

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING
THE SOMERSET RARITAN VALLEY SEWERAGE AUTHORITY
JULY 24, 2023**

Minute 1 - Opening of Meeting

The Board Meeting of the Somerset Raritan Valley Sewerage Authority was called to order at 7:03 P.M. by Chairman Joseph Lifrieri.

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	Michael Pappas	Present (Teams)
Nicolas Carra	Absent	Philip Petrone	Present
Vincent Dominach	Present	Reinhard Pratt	Present
Louis Esposito, Jr	Present	Frank Scarantino	Present
Michael Impellizeri	Present (Teams)	Joseph Lifrieri	Present
Edward Machala	Present		
Richard Mathews	Present		

Authority Staff

Ronald Anastasio, P.E., Executive Director	Present
Anthony Tambasco, Plant Superintendent	Present
Michael Ingenito, Chief Plant Operator	Present
Sherwin Ulep, P.E., Manager of Engineering	Present
Ellie Hoffman, P.E., Regulatory Compliance Engineer	Present (Teams)
Linda Hering, Human Resources Manager	Present
Peter Wozniak, Chief Financial Officer	Present
Christian Santiago, Staff Engineer	Present (Teams)
Joseph Loughlin, A/P Clerk	Present (Teams)
Gerry Zielonka, Maintenance Supervisor	Present

Professional Staff

Thomas Schoettle, P.E., CDM Smith	Present
Brad Carney, Esq., Maraziti Falcon, LLP	Present

Minute 4 – Pledge of Allegiance

All in attendance saluted the flag.

Minute 5 – Oaths of Office:

- a. Pamela Borek – Member – New Member (Hillsborough MUA) – Former Commissioner Randy Smith’s Seat; Term to Expire 1/31/2028
- b. Gary DiNardo - Member – New Member (Warren Township) - Former Commissioner Spencer Perini’s Seat: Term to Expire January 31, 2025

Ms. Borek and Mr. DiNardo were sworn in as Commissioners by Mr. Brad Carney, Esq.

Minute 6 – Approval of Minutes:

- 1. Board Meeting Open Session Minutes – June 26, 2023

With the Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Mr. Mathews, the Minutes of the June 26th, 2023 Meeting (Open Session) were approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Edward Machala	Yes
Pamela Borek	Abstain	Richard Mathews	Yes
Nicolas Carra	Absent	Michael Pappas	Yes
Gary DiNardo	Abstain	Philip Petrone	Yes
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Reinhard Pratt	Yes
Louis Esposito, Jr	Abstain	Frank Scarantino	Yes
Michael Impellizeri	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

- 2. Board Meeting Closed Session Minutes – June 26, 2023

With the Motion of Mr. Mathews, Second of Mr. Dominach, the Minutes of the June 26th, 2023 Meeting (Closed Session) were approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Edward Machala	Yes
Pamela Borek	Abstain	Richard Mathews	Yes
Nicolas Carra	Absent	Michael Pappas	Yes
Gary DiNardo	Abstain	Philip Petrone	Yes
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Reinhard Pratt	Yes
Louis Esposito, Jr	Abstain	Frank Scarantino	Yes
Michael Impellizeri	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

Minute 7 – Public Hearings – NONE

Minute 8 – Public Participation -

Seeing no one from the public in attendance in person, or via the TEAMS Meeting online, Mr. Lifrieri closed the Public Hearing.

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

Mr. Mathews asked if we could pull Res. No. 23-0724-3 to be discussed and voted on separately. There were no objections.

Mr. Albano had a question regarding Res. No. 23-0724-2. He stated that they are no longer going to be discharging into the sewer system, the chemicals they were doing, and they are just going to pack everything up and ship it out, which is what they were doing a couple years ago anyway. Ellie Hoffman stated that the volume has decreased to where we consider them *De Minimis*, so we have classified them as “*De Minimis*”. They had very little process discharge in the first place, but they’ve been able to cut back their water usage. Will they still be dumping the ethylene glycol into the sewer system? They weren’t dumping the ethylene glycol. That actually goes into a finished product which ships out. We verified the containment around it so it can’t get in my accident either. Mr. Albano stated that a couple years ago there was an issue with them with their discharges and monitoring but that is no longer an issue.

