

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING
THE SOMERSET RARITAN VALLEY SEWERAGE AUTHORITY
FEBRUARY 22, 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	<i>Absent</i>	Spencer Pierini	Present (Teams)
Joseph Lifrieri	Present	Gail Quabeck	Present (Teams)
Edward Machala	Present	Randy Smith	Present (Teams)
Richard Mathews	Present	Peter Stires	Present (Teams)
Steven Mlenak	<i>Absent*</i>	Thomas Young	<i>Absent</i>
		Michael Impellizeri	Present

*Mr. Mlenak joined the meeting via Teams at 7:25 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
Brad Carney, Esq., Maraziti Falcon, LLP	Present (Teams)
James Cosgrove, Esq., Kleinfelder	Present (Teams)

Minute 4 – Pledge of Allegiance

All in attendance saluted the flag.

Minute 5 – Oath of Office

- a. Joseph Lifrieri was sworn into office as Commissioner and as Vice-Chairman Township of Bridgewater – for a term to expire December 31, 2025
- b. Steven Mlenak joined the meeting at 7:25 p.m. At said time, he was sworn into office as a Commissioner – Township of Branchburg – for a term to expire January 31, 2026

Minute 6 – Approval of Minutes

- 1. Board Meeting Open Session Minutes – January 25, 2021 - Rescheduled to February 4, 2021

With the Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Mathews, the Minutes of the January 25, 2021 – (Rescheduled to February 4, 2021) Meeting (Open Session), were approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

- 2. Board Meeting Closed Session Minutes – January 25, 2021 - Rescheduled to February 4, 2021

With the Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Mr. Mathews, the Minutes of the January 25, 2021 – (Rescheduled to February 4, 2021) Meeting (Closed Session), were approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

3. Reorganization Meeting Minutes – February 1, 2021 – Rescheduled to February 4, 2021

With the Motion of Mr. Mathews, Second of Mr. Machala, the Minutes of the February 1, 2021, (Rescheduled to February 4, 2021) Reorganization Meeting, were approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

Minute 7 – Public Hearing – NONE

Minute 8 – Public Participation -None Present

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

- 1) **Res. No. 21-0222-1** – Resolution Authorizing Emergency Action During the Period of Time that the Governor of New Jersey Declares Covid-19 to Constitute a Public Health Emergency
- 2) **Res. No. 21-0222-2** – Resolution Authorizing Payment of Benefit Time to Thomas Strenko, Liquid Division Assistant Operator, Upon His Retirement
- 3) **Res. No. 21-0222-3** – Resolution Authorizing Payment to PSE&G for the Installation of New Natural Gas Service for the Emergency Generator at the Storm Control Treatment Facility Project and for the Future Relocated Storm Control Pumping Station

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

Roll Call Vote:

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

Minute 10 - Board Committees – NONE

Minute 11 – Chairman – NONE

Minute 12 - Reports

A. Executive Director’s Report

1. Discussion of the Somerset County Wastewater Treatment Facility & Septic Buildout and Capacity Analysis (Draft) – Engineer James Cosgrove

Mr. Anastasio indicated we would have a short discussion about the Somerset County Wastewater Treatment Facility and Septic Buildout and Capacity Analysis, in other words, the text portion of the Somerset County Wastewater Management Plan. They have issued us a draft report a couple of months ago, seeking our comments, and Jim Cosgrove, Sherwin Ulep and I have put our heads together on this report and we thought it would be prudent to address the Board to talk about capacity and to give you the key take-aways of what is important to us. There are a lot of things in this report that pertain to the entire County, not all of it is to us. In your Board books in the reports section, there is a memo from myself, and behind it are some documents. The back of the first page is a summary of the key take-aways of this report. Jim Cosgrove, Esq., from Kleinfelder, is going to take us through this list, and we will have a discussion.

