

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING  
THE SOMERSET RARITAN VALLEY SEWERAGE AUTHORITY  
MARCH 28, 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 Vice-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 (Teams)	Philip Petrone	Present
Louis Esposito, Jr	<i>Absent</i> **	Reinhard Pratt	Present
Joseph Lifrieri	Present	Gail Quabeck	Present (Teams)
Edward Machala	Present	Randy Smith	Present
Richard Mathews	<i>Absent</i>	Peter Stires	Present
Michael Pappas	<i>Absent</i>	Michael Impellizeri	Absent

\*\*Mr. Esposito joined the meeting at 7:23 p.m.

**Authority Staff**

Ronald Anastasio, P.E., Executive Director	Present
Sherwin Ulep, P.E., Facility Engineer	Present (Teams)
Anthony Tambasco, Plant Superintendent	Present (Teams)
Michael Ingenito, Chief Plant Operator	Absent
Dennis Smith, Supervisor Liquid Division	Present
Ellie Hoffman, P.E., Regulatory Compliance Engineer	Absent
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)

**Minute 4 – Pledge of Allegiance**

All in attendance saluted the flag.

**Minute 5 –Approval of Minutes**

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

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

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

2. Board Meeting Closed Session Minutes – February 28, 2022

With the Motion of Ms. Machala, Second of Mr. Quabeck, the Minutes of the February 28, 2022 (Closed Session), were approved by the following roll call vote:

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

**Minute 6 – Public Hearing** – NONE

**Minute 7 – Public Participation:** No public present.

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

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

1. **Res. No. 22-0328-1** – Resolution Renewing Sludge Cake Disposal Agreement with The Stony Brook Regional Sewerage Authority
2. **Res. No. 22-0328-2** – Sewer Extension Resolution Re-Approval - North Branch Walk; Proposed Combined 365-Unit Market Rate and Affordable Housing Development; Block 9 Lots 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 24; Township of Branchburg
3. **Res. No. 22-0328-3** – Sewer Extension Resolution - 302 Old York Road Sanitary Sewer Extension; Block 107 Lots 1, 2 and 4; Bridgewater Township
4. **Res. No. 22-0328-4** – Resolution Adopting the Updated 2021-2022 Somerset Raritan Valley Sewerage Authority Employee Handbook
5. **Res. No. 22-0328-5** – Shared Services Agreement Between The Atlantic County Utilities Authority and Somerset Raritan Valley Sewerage Authority for Sludge Disposal
6. **Res. No. 22-0328-6** – Resolution Authorizing the Authority Staff to Execute a Publicity Release Agreement with Dialight

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

**Minute 9 – Board Committees:** NONE

**Minute 10 – Chairman** – Vice Chairman Lifrieri commented on AEA Convention which he returned from, and it was excellent. There was a discussion on PFAS, which Mr. Anastasio will talk about later in the meeting. This is a highly informative topic. Mr. Lifrieri also commended Randy Smith for receiving an award for Hillsborough for his innovative way of “plugging sewer holes.” Mr. Lifrieri would like to mention that the Authority sends its prayers and support to the freedom fighters in Ukraine as they are protecting their country from aggressors.

## **Minute 11 - Reports**

### A. Executive Director's Report

#### 1. Update on Storm Control Treatment Facility Construction Project (SCTF)

Nothing is new on this project. We talked at length in the Closed Session last month. We recently sent out our response letter and we recommended that they ask us for a meeting so we can begin to sit down and have our talks. We will report on the progress next month.

Other than that, we are still picking away at administrative items. Mr. Ulep commented that the replacement light fixtures have not yet been installed but we are working away on the operation and maintenance (O&M) manuals and the red-line/as-built drawings. Mr. Anastasio added that another thing to keep in mind is that interest rates are rising, and the State's next bond sale is in May. We are going to know what the interest rate those bonds sell for so at that time, Peter Wozniak will be able to provide to the Board, correct numbers on how much we saved by financing that project six months early when the rates in November were still cheap. You can hear in the news that the interest rates are rising every day in the bond market. We think the savings is going to be significant. That was a good move on our part and kudos to Peter Wozniak for bringing it up initially. That was a great move, and it looks like it may work out good for us.

We are going to start working on the detention basin. There were some issues with that where we had to install a center drain line down the middle of it. We will start that work up in April and we will report on how it is going at the next meeting.

Mr. Albano asked, in Tony Tambasco's report, did he read that we did a dry run, not running it through the filters but checking it out? Mr. Anastasio stated that that is correct. At the last meeting, we indicated that we did. We had enough rain where we thought it would be advantageous for the operation to put the water through the plant. We didn't treat it as we felt we didn't have the need to treat. Basically, we lifted up 4mgd of flow and put it back into the interceptor. This was the peak flow coming out of Somerville. It went "swimmingly" and went very well. The staff really liked the facility. It makes sense how all of the instrumentation are laid out. Everyone is really taking to it. We had a very good experience with it and that was our first foray into operating it and we're happy with it.