Mr. Lifrieri asked if there were any other issues with either resolution and there were none.

- (1) **Res. No. 23-0724-1** – Resolution Granting Permanent Status for Erik Doyle
- (2) **Res. No. 23-0724-2** – Resolution Authorizing the Administrative Termination of the Non-Domestic Wastewater Discharge Permit 50A, issued to Prysmian Draka Cableteq USA

Upon a Motion by Mr. Esposito and a Second by Mr. Albano, the above Resolutions were approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Edward Machala	Yes
Pamela Borek	Yes	Richard Mathews	Yes
Nicolas Carra	Absent	Michael Pappas	Yes
Gary DiNardo	Yes	Philip Petrone	Yes
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Reinhard Pratt	Yes
Louis Esposito, Jr	Yes	Frank Scarantino	Yes
Michael Impellizeri	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

Mr. Mathews stated that a little while back, we had Millstone trying to tie in and that was right across the street from this. Are we again putting the cart before the horse? Does Hillsborough have to approve this since they are the ones who are going to be accepting the flow before it gets to us? Mr. Anastasio indicated they are applying concurrently for the approval. He asked Ms. Borek if their meeting was Wednesday night. Mr. Mathews asked, maybe we can accept it but with a condition that Hillsborough approves. Mr. Anastasio indicated that makes sense. This way we can keep it out of the plant if they don't approve it. Mr. Scarantino indicated that for what its worth, Hillsborough is not happy to see this approved. So, they can't use us as an excuse, basically saying they approved it, why didn't we.

So, we can either conditionally approve it or we can table it and get it off the agenda. Mr. Dominach was suggesting the conditional approval so if we conditionally approve it, then we don't have to have it on the agenda and we don't have to deal with it again. If they approve it, then we're done with it as well.

Ms. Borek stated that it puts the onus on us and honestly on the Township's side, I don't know where this stands at the moment. She hasn't seen anything. Mr. Mathews recalled that Millstone was trying to get in and Gail Quabeck was on the Board at the time, and she said don't worry about it because they have to get through Hillsborough first. I am of the opinion that we shouldn't act on it. I'm taking the same stance, but it is up to everyone. Mr. Anastasio stated that both achieve the same goal, not putting it on Hillsborough MUA's back, but it does flow through your system before it comes to our system.

Mr. Lifrieri stated that he would rather table it so that we don't get in the middle of anything between Hillsborough. On a Motion of Mr. Pappas, with a second by Mr. Mathews, the following Resolution was Tabled.

- (3) **Res. No. 23-0724-3** – Resolution Consenting to the Proposed Revision to the Upper Raritan Water Quality Management Plans - Hamilton Road (Block 183.05 Lot 35), Hillsborough Township

Roll call vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Edward Machala	Yes
Pamela Borek	Yes	Richard Mathews	Yes
Nicolas Carra	Absent	Michael Pappas	Yes
Gary DiNardo	Yes	Philip Petrone	Yes
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Reinhard Pratt	Yes
Louis Esposito, Jr	Yes	Frank Scarantino	Yes
Michael Impellizeri	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

Minute 10 – Board Committees –

- A. Planning Committee:** (MACHALA, Impellizeri, Lifrieri, Pratt, Scarantino, Dominach)
- Finance Committee:** (ALBANO, Mathews, Machala, Impellizeri, Scarantino, Pratt)