Mr. Cosgrove stated that Somerset County has been working on the Wastewater Management Plan for each of the municipalities in the County for many years, going on a decade now. They are in the final throws of finalizing the Wastewater Management Plan and submitting it to DEP. In order to do that, they had to complete an analysis to determine how high the flow will go to each of the wastewater treatment plants within the County. They provided us with a buildout analysis that they completed which includes the SRVSA service area and the estimation that they made gives a total flow to the SRVSA of 29.159mgd. The way they got that number is they took

what they define as the existing flow to the plant, which is 25.265mgd and I will describe how they calculated that in just a minute. Plus, the amount of future flow that they expect to come in as a result of development within the service area, any treatment works approvals that have already been granted, any areas that are on septic that they are planning on ultimately tying into the treatment plant, and then a hot topic lately of affordable housing. There is a fair amount of affordable housing that is going to have to be constructed in each municipality. That 29.159 mgd number is the sum of all the future expected flows added on top of what they define as your existing flow. What is important to understand is that this is just a planning tool for the County and also for SRVSA. SRVSA does not have to take any action on this just because the Wastewater Management Plan shows a flow that is higher than your present flow. That does not require us to do anything. Keep in mind that as you sit here, the treatment plant size is for 23 mgd. The other thing I want to point out is that this is an ultimate buildout number. It used to be that the Wastewater Management Plans used a 20-year horizon. Now for this purpose, they are using ultimate buildout. Some of these flows may never appear or they may appear 50 or 100 years from now. This goes out forever.

One of the things that we like about the 29.159 total number, is that it ties to the 29 mgd flow that we at SRVSA have planned for. You might recall in the last permit, we convinced DEP to put three different flows in the permit: the existing 23mgd flow, the 24.31mgd flow which has been in the permit for a number of years, and then this new 29mgd flow. That was our best estimate of what this buildout would come to and we are pretty close. No further work has to be done by the Authority for you to go up to that 29mgd flow from a permitting perspective. Obviously, you have to expand the plant but from a permitting perspective, you have a permit for 29 mgd.

I just want to mention a couple other things and then we can talk about this a little more. One thing that is important for you to realize is that the existing flow is defined in the regulations as the highest 12-month average flow that has occurred in the past five (5) years. But in the last five (5) years, in one of the years, 2018, happened to be the wettest year on record. When you have the wettest year on record, you are going to have high treatment plant flows. So that treatment plant flow during the period of August 2018 to July 2019, was the highest one-year period, which happened to work out to be 25.265 mgd. Just to give you a sense of how high of a flow that is, the current 12-month average flow, so that flow that has occurred over the last 12 months on average, was 17.71mgd. The 25 mgd number is a very high flow to be using but that is what the regulations require them to use. You might be interested to know that when you look at the breakdown of the buildout, about 1/3 of the future flow is associated with affordable housing and 1/4 of the future flow is associated with commercial development. The rest is residential development. The other document that you have from me in your package tonight is related to the strategies that SRVSA will use to address what the County refers to as the “capacity deficiency”. That is, the difference between the existing treatment plant flow of 23 mgd and the projected flow of 29 mgd. The real issue there, as we will talk about in a minute, is the fact that you are going to need an expansion of the SRVSA facility when you want to go above 23 mgd. The first part is an easy part which would be a treatment plant rerating up to the 24.31 mgd, and then an expansion after that. The other thing is in the near future, you are going to have the Storm Control Treatment Facility (SCTF) in operation. That will help you because it will shave off high flows during wet periods. Also, there is an ongoing I&I reduction program

within the municipalities and within the SRVSA interceptor, that we hope will bring flows down to some degree but won't bring it down enough to avoid an expansion. Mr. Cosgrove asked if anyone had any questions.

