

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING
THE SOMERSET RARITAN VALLEY SEWERAGE AUTHORITY
NOVEMBER 25, 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	John Murphy	Present
Pamela Borek	Present	Michael Pappas	Present (Teams)
Daniel Croson	Present (Teams)	Philip Petrone	Present
Gary DiNardo	Present (Teams)*	Reinhard Pratt	Present
Vincent Dominach	Present	Frank Scarantino	Absent
Edward Machala	Present	Joseph Lifrieri	Present

*Mr. DiNardo joined the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

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)
Gerry Zielonka, Maintenance Supervisor	Present (Teams)

Professional Staff

Thomas Schoettle, P.E., CDM Smith	Present
Brad Carney, 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 28, 2024

With the Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Ms. Borek, the Minutes of the October 28, 2024 Meeting (Open Session) were approved, by the following Roll Call Vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

2. Board Meeting Closed Session Minutes – October 28, 2024

With the Motion of Ms. Borek, Second of Mr. Pratt, the Minutes of the October 28, 2024 Meeting (Open Session) were approved, by the following Roll Call Vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

Minute 6 - Public Hearings -

A. Establishment of the Authority’s 2024 Sewer Connection Fee

1. Res. No. 24-1125-1 – Resolution of the Somerset Raritan Valley Sewerage Authority Establishing Connection Fees in Accordance with the Provisions of N.J.S.A. 40:14A-8(B) and the 1958 Service Agreement as Amended

Upon a Motion of Mr. DiNardo, Second of Mr. Machala, the hearing was open to the public by the following Roll Call Vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

Mr. Lifrieri indicated that there was no one from the public present.

Upon a Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Mr. Albano the public hearing was closed by the following Roll Call Vote:

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

Upon a Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Ms. Borek, **Resolution No. 24-1125-1** was approved by the following Roll Call Vote:

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

B. New Sewer User Rate of \$2,821.74 for the Authority's Sewer User Charge

2. Res. No. 24-1125-2 – Resolution to Establish a New Rate of \$2,821.74 Per million Gallons for the Authority's Sewer User Charge

Upon a Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Croson, the hearing was open to the public by the following Roll Call Vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

Mr. Lifrieri indicated that there was no one from the public present.

Mr. Anastasio showed a PowerPoint presentation with respect to the new Sewer User Rate

FY 2025 - Proposed 4% Billing Rate Increase

Current & Proposed Billing Rates

- The current billing rate is **\$2,713.21** per million gallons of flow volume
- The proposed billing rate, starting in FY 2025 is **\$2,821.74** per million gallons of flow volume
- This represents a **4% increase** in the SRVSA billing rate

Need for the Rate Increase

- The Authority is currently in the design phase of two (2) large capital rehabilitation projects:
 - Plantwide Mechanical Rehabilitation Project – Rough Median Cost Estimate= \$90 Million
 - Main Interceptor & Forcemain Rehabilitation Project – Rough Median Cost Estimate=\$45 Million
 - The Authority Board of Commissioners has studied the need for these projects and has established that they are both necessary *for the continued protection of human health and the environment*
- This rate increase is to prepare for the near-future debt service for these projects
- The Board has determined that this rate increase is **NECESSARY & REASONABLE**

Schedule of Construction and Start of Debt Payments for Permanent Financing

- At this point in time, based on the estimated dates for the completion of the design phase of these two large capital projects, we have made rough estimates as to when the permanent financing (30-year bond) debt service payments will begin:
 - Plantwide Mechanical Rehabilitation Project: FY 2029
 - Main Interceptor & Forcemain Rehabilitation Project: FY 2029
- This interim period can provide the Authority time to accumulate retained earnings to put into a “Fund for Capital Projects Debt Service” that would be used in future annual budgets. This could provide a “shock absorber” to help minimize the impact on future budgets during periods of little rainfall or drought

Anticipated Revenue To Be Generated

- While we are discussing the proposed 4% rate increase for the FY 2025 budget, the Finance Committee has discussed similar increases for FY 2026, 2027 and 2028
- Between 2003 and 2023, the Authority billed and treated an average volume of 6.281 billion gallons (BG) per year
- *However, to be conservative, let's use an annual flow volume of 5.8 BG*
- Using this volume for illustration purposes, the 4% rate increase would generate \$629,474 annually
- For FY 2025, the estimated total volume is 6.432 BG. With the 4% rate increase, this will generate \$698,126.87, which would be held in a fund for the future debt service for these projects