1. Report on Design Engineering Services for the Main Interceptor Rehabilitation Project

Mr. Machala indicated that we are where we left off last month and we are forwarding this over to Finance. Mr. Anastasio stated that this is a joint report between Planning and Finance. Both Committees have reviewed the results for the Engineering proposals for the Main Interceptor Forcemain Rehabilitation Project and both Committees have recommended to the Board that the engineering project laid out in the RFP, tests 1-4 and 6 and 7, excluding test 5, be awarded to CDM Smith. That is in the Resolution and the attached memorandum. He asked if there was anything to add from either Committee. Mr. Albano stated that he summarized it. We are pulling out Task 5 (Resident Project Representative), which is different from the company that is doing the work. Financing it will come out of the connection fee account. When the project is finished, we will decide whether we are going to pay for it, partially pay for it, finance it, and see what the market is doing. Mr. Lifrieri added that all of the Engineering firms that prepared a proposal are all very competent and very much able to do the work. CDM Smith was the low bidder and therefore, we felt that we should award that to CDM Smith even though they are the Authority engineer. But they won the work, and they should get the work. Mr. Carney stated that there is one minor clarification. Technically it is not a bid, it is a Request for Proposal. There is a distinction.

2. **Res. No. 23-0227-4** – Resolution Accepting the Proposal from CDM Smith For Task Numbers 1 Through 4, 6 & 7 For Engineering Design Services for the Main Interceptor and Forcemain Rehabilitation Project

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

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Edward Machala	Yes
Pamela Borek	Yes	Richard Mathews	Yes
Nicolas Carra	Absent	Michael Pappas	Yes
Gary DiNardo	Yes	Philip Petrone	Yes
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Reinhard Pratt	Yes
Louis Esposito, Jr	Yes	Frank Scarantino	Yes
Michael Impellizeri	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

Minute 11 – Chairman – Mr. Lifrieri had no comments and nothing further to add. He welcomed Ms. Borek and Mr. DiNardo to the Board, and we now have a complete 14-member Board, which at some point in time in my tenure on the Board when we did have that, but I don't remember it. Thank you both very much for stepping up to the plate here.

Minute 12 - Reports

A. Executive Director's Report

1. Update on the Plantwide Mechanical Rehabilitation Project

Mr. Anastasio indicated the design investigation and evaluation continues. The engineers are in touch with our Engineering Department quite frequently. We provide them with any information. I believe they have everything they need at this point as far as background information is concerned. We are actively looking at some solutions for the various systems around the plant. We've been doing some further field visits to look at process equipment at different sites. A couple weeks ago, the staff visited a location out in Pennsylvania for a belt filter press and we're going to another company on Friday to check out yet another manufacturer for that. There are other valuations going on as well. There were some odor samplings that we had done around the plant early in July as part of the sizing of the odor control system. The field sampling is complete, and the evaluation work is underway by the engineers.

We are moving on a number of fronts along the design for the plant wide upgrade. We have a monthly progress meeting this Thursday just to get our latest updates and see where we are at with certain things and to see if there is anything for the staff to act on or make decisions on.

Mr. Schoettle stated that the only thing he would add is that they had their architect out at the site a week and a half ago to look at a couple of the work areas so that is progressing as well. Some of the building extensions that we have, some other communications now that we've visited, the belt filter press manufacturers. There are some ideas that we are kicking around with the plant staff to look to optimizing some of space needs there.

2. Update on the Storm Control Pumping Station Relocation Project

Mr. Anastasio stated that this project is also moving along in design. We are close to finalizing and making the submittal to the NJDEP for the wetlands application. The fieldwork is mostly complete at this point. We are working on finalizing the wetlands application, the survey has been done and the design work continues. The engineers are in the process of finalizing the pump sizing and selection and we are closer to finalizing the emergency generator as well. We have an ongoing dialogue with that engineering firm as well regarding that project. We are having a project progress meeting coming up in the next week and a half. Work continues on that project as well.