#### 2. Update on the Plantwide Electrical Rehabilitation Project

The contractor is picking away at a few loose ends like Mr. Ulep mentioned in his report. The project is definitely 99% done. We are using all of the equipment that was installed. There is demobilization going on. They have a very small crew and they're not here every day, but loose ends are cleaned up. Once the rest of the materials show up, they will finish the electrical work in the maintenance shop, which was the last change order that we did. Some of the materials have shown up and they have installed the lights. As things come in, they try to get some work done. It should be wrapped up by June.

That construction loan is ending also, and we are preparing to be in the Spring bond sale with the State. We are finalizing the numbers and although a little bit of work is hanging out there, we are not going to close the contract out until after the financing window closes. We've talked about this a little in the past. We looked to maximize the amount for this project that we can borrow. Originally there was some planning and design money that we weren't planning on financing but now there is room in that loan, because part of that loan was for the Headworks Project that has grown in size and is going to be part of a bigger contract, we included the Planning and Design money. We're putting the finishing touches on those numbers now. Tonight, in the Bills List, is the payment for Thomas Controls Inc. for \$94,000.00. That includes some retainage we've reduced because we're using everything. We don't need to hold the whole 2%. We paid for some of the materials that came in for the garage, which was a \$94,000 payment. We are looking to maximize everything we can, within reason, to get it under the loan. The cut off for that is April 6<sup>th</sup>. We will finalize our borrowing amount for that project.

### 3. Update on the 1958 Main Interceptor Pipe (MIP) Condition Assessment Report

This has been on the back-burner with the Board. We've been working with CDM Smith. There were some comments we had on the report. They did a great job on the report, but we are working on honing it a little bit. There are things we know about the system that they really don't know because we didn't pay them to look into it that much. This started out as reviewing the videos and giving us their assessments of the condition of the pipe. We had asked them back in November, thru the Planning Committee, to look at another scenario that really was outside the scope of what we originally planned. We are now finalizing all that and will bring those numbers to the Planning Committee on April 25<sup>th</sup>, and then the Planning Committee will give their report to the Board.

We feel a decision will be able to be made on which option to go with for rehabbing that interceptor line, and then we can move forward preparing a request for formal proposal for engineers. The bottom-line is that we want to get to a point where the Planning Committee can select an option, make a recommendation to the Finance Committee, and then they can make a recommendation to the Board as to how we're going to pay for that project. Then we can bring it to the Board and make it a real project and look to go out for engineering services and get that rolling. Hopefully by the end of the year, we should have an engineer on board and get that project under design and move forward.

### 4. Update on the Electromagnetic/Visual Condition Assessment of the Storm Control Pumping Station 36-inch PCCP (Prestressed Concrete Cylinder Pipe) Forcemain

You might recall that we talked about this for the last few months. We did that assessment on March 1<sup>st</sup> and it went very well. We were able to inspect 90% of that pipe. Some of you may remember when we talked about this, we weren't sure we could get it all because of the steepness of the hill in the plant driveway here. There were some limitations. We weren't able to look at about 10% of the pipe but 90% of it went well. There were a lot of good visuals as well. Some of it was under water but we got to see a lot of it as well as do the electromagnetic

assessment. The crews worked well together, and we worked through any snags, which weren't many. They feel the data collection went great. We are looking forward to getting that report, hopefully before our next meeting. Mr. Schoettle stated that it should be mid-May but he expects that if there are any major issues with pipe, that they will let us know if there is anything of major concern. We'll know well in advance of the report. Mr. Anastasio commented that they said that as they were going, everything looked good to them from what they could see in the field but obviously they need to sift through all of this electronic data. So far, so good. There were no major red flags. A question arose as to how long the pipe was. The pipe is about 10,400 feet long and we were able to get about 9,500 feet of it.

## 5. Brief Discussion on Upcoming PFAS Regulations

Lastly, this is something we will plan for a discussion about in April. Like Mr. Lifrieri mentioned, we attended the AEA Conference in AC, along with Mr. Machala, Mr. Impellizeri, Christian Santiago and Peter Wozniak. An eye-opening subject that we have briefly touched on here, but not really in great depth, but it is coming that we will have to start digging into this. It is about the PFAS family of chemicals, of which there are nine or ten thousand of these types of chemicals. The bottom-line is that the EPA is moving at lightning speed to eventually categorize the chemicals as hazardous waste. There are all kinds of implications to that. It seems like they are putting the cart before the horse and racing to do this without having certain things figured out. Such as, worker health and safety and other things. There are a lot of unknowns still with these chemicals. I've heard experts say that the EPA is not actually sure that all of these compounds have detrimental effects or to what extent they are a detrimental effect. There is going to be a lot to talk about.