Anticipated Revenue To Be Generated (continued)

- The rationale behind generating this additional revenue is twofold:
 - 1) This will generate additional revenue annually to go towards funding the annual debt service
 - 2) In the interim period leading up to the time of the permanent financing, the Authority would accumulate retained earnings that would not be spent on anything else other than going into a fund for the future debt service for these projects.
- The Finance Committee also discussed similar subsequent rate increases during the next few years to slowly increase the annual revenue to be prepared to support the new debt service for these projects in the billing rate and operating budget, but we can discuss these increases as we go

Potential Future Debt Service

Using the following construction cost estimates:

- Plantwide Mechanical Rehabilitation Project – Rough Median Cost Estimate = \$90 Million
- Main Interceptor & Forcemain Rehabilitation Project – Rough Median Cost Estimate = \$45 Million
- Total Estimated Cost of Both Projects = \$135 million
- Projected Amount of SRVSA Retained Earnings to Offset These Costs = \$15 million

Based on these costs, the total estimated loan size = \$120 million:

- Assuming 2.25% Interest Rate on a 30-Year Fixed Bond (half of the current market rate due to NJIB Borrowing)
- Annual Debt Service = Approximately \$5.5 million/year
- The SRVSA is paying off some debt this decade, freeing up \$1.42 million/year in the budget that would go towards this new debt

Mr. Anastasio asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Borek asked when and how much was the last increase? Mr. Anastasio indicated that the last rate increase was 2 years ago at 5%, due to inflation.

Mr. Albano asked how the assumed rate on the 30-year bonds arrived. Mr. Anastasio stated the current New Jersey Municipal Bond Rate is 4.28% as of last week. When you borrow through the NJI Bank, it is roughly half. How are going to make this fund dedicated? Can some future

Board decide that they want to use it for something else, or reduce the rate? Mr. Anastasio stated that we cannot predict future boards. We are going to start to incur these debt payments not too long in the future. You can decide to use it for one year and not fund it through budget. The Board can do anything they want to do year by year.

Mr. DiNardo stated that what worries him is will that 4% increase be enough to carry this note in the future? You are taking on a \$135 million debt. Mr. Anastasio stated that the Finance Committee discussed in their October 21st finance meeting, to prepare for bearing the maintenance of this annual debt service, rather than have a sticker shock rate increase one year of 20%, they would ramp up and reevaluate every year, how high we need to go. That was their thinking. We have a few years to prepare. Mr. DiNardo indicated that was what he was hoping to hear. That would be something that we would evaluate every year and say, this year it has to be 6% and bank it for future use and I think that's what we need to do. So that when the bill comes in, we will be able to pay it. Mr. Anastasio stated that the good thing is that by the end of 2026 or beginning of 2027 when we open the bids for these projects, we will know the real costs. Then we won't be dealing with estimates at that point. We will take it year by year, but this is a good start.

Ms. Borek asked what happens if the complexion of the Finance Committee changes by next year or beyond? Each year you have to look at what's in front of you and plan for it but there's no guarantee. Mr. Anastasio stated that we can assume they will be reasonable, as they are this year. We have to make these upgrades. Mr. Machala stated that your thought process is to evaluate it year-by-year and look at it again. Mr. Pratt stated that you are concerned that the future Finance Committee will not increase rates to fund our debt? The alternative would be to have a larger increase now, or a larger increase then? What is the stop gap in case the complexion of the Board changes, we don't have a guarantee. Mr. Pratt stated that it made sense that we don't have a sticker shock. Mr. Anastasio indicated that next year, we'll look at what the next step should be. Let's presume it would be 4% again, that was the presumption without binding next year's Board what it should be. We are not approving the FY 2026 Budget; tonight is the 2025. If it increases in 2025, we'll discuss it next year. Dealing with the reality is having to make these improvements to the facility. We'll reevaluate it next year.

