

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING
THE SOMERSET RARITAN VALLEY SEWERAGE AUTHORITY
AUGUST 28, 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	Edward Machala	Present (Teams)
Pamela Borek	Absent	Richard Mathews	Present
Nicolas Carra	Present (Teams)	Michael Pappas	Present (Teams)
Gary DiNardo	Abstain	Philip Petrone	Present
Vincent Dominach	Present	Reinhard Pratt	Present
Louis Esposito, Jr	Present	Frank Scarantino	Present
Michael Impellizeri	Present	Joseph Lifrieri	Present

Authority Staff

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

Professional Staff

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

Minute 4 – Pledge of Allegiance

All in attendance saluted the flag.

Minute 5 – Approval of Minutes:

- 1. Board Meeting Open Session Minutes – July 24, 2023

With the Motion of Mr. Impellizeri, Second of Mr. Mathews, the Minutes of the July 24th, 2023 Meeting (Open Session) were approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

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

Mr. Lifrieri stated that there are six resolutions that are offered as part of the Consent Agenda. Does anyone have any issues with any of these Resolutions? Mr. Albano had a question on Resolution No. 23-0828-3. He stated that we have an application to remove the permit requirement. How do we verify that the company will, in fact, remain a de minimus producer? Ms. Hoffman stated that we are going to have them continue to report flow to us and that is how we’ll keep track. The reason that we decided to make this change is that they went six months without a discharge at all. It is very much based on stormwater or rainfall and even when there is rainfall, it has to be a substantial amount before they have any flow whatsoever. The biggest issue we were running into is they are required to monthly or quarterly sampling but there is literally no flow for the entire month or quarter to take a sample. It doesn’t make sense to have a sampling requirement and then have to waive it each month or each quarter. If there is not enough flow to collect a sample, they really don’t need to be in the program. Mr. Albano asked if they will continue to report flows whether they are zero or not. Ms. Hoffman stated yes.

Mr. Albano then had a question regarding the approval of the expansion of the water treatment. I don’t feel we should do anything until we hear from Hillsborough MUA. It appears that we mostly agree with that. A discussion ensued and it was stated that the representative from Hillsborough is fine with the way the resolution is written so we should acquiesce to him. Mr.

Albano feels it should be removed as he will not vote for it. Mr. Pappas stated that he wondered why that resolution was drafted instead of not taking any action. It just seems to be an unusual position to take. No action is just as good as taking the action that is proposed. The wording in that resolution, is that something could be litigated? Mr. Anastasio stated that he wrote it up that way because it does not speak to the merits of the application but the fact that the Hillsborough MUA has not yet said yes. They sent us a letter that said at this time they cannot say yes or cannot consent, which indicates that there may be a time in the future perhaps. We can do it any way we want. It is kind of semantics, but you are right, it is a little unorthodox because we are not seeking changes to the application. It is not a matter of reviewing the application, and we denied it for these reasons. It is approvable but for the Hillsborough MUA not consenting to it, this Board did not want to say yes to an application that the Hillsborough MUA said no to. A Commissioner asked can't we just keep tabling it? We would have to table it to "when". We don't know when that is. The purpose of this was to postpone it until such time that the applicant can obtain an approval from the Hillsborough MUA to consent, then they can come back to us and we can look at it then. That would be two years, a month, or never. It is just open so we wouldn't know when to table it to. So, we can't say that it can be tabled to such time that the Hillsborough MUA approves the application. Mr. Machala stated that that is basically what this resolution says. Mr. Maraziti then stated that it could go either way. But the argument *for* the resolution is it puts on record, the position of the Authority and there is an explanation rather than just dead silence as to what is happening with the application. It records the situation and sets it forth in a formal document.

Mr. Pratt asked what is the potential liability for us if we simply vote to approve what Hillsborough is asking for? Mr. Maraziti stated that as he understands it, and he doesn't really know the background on all this, but I've read the resolution. What I understand is that Hillsborough has not acted yet and has asked us not to act until they do. Mr. Pratt thought they were requesting a postponement. They want us to postpone it. Mr. Maraziti stated that that is his understanding, that they have not acted and they prefer that the Authority not act. Mr. Anastasio stated that reading from their letter, "the Township of Hillsborough Municipal Utilities Authority, at this time, is not in agreement with this amendment". So it doesn't even ask this Board to not say yes, but members of this Board last month, felt that it would not be proper for the SRVSA to say yes. So, you could achieve the goals two different ways. There was a suggestion that we could do a conditional approval that says yes, but not until Hillsborough says yes. Or we could postpone saying yes. It's all shades of the same thing. The purpose was to not be silent on it and applicant wondering what they could have done differently to get a yes. This just lays it out. When Hillsborough MUA says yes, they can come back to us again and ask for approval and consent.

