

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING
THE SOMERSET RARITAN VALLEY SEWERAGE AUTHORITY
JUNE 28, 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	Philip Petrone	Present
Louis Esposito, Jr	Present	Spencer Pierini	Absent
Joseph Lifrieri	Present	Gail Quabeck	Present (Teams)
Edward Machala	Present	Randy Smith	Present
Richard Mathews	Present	Peter Stires	Present (Teams)
Michael Pappas	Present (Teams)	Michael Impellizeri	Present

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 (Teams)
Brad Carney, 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 – May 24, 2021

With the Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Machala, the Minutes of the May 24, 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	Absent
Joseph Lifrieri	Yes	Gail Quabeck	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Randy Smith	<i>Abstain</i>
Richard Mathews	Yes	Peter Stires	Yes
Michael Pappas	Yes	Michael Impellizeri	Yes

2. Board Meeting Closed Session Minutes – May 24, 2021

With the Motion of Mr. Lifrieri, Second of Mr. Machala, the Minutes of the May 24, 2021 Meeting (Closed Session), were approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

Minute 6 – Public Hearing – NONE

Minute 7 – Public Participation -None Present

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

Mr. Anastasio indicated there are a few modifications to the following Resolutions. Resolution No. 21-0628-2 which references the WEFTEC Conference attendance, which indicates the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and two (2) Commissioners, we are going to change that to one (1) Commissioner. Commissioner Albano’s name was on the list, but he is not able to attend. The agenda says Chairman and three (3) but the Resolution says Chairman, Vice Chairman plus two (2). They read differently but are the same. Now it is Chairman, Vice Chairman plus one (1).

Also, Mr. Anastasio stated that Vice-Chairman Lifrieri pointed out that on Resolution No. 21-0628-5, in the third WHEREAS, regarding the wording “this change will increase the contract price by \$60,219.30 to bring the total contract price to \$4,703,984.45”, the following should be added “including previous change orders”. Mr. Anastasio asked Mr. Lifrieri if that is what he would like to be added to the Resolution. Mr. Lifrieri indicated yes, because if you try to add the two numbers, you don’t get the number that is there. We will make those changes. Ms. Quabeck then asked for clarification on the total contract price. What was not clear is that there were other changes, plus the \$60,219.30, bring it to the total price.

Mr. Pappas had a question regarding Resolution No. 21-0628-4 and No. 21-0628-6 that both have to do with the facility that is under construction, is that correct? Mr. Anastasio stated that yes, that is correct. Mr. Pappas requested that Resolution No. 21-0628-4 be pulled from the Consent Agenda because he has a couple questions. Mr. Carney indicated that we need a Motion to remove Resolution No. 21-0628-4 from the Consent Agenda.

A Motion to remove Resolution No. 21-0628-4 from the Consent Agenda was presented and moved by Mr. Pappas, seconded by Mr. Albano, and approved by the following Roll Call Vote:

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

- 1) **Res. No. 21-0628-1** – Resolution Endorsing and Approving Permanent Status to John Devito as Incineration Division Assistant Operator
- 2) **Res. No. 21-0628-2** – Resolution Authorizing the Chairman and Three (3) Commissioners, the Executive Director, the Plant Superintendent, the Manager of Engineering and the Chief Financial Officer to Attend the Water Environment Federation's (WEFTEC) 94th Annual Water Environment Federation Technical Exhibition and Conference in Chicago, IL
- 3) **Res. No. 21-0628-3** – Sewer Extension Resolution Approval - Proposed Three (3) Single-Family Dwelling Subdivision - South Branch Road; Hillsborough Township; Block 149.08 Lot 91
- 4) **Res. No. 21-0628-4** – **REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA - (See vote on this Resolution later in the Minutes)**

- 5) **Res. No. 21-0628-5** – Resolution Authorizing Change Order No. 6 – Additional Work for Final Clarifiers Duct Bank Modification - Contract C-19-2 – Plantwide Electrical Rehabilitation Project

Upon Motion by Ms. Quabeck, Second of Mr. Albano, Res. No. 21-0628-1, through Res. No. 21-0628-3 and Res. No. 21-0628-5, were approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Philip Petrone	Yes
Louis Esposito, Jr	Yes	Spencer Pierini	Absent
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 stated to Mr. Pappas that we can talk about Resolution No. 21-0628-4 when we talk about the update for the Storm Control Treatment Facility, or we can talk about it along with Res. No. 21-0628-6. Mr. Pappas asked if we could combine them in the discussions together as in his mind, they are related. It would seem to be efficient to do it that way and he would be happy if we could do that.

