

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING  
THE SOMERSET RARITAN VALLEY SEWERAGE AUTHORITY  
NOVEMBER 28, 2022**

**Minute 1 - Opening of Meeting**

The Board Meeting of the Somerset Raritan Valley Sewerage Authority was called to order at 7:01 P.M. by Chairman Michael Impellizeri.

**Minute 2 - Open Public Meetings Announcement**

The Open Public Meeting Announcement was read by the Executive Director, Ronald S. Anastasio.

**Minute 3 - Roll Call**

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

**Authority Staff**

Ronald Anastasio, P.E., Executive Director	Present
Sherwin Ulep, P.E., Facility Engineer	Present
Anthony Tambasco, Plant Superintendent	Present
Michael Ingenito, Chief Plant Operator	Present (Teams)
Dennis Smith, Supervisor Liquid Division	Present
Ellie Hoffman, P.E., Regulatory Compliance Engineer	Present (Teams)
Linda Hering, Human Resources Manager	Present
Peter Wozniak, Chief Financial Officer	Present (Teams)
Christian Santiago, Staff Engineer	Present (Teams)

**Professional Staff**

Thomas Schoettle, P.E., CDM Smith	Present
Joseph 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 – October 24, 2022

With the Motion of Mr. Lifrieri, Second of Mr. Machala, the Minutes of the October 24, 2022 Meeting (Open Session) were approved by the following roll call vote:

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

2. Board Meeting Closed Session Minutes – October 24, 2022

With the Motion of Mr. Smith, Second of Mr. Lifrieri, the Minutes of the October 24, 2022 Meeting (Closed Session) were approved by the following roll call vote:

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

**Minute 6 – Public Hearings**

**A. Public Hearing – New Sewer User Rate of \$2,713.21 for the Authority’s Sewer User Charge**

Upon Motion of Mr. Stires, Second of Mr. Mathews, the hearing was open to the public by the following roll call vote:

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

Chairman Impellizeri noted that there was no one from the public in attendance at the meeting. There were no questions or comments.

Upon Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Esposito, this Public Hearing was closed by the following roll call vote:

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

**Res. No. 22-1128-1 – Resolution to Establish a New Rate of \$2,713.21 Per Million Gallons for the Authority’s Sewer User Charge**

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

Mr. Maraziti stated that the record should reflect that the articulation of the reasons for increase are set forth in full in the Resolution. The statute required that there be documentation of the reasons and I just want to put on the record that we have them set forth in the Resolution.

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

**B. Adoption of the Authority’s FY 2023 Budget**

Upon Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Mr. Albano, the hearing was open to the public by the following roll call vote:

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

Chairman Impellizeri noted that no one from the public was in attendance for this hearing. There were no questions or comments.

Upon Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Esposito, this public hearing was closed by the following roll call vote:

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

**Res. No. 22-1128-2 – Resolution Adopting the FY 2023 Budget**

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

Mr. Anastasio indicated that our Labor Counsel, Mr. Matthew Giacobbe is now on the Teams meeting so we will now move to go to the Closed Session at this time.

**Minute 7 – Res. No. 22-1128-13 - The Resolution Authorizing the Closed Session for the Purposes of Personnel Matters Discussion Regarding the Possible Termination of an Employee.**

Upon a Motion of Mr. Stires, Second of Mr. Mathews, the above resolution to go into Closed Session was approved by the following vote:

Roll Call:

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

Closed Session began at 7:14 pm

**Minute 8 - The meeting reconvened to Open Session at 7:24 pm**

**Res. No. 22-1128-14 - Resolution Terminating Employee No. 1175**

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

Mr. Anastasio asked Mr. Smith if he received his email from earlier today with this new Resolution and Mr. Smith indicated that he did.

Mr. Albano asked that since this behavior was specifically prohibited in the Employee Handbook, shouldn't we have a Whereas in this Resolution indicating that he violated the conditions of employment per the Employee Handbook? Mr. Anastasio stated that this Resolution was drafted by our Labor Counsel, but he did indicate that it was termination for cause for conduct unbecoming in the workplace, which is in there. It was not called out in a specific signed document. It is inferred.

