

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING  
THE SOMERSET RARITAN VALLEY SEWERAGE AUTHORITY  
OCTOBER 28, 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 (Teams)	John Murphy	Present
Pamela Borek	Present	Michael Pappas	Absent*
Daniel Croson	Present (Teams)	Philip Petrone	Present
Gary DiNardo	Present (Teams)	Reinhard Pratt	Present
Vincent Dominach	Present	Frank Scarantino	Present
Edward Machala	Present	Joseph Lifrieri	Present

\*Mr. Pappas joined the meeting at 7:13 p.m.

**Authority Staff**

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

**Professional Staff**

Thomas Schoettle, P.E., CDM Smith	Present
Brad Carney, Esq., Maraziti Falcon, LLP	Present
Matthew Giacobbe, Esq., Cleary, Giacobbe, Alfieri & Jacobs, LLC	Present (Teams)

**Minute 4 – Pledge of Allegiance**

All in attendance saluted the flag.

**Minute 5 – Approval of Minutes:**

1. Board Meeting Open Session Minutes – September 23, 2024

With the Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Machala, the Minutes of the September 23, 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	Absent
Daniel Croson	Yes	Philip Petrone	Abstain
Gary DiNardo	Abstain	Reinhard Pratt	Yes
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Frank Scarantino	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

**Minute 6 - Public Hearings -**

**A. Recalculation of the Industrial Pretreatment Program (IPP) Administration Fee**

1. **Res. No. 24-1028-1** – Resolution Authorizing the 2023 Industrial Pretreatment Program Administration Fee

Upon a Motion of Mr. Pratt, Second of Ms. 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	Absent
Daniel Croson	Yes	Philip Petrone	Yes
Gary DiNardo	Yes	Reinhard Pratt	Yes
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Frank Scarantino	Yes
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 Ms. Borek, the public hearing was closed by the following Roll Call Vote:

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

Upon a Motion of Mr. Scarantino, Second of Mr. Murphy, **Resolution No. 24-1028-1** was approved by the following Roll Call Vote:

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

**Minute 7 – Public Participation** – Mr. Lifrieri noted that there were three (3) members of the public in attendance.

Mr. Joshua Koodray, Esq., of the law firm of Sills, Cummis & Gross, LLC introduced himself as the attorney for FH Golf Partners, LLC. Mr. Koodray wanted to address the Board tonight about an item not on the agenda. He also introduced a representative of the applicant, Steven Lapper, who would also like to address the Board. Mr. Koodray went on to state that FH Golf Partners, LLC (the “applicant”) has made a request for a Will Serve letter from this entity in connection with an inclusionary development project that is on a portion of the Fox Hollow Golf Course. You may be familiar generally with the project. It is 250 residential units and is part of an affordable housing settlement with Fair Share Housing Center. The property is situated in two towns, Readington and Branchburg. It is part of an MOU between those two municipalities which was extended most recently on October 12, 2023. Broadly speaking, as part of the agreement, the residential units would be developed in Readington and the sewer capacity would be provided through Branchburg, for connection to the Authority’s system. We do require a Will Serve Letter from the SRVSA and we have not received a response to that request. We are here tonight to provide a little more background on the timeline and hopefully get a commitment from you all as to when we can expect to have a response which I understand will be in the form of a report.

Mr. Anastasio stated that we expect to receive that report any day now. This is a report regarding the Geotechnical Report for the Fox Hollow site. It would literally come in tomorrow and as soon as we get it, I will forward it on to your engineer, Rob Moschello of Gladstone

Design, and he will forward it along to your team and we will wait to hear back from your team as to any technical questions or any other items. PS&S provided the Geotech work so you will hear their opinions on the Geotechnical investigation that we have received as part of our past letter asking whether alternatives were explored. That is where it is. I apologize that it has taken so long. We expected to get it sooner but better late than never. We told them we had no further comments on the report at the end of last week.

Mr. Koodray appreciates that information and would like Mr. Lapper to briefly address everyone about the timeline. The reason for his appearance this evening, and I understand the efforts going back and forth and we know there has been a lot going back and forth. The project cannot move forward with this analysis and Will Serve Connection Letter. In the climate that we're in, particularly considering that it is an inclusionary development (affordable housing), is a very sensitive need for the State.