Minute 9 – Board Committees – Planning Committee (MACHALA, Lifrieri, Smith, Stires, Impellizeri)

- a) Discussion of Authorizing Additional Funds to CDM Smith for Additional SCTF Project Engineering Services.

Mr. Machala stated that the Planning Committee met earlier, prior to tonight’s meeting, for an hour and a half meeting, and he will let Mr. Anastasio give us a quick summation and he will be able to address both of your questions at the same time regarding these 2 upcoming pending Resolutions.

Mr. Anastasio went on to state that the first item on the list is additional funds for CDM Smith for additional project engineering services for the Storm Control Treatment Facility. What that is related to, and we will get into more specifics on the SCTF status, and the project is going well, but basically the project is going longer than we budgeted for. The current end date of the contract was April 25, 2021, which includes a 45-day delay. The original contract termination date was March 11, 2021. We granted a 45-day extension as part of Change Order No. 2 to deal with and dispose of the contaminated soils in the easement areas and all that work is done. But we have gone way past the deadline date. We get some schedule “look-aheads” from the contractor, but we don’t have an up-to-date schedule yet. We don’t know what date is projected to end. From our estimation, and at the pace things are going, we think the project is going to be substantially complete, maybe sometime mid-August, and then the final complete sometime in September. Just to be on the safe side, we had talked to CDM Smith and they gave us a proposal

to cover four (4) months. With the approval of the bills tonight, included in that is an invoice payment to CDM which pays for the construction services up thru June 5th. The proposal included in Resolution #6 includes the month of June, July, August and September and that coverage would take us to the end of September. What is boils down to is that the project is going longer and we have to cover the construction activities longer. That's where we're at. Mr. Anastasio addressed Mr. Pappas and stated that Resolution #4 relates to something different, but we can touch on that now.

As part of the dealing with and proper disposal of and handling of the contaminated soils within the easement areas, we had to have a licensed site remediation professional oversee that work. We had utilized an LSRP from CDM Smith and we dealt with that as we went. The date on this proposal for Resolution No. 4 is March 29th, but we were kind of waiting to see how things go. Before that, we were paying for some of these services out of the Annual Service Contract that is awarded at the Reorganization Meeting. The reason why we decided to put this before the Board for formal consideration is that other things that we are talking about tonight will involve some upcoming services for CDM Smith. Therefore, we are going to utilize some of the funds remaining in CDM's Consulting Engineering budget for other work. That is why we are looking for separate funds out of the Capital Budget to pay for this LSRP work. The bottom-line is that we dealt with the soils in the scope of the work as it unfolded, and we got our arms around all that work. Everything has been properly disposed of. Now the LSRP has to prepare a final linear construction report to basically tie all this up in a bow and submit it to the NJDEP. It is a requirement, and we have to do that in order to close out that portion of the project. That is what it is related to. Also, part of that \$15,000 proposal, CDM Smith oversaw and coordinated for the sampling of some of the petroleum contaminated soils. We encountered an underground storage tank as part of the construction, which was unknown before, and we had to properly close that tank and dispose of those soils, so we had our LSRP do that as well. Now we just have to pay them for that work. That is the background on that.

A discussion ensued between Mr. Pappas and Mr. Anastasio. Mr. Pappas asked that in reference to Resolution No. 4, the memo you referenced is dated March 29, 2021, and was in our binder. This makes reference to discussions with Coleen Basista on March 23, 2021. When were these contaminated soils first discovered? They were discovered back in March of 2020 by the contractor. We have two things: we have soil contamination going on and there were also some construction and demolition waste mixed in with some of the soils. That created an added dimension to the problem. It had to be handled by an LSRP.