Mr. Anastasio stated that those are some key points. He realizes as local officials, some of you may have heard talk from your council people, possibly in Bridgewater. There was a little bit of talk that the County had issued the Wastewater Management Plan and it seemed like people knew it was out there and it was getting finalized because the County is finalizing this with the towns, the Planning Boards, and the town Councils. We thought we would bring this to your attention tonight. There is nothing for us to do right now. One thing to keep in mind is that we started looking at the rerating from 23.0 mgd to 24.31 mgd with CDM a couple years ago and it looks close. The big hang-up was our headworks facility, which removes the grits and screenings from the flow. That looked undersized in the study but also, we are at the cusp of needing to upgrade that building. We are going to be coming to the Planning Committee and the Finance Committee in the near future, to talk about that project. It is something we have to do anyway. The equipment is very old and at the end of its service life. This seems to be good timing because we want to size it such that we could rerate the 24.31mgd and we can even talk about how much bigger we might want to go with that. Other than that, there is nothing for us to do at this point. Who knows when these flows will come. As Mr. Cosgrove mentioned, and we touched on this during the last Board meeting when we talked about the SCTF recap, we got thrown into the Capacity Assurance Program like many authorities in the State because of record flows which are from now 3 years ago. We have to have 36 consecutive months of 12-month rolling average, that is below 23 mgd. You can see on the list that this month, we are at 17.71 so we need more of those to get out of the program. But what it really means is that the 25.265 mgd existing flow baseline, like Mr. Cosgrove mentioned, is very high. Mr. Cosgrove, Sherwin Ulep, and I talked about this when they came out with the number. They calculate the number according to the DEP regulations and we felt that it is a high ceiling, but it is better to have a high ceiling than a low ceiling. Ten years ago, our prior Executive Director Glen Petruski, Jim Cosgrove and I went to the DEP to argue for this policy because at that time, it was the highest flow in the last 12 months, and we were in the middle of a drought. They were calculating this buildout plan, and the buildout number was almost the same as our rated capacity, adding about 6 million gallons and they were ecstatic at the County. They thought that we would not have to expand the Plant because the base flow is 15mgd. But we stressed that we are in a drought and the flow is normally much higher. That is why we went to the State and discussed this with the Assistant Commissioner Marilyn Lennon, and they saw the light on this. They went back and modified the legislation. It took a few years, but this is the result of it. It is better to have a buffer than to have a low ceiling and we will just deal with the flows as they come. Always staying ahead of what the demand is. With the SCTF, we are in a good place and that will help us if we get into the high rain situations again, it will help take the load off this plant, not just to help this plant out but also to help us keep out of that program.

We will finalize this strategies document and give it back to the County as this is the input they are waiting on. The buildout numbers are what they are. They go around to all the vacant land in the towns, and they apply the zoning regulations on the zoning map. Then they apply the appropriate proportional flows. Does anyone have any comments or questions?

Bob Albano has a few questions: Could you clarify what is the issue of the overflow treatment plant that we are building, how does that impact our ultimate capacity? It is really just for storm control, so I do not know how that really helps us in this determination of 29 mgd. Jim Cosgrove stated that there are times today where under very high flows, you will be able to take wastewater out of the interceptor that is presently coming to SRVSA and treat it at the new SCTF. It will reduce the flow that is coming to SRVSA during those peak times. Bob asked, so DEP will allow that as part of our “capacity”? Mr. Anastasio stated that in dry weather when we cannot run the SCTF, we have to have enough dry weather treatment capacity here and I think that is what you are speaking to. It is not a flaw but the way that the State and these planning processes look at I&I. I&I comes in chunks, it rains and then it does not rain and the flows go up and come down. For planning purposes and also the Capacity Assurance Program, they divide a year’s worth of I&I into 365 days and average it out over that time. What we are alluding to with the SCTF is that we got thrown into that program because for the course of many months, our daily flow, which includes our normal dry weather flow plus a wet component on top of it, exceeded the plant rating. In those times, we will be able to use the SCTF for treatment every day as long as the river is over a certain amount. Think of it as on paper, it will help the capacity of the SRVSA treatment plant because it will make the monthly flow to this main plant lower because we will have the satellite plant share some of the load. In a dry month, we cannot run it and it doesn’t add to our treatment capacity here at the plant at all.

