

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING
THE SOMERSET RARITAN VALLEY SEWERAGE AUTHORITY
FEBRUARY 26, 2024**

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 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	Richard Mathews	Present
Pamela Borek	Present	John Murphy	Present
Daniel Croson	Present	Michael Pappas	Present (Teams)
Gary DiNardo	Absent	Philip Petrone	Present
Vincent Dominach	Present	Reinhard Pratt	Present
Edward Machala	Present	Frank Scarantino	Present
		Joseph Lifrieri	Present

Authority Staff

Ronald Anastasio, P.E., Executive Director	Present
Anthony Tambasco, Plant Superintendent	Present (Teams)
Michael Ingenito, Chief Plant Operator	Present (Teams)
Sherwin Ulep, P.E., Manager of Engineering	Present (Teams)
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)
Gerry Zielonka, Maintenance Supervisor	Present (Teams)
Joseph Loughlin, Accounts Payable Clerk	Present (Teams)

Professional Staff

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

Minute 4 – Pledge of Allegiance

All in attendance saluted the flag.

Minute 5 – Oaths of Office – Commissioners

- a. Reinhart Pratt – Secretary

Mr. Carney then administered the Oath’s of Office to Mr. Pratt

Minute 6 – Approval of Minutes:

- 1. Board Meeting Open Session Minutes – January 22, 2024 (rescheduled to February 5, 2024)

With the Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Mathews, the Minutes of the January 22, 2024 Meeting (rescheduled to February 5, 2024) (Open Session) were approved, by the following Roll Call Vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Richard Mathews	Yes
Pamela Borek	Yes	John Murphy	Yes
Daniel Croson	Yes	Michael Pappas	Yes
Gary DiNardo	Absent	Philip Petrone	Abstain
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Reinhard Pratt	Abstain
Edward Machala	Yes	Frank Scarantino	Abstain
		Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

- 2. Board Meeting Closed Session Minutes – January 22, 2024 (rescheduled to February 5, 2024)

With the Motion of Mr. Croson, Second of Mr. Mathews, the Minutes of the January 22, 2024 Meeting (rescheduled to February 5, 2024) (Closed Session) were approved, by the following Roll Call Vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Richard Mathews	Yes
Pamela Borek	Yes	John Murphy	Yes
Daniel Croson	Yes	Michael Pappas	Yes
Gary DiNardo	Absent	Philip Petrone	Abstain
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Reinhard Pratt	Abstain
Edward Machala	Yes	Frank Scarantino	Abstain
		Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

3. Reorganization Meeting - February 5, 2024

With the Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Mr. Mathews, the Minutes of the February 5, 2024 Reorganization Meeting were approved, by the following Roll Call Vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Richard Mathews	Yes
Pamela Borek	Yes	John Murphy	Yes
Daniel Croson	Yes	Michael Pappas	Yes
Gary DiNardo	Absent	Philip Petrone	Abstain
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Reinhard Pratt	Abstain
Edward Machala	Yes	Frank Scarantino	Abstain
		Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

Minute 7 - Public Hearings: NONE

Minute 8 – Public Participation

Mr. Glen Denys, newly elected Somerville Borough Councilman was in attendance as a liaison with Somerville Borough.

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

Mr. Lifrieri asked if anyone had any issues with or comments about any of the Resolution on the Consent Agenda. Mr. Pappas stated that the packet only contained five (5) Resolutions and could not locate Resolution 24-0226-4. Several other commissioners indicated that the Resolution was indeed in the packet and may have been inadvertently omitted and someone may just have two. Also, Mr. Pappas indicated that he was checking on this Resolution and stated that the subdivision has not been formally submitted and essentially, those lots do not exist. Mr. Ulep stated that the approval was signed by Bill Burr. All of the forms that required the signature of Bridgewater were already there.

Mr. Anastasio also indicated that Resolution No. 24-0226-6 must be amended at the bottom of the 2nd page, to indicate that the new figure is \$1.00 less than the figure stated. The new figure should be \$3,271,999.00. Mr. Carney also stated that we should omit the word “bid” in that same paragraph. It should read “Now therefore be resolved by the SRVSA Board of Commissioners, that it hereby authorizing the award of a contract for Liquid Sludge Hauling Service to Russell Reid Waste Hauling & Disposal Service, Co., Inc., for the total price of \$3,271,999.00 to be funded out of the Authority’s 2024 Operating Budget.”