Mr. Pappas then indicated he had a question about Resolution No. 6 but asked Mr. Impellizeri if he wanted him to cover it now. Mr. Anastasio clarified that it was Res. No. 6. A discussion ensued between Mr. Pappas and Mr. Anastasio wherein Mr. Pappas stated that the Resolution and the accompanying Memo refers to a contract for \$427,700. What does that represent and what is that contract for? That contract covers the Resident Project Representative Costs, or think of it in laymen's terms, as the construction inspection services for the project. We had our design engineer Kleinfelder design the project, but we have another firm, CDM Smith in this case. They were awarded that contract after an RFP process, so it was a competitive situation. We awarded that to CDM to basically be the inspectors on the job, monitor and administer all of the construction and also manage the receipt of all shop drawings, pay estimates, etc., monitor

the progress in the field and a whole host of other things like manage construction progress meetings and interface with the DEP. That is what that covered. When the contract was awarded, the termination date of the contract was March 11, 2021 so that contract was for about 18 months of construction. Now that the contractor is going late, we still need them out there. They are just taking longer to do the project. We'll get into that a little more in the Closed Session, but we still have to cover the field work because we don't observe it and don't know if it is being done properly. That's what it boils down to. We have to make sure it is going to finished properly. A Commissioner asked if the need for the 3 or 4 more months of construction inspection is because the construction project itself has been delayed? Mr. Anastasio answered that the contractor is taking longer to finish it. It wasn't a delay caused by the owner or any other factor such as PSE&G but again, we'll talk more about this in Closed Session. Bottom line is it just taking them longer to finish the job. We still have to make sure that everything is being constructed in accordance with the plans and specifications. What we mentioned during the Planning Committee Meeting, is that we're getting near the end of the job so the pace of construction will slow down a little bit. They're not digging holes anymore; they're not pouring large amounts of concrete. As you can see on the picture on the screen, from one week to the next, it is not going to look much different. Although, this week we should have an aluminum cover built over that circular tank. That is being installed this week. There is some associated mechanical work with that. A lot of it is electrical and soon to be instrumentation work. Sherwin and I are going to discuss this with CDM Smith, where we can possibly reduce the resident project representative from 5 days a week to maybe 3 days a week to maybe see where the pace is slower, then it won't really matter if we skip a day. We will start to look at that since we're getting near the end of the project. We are expecting not to spend the entire amount of this money, but CDM Smith felt, and we agree, that in the absence of a real schedule, it is better to have a place holder there. The Board can authorize all the money, but we will watch over it carefully and don't have to spend it all.

Mr. Pappas indicated he knows we will go to Closed Session, but will it be a general contractor? Mr. Anastasio stated that he wanted to update the Board and discuss a little bit about the verbal mentions we received about a possible delay claim so that is mainly what it is about. Again, we can talk more about that in Closed Session. What it boils down to is that we have to finish the job. One of the most important things is that the control system has to be finished and even though we're at 94% complete, things can still go wrong. We want to keep this out of the courts and out of the dispute phase. We want to finish the project nicely and have a soft landing and have everything work and everybody goes their own way. Mr. Pappas stated that he understands that there are construction oversights, based upon what you are saying, it sounds like there's a potential issue with the contractor's performance and this additional cost that the Authority is going to potentially realize, how is that paid for? That is his question. Mr. Anastasio stated that we will touch on some of that in Closed Session. Mr. Pappas stated he sees a 23% increase in CDM Smith. What does the general contractor's contract look like and how can this be recouped? Mr. Anastasio again stated we can talk about some of that when we're in Closed Session. Mr. Carney indicated that all that was stated was appropriate for discussion in Open Session. So, we will circle back to it in Closed Session.

Mr. Impellizeri and Mr. Anastasio discussed which resolutions can be done now and which have to wait. Resolution No. 21-0628-4 can be done now but we'll have further discussions about

Resolution No. 21-0628-6. The bottom-line about Resolution No. 21-0628-6 is that no matter what, we have to do it and we can figure out what Mr. Pappas was referring to, later. Mr. Impellizeri stated that we will now look to consider both Resolutions #4 and #6 at this time. Mr. Carney stated that we have to move both resolutions separately.

Upon Motion by Mr. Machala, Second of Mr. Smith, Resolution No. 21-0628-4 was approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

Upon Motion by Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Esposito, Resolution No. 21-0628-6 was approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

b) Discussion of 1958 Interceptor Corrosion

Mr. Anastasio stated that in regard to the Planning Committee meeting held earlier today, we had a long meeting and much of it was about the 1958 Interceptor Corrosion. We spoke a little about this last fall when the Authority staff had to make a spot repair of the upper most portion of the interceptor pipeline. It is 63 years old, and we've gotten our use out of it. It is pretty severely corroded. In 2014, the Authority under the Administrative Consent Order with NJDEP, was required to TV inspect both interceptor lines. We still have that video, and it is a valuable video. If we had to reproduce that work, to TV both lines, you could be talking in excess of \$500,000. WE know it looks bad and rather than go out and TV it again, our goal was to see if we could draw conclusions based on the 2014 video, about replacement of the pipelines. Sherwin Ulep is sharing some still photos of some of the video. You can see that this is the concrete pipe, the

