

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

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

**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 – March 27, 2023 Regular Open Session

With the Motion of Mr. Impellizeri, Second of Mr. Mathews, the Minutes of the March 27, 2023 Meeting (Open Session) were approved by the following roll call vote:

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

**Minute 6 – Public Hearings – NONE**

**Minute 7 – 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 8 – Consent Agenda:** Resolutions for Consideration and Possible Formal Action

- 1) **Res. No. 23-0424-1** – Resolution Authorizing the Modification of Non-Domestic Wastewater Discharge Permit 6H Issued to Ortho Clinical Diagnostics
- 2) **Res. No. 23-0424-2** – Resolution Authorizing the Administrative Termination of the Non-Domestic Wastewater Discharge Permit 12G Issued to Ethicon Inc.
- 3) **Res. No. 23-0424-3** – Resolution Authorizing the Executive Director, Plant Superintendent, Chief Plant Operator, Manager of Engineering, Regulatory Compliance Engineer, Plant Working Leader, Staff Engineer and One Commissioner to Attend the 108th New Jersey Water Environment Association (NJWEA) Annual Conference in Atlantic City, NJ To Be Held on May 8-12, 2023
- 4) **Res. No. 23-0424-4** – Resolution Awarding a Contract for the Manufacture and Delivery of Two New Envirex Replacement Grit Collector Units to WSG & Solutions, Inc. For The Authority’s Existing Headworks Facility
- 5) **Res. No. 23-0424-5** – Resolution Renewing Sludge Cake Disposal Agreement with The Stony Brook Regional Sewerage Authority

- 6) **Res. No. 23-0424-6** – Resolution Authorizing Change Order No. 1 for the Upgrading and Integration of the Authority’s Existing Ammonia Control System into the Liquid Division SCADA System Rehabilitation Project
- 7) **Res. No. 23-0424-7** – Resolution Affirming the Authorization of Additional Funds for the Emergency Repair of the Aeration Blower #2 Main Shaft Assembly
- 8) **Res. No. 23-0424-8** - Resolution Authorizing Payment of Benefit Time to Assistant Chief Plant Operator Dennis Smith Upon His Resignation

Mr. Lifrieri asked if there were any questions or comments regarding any of the eight (8) Consent Agenda Resolutions above.

Mr. Albano asked, in Resolution # 23-0424-1, we are going to modify the wastewater permit but for clarity, it should indicate why we have four (4) quarters of well-below the normal readings and go to a semi-annual sampling instead of quarterly. Mr. Anastasio stated that we can add a “Whereas” to the Resolution. After the fourth “Whereas”, add the following: WHEREAS, Ortho Clinical Diagnostics has the data from the last four quarters and has shown that the VOC and the SVOC concentrations are consistently low which allows for reduced sampling frequency.”

In Resolution #23-0424-4, Mr. Anastasio stated that on the second page, below the second Whereas, there is another “whereas” that needs to be read into the record. “WHEREAS, a performance bond is not being provided for the work; and”. Also, in the NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED paragraph, after the word “account”, add “, subject to the receipt of all documents from WSG & Solutions, Inc. required by law to be provided prior to award of contract; and”. And in the next paragraph “BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED”, after the word “Commissioners” and before the word “further authorize”, add “subject to the receipt of all documents from WSG & Solutions, Inc. required by law to be provided prior to award of contract,”. We will make those additions to the final Resolutions. Mr. Lifrieri asked why those additions were made. Mr. Anastasio stated that they were made by Attorney Brad Carney and somehow, they got omitted when he ran the copies. They were intended on being in there but was just an oversight. All present agreed that Mr. Anastasio’s reading of the additions were sufficient and acceptable.

Mr. Pappas had a question on Resolution #23-0424-7, not the Resolution itself, but rather on the memo. As he understands it, there was a discovery on August 16, 2022, and the facility hadn’t been visited for period of time, and he just wants to understand is that the normal protocol or should it have been visited more recently. Mr. Anastasio indicated it is not a matter that it hasn’t visited, the plant has two large legacy air blowers which are the lungs of the treatment plant. We only need one at a time. They are 1,000 hp electric motors and are massive pieces of equipment. They make more air than we need. We only run one at a time and it is common practice for us that when one is in operation, we’ll leave it in operation for months or even up to a year. We hadn’t operated the other one since after Hurricane Ida, so we didn’t know that the water was laying in the bottom, and it caused pitting on the shaft and created the problem where we had to have it repaired. We added that on to our insurance claim through our property coverage. That was the reason. We are at this facility every day. It is not something that we failed to do, it is

just that we had not operated that blower and we really didn't know about the pitting on the shaft. When we did operate it, we realized we had a problem in very short order.