Mr. Steven Lapper introduced himself and stated he was here back in August. Tonight, he would just like to walk everyone through this. Our first correspondence with you was done through our first contract purchaser, Rosenbloom & Esposito, which was back in 2020-2021, and Mr. Anastasio would know those dates better. They were a bull in a China shop. They came before you and other entities and had an expectation that everything would be handed to them on a silver platter. That led them to the trouble of not being able to perform according to the contract and we replaced them as soon as we were legally able to do so. Our current contract purchaser is Pulte Homes. What I'd like to do is just illustrate the fact that since we took over the project from Rosenbloom & Esposito, which was effectively in 2023, we had a number of correspondences. We've also refunded the escrow deposits with you folks. We paid for a number of studies, the first of which there was a good deal of legal correspondence, the legal work that went on between the different parties, as to be expected. After that there was a request from Mr. Anastasio and your Body, for documentation, back in January. A series of requests that were very similar to the ones made to Rosenbloom & Esposito, but since we were effectively new applicants, or a change of applicants, we followed that process. We provided all the information including a description of the MOU from Branchburg and their legal counsel. We redeposited more money back in. We submitted documents to you in April, and we finalized our first submission in April. We then asked to see where we were and it took until July, to receive an updated letter that asked to study our alternative analysis or portions of it that were not covered in the original request for documentation. Our alternative analysis was conducted by Tom Dwyer who is pretty well renowned in the State and the Northeast region as one of the best Geotechnical Engineers. We spent months and a considerable amount of money examining all the possibilities. Quite frankly, I wouldn't be standing before you if we had any possibilities. We exhausted this search. We did so in a fashion, including some new very interesting techniques. One is the use of a state of the art, Defense Department ELN antenna to look at the Geotechnical rock stratifications throughout the region to find out if they would be acceptable for a package plant and a discharge and the run rates that would make the discharge acceptable to everybody. We came up empty and kept coming up empty. We wish we didn't, because quite frankly it would have been a lot easier for us to be moving in that direction. We then asked for a meeting to which your Executive Director offered a meeting, on a Friday, only to find out on Monday that your counsel suggested that it wasn't a good idea to meet. We then came back and offered to have a meeting with our counsel and your counsel in the room, and we were told that was unacceptable which is unfortunate because all we're trying to do is work the process and

understand what can be done, what do you want from us, how we should proceed, what we should do to give us the possible chance to make the application. We also paid for, and we saw that there was a GIS Streamerview by One Water, a third-party vendor. We've never seen a copy of that test even though our escrow funds have paid for it. And unfortunately, since the better part of late July, we kept asking for the analysis of our Geotechnical tests that were going to be performed by PS&S. We asked for meetings through our engineer Rob Moschella, and we were told by Mr. Anastasio that you were waiting for the report and would get back to you as soon as possible. Quite frankly, there has been an email trail between Mr. Anastasio and Mr. Moschello, that has gone on for a better part of 8-10 weeks. While I have no doubt that Mr. Anastasio is sincere 100% that this report will be ready shortly, it compelled us, and myself when I came back in August, to appear before you today. Because quite frankly, the Counsel said that the timing of this application is critical. There is an agreement between Branchburg and Bridgewater, to endorse and support this application. That has been conducted between the different legal counsels and Administrators of each Township. The Mayor and Counsel have been steady supporters of this on our behalf and frankly, we stand before you because we can't afford to face what, like it or not or intentional or not, there has been somewhat of a stonewall for us. We need to try to break that wall and understand how we can proceed forward, and we ask for your support in accomplishing that and to better understand the viability of this project with you. The last piece does involve some complexity because the building and construction of the residences and the affordable housing part all will be in Readington, which is outside of your normal district. However, Readington is offering to expand the district to include the SRVSA as part of the district and will put such in writing at the appropriate time. As I said, Branchburg has endorsed it and as I said, Bridgewater has told us they have no problems serving as the conveying pipeline to your treatment plants accordingly. We have no problems paying whatever fees are deemed necessary. I sat in this meeting in August and watched the consternation on people's faces when one large project came in at a very different price than was originally priced at. I can sympathize for all of you that today's costs have gone through the roof in every factor from eggs to sewer treatment plants. We understand that but the further we wait, the more uncertainty there is. What we are here today to do is to ask, to beg, your ability to move forward swiftly on this, especially once this report that Mr. Anastasio said should be ready any day now. We would also like to receive the GIS report that was done back in June, that we paid for. We think that is reasonable. We'd be happy to also present Mr. Dwyer and Mr. Moschello, who are very capable professionals in your field and are more than willing to stand before you and work with whomever deems necessary, to move this process forward. Mr. Lapper thanked the Board.