3. Update on the Liquid Division SCADA Upgrade Project

Mr. Anastasio indicated that this is a project that has been working in the background for quite awhile now. It is a longer timeline than we originally anticipated but through the supply chain issues, we had to be flexible on when we could expect to receive the PLCs (Program Logic Computers). That work is progressing nicely, and we are happy with the work product and the company staff that is doing the work. They've done some field installations a couple weeks ago in the 600 Building and they are moving along to our return activated sludge pumpstation building. It is about 45% completed.

4. Update on the Administration Building Addition/Renovation

Mr. Anastasio stated that this item may be new to some of the Board members except those on the Planning and Finance Committee. Although there are 2 new Commissioners here tonight the ones that have been here awhile are familiar. We have a very antiquated and cramped Administration Building. You are currently in our fanciest room that we renovated about five years ago. A few of the members will remember the old Board room which was about 2/3 the size of this one and the wall went down about where the television is. We used to cram the same number of people into that same small room. This is luxurious. I have handed out some plans and thought I would share them with the whole Board. We had a discussion with the Planning Committee about this project and all the committee members are eager to move on to the next steps. I have to do a final review and we'll get it out the door. We are going to distribute a Request for Proposals to several Architect firms to get an idea of what it would cost for the design, and I believe, the construction administration is in that RFP as well, for the construction of this building.

What it would be is an addition to this building that would be behind this wall and there would be about an 8' space to where the outside wall of the addition would be. It would be a two-story addition. We have people scattered about the plant right now, in various buildings and offices. We are one office short. Ellie is still working remotely and that works seamlessly and there are no problems with that, but it is not ideal. We have two of our supervisors in trailer offices. We get by but this has been in the works for years. Not this plan per se, but in the mid-90's, the Board and staff at the time had considered the construction of an Administration Building at that time. Something that was located somewhere else, and it was a completely new construction. We think this is a good solution. We are not looking for any action tonight. This is just for information. We are going to continue to work with the Planning Committee and report to them with what our findings are with proposals from Architects. When we had a Finance Committee meeting on July 5th, I brought it up then too for those committee members information. It is something we are looking at and will meet both the current needs and also some future needs of the Authority. There is room for some future expansion as well.

There is nothing to do. I Just thought I'd mention it so that you have it on your radar. We'll update everyone as we learn more about it.

5. Report on the Purchase of R2 Incinerator Dome and Wall Refractory Blocks

Mr. Anastasio stated that for those who are new tonight, we incinerate our sludge on-site at this facility. That is not something that is typically done anymore. We are one of five Authorities that do this. Incineration has gotten more difficult over the year. We stayed in it, and we are happy we did. Getting rid of sludge at wastewater plants is a very difficult thing for the larger plants. To put it in perspective, when the incinerator is down, we can haul it out in one of two forms, or both forms. We can haul it out like a cake sludge which is like cookie dough, and we fill dumpsters. Or we haul it in liquid form. What typically is the case, we can't always get rid of one day's amount of generation in the solid form so the rest would have to go out in liquid form. When this is off-line, it takes 23 tractor trailer tankers to haul the sludge off, which is for one day. It is about 130,000 of liquid sludge. This is the magnitude of things we were talking about. The incinerator is a very important thing to us. Plus, the cost of sludge hauling is very high. We don't have a backup sludge incinerator right now and this is what we have to do. To be prudent, we need to have extra refractory blocks, think of them as fire bricks in a fireplace. What lines the shell of the incinerator is this refractory block or fire brick. It is analogous to the firebrick in a fireplace, but it is much more sophisticated and much more robust and durable. A fireplace burns at 450 degrees and sludge burns at about 1,540 degrees. It takes at least a year to buy it, from the time you order it. This is something that we've talked about doing for a number of years. We had a spare set of blocks for a portion of the "dome", which is domed section in the interior of the incinerator. We used that back in 2010 so that is a fairly long time ago. These domes can last a lot of years but given the cost of hauling and the lack of available quickly for this brick, we feel that it is prudent to go out for bid for this. We talked about doing this and had it in our capital budget for a number of years now.