There was a panel of experts speaking about it a little. There was also someone who dropped into the conference virtually from Michigan. Michigan is a couple of years ahead of New Jersey in regulating and studying it. What we're thinking is to have Jim Cosgrove come to our meeting, in person or virtually, to give us a short presentation so we can get our arms around the subject of what we need to know. Right now, the water purveyors throughout the State, especially the ones with wells, have been put under some very strict conditions where they had 12 months to perform 4 quarterly samples. based on that sampling results, they had another 12 months after that, which was not enough time, to obtain engineers, design a solution to treat for the removal of this PFAS and there are not a lot of options for it, construct and then get it online. It sounds like everyone is behind on this even though they are moving and things are under construction. It seems like there are going to be a lot of Consent Decrees that come out of this with respect to the water companies. But then there is the other side of it. What we heard in Atlantic City is the DEP is looking to create a stream-standard, a water quality standard for the surface water, the streams, that everyone discharges to, in like one month. A couple of months ago, that might have been ten months and now it just seems like they are looking to push this out the door, I think for partial political reasons too, then clean up the details later. There are so many unknowns with it and the DEP is very candid that they don't know a lot and they've looked for input from us, being the wastewater community.

Mr. Lifrieri stated that the problem with this is that if they set a standard, then we have to meet that standard or we're in violation of that standard. Yet, they don't really care about us and our

ability to meet that standard. They are just putting that out there so what happens if we are violation of this standard? Are we going to be fined or get an ACO to fix this up? And do they even care? Mr. Anastasio said he does not have the answers to those questions, but it sounds like its not going to be pretty. They are looking, to put in layman's terms "blow everything up" and deal with the problems later to see where the problems are. They have not mandated that testing happen yet and we've dragged our feet on testing. I personally, did not want to be the first one out there testing because there are a lot of unknowns. What we were told down in Atlantic City is that the DEP recently said, go ahead and test but we're not looking for you to report the numbers, but we want you to know where you stand. Ok, put that in writing and maybe then we'll feel better about it. We, Jim Cosgrove, Diane Alexander and I, have already discussed how we would go about some sampling and we will talk more about that next month. We perform sampling for the industries through the IPP Program for which we currently have 34 permits. They do sampling either monthly or quarterly as per their permits and report those results to us. Some may be semi-annually or annually, depending on their permit. We also do an annual sampling as well. I think we will also sample for these compounds this year, to see where they stand. Plus, we're going to do some sampling in the plant, what is coming in and what is going out. Also, there is a sludge component to this too. Mr. Lifrieri stated that he is concerned because with the mercury, if you remember, we never polluted mercury into the atmosphere but yet but because we voluntarily turned off our equipment, we still had to pay a fine. So, they shoot first and ask questions later. Its not like a bullet, its like buck shots, and you're going to get hit.

Mr. Pratt asked, since he is new, where is mercury entering the waste stream. Mr. Lifrieri stated that it was in the incinerator. Mr. Anastasio stated there is some mercury in our influent that comes in. We have a local limit for mercury as well as a discharge limit. There used to be a lot more mercury. Here's a cliff notes situation on mercury: Fifteen to twenty years ago, there were compounds like thimerosal which was widely used in the pharmaceutical industry with the making of test kits and such. There used to be ten-parts per million of mercury which we would find in our sludge. Now we're at one or below one. Sometimes we'll get a spike, but it is pretty controlled and almost never see a violation of our local mercury limit. It happens once in a blue moon. The last one I could think of, happened because one of the pharmaceuticals was doing some sewer line jetting on their campus sewer system and they must have just dislodged some that was in a crack in the joint of a pipe. We actually gave them an Affirmative Defense for that. We got that under control, but it ends up in the solids and the sludge. Mr. Pratt asked if we have stack monitoring, so we know how much is going out? Mr. Anastasio said yes, we do. We had to build a control system because we didn't know when we would be violating the air standard, which is very stringent.

Back to the PFAS, there are not a lot of great answers for treatment, from what we've looked into so far. Basically, we would have to put the plant's effluent through a carbon filter and the way Sherwin sums it up, we may as well sell this water to NJ American Water because we're making drinking water at that point. That is the level of where this is at. It is an extraordinary amount of money to provide that treatment on a plant like this. The limits are about around 12 or 13 parts per trillion. Think of it as a couple grains of sand in a swimming pool kind of concentration. It seems very low. We haven't done any numbers certainly, but the Passaic Valley Sewerage Commissioners, our former engineer Tom Lausten is the COO, is a huge plant.