Upon a Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Mr. Albano the public hearing was closed by the following Roll Call Vote:

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

Upon a Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Ms. Borek, **Resolution No. 24-1125-2** was approved by the following Roll Call Vote:

Robert Albano	Yes	John Murphy	Yes
Pamela Borek	Yes	Michael Pappas	No
Daniel Croson	No	Philip Petrone	Yes
Gary DiNardo	Yes	Reinhard Pratt	Yes
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Frank Scarantino	Absent
Edward Machala	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

C. Adoption of the Authority’s FY 2025 Budget

3. Res. No. 24-1125-3 – FY 2025 Adopted Budget Resolution

Upon a Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Mr. Borek, the hearing was open to the public by the following Roll Call Vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

Mr. Lifrieri indicated that there was no one from the public present.

Upon a Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Mr. Albano the public hearing was closed by the following Roll Call Vote:

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

Upon a Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Ms. Borek, **Resolution No. 24-1125-3** was approved by the following Roll Call Vote:

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

Minute 7 – Public Participation – None

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

Mr. Lifrieri indicated that we have a Consent Agenda consisting of nine (9) Resolutions and asked if there were any comments on any of the Resolutions. Mr. Anastasio stated that Attorney Carney is going to speak about Resolution 24-1125-8.

Mr. Carney recommended that this Resolution be considered separately, outside the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Albano stated that the amount in Resolution 24-1125-4 is \$30,000 less than we had authorized, which is unusual but good. Ms. Borek asked, “Didn’t we authorize that in October? Mr. Anastasio stated we authorized up to \$160,000. Ms. Borek asked, wasn’t it “not to exceed”? Mr. Carney stated that at that time, it was contemplated that the resolution with the actual final number would be set forth at a future meeting. So now we are affirming the specific amount, and the payee is also listed here. They have trouble getting the quotes. We always reach out right after Labor Day and it happens to be at the end of hurricane season.

Mr. Albano stated that on Resolution 24-1125-5, he and Ron spoke today about whether we could use the Bridgewater Disposal Transfer Station site which is located on Polhemus Lane as opposed to shipping it off to Warren and that it might be cheaper. It is about \$100/ton but might be able to negotiate a better price. Mr. Anastasio stated that it is licensed to only accept certain wastes, ID13 which is municipal waste. This is not classified as that, but I will make a phone call. Ours is classified as daily cover for the landfill, it is not garbage. It is what they use to layer the garbage every day. Does it go to the same place? Mr. Lifrieri stated that ID27 category of waste is dependent on the results of the TLCP tests because there are metals in the waste. That is where all the heavy metals fall into because they are too heavy to be volatilized and go up the stack. They come down as ash. It may in fact, be an ID27 waste so we need to find out if they can take it or not. Mr. Anastasio will look into it.

Upon Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Mr. Pratt the following Consent Agenda Resolutions, were approved by the following Roll Call Vote:

- 1) **Res. No. 24-1125-4** – Resolution Authorizing the Renewal of a Flood Insurance Policy for the Storm Control Pumping Station
- 2) **Res. No. 24-1125-5** –Resolution Accepting Ash Disposal Services Agreement Between The Pollution Control Financing Authority (PCFA) Of Warren County and The Somerset Raritan Valley Sewerage Authority Regarding Disposal of the Authority’s Incinerator Ash
- 3) **Res. No. 24-1125-6** - Resolution Awarding Contract for Sludge Cake Hauling Services to SpectraServ – Contract B-25-2
- 4) **Res. No. 24-1125-7** – Resolution Awarding Contract for Liquid Sludge Hauling Services to Russell Reid Waste Hauling and Disposal Service Co., Inc. - Contract B-25-1
- 5) **Res. No. 24-1125-9** - Resolution Authorizing the Manager of Engineering and the Plant Superintendent to a Factory Tour of Hobas Pipe USA in Houston, TX for the Main Interceptor & Forcemain Rehabilitation Project

Roll Call Vote:

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

Mr. Carney stated that on October 18, 2024, the Authority received bids for the Storm Control Pump Station Flood Mitigation project. The bid that had the lowest price was Rapid Pump and Meter Service Co. The next bid is approximately \$500,000 higher, Coppola Services. Unfortunately, the low bidder, in our opinion, did not complete the Statement of Ownership Disclosure correctly, in the sense that it names another company, Rapid Pump Acquisition Inc. of having 10% or more ownership of the company of Rapid Pump and Meter Service Co. But then, it did not provide who owned 10% or more of Rapid Pump Acquisition Inc. in accordance with N.J.S.A 52:2524.2. General Counsel contacted me today, and he’s from Florida. They acknowledged that they do not practice in New Jersey. They don’t know the Local Public Contracts Law and the nuances of the Legislative requirement that the Ownership Disclosure be continued for each and every company listed, who owns 10% or more, until you actually get to real names and addresses, and that statute is clear. I do know that the State Senate has a proposed change to that legislation that has sat in Committee since January 9th, changing the requirement that it be provided prior to award of contract, but that is not the law today. The case law that interprets the Statute is clear as well. This afternoon I received a call, after I spoke with

two of the General Counsel in Florida. They stated that they need some time to understand all of this and we're going to hire a lawyer in New Jersey. They did that this afternoon, and that is Connell Foley. They submitted a letter today, after 5:00 pm, requesting that this matter be tabled to the next meeting and they provided some arguments in a letter that I would need to respond to. In light of all of that, my recommendation is that since you are still within the 60-day period of time to award the Contract, that your regular December meeting, would be to table the matter this evening, until the next meeting. Then we can write back and forth the position on our law. In my phone conversation this afternoon, they were requesting the item to table so that if they, indeed, conclude that we are correct, maybe they would not file litigation. If we do not table the matter this evening, they are going to file an Order to Show Cause tomorrow, or draft the Order to Show Cause, seeking a preliminary injunction before Thanksgiving, and maybe that can be avoided, I'm not sure. I think it's in the best interests to see if can avoid litigation by having a letter writing campaign in the next couple of weeks.

A question arose, and a discussion ensued with Mr. Carney, that we are certain that Rapid Pump omitted some sort of ownership information that is clearly required. Yes. Why don't they realize that? Why are they threatening us? Because they are trying to argue, in my opinion incorrectly, that this is not a material defect, and it is. It is a material defect pursuant to Statute. They want to clarify, after the fact. That is not clarification, in my opinion. It is improperly supplementing the bid with information. Again, in my opinion and what the Court says as well, if you were to allow a bidder to basically ignore half the Statutory requirement, not only is that bidder ignoring the law but it also would allow bidders to intentionally do this, see what all the bid pricing is, realize they left too much money on the table, and withdraw. There are a lot of reasons why I think this position is correct, but I want to take the time to have a conversation in a letter, to New Jersey counsel, to see if we can come to some sort of conclusion. Does the delay screw up the project schedule? Not necessary. The meeting is only three weeks away and it doesn't really move the needle too much. There is no work starting on day-one in the field. They have to begin the process of procuring the two independent power assembly units. It is not like they are breaking ground on the third day after getting awarded. It could delay it more, even if we are right, if they go to court and wait for that to churn, it will certainly take longer than three weeks. The other thing to keep in mind is that the second low bidder can pull services. They are going to want the contract awarded to them based on this analysis. So, you have two parties here, one will not be pleased, but I am just trying to follow the law. While we are sympathetic to screwing up complicated paperwork, but our attorney's argument seems persuasive to me. The problem is that, let's say they are persuaded that they can do this after the fact, even though we know he won't be, then Coppola is going to sue us. We'll be delaying it even further. The fact that they just hired an attorney that is more competent in analyzing the situation from a New Jersey law perspective, that I agree with Brad that we should just postpone it. Their attorney just got hired an hour ago. They knew they were bidding on a contract in New Jersey but clearly didn't understand the rules. The numbers are out there. For form actually says keep going identifying parent companies until you get to the individuals that own it, unless no one owns more than 10%.