Mr. Anastasio appreciated everything and stated that once he gets that report, it will get sent right over to Mr. Moschello and then you can look at it and we can set up a meeting, including Counsel, and go from there. Mr. Lapper stated he had one question, and that is since this report doesn't include new data, in other words, there was no primary testing done by your third party, I believe PS&S, how much longer should it take to analyze effectively, data that has been shared in full and shared completely by one of the industry's leaders in that field. The soon we can get all these people in a room to understand it, the better off I think every party would be. Mr. Anastasio again stated we would get it to you as soon as possible and then we can talk about next steps.

Mr. Lifrieri thanked Mr. Koodray and Mr. Lapper and asked if the third gentleman wanted to speak at all and he stated he was here for moral support.

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

Mr. Lifrieri indicated that we have a Consent Agenda consisting of one (1) Resolution and asked if there were any comments on any of the Resolution, and none were noted.

- 1) **Res. No. 24-1028-2** – Resolution Authorizing the Executive Director, Manager of Engineering, Chairman Lifrieri and Commissioner Dominach to Attend the AEA Annual Conference in Atlantic City, November 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>, 2024

Upon Motion of Mr. Borek, 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	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

**Minute 9 – Board Committees –**

**A. Personnel Committee: (PETRONE, Albano, Lifrieri)**

1. Report on Proposed FY 2025 Salary Increases for Supervisory Personnel (Closed Session – Personnel Matters)

Mr. Anastasio asked the staff that was on Zoom to disconnect and if they want, they can jump back on when Closed Session is over. All other staff members also left for the Closed Session.

**Res. No. 24-1028-10** – Resolution Authorizing Closed Session for the Purposes of Personnel Matters Discussions Regarding the 2024 Supervisory Personnel Salary Increases and the Chief Financial Officer Part-Time Employment Agreement.

Upon Motion of Mr. Murphy, Second of Mr. Machala, the Meeting was adjourned to Closed Session at 7:21 p.m., 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	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

Upon a Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Ms. Borek, the Open Session Meeting reconvened at 7:57 p.m. by 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	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

**Res. No. 24-1028-3 – Resolution Authorizing Salary and Wage Increases for Supervisory Employees for Fiscal Year 2025**

Upon a Motion of Mr. Petrone, Second of Mr. Albano, the 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	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

**Res. No. 24-1028-4** – Resolution Accepting the Resignation Letter from Peter Wozniak and Thanking Him for his Service to the Authority and the Acceptance of a Part-Time Chief Executive Officer Employment Agreement

Upon a Motion of Ms. Borek, Second of Mr. Machala, the 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	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

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

1. Report and Recommendation of Proposed (Introduced) FY 2025 Budget (see pocket of binder)

Mr. Lifrieri stated that we have a Resolution introducing the FY 2025 Budget. Mr. Anastasio indicated that we will be having the discussion in Open Session regarding the concept of increasing the billing rate to begin to prepare for the future debt service of these large capital projects. This was a discussion that came up during the Finance Committee meeting. A couple of the Commissioners had suggested that independently, and the rest of the Finance Committee agreed. Mr. Albano stated that it is important to recognize fiscally responsibility. We have lots of very big expensive projects coming down the pipe. In your packet, is a nice preparation of the costs of those projects and the timeline of which they will come into play. If we wait until the bill hits the door, we are going to be in trouble. We will be looking at 15% - 20% increases in fees for those years. We thought it would be fiscally responsible, since we know what's coming, to plan for the next 5 or 6 years, to gently increase as opposed to kicking the can down the road until we run out of room and that would be a very expensive way of doing it and would lead to a lot of angst and anxiety. That's a big part of what is in the budget. All the other stuff, we are not in a position to question whether Tony or Mike need 3 pumps or 4 pumps. That's not our job. But to think about the future is. Building in some rate increases now, to avoid what we know, would be catastrophic increases in the future, would be good fiscal planning.