- 1) **Res. No. 24-0226-1** - Resolution Authorizing the Reissuance of a Non-Domestic Wastewater Discharge Permit to Rebtex LLC
- 2) **Res. No. 24-0226-2** – Resolution Granting Permanent Status of Timothy Zimmerman as Assistant Operator in the Liquid Division

- 3) **Res. No. 24-0226-3** – Resolution Authorizing the Executive Director, Manager of Engineering, Chief Financial Officer, Staff Engineer, and Two Commissioners to Attend the AEA Utility Management Conference in Atlantic City – March 12th & 13th 2024
- 4) **Res. No. 24-0226-4** – Sewer Extension Resolution - Washington Valley Road Sanitary Sewer Extension; Block 905 Lots 11.01, 11.02, 11.03 and 11.04; Bridgewater Township
- 5) **Res. No. 24-0226-5** – Resolution Rejecting All Bids for the Repair of the Hankin Fluidized Bed Incinerator Primary Heat Exchanger Tube Bundle – Contract B-24-7
- 6) **Res. No. 24-0226-6** – Resolution Awarding the Contract for the Liquid Sludge Hauling Service to Russell Reid Waste Hauling & Disposal Service, Co., Inc.

With the Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Mathews, the above Resolutions were approved, with No. 24-0226-6, as amended, by the following Roll Call Vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Richard Mathews	Yes
Pamela Borek	Yes	John Murphy	Yes
Daniel Croson	Yes	Michael Pappas	Yes
Gary DiNardo	Absent	Philip Petrone	Yes
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Reinhard Pratt	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Frank Scarantino	Yes
		Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

Minute 10 – Board Committees – NONE

Minute 11 – Chairman – Chairman Lifrieri stated that he met with Mr. Pappas because he had some questions regarding the history of the Board and its dealing with consultants. Mr. Lifrieri gave him all of the information that he had available to him, and he was grateful for it, and he is able to see why we do what we do, and the way we do it. If Mr. Pappas is not satisfied, he should give the Executive Director a call so that we can provide him with more information.

Mr. Mathews wanted to address something with the Board. We are getting into the funding where the towns are now falling out and going to the I-Bank may change, he would like to suggest we delve into that as now more towns are going and what it is we are going to do. If we are going to do it equally by just raising the rate, or do we have to hit the towns with extra. Being that I am from Somerville, and the first one out. Mr. Carney asked what specifically we are talking about. Mr. Anastasio stated that we are talking about the funding for capital projects coming up when we go to the I-Bank whether our borrowing costs will be higher. We haven't gone yet, and we are going to be preparing an application, both myself and Peter Wozniak and CDM, later this year. Mr. Mathews indicated that he may be leaving in a couple of months and wanted to make sure something gets done about that. He doesn't want it forgotten. Before we start losing more towns, let's get something in the works that we can use when we go to the towns to talk to them. Mr. Anastasio stated that if they would have sold, then the borrowing costs go up, that they should pay a higher share because they caused the borrowing costs to go up. Mr.

Mathews stated that they should absorb the differential for the Authority. Either that or we raise the rates, and everybody pays. I don't think everybody is going to be happy about that so it should be taken care of before it happens.

Minute 12 – Reports

A. Executive Director's Report

1. Update on Plantwide Mechanical Rehabilitation Project

We met three weeks ago and had our regular January meeting on the night of the Reorganization meeting. We had a progress meeting since then and everyone had a chance to sleep on the proposed location of the Headworks Building which we talked about in December. People seemed to like the idea of locating the new Headworks Building in the grass lot behind this building. What we've agreed to is that CDM is going to look at that now and go the next step further on what it would take to do that. Other parts of the project are moving along nicely, including the design of the clarifiers and the multi-media filters and pumps. Tom Schoettle will likely give us an update on the pump station modeling. We are going to move forward with what needs to be done to locate that facility outside this room here.