Mr. Pratt had a question on Resolution #23-0424-2. Is there some sort of formula that determines the De Minimis user or is there an absolute value. Mr. Anastasio stated that there is not an absolute number. We came up with this in-house because it is not practical to monitor low flows. They are difficult to sample and measure the flow quantity. It typically is around 500 or so but it could be more depending on the nature of it. For example, if we are talking a lab sink or two, or some small operation where it depends on the nature of it, the quantity of it, number of sinks, and things like that. We have a broad guideline, but it is also our judgment too, that if it seems to fit better in a "De Minimis" category. Mr. Pratt asked, do we take their word for it, do they give us an opportunity to inspect their facility? Mr. Anastasio stated that we inspect it annually and I did the inspection of this facility in September 2020, and I actually drove by this for forty years and never got to go inside. It is on Rt. 22 near Country Club Road. I did the IPP inspection that year and I caught them on the last day of production. The next day they were shutting down. They were moving all the production offsite, and they had been moving offline by line, and that was the final day where they made surgical needles there. They moved all their processes over to the Janssen site which they also own on Rt. 202, and this is just a skeleton crew now. Mr. Anastasio asked Ellie Hoffman what the nature of the process water at the Ethicon site is right now. Ms. Hoffman indicated that it is just a little R&D that is left. They have been slowly moving them to their Raritan facility. Mr. Anastasio stated that what this was intended for, for instance in Bridgewater at the Center of Excellence, you have a number of tiny cottage lab industries, where it will have 2 lab sinks, and there is just no way to get a consistent sample or measure the flow, so we came up with this De Minimis category and it doesn't fit into permitting. As big as the Ethicon facility is, they fall under it too, so we downgraded them. Another question was posed, what prompted it, just your judgment or was there something in a request. Ms. Hoffman stated that they made the request by application. What is the benefit to them? Ms. Hoffman indicated that they do not have to do the routine monitoring any more. Mr. Anastasio stated that it is not practical to grab a real sample of their process water, so they just fit into this category. The benefit to them is that anything that they were producing over there, they've either moved out of the country, state or the Janssen site. With Janssen site, they have increased that. We added a sampling point a couple of years ago when they started moving their production. It is just the right tool for the job.

Upon a Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Mathews, the above Resolutions, as amended, were approved by the following roll call vote:

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

## **Minute 9 – Board Committees – None**

**Minute 10 – Chairman** – Mr. Anastasio prepared a memo that will be distributed to the Board via email, wherein we updated the committee assignments as we have some new faces here. The memo will have all the updates where everyone is placed. Speaking about the new members we've added this year, in discussions with the Chairman, we will add Mr. Scarantino and Mr. Dominach to the Planning Committee and add Mr. Carra to the Finance Committee. I will send the memo out and it will have all those updates in it.

Mr. Lifrieri wanted to thank everyone for coming tonight. It is good that we get to meet each other face-to-face and maybe spend a few minutes after the meeting talking. It will help with camaraderie, and it will help to facilitate these new committees. Mr. Carney stated just as long as you don't have a quorum present.

## **Minute 11 - Reports**

### A. Executive Director's Report

#### 1. Report on the Plantwide Mechanical Rehabilitation Project

Mr. Anastasio stated that we had a meeting in early April with the design engineer CDM Smith on this project. It was a couple of hours long and was kind of like a kickoff meeting, just to talk about CDM's approach to the project and the schedule. We discussed certain nuances and drilled down a little on some of our thoughts on different aspects of the project. From what I understand, CDM is ready to go and internally they are moving. Mr. Schoettle added that they are collecting information now with your staff and we've had at least one internal quality assurance meeting. We will continue to update the quality assurance point of control process internally where the project gets vetted by external people not associated with the facility or are a local team. We've been through that process where we verified the scope of work and our approach internally. So that is underway, as well as a field walk-through meeting and on-site information-gathering. I think the most notable is planning for a physical influent pump station model that is going to be constructed by our subcontractor Clemson Hydraulic Labs where we exchange information. They are going to prepare a small-scale physical model of the influent pump station so we can test that and given the unique hydraulics that are associated with that facility, get a better understanding of the vibrations and problems with the existing pumps moving forward. We are off and running and looking forward to a great project.