RSCP. Mr. Ulep stated that this is a video of one of the sections of our interceptor sewer. Mr. Anastasio asked to show the diversion chamber to meter chamber 9H interceptor. Which section is this? This is from manhole 9 to manhole 10. This is near the area of the Finderne Avenue bridge where the pipeline crosses under the Raritan River and what is known as “the farm area” section of Bridgewater, also known as Myers Farm. You can see that there is some severe deterioration, and you can also see the reinforcing steel grid. The rust color is actually rust bleeding through the concrete and this is an example of what some of this pipe typically looks like. Other sections where you don’t see the steel ribbing as much, you still have pretty severe deterioration. Where that pipe wall might be 4” thick or more, the steel likely in the middle we might have lost at least 2” of that wall thickness. What that has to do with is the gasses above the waterline and the pipeline, that’s where you get the hydrogen sulfide corrosion. What is showing here on the screen as the camera pans and tilts around, is when it gets around the waterline, the walls look better. Actually, the pipe that is underwater is in good shape. But it is the tops that fail. About a week ago, Vice-Chairman Lifrieri, Sherwin, Tony Tambasco, Peter Wozniak and Tom Schoettle and I spent a few hours going through a lot of this video getting our arms around the extent of the deterioration. The bottom-line is that it is all bad-looking. Some looks better than others but a lot of it is quite scary looking. Our thought was to utilize the 2014 video, not having to reproduce it right now, and have CDM go through it and grade the pipe based on industry standard pipe defect criteria. From that, they can give us planning level cost estimates comparing the various ways that we can repair or replace the line. Either we’re going to line it with like a flexible fiberglass tube sock, if you will, to get pushed through the pipe and then get cured in place. Or, dig up the ground and replacing the pipe in the same place. We are going to look at those technologies and compare costs. (At this point, our Teams connection went down for about 2 1/2 minutes and discussions stopped until the Teams was reconnected). Upon reconnection, Mr. Anastasio stated again that from the video, this pipe looks bad and severely corroded in some areas. Mr. Carney asked if there are any public roadways that run over that ground of the pipe that is deteriorating? I’m talking about deterioration at the crown of the pipe, if that is under any direct roadways? Mr. Anastasio indicated that there are a couple of roadways that run over this pipe. With the area in question where Sherwin showed us, is not. Most of the sewers are in easement areas. There are only a couple of areas where we have road trusses. It’s not like it is in urban areas. It is mainly wooded and field areas along the river easement areas. The 2014 video is a great place to start. We know the pipe didn’t get better in 7 years but rather than spend another half million dollars to look at the pipe, which we could do again and it would take more time, but this looks like a quick and easy way to get an assessment based on what we had 7 years ago and if we can draw conclusions for replacement or repair, based on that, I think we’re ahead of the game. That is what our goal is. Ms. Quabeck mentioned that the point is there are only one or two places. Mr. Carney stated that he would focus the additional effort at what does the crown of the pipe look like under the roadways. Mr. Anastasio stated that is part of CDM’s assessment. They are going to be looking at every run, every manhole-to-manhole section of pipe. That will be part of their report. They can report on any extra loads on top of the pipe besides the dirt out in the farm fields. This is a good starting place for us to get our arms around the scope of the project. That video is very valuable. It was costly to get but we have it. If we have to TV select runs of pipe, we could always do that, but this is a good starting point and that is what we discussed with the Planning Committee.

This is one of our next big projects that we've been talking about and getting CDM started on this assessment is a good first step. This is for Resolution #21-0628-7. Before we get to #7, Mr. Anastasio wanted to touch on a couple things.