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

**Minute 9 – Public Participation:** NONE

**Minute 10 – Consent Agenda:** Resolutions for Consideration and Possible Formal Action

- 1) **Res. No. 22-1128-3** – Resolution Authorizing the Connection Fee Refund to John Guastella Jr. for a Proposed Three Unit Residential Building Block 111, Lot 25, 26 and 27 in the Borough of Manville
- 2) **Res. No. 22-1128-4** – Resolution Authorizing the Modification of a Non-Domestic Wastewater Discharge Permit from ViacomCBS Inc. to Paramount Global (name change)
- 3) **Res. No. 22-1128-5** – Resolution Authorizing the Modification of a Non-Domestic Wastewater Discharge Permit from Ashland LLC to Ashland Inc. (name change)
- 4) **Res. No. 22-1128-6** – Resolution Authorizing Permanent Status of Michael Fabiano as Assistant Operator in the Solid Division
- 5) **Res. No. 22-1128-7** – Resolution Authorizing the Renewal of a Flood Insurance Policy for the Storm Control Pumping Station
- 6) **Res. No. 22-1128-8** – Treatment Works Approval Application - Meter Chamber 9B Sanitary Sewer Collection System Upgrades; Township of Branchburg
- 7) **Res. No. 22-1128-9** – Resolution Accepting the Proposal from Morehouse Engineering for Engineering Services During Construction for the Liquid Division SCADA Upgrade Project

Mr. Impellizeri asked there were any further comments or questions with regard to the resolutions.

Mr. Pratt asked, in reference to Res. No. 22-1128-7, does any insurance we buy affect what we may or may not receive from FEMA in the event of some sort of natural disaster? Mr. Anastasio stated that we did go through this last year with Hurricane Ida. They want to know what coverages we have in place, so they want us to go through them first and then if the damage exceeds the coverage, we will go to FEMA. In Hurricane Irene, FEMA had said now you have to have flood insurance up to what the damage was last time, which was \$1.2 million and above that, they would cover it. This time, the damage was below the threshold, so it is purely covered by insurance.

Mr. Anastasio stated that Mr. Albano had a question on Resolution No. 22-1128-9 which is awarding a professional services contract to Moorehouse Engineering and his question regarded bidding, fair and open vs. non-fair and open. I mentioned to Mr. Albano that we are hiring Mr. Moorehouse's firm under the non-fair and open and asked Mr. Maraziti to comment on the permissibility of that.

Mr. Maraziti stated that it is permissible to go either way. The fair and open is the way that permits a professional to make political contributions. The non-fair and open does not. There is an alternative here, that we can choose one or the other. A conversation ensued between Mr. Albano and Mr. Maraziti: we presume that hiring Moorhouse would give us a lower cost, but we don't know that to be true. That that is a different question. That's why we do an open bid, put it out on the street and let people bid and look at the pricing. We're assuming that we'll get a better deal. But that is different that the question about non-fair and open. The question you are raising now is whether you should go out to bid an RFP for a professional service contract. You have that option, and you can go either way. So why did we not? We speculated that it would be cheaper if we used Moorhouse and I agree, but don't know that to be sure. Is it the nature of the work so maybe you can explain this. Mr. Anastasio added it is the nature of the work. If we were to award this type of work to another firm, which we could do, and as the designer Moorhouse is completed their work. If we were to award this to another engineering firm, then we would have to involve Moorhouse as the designer to educate the inspection firm on what the project is when there are discussions between the programmer and the inspection firm, then we would have to have the designer involved. The way it always works out with these computer scopes of work, is it not just as simple as engineering plans and specifications. Because it speaks to the nature of computer programming, it always comes to lengthy conversations between the designer and the programmer, what the intent is and how to achieve that intent. As we all know, you have 10 programmers, and you are going to get 10 different ways to program the same function. That was the intent. Based on experience, it seemed like a way to get this project going and almost certainly be cheaper than the alternative. Is it legal and defensible if we get into a situation that we put \$44,000 contract out on speculation that it is going to be less expensive. We have no evidence of that and then may have done something inappropriate.