They do hundreds of bids a year, and dozens of times, people make mistakes. Sometimes it is on purpose, and sometimes it's not. There is no question that this is a material defect. It makes no sense not to wait because the worse thing that happens is that we are in the same position and we have to give the second one, based on the advice of counsel. The best case is that the attorney who had two hours to write a letter, to tell us that he's going to do an Order to Show Cause, why wouldn't they do that? It protects them so three weeks from now, hopefully after a couple of

hours speaking to him, he'll see the law is crystal clear. There really isn't any wriggle room. It is clear to us, what happens if we award it to Coppola at the next meeting, and they contest it? If they still want to contest it, they will seek a Preliminary Injunction and they have to hit all four elements of that. They have to demonstrate that there is irreparable harm. They have to demonstrate that there is a likelihood of success on the merits, which I would argue there is none. Then they would demonstrate that the balance of hardships favors them in the absence of an Injunction. And then there is also public policy consideration. They would have to get all four of those correct before a Judge would even issue a Preliminary Injunction. So, the judge would hear it but, in my opinion, would deny it. If we award this, we are not going to cause a delay to our contractor, if we award it in December. If three weeks from now, the two attorneys don't agree, they are going to do an Order to Show Cause, and we are going to be in Court. But this is very clear, even if we have to go to Court. We have done this issue six times and the Judge each time has said yes, absolutely you're right. The Statute is clear.

Mr. Carney stated that the only reason he is recommending that you table the manner, that maybe in three weeks, this argument goes away. I can't work miracles, but I want to be able to have the opportunity to explain. Mr. Anastasio said that there is lead time in ordering materials. If we give Coppola the contract, he's going to start ordering the materials. Then there are damages if something were to happen where they didn't get the job. We are not under any Consent Agenda. Let's get it right and move forward. That's why we have Mr. Carney, he's our counsel and we should listen to his advice. It is the cleanest thing to do.

Mr. Carney recommended making a Motion to table the resolution until the next regular Board meeting. It won't delay anything, and we get time to sort it out.

Mr. Lifrieri requested a Motion to Table Res. No. 24-1125-8, to the next Board Meeting in December.

Upon Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Mr. Pratt, Res. No. 24-1125-8 is tabled to the December 16th Meeting with the following Roll Call Vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

Minute 9 – Board Committees –

A. Finance Committee: (ALBANO, Machala, Scarantino, Pratt, Pappas, Dominach, Croson)

- 1) Discussion on the Awarding of the Architectural Design Contract and the Stormwater Management Design Services for the Proposed New Administration Building

- a. **Res. No. 24-1125-10** – Resolution Accepting the Proposal from DRG Architects for Architectural Design Services for the Proposed New Administration Building Project
- b. **Res. No. 24-1125-11** – Resolution Accepting the Proposal from One Water Consulting, LLC for Stormwater Management and Design Services for the Proposed New Administration Building Project

Mr. Albano indicated that after reading the report provided by our Consulting Engineers, we need to move forward with the with the proposed administration building, storm water management services in the best interest of the continued operation of this facility and for future events that make sense. The report from Mr. Schoettle was excellently written.

Upon Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Machala, **Res. No. 24-1125-10** was approved by the following Roll Call Vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

Upon a Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Machala, **Res. No. 24-1125-11** was approved by the following Roll Call vote:

Ms. Borek asked, why not PS&S? And is it Engineering and Environmental Services and Land Use permitting, or just the stormwater management and design services? Mr. Anastasio answered that it is not Land Use, like in the sense of Planning Board, but DEP land use permitting stormwater, flood hazard area, things like that. One Water’s proposal includes a \$15,000 allowance for geotechnical investigations, where PS&S does not. When you take the \$15,000 out, they are far below PS&S. They will likely be going to need geotechnical services because they have to determine how to dispose of the water they collect as a result of the reduction in infiltration that they are going to take away with the construction of the building. They have to dispose of that and get a net zero proposal amount. They are going to have to determine percolation rates, etc. in the stormwater basin.

But the difference between the two bids wasn’t \$15,000. Mr. Anastasio explained that \$54,100 was One Water and \$53,950 was PS&S. But \$54,950 minus \$15,000 is a lot less than \$53,950. They are doing the same thing, but they referred to it differently. We gave them a scope of work, so they are working from the same scope of work. So, one outlined it a little differently? That, and PS&S did not include geotechnical, and One Water had a \$15,000 allowance. When you take the Geotech out, it’s apples to apples and One Water is much less.