c) Discussion of Storm Control Pumping Station Force Main Inspection

Mr. Anastasio stated that in addition to the 4 ½ mile long gravity sewer pipe, we have a 2-mile-long force main pipe that starts about halfway along that map that Sherwin has on the screen and runs to the plant. That pipe also needs to be looked at. That is a different animal. That is a prestress concrete cylinder pipe. That type of pipe has a history, in some instances, of some failures but it was due to some manufacturing defects that we believe were not in the time our pipe was from. This pipe was from 1970 and 1971. I think the pipe mostly likely to fail was in the mid-late 1970's and the basic reason for that is that the manufacturer of the pipe brought one of the steps of manufacture inhouse. That pipe is a steel cylinder wrapped with a prestressed wire and then they pour concrete all around it. There is concrete inside and outside the pipe. The wires that they used began to fail prematurely and that is the reason why there were a number of failures. This came into prominence about 21-23 years ago with a major failure along the Raritan River by the Middlesex County Utilities Authority. Once that happened, it really opened industry's eyes to the potential failures of this type of pipe. This pipe is 50 years old, and we've never looked at it. Unlike the gravity interceptor which has a number of manholes on it, this only has 4 or 5 cleanouts through the whole 2 miles. It can only be looked at remotely and there is only one main player that has the technology to evaluate this pipe. Tom Schoettle, I don't know if you have your animation handy. I realize Ms. Quabeck will not be able to see it but maybe you can play it for the others, the animation for the Smart Ball. Mr. Anastasio confirmed with Mr. Ulep that he was the one who played the animation earlier in the meeting.

So, this pipe has been in the ground for 50 years and no one has ever looked at it because it is not easy to look at. You can't walk through it, you can't go into manholes and look at it, it is always full of water. What Sherwin is showing is an animation of what is called a Smart Ball. This company inserts this ball into the flow, and we turn the pumps on, and it travels through the pipe. In the animation, the ball is talking to the computer and has a GPS locator on it. The ball is inserted into the pipeline and the ball is then free to travel through the pipeline and gather data and transmit data about the pipeline. That is what we think we need to do. We are not looking for any action on this tonight, but we wanted to get this on the Board's radar especially since it was a good time to talk about pipeline deterioration. This is something we feel we need to get the ball rolling on, no pun intended, as well. Talking with CDM, what is done commonly because there are not 10 or 20 firms that do this type of work, engineering firms typically procure this service. They hold the contracts and it is procured as a professional service under the umbrella of a consulting engineer. This is something that we are also looking to talk to the Board further in the future about and look to see if there's some way we can start to make progress on making this inspection. What we are going to do now is continue to talk with CDM. Sherwin and CDM will have discussions with the inspection contractor to see if we can come up with a cost for what this project would cost. Then we will report back to the Planning and Finance Committees and the Board and will have more of the facts. We want to start working on this as well because we don't want to take our eye off the ball here with this force main. We don't think about this pipe much, but it is 50 years old and never been looked at and it is pretty

prudent to do that at this time. We'll report back to the Committees and the Board when we get more facts.

d. Discussion regarding Corrosion of Steel Within Piping Caused by Stray Currents

We talked a lot about the interceptor lines and the areas by the Finderne section of Bridgewater and Manville areas as well. Stray currents...where do those currents come from? There are high tension wires that basically parallel the interceptor and force main pipes for a little more than 3 miles and what is shown there on the map is the interceptor pipe and then the high-tension wires are shown in blue. What we noticed is that some of the steel corrosion in the interceptors seem worse the closer you got to the overhead wires. According to CDM Smith, that is a real phenomenon that happens. That as bad as the hydrogen sulfide deterioration is, the stray currents make it worse and basically turn the pipe into a battery and you get degradation on one section of the steel, and it collects on the other section. Mr. Impellizeri asked if the power utility have any obligation to compensate us for restoring our pipes? Mr. Anastasio said he does not have the answer to that. That is something that we can look at. Mr. Schoettle stated that in their experience, they haven't had any activities related to recovery with the power companies. That is not to say it hasn't happened but in his experience in New Jersey, we have not gotten back to electrical suppliers for some kind of recovery. Mr. Carney, have you ever heard of that? Mr. Carney said he has not, but that doesn't mean it doesn't exist. We should look at that. Mr. Lifrieri stated it might be impacted by what was there first, the line or the sewer. Mr. Albano stated with the pipeline under the high tensions, it's the induction fields in the wires that cause the corrosion. These are all good points. Mr. Anastasio stated that he wanted to point out that it is affecting the gravity interceptor line that we have the video on, but we also have to think about that force main pipe that we cannot look inside. This is what we're concerned about. We will keep on this, gathering more information, and will report back to the Committees and the Board.