Mr. Maraziti indicated that he has read the memo. The evidence of it is basically a deeper version of what Mr. Anastasio just said. It is not a completely frivolous statement at all. There is evidence there. The question of whether you choose to issue a request for proposals for any professional service is completely up to the legal discretion of the Authority. You have the power to go either way, and you can do whatever you want. Mr. Albano stated that that is what he wanted to hear. Mr. Lifrieri stated that we do have a resolution that we did 2-3 years ago where we limited not going out for proposals to \$15,000. We are obviously violating that. Mr. Maraziti stated that it is not a violation. The resolution, and I am not aware of that resolution. Mr. Anastasio stated that may have been a Motion and it doesn't make the applicability any less, but I don't think it was a formal resolution. It was a Motion after a discussion. Mr. Maraziti continued that the resolution that was adopted a couple of years ago does not bind a subsequent board. This Board is changing all the time, so the decision was made, and I'm not sure if it was made by a motion or resolution, is not legally binding. This would not be an illegal thing to do. If the resolution had been adopted just last month, and you chose to do this, by implication, this would be an amendment of that. You are not in a straitjacket; you can change your mind. So, we are not obligated to do that. We have a good reason to do what we are doing. Mr. Impellizeri stated that if we give it to Moorhouse, or we give it to someone else, we will still have to pay them to consult with the new folks. Mr. Pratt asked to bid work and for it to be a transparent objective and fair process for all parties involved, not just going through the motions, it is time consuming and expensive. When I saw the \$44,000, that was it for me. So maybe in some

future date, we look at that \$15,000 figure which seems very low in my opinion and come up with a new guideline. For me, I support a sole source. Mr. Anastasio indicated that we discussed with the Planning Committee, which did vote to recommend it, but maybe the \$15,000 needs to be adjusted a little bit but that intent is good and has worked very well with this Board for probably the last 8-9 years. But this is a unique situation that just didn't seem to fit well. Mr. Maraziti stated that under the Local Public Contracts Law, you do not have to go out to bid on every purchase. We have a Qualified Purchasing Agent on staff, Mr. Wozniak, so under that regime you don't to go out for bid to buy something if the number is under \$44,000. That is not because of this. My point is, that when you compare the power that the statute gives you to go out to make purchases without going to bid, the number now creeps up every year due to inflation and is now about \$44,000. That makes the \$15,000 even lower by comparison.

Mr. Albano stated that his concern is that we were not leaving ourselves open to any dispute of the award of the contract. Mr. Maraziti very much respected the questions.

Mr. Albano then stated on Resolution No. 22-1128-8, the 8" pipe is going to be removed or will they still be using it for sewage flow. No, they will remove and replace it with the 10" and 12".

Upon hearing no further questions or comments, and upon the Motion of Mr. Stires, Second of Mr. Mathews, the above Resolutions were approved by the following roll call vote:

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

**Minute 11 – Board Committees –**

**A. PLANNING COMMITTEE (MACHALA, Lifrieri, Smith, Stires, Impellizeri)**

1. HTMUA Proposed Pump Station Upgrade – Letter Clarifying Interim and Future Pump Station Capacity Sizing

Mr. Machala stated that the one issue here with Hillsborough, our feeling is to try and get them to maintain the same capacity level they've had in the past and not go beyond that at this time. Mr. Anastasio stated that Hillsborough MUA needs to desperately rebuild its pump station. It is approximately 50 years old and is beyond its service life. They are building a new station and would like to make the new station bigger. We talked about some of the issues we have during



wet weather flows and controlling those and the fact that potentially, the flow to the SRVSA facilities would be greater than it is now if they build the station larger. We asked them to keep it at an interim capacity matching the existing capacity of 9 mgd with the intent that at some point, we would be able to improve, what would be a Treatment Works Approval, for increasing the size of the pump station and they can build in the expandability however they want, maybe add another pump later, but leave provisions for it, or make the pumps bigger in the future. They were OK with that but had asked the Authority formally, and we brought it to the Planning Committee and discussed it. What you see in the Board book, behind the Board Committee section, is a draft letter to the Hillsborough MUA basically stating that fact and we plan to issue that letter tomorrow. We just wanted to brief the Board on it.