Mr. Albano wanted to compliment Sherwin Ulep for going through that with a fine-tooth comb and identifying what might be subtle differences in all the boiler plate that they sent over.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Minute 10 – Chairman – Designation of Nominating Committee for 2025 – 2026 Authority Officers

Chairman Lifrieri stated that we are coming up to the Reorganization Meeting in February and as a result, the terms of the Chairman, Vice Chairman, Secretary and Treasurer, will be coming to an end. We have to come up with nominations for those four positions. Normally, the current Chairman designates a Nominating Committee and after much thought, I would suggest that you consider Phil Petrone as the Chairman of that Nominating Committee, Vince Dominach, Gary DiNardo, Frank Scarantino as assistants on that. If there are any other suggestions, I will be happy to entertain them. Are there any issues with any of my suggestions? After none heard, the Committee will be what I have suggested.

Minute 11 – Reports

A. Executive Director’s Report

1. Update on Main Interceptor & Forcemain Rehabilitation Project.

Mr. Anastasio stated CDM is currently working on a hydraulic model of that interceptor because they are looking at the pipe sizing. We are going to install a new inverted syphon at the river crossing near the Finderne Avenue bridge which currently has a gravity line that goes through it but there’s not enough cover above the pipe. There is actually no cover above the pipe and the pipe is exposed and you can see it in satellite photos when the light is right. It is not possible to get a gravity line of sufficient size under the riverbed at this time. We need to do an inverted syphon which is like a sagging pipe. We have invert syphons on other locations in the interceptor and they work fine. They are working on that. We are also in continued discussions with Duke Farms. We want to have a meeting with them to discuss the obtaining of the easements on the Duke Farm property. We are working on setting up a meeting with them. We

had a couple dates in November, and they asked us to push it back. We are hoping for some time in December, and we are still working on that.

Also, we are looking at two types of pipe material for the gravity line of solid wall PVC pipe and also the fiberglass reinforced pipe (FRP). Sherwin and Tony are going to make a factory visit for Hobas, the leading manufacturer of FRP. They make a good pipe. For thirty years, I've always been involved with projects where we always spec'd it against PVC and PVC won out because of cost. Hobas has always been getting closer over the years and now we hear there is some difficulty in getting the larger diameter solid wall PVC pipe, I think still due to supply chain issues. Hobas is a quality pipe, and it may be something we see on the job. We are going to take a close look at it. They also make a pipe section that is in the shape of a T-fitting that would work in lieu of a traditional manhole design. We will start with a factory tour and visit a job or two that is under construction with the pipe.

Mr. Lifrieri said that for those of us who don't know what an inverted siphon is, can you explain what it does and how you would clean it out in the event of a clog, and how you would replace it if you had to. Mr. Anastasio indicated a gravity pipe is basically a pipe on a slope. Approaching the Raritan River, where this pipe is now, on the up-stream side, that invert or the inside bottom of the pipe, is at a higher elevation of the inside bottom of the pipe at the downstream side of the river crossing. The idea between an inverted siphon, is the inlet elevation is higher than the outlet elevation, even though the pipe may sag, it dips like a "U" or a trip under your sink, but it still comes out on the other side. That's an inverted siphon. They should have designed it that way in 1957. They squeezed in a gravity line and put it under the riverbed. They should have just put a siphon, but we are going to do it now, the right way. It is impossible now. There is not enough riverbed clearance to get a pipe in there under the riverbed. As for cleaning them, we have a cleaning schedule every four years, we put out a bid for the cleaning of three sets siphons, twelve pipes, four pipes at each crossing. This will be our fourth crossing. We put out a bid to clean and maintain them. We TV them pre and post cleaning to get a good look at everything. We do that every four years. That's what we'll do to maintain this siphon as well. As for replacing the pipes, if ever you have to do it, we don't anticipate that, given the pipe materials. Unlike a concrete pipe which would be under the river, this is going to be either PVC or fiberglass reinforced pipe. In the event it had to, some decades in the future, you could simply line it with the type of lining that we are going to be doing on the upper 50% or 60% of the interceptor sewer. Mr. Lifrieri asked if it would increase the diameter of the siphon in the event it would have to be lined later? Mr. Anastasio stated no, that is not anticipated but usually the reduction in diameter is made up for by the slipperiness of the interior wall of the lining. What you lost in cross-section areas, you make up in the lack of friction. We won't lose much by doing that. It might be better than the FRP and it certainly is better than the concrete pipe.