Mr. Impellizeri proposed that we now move Resolution No. 21-0628-7. Upon Motion by Mr. Machala, Second of Mr. Albano, Resolution No. 21-0628-7 was approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

e. The Discussion of CDM Proposal to Review the 2014 Video Inspection Records and Provide the Main Interceptor Condition Assessment Report. This item was covered in the previous report of Mr. Anastasio.

f. Discussion of the Order of the Upcoming Capital Projects

Mr. Anastasio stated that a question came up from the Finance Committee Chairperson, Ms. Quabeck. Ms. Quabeck wanted to inquire as to the order of the upcoming capital projects. We spoke about this a little bit. We have four (4) projects that we are looking at. I think of them as 3 ½ because one of them is just the inspection of the force main. The others are the rehabilitation and replacement of the 1959 gravity interceptor, the rehabilitation of the headworks building, and the rehabilitation of the multi-media filter system and, of course, the inspection of the force main. We can talk about all of them concurrently. In the upcoming month or so, we are going to come to the committees and the Board to start to discuss the scope of the multi-media project and also the headworks project and assign some rough cost to them without doing any exhaustive cost estimates. I think we can assign a number to them, but we can think of it like this. We are working on the interceptor pipe, let's say CDM is proceeding with their study. In the meantime, maybe Sherwin is preparing an RFP (Request for Proposal) for design of the headworks building and we're talking with the inspection company and we're also looking at multi-media. We are looking to move these balls down the field concurrently and at different times, one will be in the lead rather than the other. When we get closer to when we would do construction, then we can talk about when we would want to put out contracts and in what order. We also going to, in the near future, talk about how we're going to pay for all this. Peter and I have been talking about this. Ms. Quabeck commented that that would be interesting to do. We are going to do that soon and we would like to get some numbers on the interceptor. The interceptor is the biggest wildcard because depending on how much of it and what we do, determines the cost. It is a huge range between as little as it could cost and as much as it would cost. The multi-media and the headworks are fairly easy to predict and shouldn't vary too much. But the interceptor, you could drive a truck through what we think could be the estimate. That's how we see things going. With the nature of these projects, it is not like the third project could be 5 years from now. I won't get into it right now in great detail, but they are all important. Without the multi-media filter, it's more challenging to meet the NJDES permit to do proper treatment. We meet permit every day and haven't had any problems, but having that filter is a big benefit to the Authority and we can treat water better and, at times, when the plant is not feeling good (think of it as a living organism) the filter makes up for it. Long-term, that filter is very important. The headworks facility is the first step of treatment. We replaced the bar screens which remove debris from the water, but the system that is really suffering in that building is the system that removes the grit from the water and keeping that out of the treatment tanks. The Maintenance Department has been doing a great job keeping that running but they've really been pulling a rabbit out of a hat for years and years now and we're not going to be able to do that forever. We need to get that underway as well. I just wanted to make a mention of the order of these projects. We'll talk more about them later.

Minute 10 – Chairman – Nothing to Report. However, Mr. Impellizeri mentioned to everyone on the Board, if you've never had a tour of the facility or if it has been a long time, I think it behoove you to come through here again and check out and ask questions in real-time as you check out the plant. It may help you ask more questions, or it may answer some questions.

Minute 11 - Reports

A. Executive Director's Report

1. Update on Storm Control Treatment Facility Construction Project

Mr. Anastasio stated that we will go into Closed Session. The bottom-line is that the project is going well. Construction is proceeding every day. The utilities have been installed. The gas line has been installed as well as the electrical connections have been made. We've received Township inspection of that. Now the power company and the contractor can figure out where to place the electric meter and get the power on to the facility. Sherwin, is that accurate? Mr. Ulep stated that that is accurate. The gas meter, as we understand it, may get set this week but PSE&G doesn't really communicate and are not good at committing to dates because so many things pop up on their radar. They have been working with us and we expect the gas meter to get set soon. Why is that important? So, they can finalize the generator connection, which is the natural gas user. Other things are happening like the cover on the clarifier is coming soon, and then some odor control piping will be connected to close up that system as well. They are working on electrical every day and we expect to see some more progress on the instrumentation system as well. Meanwhile, new grass is growing on our restored easement areas and it looks nice out there.

- a. We are going to talk about in Closed Session.
- b. Discussion of Scheduling a Facility Ribbon-Cutting Ceremony.