Mr. Albano then asked: It says in the report, they used the maximum flow over the last five years, the 12-month rolling average. I checked when the maximum rain flow was in New Jersey and it was not in the last five years. It was 1939 so I am wondering is that a valid way to look at the maximum rainfall, looking at 5 years versus going back to 1939 which was the highest for NJ? Mr. Cosgrove said that a few years ago, we were saying to the DEP, you should allow us to use a longer time period because if you happen to have a dry 5-year period, you might underestimate what the true flow could be. There is a provision in the regulations that if you want to use a longer time period, you can petition the DEP to do that. I would not go back to 1939, but by having that 2018 period included here, I think it gives us a lot of protection. Mr. Anastasio stated, let’s put it this way.: if the weather for the next 5 years were normal and they were doing the process 5 years from now, we would want to argue to go back and use 2018 and 2019, just to have that high water mark.

Another question from Mr. Albano: In the report, it shows no septic conversions from Bridgewater and I cannot believe that there are no septic tanks running in Bridgewater. I am just curious as to that one. Mr. Cosgrove stated that there could be septic tanks operating in Bridgewater, but Bridgewater may have told the County that they have no intentions of sewerage those septic tanks.

Mr. Albano stated, let’s face it, NJ is reducing population, industry is moving out and I’m wondering how those were factored in? If you look at flows in our IPP program, we have about 30 companies. As those companies phase out of manufacturing, we are going to see water usage go down. How is that managed in this plan? Mr. Cosgrove stated that is it not managed in the buildout. In effect, what happened is you would not see the projection of the buildout. That is why I said earlier that SRVSA does not have to take any action now. We will take action when we convince ourselves that we are getting close to the actual capacity and that we have to expand the plant by some degree. If only half of the buildout comes to be, we may only have to

add 2 mgd to the treatment plant rather than almost 4 mgd. So, since we do not have to do anything, we are not all that concerned by some of the methodology used, yes? Correct.

Mr. Albano asked, in this calculation, how are we dealing with the fact that Branchburg asked us to handle the Fox Hollow flow? Mr. Cosgrove indicated that it is his understanding that it is not in here at this point. Ms. Quabeck stated that a decision yet to be made on this. (At this point, Steve Mlenak joined in on the Teams call).

Mr. Albano had a general question: if we have to expand, where would we expand? Do we have enough property to do that? Mr. Anastasio indicated that we think we do. We would have to look at it further. We have more space to add primary clarifiers. We have enough room to add 2 more of the size we have now. We have plenty of aeration capacity so we would not need to add any additional tankage. We have a spare set of aeration basins as it is plus another basin that could be upgraded to handle aeration. On the final clarifier side, we do have some available real estate down in that end of the plant where the carbon towers used to be so if need be, for final clarification and also sludge thickening tanks, we do have room for that. That's me speaking off-the-cuff. We have not done a formal site assessment. Ms. Quabeck stated that we have not really looked at it that closely, nor did we need to. Mr. Anastasio stated that our rectangular clarifiers, 3-14, sometimes they are offline so those are not fully utilized yet and they were constructed 20 years ago. We can grow into those as well. We may be good with what we have for now, but we'll have to see. We know the choke point right now is the headworks building, the grit collection. As part of the headworks, we did the bar screens installation several years ago which was one of Sherwin's first projects. Those screens are good with sending up to 72 million gallons so there is not a choke point there. It is just the grit collection at this point. We will be taking another look at that soon. As we get closer, we will study it further.

Mr. Albano thanked everyone for their patience in answering his questions.

Mr. Cosgrove excused himself from the meeting at this point.