Mr. Dominach felt it was much fairer to the applicant to at least give an opinion on it and tell them were not doing anything now because we don't have, what we consider, a prior approval. I think we should say that and whatever form you want to say that. Mr. Albano indicated that is not what the resolution says. It says were postponing consent. We should postpone consideration. Consent says that you give us this, and we're going to consent and I don't think that is how it should be worded. Mr. Anastasio stated that we can change the word from "consent" to "consideration", does that sound better to everyone? Yes, then that leaves it open to discussion.

That means that we haven't even considered it until such time as Hillsborough consents. Then they have an answer.

Mr. Maraziti stated that there is a Motion to amend the resolution to change all references to the word "consent" to the word "consideration". Is that what I am understanding? Yes, that is correct. It makes sense to vote on that resolution separately. Mr. Maraziti recommended to move on all the other resolutions on the Consent Agenda, then we will come back to this.

Mr. Lifrieri indicated we will remove Resolution No. 23-0828-4 and will vote on that separately, as amended.

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

- (1) **Res. No. 23-0828-1** – Resolution Authorizing the Issuance of a Mass Modification of all Industrial Pretreatment Program Permits that Require Quarterly Monitoring
- (2) **Res. No. 23-0828-2** – Resolution Authorizing the Reissuance of a Non-Domestic Wastewater Discharge Permit to Allergan
- (3) **Res. No. 23-0828-3** – Resolution Authorizing the Administrative Termination of the Non-Domestic Wastewater Discharge Permit 7B GW, issued to Glenn Springs Holding, Inc.
- (4) **Res. No. 23-0828-5** – Resolution Awarding Contract A-23-6 for the Furnishing and Delivery of Complete Set of Spare Incinerator Dome Blocks & Refractory Bricks to Hankin Environmental Systems, Inc.
- (5) **Res. No. 23-0828-6** – Resolution Affirming the Declaration of an Emergency and Award of Emergency Contract for the Repairs to the R2 Incinerator Vessel Roof Structure

Roll Call Vote:

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

Mr. Maraziti stated that we now need someone to move Resolution No. 23-0828-4, with the change in the wording, to change the word “consent” to “consideration”.

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

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

Minute 9 – Board Committees –

A. Planning Committee: (MACHALA, Impellizeri, Lifrieri, Pratt, Scarantino, Dominach)

1. Report on Design Engineering Services (Task 5 – RPR Services) for the Main Interceptor Rehabilitation Project

Mr. Impellizeri, acting in place of Mr. Machala, asked Mr. Anastasio to elaborate on the discussions during the Planning Committee Meeting. Mr. Anastasio indicated that a few months ago, the Board considered and awarded an engineering contract to CDM Smith for the Main Interceptor and Force Main Rehabilitation Project. That approval did not include Task 5, which is for the construction inspection which the Board favors awarding to a different firm. Tonight, at our Planning Committee meeting, we discussed the two candidate firms that, as part of the original submission, were the two lowest firms for Task 5: Mott MacDonald and Hazen. We discussed both firms, the cost of the work and the qualifications of the candidates and the Committee and the Authority staff concluded that Mott MacDonald has a more experienced professional as the field representative, for a slightly increased cost over what Hazen is, and they will refer it to the Finance Committee to award that Task 5 scope of work to Mott MacDonald.

2. Report on Updating the Current R1 Incinerator Final Control Plan

The other thing we discussed was the final control plan for the R1 incinerator. There was a schedule of dates that we had given to the EPA and the DEP regarding a time when we would work to reconstruct R1 and we prepared this final control plan back in 2016 and we put dates in there such as September 2023 we will begin the financing/planning document and will move forward on this project and have it rebuilt by 2028. That seemed like a long time ago but now we're here. We're not ready to do anything with it yet. As we've been talking about PFAS, which is a new contaminant of concern with the EPA and the DEP, there is research that has yet to be done to determine how hot incinerators have to run to destroy PFAS. There is very little research in this area. We know that there is destruction in incineration but it is hotter than the temperatures we typically burn at. That would be a different design of a vessel. The bottom line is that we don't want to do anything now because we might not make it hot enough to burn the

PFAS. Let's let the research take place and let the subject mature a little bit and get more facts determined. We have our plates full with the two large projects that we are kicking off now so let's focus on them and we can update the R1 file control plan dates. Our thinking is that we push all the dates back seven (7) years and in seven years, we'll revisit it, if we haven't gotten to it before that time. That is what our thought was and the Planning Committee was in agreement with that thinking as well. If there are no objections to that, Ellie will prepare an update to that File Control Plan. It is just a matter of submitting it to the DEP and EPA.