A couple of people have mentioned to me, should we consider having a ribbon-cutting ceremony or a commissioning ceremony for the facility? That is not normally something that we do. This is a pretty high-profile project. The NJDEP is very interested in this project's success, and I think once we get it commissioned and we're operating it and we've pulled it off, they would like to urge others to follow suit. This is a first of its kind in the State. It's one of few in the Country. It is something special. If the Board is in favor of that, we can look into the logistics of that a little bit and report back on what costs would be. We wouldn't want to do anything overboard but I'm sure we might see the NJDEP Commissioner here. Someone said to me that maybe the Governor would even show up. They want to promote the NJ State Revolving Fund and DEP wants to take a victory lap as well. Mr. Lifrieri stated that this would also be good in our quest to get money out of the County from the Infrastructure Bill if something like this had notoriety and would be made known to the public so they can see how much we do for the many of the residents of Somerset County. That is a good point and we've been having discussions with Somerset County, like we talked about a month ago. We just sent them an update and we elaborated on the projects and what the Authority is all about and our mission and we keep hammering the point home. The more I say it, the more it sinks in with me too. We serve roughly 40% of the County population and probably around 60% of the businesses. That's not a small number which is something to be proud of. Does anyone have any thoughts about having something like this? Would the Board be

amenable to this? Mr. Impellizeri said it is a good idea. We owe it to the public to let them know what we're spending money on. Mr. Liferi asked if we could have a show of hands. Mr. Anastasio asked Mr. Carney what would be appropriate. Mr. Carney stated that we are not scheduling the ribbon-cutting ceremony yet. Ms. Quabeck stated that we do not have to make a motion. This is just to get a feeling from the Board and then we will learn what the plans are. Mr. Carney stated that we are not looking at final completion. If he recalls, we are not looking at final completion. I think Mr. Anastasio indicated in his report, that it would be mid-September. Yes, this is just to see if the Board would like to do such a thing, if they are in favor because what I understand is these high-profile officials need a few months advance notice if something is coming up. If the Board has no objections, we'll go ahead and frame out what this event would be and get some ideas of costs and will report back. Ms. Quabeck stated that we should not make it a big deal. Mr. Anastasio said he's more of a fly below the radar kind of person. Ms. Quabeck said it would be nice to have the officials present and it would be a good idea, but we don't want to overdo it either. Mr. Anastasio will gather more information on that.

2. Update on Plantwide Electrical Rehabilitation Project

This project continues to move along very well. We are about 84% complete and we keep moving along. Tony Tambasco and Sherwin are doing a great job working with the contractor, CDM Smith and Morehouse. We're working through a number of little hurdles, but everything is going well. We're happy about that. I mentioned discussions with the County already. We just sent them more information and are waiting to hear. We'll report back when we hear more information.

B. Engineer/Consultants – CDM Smith Engineer's Report for May 2021 – Mr. Schoettle indicated he had nothing further to add to his report but would be happy to answer any questions. None were stated.

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

D. Department Reports:

1. Operations
2. Laboratory
3. Maintenance/Electrical
4. Special Projects

E. Facility Engineer Reports:

1. Capacity Allocation
2. Capacity Assurance

- 3. Monthly Flow Report
- 4. Facility Engineer's Monthly Report

12. Communications

- A. NJDEP, Division of Water Quality; Residual Transfer Report; Reporting Period 5/1/21-5/31/21
- B. NJDEP, Division of Water Quality; Surface Water Discharge Monitoring Report; Reporting Period 5/1/21-5/31/21
- C. NJDEP, Division of Water Quality; Residuals Discharge Monitoring Report; Reporting Period 5/1/21-5/31/21

13. Payroll – Res. No. 21-0628-8

Upon Motion by Ms. Quabeck, Second of Mr. Smith, said Resolution was approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

14. Bills – Res. No. 21-0628-9

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

Roll Call Vote:

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

15. Adjourn to Closed Session

16. Res. No. 21-0628-10 – Resolution Authorizing Closed Session for the Purposes of Contract Negotiations Regarding the Storm Control Treatment Facility Project.

Upon Motion of Mr. Lifrieri, Second of Mr. Smith, 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	Absent
Joseph Lifrieri	Yes	Gail Quabeck	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Randy Smith	Yes
Richard Mathews	Yes	Peter Stires	Yes
Michael Pappas	Yes	Michael Impellizeri	Yes

Adjourned to Closed Session at 7:57 p.m.

Open Session reconvened at 8:10 p.m.

20. Adjournment

Upon Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Mr. Lifrieri, the meeting was adjourned at 8:11 p.m.

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Philip Petrone	Yes
Louis Esposito, Jr	Yes	Spencer Pierini	Absent
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
JULY 26, 2021**