaking, seems to have less PFAS in it than groundwater in New Jersey. You may have read about some of the water purveyors in NJ have had to install treatment on their wells in order to comply with the new drinking water standards. I am not aware of any surface water intake to a water treatment plant that has had to install treatment. The hope would be that you are not getting a large concentration of PFAS. You may have a detected amount of it in the drinking water, but my

hope is that it would be well below, certainly single-digits, rather than up near the 13 or 14 where the standards are.

On slide #9, you talk about non-potable water. Is that what we consider wastewater? I know you can't drink it, but non-potable is puddles in the street and any other kind of water and would the standard apply to wastewater treatment, given the fact that the process itself generates PFAS? Mr. Cosgrove answered: non-potable water is defined as wastewater, stormwater and stream water. That is mostly how they are defining non-potable water. The surface water quality standards won't apply directly to SRVSA but what would happen is, let's say the stream standards that are adopted are similar to the drinking water standards, which is what I'm being told will happen initially, and once they set the aquatic life, the criteria that is needed for fish, it will be far lower. It will probably be single parts per trillion numbers but once they set a stream standard, then you'll have to calculate how much SRVSA could discharge without going over that limit. So, it depends on what is in the stream upstream of you but let's just say for argument's sake, the standard is 13 and your upstream condition is 5. You would have to calculate how much SRVSA could discharge before the stream concentration would go from 5 to 13 with a little bit of a reserve. That is how they would calculate the limit.

Are PFAS chemicals soluble in water? Mr. Cosgrove answered yes. And temperature stable? Yes, they are pretty stable. They are stable to about 500 degrees Celsius. Yes, it is stable for sure. In fact, to incinerate PFAS you have to use extremely high temperatures which, I am not an expert in PFAS incineration, but from what I've read, the temperatures are higher than a typical sludge burning incinerator would be.

Mr. Pratt introduced himself to Mr. Cosgrove and asked is monitoring at this level of parts per trillion, is that straight forward? Is there any difference of opinion on what method might be more or less accurate? Just a little percent error here and we're all over the place. Mr. Cosgrove stated that is a very observant question. He was reading something today about how important it is, when you are sampling, you can't use a sharpie to mark the bottles, you cannot use moisturizer in the morning before you come to work and you are going to collect a sample, you cannot use certain deodorants. There is a laundry list of things that could contaminate the sample when you are talking about a parts per trillion level. Certainly, I know of many people who have already sampled for PFAS and when I mention some of these things to them, they said "oh, I labeled my bottles with a sharpie" or "I did all my regular hygiene things in the morning and I didn't know I wasn't supposed to do that". One thing I always recommend to people is when they sample for PFAS, they take a blank. So, you put distilled water into a sample bottle at the same location you are collecting the sample so that if it is your aftershave contaminating the sample, you'll see it in the blank and you'll know that it's not necessary just naturally in the water.

Mr. Albano indicated this is more a question for Mr. Anastasio and Ms. Hoffman. This is going to have an impact on our Industrial Pretreatment Program, and we will probably have to educate the users or the generators because some of them are very sophisticated and others are not, as Ellie will attest to. Mr. Anastasio stated that no doubt, we'll be talking about this a lot in the future. We've been hearing about this at AEA for awhile now and we just heard a lot of talk about it in March and we saw Jim Cosgrove in Atlantic City and said we should plan to have him

attend our meeting virtually and giving the Board an overview on what is this PFAS. What are we talking about here? Jim has provided us all with the latest information. We haven't done sampling yet, but we are going to start with Pfizer and we'll see where that takes us. As Jim has indicated, until only recently they really haven't had a concrete method for it. People who are doing sampling early, it is apples to oranges, if they are using different methods or frequencies or composite samples vs. grab. So now that is getting standardized, and we'll have our meeting on Wednesday (April 27th) with Pfizer and go from there. We will keep the Board apprised as to any developments on this topic. Won't Pfizer also have to comply with every standard because they are treating their groundwater and the water from the ponds? Yes, they have a groundwater standard now and Pfizer is a little different because they have a "permit equivalency" but we don't know that their permit equivalency handles this. They are under the watchful eye of the EPA and EPA is really hot on this topic, so we think that is why they've collected data in the last few years and that's what we've had an opportunity to look at. It will be interesting what we learn from them when we meet with them.