Mr. Schoettle stated that with regard to the impetus behind moving the Headworks building was due to the deteriorated structural condition. The Authority Staff made arrangements to provide temporary shoring in that building based on the recommendations of our structural engineer, which is now in place. We are a little bit more comfortable with the fact that it is an operating facility and we got this done rather quickly. We did get the physical model done and are awaiting reports to come back from Clemson Hydraulics for the pump station. We are pretty much touching every aspect of the plant now in terms of advancing our design of the Return Activated and the Waste Activated Sludges being looked at, as are a lot of other areas in the facility. Things are starting to get to the point in the project where the inertia of the project starts to keep the train rolling and we are over the starting hump at this point. We've had very good communication with the Authority and the staff.

2. Update on Main Interceptor & Forcemain Rehabilitation Project

Last Thursday, we had a progress meeting on the Main Interceptor & Forcemain Rehabilitation Project. Up until now, since we awarded this job, CDM has been doing the preliminary investigations, looking at existing geotechnical and environmental reports and they also commissioned the surveyor to survey the entire pipeline. Much of that has taken place. The surveyor still has a few things to finish up. CDM is starting to get into the design and the permitting of this project, which is sensitive to environmental permits. One thing they noticed is there is a freshwater mussel in the Raritan River that we had encountered twenty years ago, when we did the same project. It is twenty years hence, so maybe things have gotten stricter. We are looking into this. The design team seemed to think that it might be more of an impediment to try

to get a permit to cross the river with the mussels. We have to study this, and we don't really know what we have to do yet. That was the first that we were hearing of that because the first 40% or the lowest 40% of this project, we were open cutting and putting a bigger pipe. By doing that, we get 25% more capacity. It is a 48" pipe now that has 7" thick walls on each side. We were thinking to put in a 54", bump the capacity in a little bit, we don't have to buy any more land, we own the easements, and the material almost costs the same amount. This is a different set of eyes than the people that studied this three years ago. We will have this discussion and weigh the options. Lining will be cheaper than open-cutting it. How difficult it will be to get these permits? We are just starting to get into it now. Has the DEP said anything? Mr. Schoettle stated that they have been talking with them about it, but it is based on a review of the regulations which are definitely more stringent now because these are being considered more of an endangered species. They are starting to look at various species of mussels and there is a lot of freshwater mussel deterioration.

One of the other things I'm going to look at is, and some of you may be familiar with the Headgate Dam, which is upstream of this work area, is about to be removed and that will be a major disturbance to the Raritan River. At this point, we are working with the town of Bridgewater to review the design of their interceptor as it crosses the river. There is a test case that will be in front of this project, and that project is driven by NJDEP, even though it has been funded by a private entity, the removal of that dam is being paid for as part of the Environmental Remediation Project. The DEP has an interest in removing the dam and there may be some expedited permits, or there may not be, but there is a litmus test for us to go to them with the Authority's project and we are in a fortunate position because we can watch that unfold for one of our member towns. We will provide an update. Mr. Schoettle stated that what Ron and the rest of the team heard was a conservative review and some concerns about the revolving regulations on these organisms in the river. Did they talk about relocation of mussel beds? Unfortunately, I was unable to attend that meeting, but Mr. Anastasio added that they did not get into that. They just started talking to DEP about this project. The surveying is nearly complete and now they are just getting ramped up. This may have been the initial conversation. Mr. Lifrieri stated that it will be interesting when they take the dam down, what is the DEP going to do? The timing is great because it is coming ahead of ours and that is a longer distance. Mr. Schoettle stated that he has a meeting tomorrow (February 27th) with the town of Bridgewater to talk about the removal of the dam so I will be on the phone with the Bridgewater engineers. We've already provided our review comments because the Bridgewater interest in that project is not necessarily the dam, it is the relocation of its main interceptor sewer which has to move upstream about 50' in order to accommodate the dam removal.