#### 2. Update on the Storm Control Pumping Station Relocation Project

Mr. Anastasio stated that we recently had a field meeting with the engineer on that project, Moorhouse Engineering. Their whole team that is working on the project was out at the site and we spent about an hour and a half to two hours showing them around the facility, things they needed to see. They didn't do any confined space entries. We did de-water the wet well so they

could see it empty and see the pumps. We opened various hatches for them. It was a good discussion in that we drilled down on some of the details of that project as well. It is one thing to look at paper and pictures, but it is another thing to walk around the facility and discuss all the little nuances and talk about their project approach. That project is up and running and we look forward to seeing more from Moorhouse.

### 3. Update on the Main Interceptor Rehabilitation Project

This is the meeting we had on April 14<sup>th</sup>. In that project, we issued an RFP for engineering services and that project is out to bid right now. We will be receiving those responses on July 1<sup>st</sup>, which is a good amount of time to give them all a chance to review. There were five respondents. We sent it out to the five firms, and they all attended. It was a “pre-bid” meeting, non-mandatory, but it was suggested, and we had a good discussion taking them through and giving them, a rundown of the project and we fielded some good questions, and we also urged them to email the questions to us and we’ll respond to all the firms. This way it is a level playing field; everyone knows what the questions are, and everyone gets the answer. A commissioner asked if there is a required minimum number of bidders? Mr. Anastasio responded, no, we don’t put in something like that in procuring professional services, this is a situation where it could be as simple as you could pick up the phone and call one firm and award it if the Board is so inclined. We sent this out to the five firms in the State that we feel are qualified to do a project of this magnitude. Not everybody could handle this work, larger pipe diameters plus very heavy in the environmental permitting wetlands, river crossings are involved, plus understanding the hydraulics of the interceptor sewer. The five firms that we sent it out to and are responding, all do this type of work. It was a good meeting. Commissioner Pratt and Chairman Lifrieri were present as well. I see we are getting more questions are we are getting closer to the deadline. Mr. Ulep indicated that today (April 24<sup>th</sup>) is the deadline for questions and we received multiple emails from the respondents. We will answer those questions by next week. Mr. Lifrieri asked if we send out a list of all the questions with all the answers to all the respondents. Yes, we do. We met today to start going over the responses and we will put them all together and we will send them out by Monday, May 1<sup>st</sup>. Some firms are going to take us up on an individualized tour where we take them around. It was not practical to take all the attendees at the meeting around at one time. It really is a guided tour where we take them around in one of our vehicles and drive them through the entire length of the pipeline. They have plenty of time to review all questions and answers and put their bids together.

Mr. Albano asked, going back several years, didn’t we have an engineer’s estimate for this project? No, not yet. Part of that is included in the RFP, to get a construction estimate. We have a very broad estimate that we did, a planning level estimate, but when a design is developed, then we will be able to develop a more concrete cost estimate. Mr. Lifrieri said that if you recall, we

had a menu of different types of ways to build it and we got costs that were associated with those, but those were broad-stroke costs, and it wasn't meant as an engineers estimate but it was meant to give us an idea of potential costs. Mr. Albano stated that his concern is that we don't get caught in the situation with the Somerville project which started at \$18M and went up to \$32M and one of the arguments was that we don't have an engineering estimate so how can you reject all bids. I don't want to get into that situation again. Mr. Anastasio stated that we will have it at that time. It is part of the RFP. Mr. Albano stated that he isn't sure if the new Board members know what we are talking about, but we had a situation where we did a very rough estimate and when the bids came in, they were all over the estimate so we wanted to reject them but since we did not have an engineering estimate, we legally could not. Mr. Carney stated that he does not recall having an engineering estimate. We need one too, for the Office of the State Comptroller, to know whether or not they need to review the draft bid specs before you go out to bid. For example, if the engineers' estimate is over \$12.5M, the Office of State Comptroller reviews the documents in advance. If you are between \$2M and \$12.5M, the Office of State Comptroller just needs the resolution of the award after the fact. We always need an engineering estimate. Mr. Anastasio stated early on, there was a planning level estimate but then we expanded the size of the plant by 50% because we realized that the flows that we need to divert were larger than we originally anticipated. We have until July 1<sup>st</sup> so in that period, is it possible for Sherwin to put together an engineers estimate? No, we are not awarding a construction contract. We are just awarding an engineering contract. Through the course of design, they will develop an engineering estimate for what the construction would cost. What you are referring to, going out for the construction bid, yes, we are probably 2½ or longer years from that. Mr. Schoettle stated that we did prepare a very preliminary estimate during the study phase of the project and carried a pretty heavy contingency. So, whoever is successful in winning the job, I'm sure we will revisit that. Mr. Lifrieri stated that if you recall, how the supply chain issues threw a monkey-wrench into what was going on and numbers were getting higher and higher. It is a crazy time right now for procurement. Good thing we got the Storm Control Treatment Facility built when we did. It is a bargain looking back.