2. Update on Storm Control Treatment Facility Construction Project

Mr. Anastasio indicated that the project continues to go very well. They hauled out a large portion of the contaminated soils for disposal, which is the issue we have been talking about for some months now. They hauled out about 2,600 cubic yards or 3,500 tons. We are paying by weight and the projected cubic yards was around 2,700. Sherwin Ulep indicated that was in the ballpark. Mr. Anastasio stated that we had a conservative unit weight so we might be a little lower on the weight with having the volume. Our plan was to not haul out any more soil and they are going to go ahead and install the pipes. If we need to haul out a little more, we will. The numbers may come in lower than what the ceiling is in the Resolution, which will be a good thing. Spending less money is a good thing for sure. The construction of the treatment plant moves along very well. We sent you a few more photos in an email. You can see that the roof is on now and PKF's forces are mainly working inside the building doing mechanical and electrical work and they subbed out the pipeline installations in the easement areas to a subcontractor and that contractor is onsite actively working. We are happy with everything going on.

As part of the Consent Agenda tonight, we have approval of a payment for PSE&G for the new gas service. Mr. Lifrieri asked, have we satisfied the complaints of the neighbors? Mr. Anastasio indicated that we had a noise complaint and it was rectified. Sherwin Ulep had to remind the contractor not to start before 7:00 am. However, one neighbor claimed to have some damage to his home as a result of the vibrations. The site is pretty close to the homes and when they are digging, there could be some vibrations. We contacted the neighbor, and we had the contractor's insurance company contact him and that process is moving along. There have been insurance adjustors out there to take photographs of the home and damage, and even today, there was an email from the resident in touch with the insurance representative at the contractor's insurance company. Hopefully, this gets resolved and the neighbors are happy. Getting the payment approved for PSE&G just further frees things up. Now they can go schedule that work. We are installing the generator pad and the pipeline in the vicinity of where the gas service will go. We will get out of PSE&G's way, and then they will go in and install that service. We do not want to have a situation where the contractor is delayed because one of the utilities has not provided a service yet.

We are still waiting on doing some additional soil sampling for the topsoil that is stored at the plant site. There were some issues with some contaminants in the soils, so we are further evaluating them before we put them back on the site on the easement areas. We will report more next month. We are about 75% complete so just several months to go and we will be finished.

3. Update on the Plantwide Electrical Rehabilitation Project

Mr. Anastasio stated that this project is also going very well. We are about 2/3 done with the project. They continue to do a good job and work very well with our people and our engineering people.

We have 2 major construction projects that are both going smoothly so far, and we are very happy.

4. Update on the Status of Terminated Employee Jozef Sudnik (Closed Session – Personnel Matters)

Mr. Anastasio indicated he will report on this in Closed Session. It will be a very brief report

B. Engineer/Consultants – Nothing further to add.

C. Attorney – Maraziti Falcon, LLP – No report this evening.

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

Minute 14 - Res. No. 21-0222-4 - Payroll

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	Absent	Spencer Pierini	Yes
Joseph Lifrieri	Yes	Gail Quabeck	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Randy Smith	Yes
Richard Mathews	Yes	Peter Stires	Yes
Steven Mlenak	Yes	Thomas Young	Absent
		Michael Impellizeri	Yes

Minute 15 - Res. No. 21-0222-5 - Bills

Upon Motion of Mr. Lifrieri, 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	Absent	Spencer Pierini	Yes
Joseph Lifrieri	Yes	Gail Quabeck	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Randy Smith	Yes
Richard Mathews	Yes	Peter Stires	Yes
Steven Mlenak	Yes	Thomas Young	Absent
		Michael Impellizeri	Yes

Minute 16 – Res. No. 21-0222-6 - Adjourn to Closed Session - Resolution Authorizing Closed Session for the Purposes of Personnel Matter and Discussions Regarding the Status of Terminated Employee Jozef Sudnik.

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	Absent	Spencer Pierini	Yes
Joseph Lifrieri	Yes	Gail Quabeck	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Randy Smith	Yes
Richard Mathews	Yes	Peter Stires	Yes
Steven Mlenak	Yes	Thomas Young	Absent
		Michael Impellizeri	Yes

Open Session reconvened at 7:40 p.m.

Minute 17 - Adjournment

Upon Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Mathews, the meeting was adjourned at 7:43 p.m.

Roll Call Vote:

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

**NEXT REGULAR BOARD MEETING WILL BE HELD ON
MARCH 22, 2021**