Mr. Lifrieri said that whatever solution they get to, maybe we should consider having them throw our solution into it too. To this point, the issues of mussels have not come up on the dam removal project and the plan was to open cut the excavation through the river for the relocation of the interceptor. At this point, that issue has not arisen. Our environmental people tend to be a little more conservative too, in terms of the regulatory interpretation. If for whatever reason, we

got stuck with having to worry about mussels on this project, I don't think we would have to forego the replacement of the interceptors anywhere else but in the river. We may have to reline or in the alternative, we may have to do a trenchless crossing where we had planned to go open cut, and just go with a directional drill which is feasible or some kind of jacking and boring operation. The least expensive thing is to do an open cut across the river, which is how you did the last one. There are other remedies that could solve the problem if the mussel issue becomes more of an issue. A question arose about the location of the dam and the interceptor. It is up by Duke Island Park, at the head of the canal.

Mr. Schoettle reiterated that the dam was constructed for the purpose of the power plant, that used to sit by the stone building near Raritan Avenue. It is being removed to restore the fish habitat. Mr. Lifrieri stated that it had an impact on the fish habitat when they built it. In those days, nobody really cared. Now they are much more conscience of the issues. A Commissioner stated that he was speaking with a gentleman who works for the company that is doing that, and they will also be planting all the trees on the Duke Estate, trying to replace all the foreign trees with indigenous plants and he stated that when they remove that dam, his understanding is that it is going to be in steps so it wouldn't affect water life going back upstream. Mr. Schoettle stated that they are going to remove the dam and dredge the riverbed by about one foot.

Another reason they have to relocate the sewer line is to deepen it because they are going to return the original riverbed depth back to where it was before the dam, which was a few feet below where it is now. The person that is responsible for the remediation wants to put a siphon, which is similar to the ones the Authority has, that crosses the river. The tide then comes in, drops down under the river, then comes back up. That is the design. There is no schedule yet. I see a very small sliver of the overall project which really relates more to the sewer line. One of the things that I am interested in and understanding a little bit more of, is the sequence of construction on the dam demolition to make sure we protect the new line because it will be a point of no return once they switch over to the new line. It is being funded under a lawsuit between NJDEP and a polluter somewhere in the State. A Commissioner stated that originally the one we had taken down was El Paso Corporation and it is believed that it is part of the same project that they have taken down about 7 or 8 dams. This remediation was in lieu of fines for environmental benefits.

Mr. Schoettle added that this project is starting to move forward. Once the survey is done, we can get the regulatory things moving and we should be off and running with the design of that.

3. Update on Administration Building Addition Project

Mr. Ulep put a slide on the screen. Mr. Anastasio indicated that we have to find a new place to locate the proposed Administration Building. It will no longer be an addition because it won't be connected to this building. I don't have a lot to get into right now. We have to get the Planning

Committee together to talk more nuts & bolts about this. On the screen, there are 3 possible locations. Alternate Site #1 is likely going to be occupied with the Headworks Building.

We came up with three possible locations. Site #3 is the one off Polhemus Lane, and is probably the favorite because it is out along the road and is separate from the plant site and can be outside the plant. Where this is, is close to the flood plain. It was an elevated area because there was a former tank farm from Cyanamid. We pulled the tanks out several years ago. We are looking into that but the current elevation states that it has to be above 46 and we believe it is. A commissioner asked is that +12 above flood? Mr. Anastasio responded whatever the flood hazard elevation is for 500 years, is 46. We had One Water look at that for us. This site would be out of the flood plain, so we are looking into this a little more. Another site that we never really talked about, is what we show as #2 on our sketch, which is up in the corner of our property behind our laboratory building. These two circles represent some nearby relic final clarifiers from about 50 years ago. That is an interesting idea. It is not our favorite, but it is another location we can look at. We will look to come to the Planning Committee and talk about these locations.

We also sent out an Addendum to all the respondents to our Architectural RFP and we got revised prices for that, plus some additional prices. That doesn't include this change but first we have to decide where we want this thing and then we would look to go back to the lowest two bidders to ask them what changes, if any, would this affect their price. Their price may actually go down because they don't have to deal with this old building renovation. It would be a clean slate design. This is what Sherwin and I have been playing around with and we will be looking to see if #3 is a viable site.