#### 4. Report on Entering an Agreement with PSE&G to Perform an Energy Analysis and Possibly Fund Energy Efficiency Projects

Mr. Anastasio indicated that we have been talking with PSE&G. The bottom line is they will perform an energy audit on our plant to see what pieces of equipment use what and they will do a complete study. We did one of these back in 2006 and it is very informative. You get a pie graph of what the different systems are and how much energy they use. The blowers that we talked about are a big user, almost 50%. Sherwin, Brad, and I had a meeting last week with PSE&G, their attorney, and staff. It was a very good meeting and we talked about the nuances of the agreement and there are some changes that need to be made to public bodies. They are going to take care of that. It was a very good meeting, and we reached a good agreement. We are just waiting to see it. Mr. Carney stated it was a two-hour meeting, longer than I thought, but we really hammered out a decent agreement. There were a couple of changes that they needed to

discuss with upper management, and we are just waiting to hear from them. They are very interested in doing this project. They will perform that audit, we will look at it and discuss it, and they propose a variety of energy efficient projects. Maybe it's a list of A through F and we only want to do A through C, or we want to do them all, or not do any of them. There is no obligation as long as they don't move forward with any engineering on any of these projects. Once we commit to the moving forward with a project to perform the engineering, then we have to see it through or if we didn't like the economics after they did the design and did their final estimate on what the subsidizing or the grant to us would be, and we decide not to do it, then we would have to reimburse them or the engineering costs that they would incur, which is only fair. We are just giving you a small sketch of what we talked about and how the project works. Once we get this back, we will give you a deeper briefing on what we're getting into. That is the direction we are going, and it will be interesting to see what we find from their audit. A question was asked, are they proposing any kind of change to the type of power generation than what has been traditionally used? No, think of it as low-hanging fruit opportunities like the blowers that we talked about. They go back to 1956 when American Cyanamid built the secondary part of this treatment plant. I go into it a little in my memo. There are not many of these in service and they are tough to get worked on and expensive when you do need to work on them. And, they are very inefficient, in today's standards. They don't use variable speed drives or variable frequency drives that alter the speed of the blower to meet the demand that you need, not excess demand. We make too much air right now. That is a very ripe opportunity but there may be some others. PSEG did indicate in our call, because I wanted to drill down on exactly how the economics work. It is different from project to project but like they said on the call, typically they end up funding 30-40% of a project, which is pretty good. There is that, coupled with the I-Bank which will fund up to \$2M of an energy project which will grant. I must double-check but it is either a 0% interest loan or a grant of \$2M for an energy improvement project. Our thinking is that if we can blend those two opportunities together, and we will see as we get further down the road, maybe we can blend in the blower project, if it is a project which we think it will be. If we can blend this project with the Plantwide Mechanical project, somehow, in the eyes of the I-Bank and the DEP and blend them together as far as the funding package goes. The way this works with PSE&G is their engineers do the work so that is why we would reimburse some engineering costs. It wouldn't be something that our design engineer would necessarily design. However, we would have to coordinate that work with our contractor and our contract, and that must be done in the general conditions of the contract. There is a lot of meshing here. Looking down the road, that might be a possibility, so we'll see where this goes.

5. Report on Arbitration Hearing Regarding a Terminated Employee (Closed Session – Personnel Matters)

Ms. Hering also commented that she sent out an email last week or the week before about the Financial Disclosure Statements. The deadline is April 30<sup>th</sup>, which was only a two-week window. If anyone has any questions about how to complete it, please let me know.



B. Engineer/Consultants – Mr. Thomas Schoettle, P.E., (CDM Smith) had nothing further to add to his Report.

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

**Minute 13 - Res. No. 23-0424-9– Payroll**

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

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

**Minute 14 - Res. No. 23-0424-10 – Bills**

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

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

**Minute 15 – Res. No. 22-0424-11 - Adjourn to Closed Session**

Resolution Authorizing Closed Session for the Purposes of a Personnel Matters Discussion Regarding a Terminated Employee

Upon Motion of Mr. Mathews, Second of Mr. Albano, the above Resolution was approved.