Mr. Anastasio asked Mr. Smith asked if he had anything to add to that. Mr. Smith stated that the only thing he would add to that is the Board Directors of the Hillsborough MUA are also looking at rehabilitating the existing pump station which I think is like “putting lipstick on a pig”, so to speak, but we’ll see what happens. I think they will go with the bigger pump station and the premise behind the bigger pump station is to have a bigger wet well so we can have a larger holding capacity to pump to the SRVSA. Mr. Anastasio stated that that station went into service in 1974 and the Hillsborough MUA has really grown past what they were flowing at that time. We have outgrown that station 5-fold, at least. That is the purpose to this, and we’ll be getting that letter out to the MUA tomorrow.

### **Minute 12 – Chairman –**

Mr. Impellizeri stated that it is time for him to designate a nominating committee for the 2023-2024 Authority Officers. I have chosen Philip Petrone as Chair, and Rich Mathews, Bob Albano, and Randy Smith do perform this function.

### **Minute 13 - Reports**

#### **A. Executive Director’s Report**

1. Update on the Plantwide Mechanical Rehabilitation Project – Receipt of Engineering Proposals

We opened the proposals today for the Plantwide Mechanical Rehabilitation Project. We received the Engineering Proposals for design and construction services. The RFP was sent to four (4) large firms within the State that are widely known, and we received only two (2) proposals, from CDM Smith and from Hazen & Sawyer Engineering. We need to evaluate these and look into all the nuts and bolts of it. The results were: Hazen was \$4.874 million and CDM Smith was \$3.749 million. The CDM number is just about what our budget estimate was for those services. We will evaluate them at the staff level and then we will take them to the Planning Committee and discuss the next steps. They will then go to the Finance Committee. It is likely that we won’t make the December Board meeting with the potential award to be considered. It may have to wait until the end of January or February.

## 2. Update on the Storm Control Treatment Facility Operations

We wanted to update you on our Storm Control Treatment Facility operations. As you know we completed the project and we've had the keys for the plant for almost the entire year. We learn something every time we run this plant but one thing that we've come to realize is that we're having a problem with the UV disinfection system in that it is not disinfecting enough. We have learned that a couple ways when we discharge to the river. The first event we had was April 7<sup>th</sup> and it was a very large storm event and there was a hole that was found in the Somerville trunk sewer to allow gross amounts of muddy river water to get into the plant, which overwhelmed the plant. We did not disinfect properly under those conditions and the water was muddy. It disinfects somewhat but not all the way, and we attributed the cloudiness of the water to the mud. Even the water after treatment was muddy-looking. You could see through it, but it was muddy-colored.

The next storm event that we could run the plant was October 4<sup>th</sup> and this time, we did not have the muddy water problem. Somerville fixed the hole in the sewer. We had an event in the size that the facility is designed for. Our peak flow was about 6 million gallons which is in the zone of operating this facility. We were discharging to the river in both of these storms. But we discovered in this storm that we did not disinfect fully in the October storm as well. We learned this after the fact. You don't know this at that moment. We reported to DEP and made an Affirmative Defense that was attributed to an equipment problem, or an equipment failure and we sent the proper letters and notifications after the call. We've been in touch with the DEP about it. Since then, we changed a couple things out there. We've run the plant since then but discharged to the interceptor sewer so there is no discharge to the river. What we are doing is, we're in the process of fine tuning the UV system. When we went to WEFTEC, Tony and Sherwin spent a lot of time with the vendor, talking about the problems that we are having, and we've registered a warranty claim with that. There are some parts that we are going to change out, that we're waiting for, and they gave us some parameters to adjust. From what I understand from Kleinfelder since we discussed it with them, being they are the designer, is that it is a matter of tuning sometimes and we are in that process. The problem is that we cannot work on it every day because we need a storm to work on it. We can't use raw sewage to experiment with because it is too concentrated, and the facility was designed to treat diluted sewage. We are waiting for that process, and we may have some rain coming later this week and we might have an opportunity to further use the plant but discharge to the interceptor so there is no exposure to the Raritan River, since we don't know if the disinfection is working.

I just wanted to brief the Board that we are working on that process, and we'll work the problem through. I'm confident that we will solve it. Everything else with the plant is working out well and it is definitely a well-constructed plant. We just have to fine-tune the system.