Mr. Albano asked why we are taking up the access road on Duke Farms? Wouldn't we need an access road to get in and service it? It would be nice but there are some issues with it. One is that CDM estimated the cost of it at \$5,000,000 to put this road in. The other part is that it is a

problem to get the permit for a road that is over one acre. As infrequent as we go in there, and we do deal with it by putting mud maps down, it is too expensive. It would be nice, but it is too much. Mr. Lifrieri stated that the State gives out maybe 2 or 3 individual permits. They don't like to give them out and they cost a lot of money to repair.

We are going for an individual permit for this project, so we will hopefully be number 2 or 3. We'll keep our fingers crossed.

2. Update on the Plantwide Mechanical Rehabilitation Project

Mr. Anastasio indicated we are making progress. We are moving along with different parts of the project. We are at the 30% design for the return activated sludge and waste activated sludge system. We are still getting into more of the nuts and bolts of this. We had envisioned a temporary sludge thickening set up so that we can take our T3 sludge thickener offline so we can rehabilitate it. It is a glorified clarifier in a sense, but it thickens the sludge. CDM and our team found that that wasn't practical. There really was not a good option to have a portable thickening sludge mechanism or machine to put there during construction. Brilliantly, our staff came up with the idea of how we can take primary clarifier #2 offline and use it as a lifeboat sludge thickener during the construction. We feel that is a very good solution, it is easy to do and is not a lot of cost. We are also continuing to move along studying the influent pipe station maintenance and plant operations, how to minimize bypass pumping. We have reported to the Board about the idea that we are looking to purchase the IPS pumps under the PVSC Co-Op and have them installed under the Co-Op as well. We are getting closer on our gravity multi-media filter as well. The legacy company can provide replacement parts to restore it. We got a reasonable cost estimate.

Mr. Pratt had a comment about last month's minutes, the Public Participation and the golf course people and their lawyer, but is there any update on that? Is that a legal battle that is coming? Mr. Anastasio indicated we received the geotechnical report, and we have scheduled a time when their engineers will talk to our engineers who evaluated the report, and they are going to have a technical discussion. Then we will decide the next steps. The owner wanted to have a large meeting with attorneys and everyone else, but we felt it better to have the engineers talk. The SRVSA staff will not be on that call. Just the consulting engineer, PS&S, who did the evaluation of their geotechnical report. They will have their general project engineer and their geotechnical specialist. Let them hash it out and we'll see where go from there. When exactly did we get that report and hand it over to them? I had it on Thursday, October 31st.

Mr. Albano stated that the Board may be interested to know that Mr. Lifrieri, Mr. Anastasio, Mr. Ulep and I did a tour of Bridgewater's Middle Brook and Gilbride Pumping Station where they described the extensive improvements that they are going to be making into both of those sites. We also got to see Gilbride's pumping station and it is a 50' case iron in diameter and 50' deep, this thing is huge. It was impressive.

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

Mr. Schoettle stated he thinks the collaboration between CDM Smith on both of the projects has a very high level of collaboration. Both teams are working very well together. Both projects are making good progress. Other than that, he has nothing further to add.

Mr. Dominach made a comment on Christian Santiago's memo that he sent to Sherwin. I think it is very important to point out when staff do something small but saved a lot of money. In the memo, we had some issues with some software where it reached its capacity, and they got a quote from the software company that was very easy to accept, \$19,000 for a license. They took it upon themselves, from the memo, to find a solution that cost zero. I think it's important that the Board see that, and we put that in the record because that is not something that a typical government or quasi-government employee would do. They would take the quote and move onto the next step. It was rather impressive. Mr. Lifrieri stated that it was reflected in the raise that Mr. Santiago got this year. We recognize his hard work in saving us money and we appreciate it.

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

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

Minute 13 - Res. No. 24-1125-12 – Payroll

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

Roll Call Vote:

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

Minute 14- Res. No. 24-1125-9 – Bills

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

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

Minute 15 – Adjournment of Meeting

Upon the Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Ms. Borek, the Meeting was adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

Roll Call Vote:

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

The SRVSA 2024 Holiday Party will be on Friday, December 20th at noon, in the Admin Conference Room.

**NEXT REGULAR BOARD MEETING WILL BE HELD ON
DECEMBER 16, 2024**