I just wanted to give the Board a little bit of background on this. We have a publicly advertised bid that we advertised a couple of weeks ago. We are opening it on August 15th. We look forward to getting the submittals on that. Costs have gone up and there are less manufacturers than there were 13 years ago. We'll keep them in stock, so we'll have them when we need them. We will update the Board at the next Board meeting.

Mr. Lifrieri added that another reason we like having the incinerator is that the trucks that go on the road to haul sludge, should they have an accident, we would be responsible, and we don't want that responsibility. It is best to have something within our own confines here to deal with it. Mr. Anastasio also added that from a pollution standpoint, it generates more pollution to truck the sludge off-site than to burn it in our incinerator.

Mr. Pratt asked that if we haul sludge off-site, how many truckloads of sludge per day are we incinerating? When we don't incinerate and we haul it off-site, and we can haul it off all in cake, it is about 3 ½ 30-yard dumpsters. I am just trying to reconcile the quantity of "cookie dough" coming off that conveyor belt in the incinerator, with the truckloads. Mr. Anastasio responded that, in a perfect world, we'd love to haul it off in cake form. It is economically more beneficial. To haul and dispose of a dumpster of cake, is around \$3,500-\$3,800 per load, times 3½ or 4, but we are not able to find someone that can take it at that rate. It is difficult to get rid of it. Would we be sending it to somebody else to incinerate? Yes, we send it to Stony Brook Regional Sewerage Authority in Princeton, almost 20 miles away. There are no issues there. Our backup for cake sludge incineration was Atlantic County Utilities Authority, 114 miles away, one direction. That is still more beneficial than hauling sludge. One dumpster of cake equals seven

liquid trucks, and the liquid trucks are about \$2,800 to \$3,000 per load. Unfortunately, you can't get rid of it all in cake. It would cost \$250,000-\$300,000 per month to haul sludge off-site. That's why it is critical to have some parts in stock because we could burn a lot of money hauling sludge off-site while we're waiting.

B. Engineer/Consultants – Mr. Thomas Schoettle, P.E., (CDM Smith) had nothing further to add to his Report. However, he wanted to thank the Board for bringing them on for the project. We are looking forward to it. We have another team scheduled and ready to go and look forward to starting that as well.

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

D. Department Reports:

1. Operations
2. Regulatory Compliance
3. Laboratory
4. Maintenance
5. Special Projects

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. 23-0626-5 – Payroll

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

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Edward Machala	Yes
Pamela Borek	Yes	Richard Mathews	Yes
Nicolas Carra	Absent	Michael Pappas	Yes
Gary DiNardo	Yes	Philip Petrone	Yes
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Reinhard Pratt	Yes
Louis Esposito, Jr	Yes	Frank Scarantino	Yes
Michael Impellizeri	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

Minute 15 - Res. No. 23-0626-6 – Bills

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

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Edward Machala	Yes
Pamela Borek	Yes	Richard Mathews	Yes
Nicolas Carra	Absent	Michael Pappas	Yes
Gary DiNardo	Yes	Philip Petrone	Yes
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Reinhard Pratt	Yes
Louis Esposito, Jr	Yes	Frank Scarantino	Yes
Michael Impellizeri	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

Minute 16 - Adjournment

Upon Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Mathews, the meeting was adjourned at 7:33 p.m.

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Edward Machala	Yes
Pamela Borek	Yes	Richard Mathews	Yes
Nicolas Carra	Absent	Michael Pappas	Yes
Gary DiNardo	Yes	Philip Petrone	Yes
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Reinhard Pratt	Yes
Louis Esposito, Jr	Yes	Frank Scarantino	Yes
Michael Impellizeri	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

**NEXT REGULAR BOARD MEETING WILL BE HELD ON
AUGUST 28, 2023**