Minute 10 – Chairman – Chairman Lifrieri made reference to the alligator siting in Middlesex Borough.

Minute 11 - Reports

A. Executive Director's Report

1. Update on the Plantwide Mechanical Rehabilitation Project

Mr. Anastasio indicated that we had a progress meeting on September 20th to talk about that project. The engineer is moving along on several fronts with that. One thing we did bring up at the meeting was that internally, we've been discussing, that in the RFP we want to construct a new sludge holding basin because we were looking for more volume. We recently cleaned and had made mechanical repairs to our existing blend tank, which is our sludge holding tank so that the sludge can work its way to the incinerator system. Based on our discussions and also doing an informal poll with our peers around the State, what we concluded is what we don't want to do is construct too much tankage that'll never use because it costs money. When we put the RFP together, we had left it open where we were looking to discuss with the design engineer, what the proper storage volume would be and it could be anywhere from half a basin, to two of these aeration basins. We concluded that smaller is better. We want to keep what we have and add to it with half a basin. We have about 440,000 gallons of storage and we want to roughly 300,000 to it. The beauty of that is that we can use the smaller new tank while we rehabilitate the older tank. The older tank looks very good inside. We cleaned it and made some mechanical repairs to some suction pipes that had come dislodged over the years. It's always been very difficult to service because when you take it offline, you can't even process sludge and we'd have to back it up in the plant. Talking with our peers around the State, I found that all of them don't have beyond seven (7) days of storage. Many of them only have a day or two worth of storage. Constructing half of a basin's worth of tankage will be about 300,000 gallons. We can always have the second half for future needs when all the affordable housing is built and when everything is built out 10 or 20 years from now, but we don't need it now. The last we want to do is build something we'll almost never going to use. Plus, if you store all this sludge, and those tanks are easy to fill when you have millions of gallons of sewage coming in every day, that sludge ages quickly and then its difficult to burn and it is more difficult to get dispose of either on-site or off-site. We informed the engineers that we would like to keep it at half a basin. That is a bit of a milestone for us and it helps us move things along with the engineer.

Mr. Anastasio asked if Mr. Ulep or Mr. Schoettle had anything to add. Progress has been made on a number of fronts with belt filter presses and locations of those and we also talked about a

storage building that is part of the contract. The federal government raised the flood elevation levels by 2' which makes the area of the flood plain bigger. Our thought is that we can have a vehicle and equipment storage garage in the flood area on the existing base slab for the former American Cyanamid carbon tower system. It is a strong slab and foundation and is in good shape. When the hurricanes come, we always locate the equipment to the high ground anyway. Believe it or not, we can let the building flood as its just a garage. It wouldn't occupy any storage volume in the flood plain and it is likely that we would be able to get that improved. That is the best location for it. To put it in a couple of other locations that were possible candidates would involve retaining walls which would be integrated with the wall construction, and they would be smaller and much more expensive. This is a good solution.

Mr. Schoettle added that we made a lot of progress on the odor control sampling report. We made a lot of progress on collecting and evaluating the data for the odor sampling that was done out at the site. We should be pretty close to issuing a draft report. We're finalizing some calculations on that. We've had our architects out at the site looking at alternatives for the headworks building and options for re-pitching the roof up there. We've already mentioned the aeration tank discussion and the flood hazard elevation. We are looking at options for the headworks junction chambers, #2 multi-media filters and the abandoned aeration tanks and the final clarifiers. We are making progress along a broad front of areas in the facility and we are still finalizing our subcontract with Clemson Hydraulics. As we mentioned at the last Board meeting, that was complicated a little bit by a change in ownership of that firm. The Clemson Hydraulics folks will have somebody oversee their contract terms & conditions, so we are working through some minor issues, nothing that will have a major impact. Mr. Anastasio indicated that based on a conversation with Dave Leon, the price didn't change. So that's good. Just a little bit more fine print in the subcontract than we are used to dealing with Clemson.

Mr. Ulep indicated they are also scheduled to provide us with a technical memo on some of the equipment, final clarifiers and belt filter presses in the next couple of weeks. We are scheduling something with CDM Smith to do the structural evaluation of some of the structures. That will come in the next few weeks. We are arranging our schedule with CDM Smith to do the structural evaluation of some of the structures. That will come in the next few weeks.