Mr. Anastasio thanked Mr. Cosgrove for bringing all this information to the Board and can see him doing a repeat performance in the future. This was very informative and now the Board has had a chance to hear what we've been hearing, and we will keep everyone posted on changes and developments. Mr. Cosgrove and Ms. Toro then left the meeting.

2. Update on Storm Control Treatment Facility Construction Project

Mr. Anastasio indicated that on April 7th we were able to operate the plant in treatment mode for a few hours and we learned a lot of good lessons. There is some fine tuning needed with the plant, but it does work well and we are going to make those adjustments as time goes on. It was good see it in operation. Going into the system, it may have been as high as 16 million being pumped by the pump station, but we had some glitches with our flowmeter entering from the Somerville system. We're not sure what that meter saw but some of it was also backwash from the cells too. We need to get that meter issue resolved so that we can differentiate between the two flows. Most of it is Somerville for sure but we don't know that missing figure, we need to get that meter working to know exactly what the Somerville flow is. We look forward to getting to use it again.

a. Update on PKF Mark III Construction Delay Claim

With this regard, there is nothing to talk about in Closed Session. We responded to their second letter and we haven't received anything back. We spoke about the second letter as far back as the Closed Session at the February meeting. We are waiting for a reply.

3. Update on Inquiry of a Connection to the SRVSA Facilities of the Proposed Fox Hollow Affordable Housing Residential Development in Readington Township, Hunterdon County

There is nothing to talk about here. We sent a letter out around Christmas time asking a lot of questions and also requiring the signing of an escrow agreement and the posting of

\$30,000 in escrow to cover Authority costs for this inquiry. They did submit the signed escrow agreement which I have signed, and we have received a check as well. We expect to start hearing, on the technical side, what some of the responses are to our questions.

4. Update on Plantwide Electrical Rehabilitation Project

a. Update on Project Long-Term Financing

The loan closing is coming up in early May, May 11th is the loan closing. Our bond counsel expects to have some documents for us to sign by the end of the week. I will call our Treasurer and Secretary to stop in to sign those documents.

As for the project, we are just waiting to finish the last few pieces of that project. They are waiting for materials to come in.

B. Engineer/Consultants – Mr. Schoettle stated he had nothing to add unless anyone had any questions. Mr. Albano asked what is the Asset Management Plan that you mentioned in your report. Mr. Schoettle stated that they put together an Asset Hierarchy for the risk assessments to look at and start to build templates for things we’ve done with other clients to begin to think about an asset management. With cost estimates? Eventually that is what we will get to, but our experience is taking this in small bites is the best way to go.

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

D. Department Reports:

1. Operations
2. Regulatory Compliance
3. Laboratory
4. Maintenance/Electrical

E. Facility Engineer Reports:

1. Facility Engineers Monthly Report
2. Capacity Allocation
3. Capacity Assurance
4. Monthly Flow Report

Minute 13 – Communications – Standard monthly communication submittals to the State are in the Board book.

Minute 14 - Res. No. 22-0425-7 - Payroll

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

Roll Call Vote:

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

Minute 15 - Res. No. 22-0425-8 – Cancellation of Checks

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

Roll Call Vote:

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

Minute 16 - Res. No. 22-0425-9 - Bills

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	Absent
Louis Esposito, Jr	Absent	Reinhard Pratt	Yes
Joseph Lifrieri	Yes	Gail Quabeck	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Randy Smith	Yes

Richard Mathews	Yes	Peter Stires	Yes
Michael Pappas	Yes	Michael Impellizeri	Yes

Mr. Albano commented that Peter Wozniak did a good job at scraping up some reasonably decent earnings on about \$2 million given that interest rates have been down to .5% per year. He latched onto a couple of T-Bills for 2.4%. Mr. Wozniak thanked Mr. Albano and stated that we found a good opportunity and we took advantage of that on the ratepayer’s behalf.

Minute 18 –Adjournment

Upon Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Machala, the meeting was adjourned at 7:49 p.m.

Roll Call Vote:

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

**NEXT REGULAR BOARD MEETING WILL BE HELD ON
MAY 23, 2022**