Mr. Lifrieri asked what does fine-tuning mean? Mr. Anastasio answered that there is one parameter that transmissivity, which is one of the parameters of the system. When the system was turned over to us, it was "started up" through the start-up process with the contractor and the vendor. This transmissivity parameter was not turned all the way up. That was one of the things they told us to adjust. There are a couple of other things we learned. Think of it like there are banks of fluorescent bulbs, even though they are not that basic, they are more sophisticated.

There are couple of ballasts that are not working properly even though the system should be able to function even if a third or quarter of the bulbs are out. We will eliminate those potential problems and try again and again. I think there are some other adjustments that can be made. We are also in communication with them now and they may make a field visit. They asked us to try some things in the field first on our own. We are in the process of this. During the process, we collected all the biological data and provided it to the vendor, which is what the designer, Kleinfelder, did and it was the vendor that sized the unit. They are the ones that determined how many bulbs and where they need to be positioned. The raw flow that we get is well within the design concentrations, the design levels are made conservatively “fat”. It should work. We are not UV people, we don’t have UV here so we can’t just look at it and say, oh its this or that. It is a slow process because we have to wait for the storms.

Mr. Lifrieri then asked, the transmissivity which means something to me as a geologist, but what does it mean as far as this goes. Can you describe what that means? Sherwin Ulep then explained it is basically how the UV rays go through the flow. How far it can go. If you have a transmissivity of 33%, that means that the intensity of the UV must be at 100%. So, the lower the transmissivity is, the higher the intensity of the UV should be. In our case, we should have put it on manual, and we should have put it on the lowest setting so that the intensity of the UV isn’t the highest setting. Mr. Anastasio said that wasn’t done. We learned that after the April storm, that it wasn’t set at the highest setting. Mr. Lifrieri asked, how about the fouling of the bulbs, have we experienced that? Yes, that was one of the settings that we changed. The original setting wiped the bulbs every 12 hours so now we changed it to every hour, so it wipes the bulbs constantly, every hour. And that was the problem with the April 7<sup>th</sup> storm. The mud fouled them quickly and they weren’t wiping frequently enough. In that storm, we operated the storm for 4 hours that night, 8pm to midnight. Again, we’re learning things and I’m confident we’ll get this. But we’ll do it in a way that is safe, we won’t discharge to the river. We will discharge back to the main plant. Even in a severe storm, there is still a great benefit to that facility being online, pumping the water up to the clarifier and then down to the interceptor. It still prevents any of the SSO’s that would have happened. Whether it discharged to the river or the interceptor, the same protections are in place. We’ll keep the Board updated.

Mr. Lifrieri then asked, so we will determine whether or not the system as designed, should operate properly? Yes, that is it. If we can’t then we’ll have to talk about that again. The concentrations that we are seeing of the raw sewage, even though it is diluted in these storms, the influent concentrations are well below the concentrations that were used for design purposes. It should work. It is just a matter of tuning.

### 3. Report on Solicitations for 2023 – 2024 Authority Professional Positions

I just wanted to let the Board know that we are issuing the solicitations for the 2023-2024 Authority’s Professional positions. We will advertise those in the fair and open process as we do every year. They usually go out the second week in December and we receive the proposals about the second week in January. We will receive and review them. Peter Wozniak will prepare a detailed comparison table, and we will distribute that to the Board, and we will do our evaluation. A commissioner asked if it does that include the professions and engineers? Do they include rates in that? Yes, and yes. We will have everything. You will see that in the January

meeting, which we usually hold the first Monday in February because we do the Reorganization Meeting at the same time to save you all a trip.

B. Engineer/Consultants – Mr. Schoettle stated that he had nothing further to add.

C. Attorney – Maraziti Falcon, LLP – Mr. Maraziti indicated he had nothing further to add unless anyone had any other questions of him.

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

**Minute 15 - Res. No. 22-1128-10– Payroll**

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

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

**Minute 16 - Res. No. 22-1128-11 – Cancellation of Checks**

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

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

**Minute 17 - Res. No. 22-1128-12 – Bills**

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

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

**Minute 18 - Adjournment**

Upon Motion of Mr. Esposito, Second of Mr. Machala, the meeting was adjourned at 7:53 p.m.

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

Mr. Anastasio mentioned that the Authority's Holiday party will be held on Wednesday, December 21, 2022.

**NEXT REGULAR BOARD MEETING WILL BE HELD ON**  
**DECEMBER 19, 2022**