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

The meeting adjourned to Closed Session at 7:33 p.m.

Open Session reconvened at 7:40 p.m.

A question was raised regarding the quarterly flow report. The status of some of the equipment within the whole network, some are better than others. The flow metering for each of the participant communities, is the one flow meter in a single point of failure, potentially, and the status of the various flow metering devices, is it all the same equipment? Are they all the same age? Or are some better than others? Mr. Anastasio explained that they are not all the same age. We are in a transition period. In 1996 they installed a compound metering system because before that, during rainy periods, the sewers fill up with water because the sewers leak, which is called inflow and infiltration. The old-style meters were just floats in a flume, which is an open channel nozzle. When it rains, the float would max out and they would have to throw away all that data and then put in its place, dry weather data which would cheat the authority. Because at the end of the day, it would cost “x” to run the plant per year so they would calculate a rate. We didn’t know which towns have more flow than others. In 1996, they installed a system where they can measure partial or full pipes filled with water. That is the system we have now. These

meters are workhorses. Some of them date back to 1996, however, they are failing. We are trying to find a replacement. The replacements that exist, which we have purchased a few of, don't work for us. Even though they seem like a good meter in some cases. Most of ours are square chambers where the pipe comes in and there's a large rectangular chamber, instead of a 4' or 5' round manhole, which is really what they are designed to measure flow in. Those things only work in certain places and the ones we have, we are relocating them to places that they can work well in. The conclusion we are coming back to is that we need the new version of the ones we put in in 1996. We just came to this conclusion recently. We were demonstrating another type of unit that is non-contact, which uses a radar to look at the water, and it is not performing as good as it should. It doesn't perform as well as the original meters and there is too much at stake. The money is not that much different. Those are roughly \$30,000 and the other ones are roughly \$45,000, that is just an estimate number. But it is not that much more but it works all the time, and under all conditions. We are in the process of renewing this fleet of meters. The good thing about this report is that we have this coding system that the Board adopted decades ago because they were throwing out all this data, so they needed a better coding system. Code A is a perfect week; Code B throws out up to 96 hours; Code C throws out greater than 96 hours. There is a protocol that is level playing field for everybody. We have operated that compound meter system since 1996 and we have a lot of data. We wouldn't substitute data from 2001 into a week that we threw the data out today. But we would use data that was collected six months or a year ago or last week, because it is fresh and accurate, and it matches what's coming down the pipe. In the interim, we fall back on the coding system. Even when they are all new, there will be some things that come up and we will code. We've been going through some struggles with the metering system, and we are trying to work through it. We were hoping to find a replacement that is cheaper and easier to maintain but that other style is pretty much bullet-proof. We were hoping the radar ones would work but they don't work under these conditions. Talking about single point of failure, if Meter Chamber 4A which is one of Somerville's eastern most meter chamber cuts out, it doesn't affect anything else. One situation where there is a trickle-down effect is Meter Chamber 7, which is Bridgewater's big meter, the biggest of the 5. Upstream of that are the 5 Branchburg meters. The five Branchburg's all measure independently and that is fine. So, if one fails it doesn't affect the other 4. If 7 fails, which is the western part of Bridgewater that connects to the North Branch trunk which is from the Finderne area, all the way up the Raritan and is unmetered. That flow is measured by Meter Chamber 7 minus all the Branchburg meters. If you lose 7, you don't know what that is, but we have a coding system and we have history. It is pretty accurate. If it is very dry time, we have data that substitutes in for that condition. We are so calibrated. We've been doing this for so long that we could plug in pretty accurate data and come close. When in doubt, we give the bias to the customer, of course.

Sherwin Ulep and Christian Santiago put the numbers together, I go over them, we talk about them and sometimes we look at graphs, but we are all satisfied. The customers have twenty days from the date they receive it, per the Service Agreement, to send us a letter and express if they don't like those numbers. Then we would investigate, and it would put a pause on it. If it goes over the 20 days, then they don't have an opportunity to correct something if there's a problem.

**Minute 16 - Adjournment**

Upon Motion of Mr. Mathews, Second of Mr. Impellizeri, the meeting was adjourned at 7:48 p.m.

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

**NEXT REGULAR BOARD MEETING WILL BE HELD ON**  
**MAY 22, 2023**