They are a 500 mgd plant and we're 23 mgd, so it's more than 20x our size. They did a rough calculation of what it would cost to provide the treatment for that size plant, and it is like a Billion Dollars, on a plant that has about \$180-200 million dollar budget. Scale that down to us and it is still could be way more money than we have. We don't know where this will all shake out and we will be talking about this for years to come. But this year, it may be a little scary. We don't know where things are going. They just seem like they are going in like gangbusters and wanting to set these limits, but they don't have all the questions answered yet. The prospects aren't good but like I said to someone down in Atlantic City, who better than us to figure it all out. We'll see what happens.

Mr. Lifrieri stated that he decided to get on the committee with the AEA on this particular subject. Mr. Anastasio stated that he sits on this committee as well, and also on a NJPDES committee for the AEA and then they have this subcommittee for PFAS and I'm on there too. Mr. Lifrieri wanted to volunteer.

It is a scary time right now and it is haphazard, and they are just looking to race to set a limit and then sort it out later. Mr. Lifrieri stated that this seems to be the "flavor of the month" but remember that we still have phosphorus hanging over our heads also. That is on backburner, and no one is knocking down our door about that. We submitted a report to the DEP explaining why we don't believe we need a limit, and that was about 4 years ago, and they haven't talked to us yet about that.

Another thing about PFAS, especially if it becomes a hazardous substance too, is now the carbon is hazardous and where do you dispose of it? There are also reverse-osmosis treatments which are used for some of the water plants. Mr. Schoettle commented that Ion Exchange is another technology used for this. So those technologies, definitely the reverse osmosis or RO, are a reject component to it, a reject water, which is loaded with all the crap that you took out of the rest of the water. Where does that go? This is just not figured out yet. We'll be talking about this in April. Down in Atlantic City we realized, and we spoke to Jim Cosgrove about this, he should come here and explain all this to the board. We'll have a power point presentation and some handouts. This is the beginning of a new subject for us.

Mr. Albano asked since we're talking about all this great news, have we ever assessed our cyber vulnerability? Mr. Anastasio stated that as part of our membership of the JIF, we are required to meet certain criteria for a Tier Level Two level of cyber security. Our IT Consultant is Look First Technologies who works closely with Dennis Smith, as our point person for the Authority. LookFirst also consults with the JIF about what standards need to be done. So, they had a hand in setting what the standards are for the members of the JIF, and we meet those standards. LookFirst is also our consultant, so they are the ones making sure that we're up to that level. Our SCADA systems are not connected to the internet. None of our Supervisors can log in remotely to see what the flow is or how the plant is running. We have on-call supervisors for that. We have operators here 24/7 for that. The wires don't go outside the plant. It is not a connected system and we're happy about that. Hopefully, that answers your question.

Mr. Anastasio stated that cyber security is also a very scary subject too. But it is comforting to know that the JIF is very proactive with this, and it is nice that we have LookFirst because we're

getting it straight from the horse's mouth. They guide us on everything we do, and they are always looking out for us. They monitor our firewall every day. We have a great relationship with them, and they are very responsive too.

So, there are three compounds to this: PFAS, PFOA and PFNA. They are all part of this PFAS family of compounds. These are basically a surrogate for five or ten thousand compounds. They have very strong molecular bonds, so they are hard to disintegrate very tight. For instance, chemicals related to Teflon. Chemicals in firefighting foam, chemicals that line the inside of a microwave popcorn bag, flame retardants in clothing, scotch guard, its everywhere and its in everyone's blood. It is just one of these things out there...it's a forever chemical.

B. Engineer/Consultants – Mr. Schoettle stated he had nothing to add. Mr. Anastasio covered the two projects CDM is involved with, the interceptor and the forcemain, so we are up to speed.

C. Attorney – Maraziti Falcon, LLP – Mr. Carney indicated he had nothing further to add. However, on the SCTF, they are putting together the Maintenance Bond for us, which falls under all of the closeout documentation for that.

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

**Minute 13 - Res. No. 22-0328-7 - Payroll**

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

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

**Minute 14 - Res. No. 22-0328-8 – Cancellation of Checks**

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

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

**Minute 15 - Res. No. 22-0328-9 - Bills**

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

**Minute 16 –Adjournment**

Upon Motion of Mr. Smith, Second of Mr. Machala, the meeting was adjourned at 7:36 p.m.

**Roll Call Vote:**

Robert Albano	Yes	Philip Petrone	Yes
---------------	-----	----------------	-----

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

**NEXT REGULAR BOARD MEETING WILL BE HELD ON**  
**APRIL 25, 2022**