Mr. Lifrieri asked, if we put the Administration Building outside the gate, how do we get security there. Mr. Anastasio stated that we can fence it and put a gate along the curb line. There is a fence along that curb line now so we can have a fenced area that is separate from the operation area of the plant but is still fenced in. Will this be locked? Yes, it will be an automated gate with passes like we have now. During the day we will leave it open, and the public can enter just that area. This also keeps the public out of the plant grounds. It is our favorite. A commissioner asked do we know how many parking spaces we would need. Mr. Anastasio responded maybe 25 or so with a few handicap spots. A commissioner asked where would we put that? Mr. Anastasio responded that would be in the adjacent area, that the parking lot may be in the flood plain but that doesn't matter. If there is a hurricane, people won't be in the building. We will be out trying to save the plant or working from home. On the off occasion that happens, which is literally about every 10 years or so, it is not a bad proposition to use that land because we aren't using it for anything else and it is a little out of the way. It would free up this area up here for other operation type things. Would we need a sidewalk connecting it to this part of the plant? We are not sure at this point if it would be required. Any visitors to the building that would then be heading into the plant, would then go through another gate and meet with the appropriate person. It is really authorized personnel only. They would have to get into their cars

and drive to wherever they needed to go, or someone would meet them. It would definitely be easier for the public, kind of like a municipal building. Ms. Hering stated that it would alleviate the need for them to come to the main gate and use the yellow phone to call us. If the gate to the Administration Building is open 8am-4pm, they can just come in. We wouldn't have to scan everyone coming in. If they are coming in to see our supervisors, then we can guide them to the right direction. It helps us up here with not having to field so many phone calls. People can just come in and it will be more clearly marked with signs for entry by the public.

Mr. Anastasio added that he would like to have a Planning Committee meeting with regard to the Administration Building and some discussions about the Interceptor Project, maybe sometime in late March. Not the evening of the Board meeting because we may need more time that that usually affords. It may be a good time to talk about the aspects of all these projects.

B. Engineer/Consultants – Mr. Thomas Schoettle, P.E., (CDM Smith)

Mr. Schoettle stated that he had nothing further to add (see comments above on the various projects).

C. Attorney – Mr. Brad Carney, Esq., Maraziti Falcon, LLP – No report this evening.

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

Mr. Albano had a question for Mr. Ulep. On January 8th, all the meters were reading with their C reading, and it wasn't a very heavy rain day. Mr. Ulep stated that there was a very heavy storm on January 8th. We had a lot of surcharges and issues with the meters. When it goes that high and the rain is that high, we usually have an issue with these meters. The interceptor surcharges and the flow stops. That is why we have the coding system. Mr. Albano stated that he was looking at the rainfall that day and it didn't seem particularly high but if it was very intense, I could see that would happen. The storm actually started on the 7th, into the 8th.

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

Minute 14 - Res. No. 24-0226-4 – Payroll

Upon Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Mr. Mathews, the above Resolution was approved by the following Roll Call Vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Richard Mathews	Yes
Pamela Borek	Yes	John Murphy	Yes
Daniel Croson	Yes	Michael Pappas	Yes
Gary DiNardo	Absent	Philip Petrone	Yes
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Reinhard Pratt	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Frank Scarantino	Yes
		Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

Minute 14- Res. No. 24-0226-5 – Bills

Upon Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Mathews the above Resolution was approved by the following Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Richard Mathews	Yes
Pamela Borek	Yes	John Murphy	Yes
Daniel Croson	Yes	Michael Pappas	Yes
Gary DiNardo	Absent	Philip Petrone	Yes
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Reinhard Pratt	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Frank Scarantino	Yes
		Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

Minute 16 - Adjournment

Upon Motion of Mr. Murphy, Second of Mr. Mathews, the meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	Richard Mathews	Yes
Pamela Borek	Yes	John Murphy	Yes
Daniel Croson	Yes	Michael Pappas	Yes
Gary DiNardo	Absent	Philip Petrone	Yes
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Reinhard Pratt	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Frank Scarantino	Yes
		Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

**NEXT REGULAR BOARD MEETING WILL BE HELD ON
FEBRUARY 26, 2024**