2. Update on the Main Interceptor and Forcemain Rehabilitation Project

Mr. Anastasio stated that we just have the kickoff meeting for this project, and CDM Smith is planning to get started right away on the design phase. We discussed a number of project elements, one of which is meeting with the Duke Farms representatives to discuss the restrictions of an existing federal wetlands easement in the area where we are proposing to install a pipeline realignment adjacent to our Relief Interceptor Sewer pipeline installed in 2005. We plan to approach the Federal government representatives together with the Duke Farms representatives to begin the dialog about granting us a new easement for a new pipeline out in the farm fields versus along our existing pipeline easement along the river, which is in a grove of highly coveted sycamore trees that they didn't want to cut down 20 years ago when we built the other line, and they still don't want to cut down now. We also discussed setting up meetings with the affected other stakeholders on this project to begin discussing the project, access, and impacts.

3. Update on the Storm Control Pumping Station Rehabilitation and Relocation Project

Mr. Anastasio indicated that our engineer has set up a meeting on September 5th with the NJDEP and the design engineer to discuss the wetlands and flood hazard area permit submittals, which we are about to file an application for. We hope this will only take a year. We know from our own experience and others that they can take a long time. Also, the design is roughly at or beyond the 50% point, and we are in the process of furthering along the final design. We are going to start to give some thought to what we would like to do because the equipment takes a solid year or more, once a purchase order is issued, to get a generator. We are having discussions and will involve our counsel, regarding a contract that uses the time concurrently while we are waiting for a wetlands permit and perhaps it can be awarded and equipment can be procured and stored until such time the permit is granted, then the construction will take place. The American Rescue Plan Funds have a clock on them, and we would hate to waste a year or more. We are also waiting on a response from Somerset County regarding the procedure for making our first expense submittal for reimbursement against the \$3.8 million American Rescue Funds grant.

4. Update on the Participation in the PSE&G Energy Audit/Energy Efficiency Project Grant Program (Closed Session)

Mr. Anastasio indicated that this topic will be discussed in Closed Session under the contract negotiations exemption.

B. Engineer/Consultants – Mr. Thomas Schoettle, P.E., (CDM Smith) stated that the only thing he would add to his report is that the Plant Re-Rate draft memo that he was planning to issue this week will be issued next week. The Board may recall that there was a presentation given by Mr. Cosgrove a few months ago about the potential for a phosphorus TMDL in the receiving waters. We've decided to add that to the plant re-rate study subsequent to Mr. Cosgrove's report to the Board. We've made those additions and it took a little longer than I expected. We should have that to you in the next week or so, in a draft to the Authority staff. We will be happy to make a presentation on the findings once we submit it.

C. Attorney – Maraziti Falcon, LLP – Mr. Maraziti had nothing further to add but will answer questions in the Closed Session.

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. 23-0828-8 – Cancellation of Checks

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

Roll Call Vote:

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

**Mr. Machala was temporarily disconnected from Teams

Minute 14- Res. No. 23-0828-9 – Payroll

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

Roll Call Vote:

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

*Mr. Machala was temporarily disconnected from Teams

Minute 15- Res. No. 23-0828-10 – Bills

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

Roll Call Vote:

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

*Mr. Machala was temporarily disconnected from Teams

Mr. Albano commented that regarding this month’s Treasurer’s Report, Peter Wozniak was able to get some of our accounts that are savings accounts, a very nice rate of interest of 5%. And, we have accumulated \$1.4 million in interest income so far this year against a budget of a million or so. We are taking advantage of the current high interest rates, which will help.

Minute 16 – Adjourn to Closed Session

Upon Motion of Mr. Mathews, Second of Mr. Albano, the meeting was adjourned to Closed Session at 7:35 p.m.

Roll Call Vote:

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

***Mr. Impellizeri left the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

Minute 17 – Reconvene in Open Session

- (1) **Res. No. 23-0828-7** – Resolution Authorizing Execution of the Master Customer Agreement by and between the Somerset Raritan Valley Sewerage Authority and PSE&G

for Performance of an Energy Audit and Potential Installation of Energy Efficient Measures.

Mr. Lifrieri indicated we are going to amend Resolution No. 23-0828-7 to change the wording to extend the date for our review from thirty (30) days to ninety (90) days.

Mr. Maraziti stated that the amendment in the Resolution, on the second page, if agreeable to everyone, will be as follows: under the “NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED” portion, paragraph (1), I added at the end of it: “provided that paragraph 2 of the Master Customer Agreement shall read ninety (90) days instead of thirty (30) days”.

With that edit and amendment, and by a Motion of Mr. Mathews and a second of Mr. Albano, the Resolution was approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

Minute 18 – Adjournment

Upon Motion of Mr. Mathews, Second of Mr. Esposito, the meeting was adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

Roll Call Vote:

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

**NEXT REGULAR BOARD MEETING WILL BE HELD ON
SEPTEMBER 25, 2023**