Mr. Anastasio stated that attached to Resolution #5, which is the Budget Resolution, there is a memo in the back which runs some numbers on the potential revenue from a 3% and a 4% rate increase. The Finance Committee discussed both and the numbers are in the memo. It all comes down to the fact that we are going to have a large debt service to deal with in the future and the costs seem to keep going up. These projects are still a couple of years away from going out to bid. It comes down to what, if any, the Board wants to raise the rate. More is better and we



thought collectively at the Finance Meeting that 3% or 4% is a manageable number. We also discussed the idea that if we do nothing and then have to have a twenty-something rate increase in 4 years, seems like mismanagement. At least we have time to prepare, and we can take the revenue generated from this and put that in a fund, if you will. We can have the Board establish a fund for the future debt service for these projects, and not touch it for anything else. It is part of the budget, but it is not part of the operating money. That is the plan, to have a debt service reserve fund, like we do for the storm control treatment facility. Depending on the number that the Board decides on, 3% or 4% or whatever, Peter will recalculate the numbers in the Budget Resolution to reflect this increase so that the Budget introduced will be of the proper size. We won't have to amend anything later.

Mr. Albano suggests that we do 4%. 3% doesn't give us the money that we think we will need in 4 years and 5% gives us a little bit more but that is a little difficult to swallow. I've run through my own numbers, and I think 4% is a good start. Remember, we can adjust that every year. As we learn more as we move forward, we can use a little less or need a little more, it is easier to tweak ½ % one way or the other, than it is trying to avoid that 15% or 20% hit in 4 or 5 years. Several members agreed. Mr. Pappas asked at the Finance Committee, and he appreciates this detailed report, but really thinks that this move should be a public presentation, about what the 3% does, what the 4% does, or to review the memo publicly. If any one member of the public ever watches a recording of this meeting, I think there should be a presentation of some sort. Mr. Anastasio pointed out that this does not represent the rate hearing. We have to have a Public Hearing which is what Mr. Pappas suggests. The Budget will be introduced tonight, and it is your plan to raise the rate. The rate doesn't get raised until the next Board meeting. We would have a public hearing, and we can actually read into the record, a public presentation, if the Board would like to go that far, and the justification for a the rate increase. I just wanted to point that out. This is what we plan to do. Mr. Pappas stated we are asking the Board to vote. Mr. Anastasio stated that this is to introduce the budget with an anticipated rate increase and that we would have to have a Budget Hearing and Rate Hearing for it. Mr. Dominach commented that the memo that was written was exactly what we asked for. He understands Mr. Pappas's point, and I think we can do that at the hearing level. We have to introduce the budget, and we have to plan, and I don't think there's anyone here that disagrees that to be financially prudent, we have to raise the rates, and it is much better to raise them a little. And whether we raise it 3 or 4% this year, it is not a big difference, but it gives us a start and we can reevaluate next year and the year after. I think we have to move forward tonight with the budget. Mr. Albano stated that Mr. Wozniak did provide an amount and if you look at the amount each year, then the accumulated amount when we actually begin financing these projects at 2.5%, you can figure where you want to be and the amount that we need to set aside is based on the assumptions on the engineering estimates that we have now. I think, essentially, to answer Mr. Pappas' question, we don't have the detailed memo that you may have expected, but we have enough to justify moving forward with some rationale of how we arrived at 4%.

Mr. Carney suggested that Mr. Wozniak's memo be made be public as a public document and that the rate hearing that takes place, at a minimum 20-day notice to two newspaper publications, and has to be mailed to the Clerk of each Town, and that standard is reasonable and necessary. An explanation at a Public Hearing has to be made as to why the rate increase of whatever percentage is, is reasonable and necessary. The public can participate, and if the public shows up, they have the right to cross-examine it, if they actually show up. Then you close the Public Hearing, and you vote to approve the resolution for the budget.

Mr. Lifrieri asked if there were any objections to that approach. None heard.

Mr. Anastasio stated that the Resolution does not specify a rate increase percentage, it is just budget totals. This is the State form. If the Board indicates that they want the 4% rate increase included, Mr. Wozniak can quickly recalculate what the budget total numbers would be with that anticipated rate increase. Then those numbers would get introduced in the Resolution.

Mr. Murphy stated that he had a question about rate increases and the process of it. He thought he read in the paper recently where Somerville and other towns that were bought by American Water, it looked like it was 8% overall, whether it was water coming in or water going out. It was a total of 8% increase. They had to go before the BPU. Mr. Anastasio stated that that was not us. We don't have to go in front of them. Mr. Carney stated that the statute that governs this is N.J.S.A. 40:14A-8 and is specifically paragraph C, that sets forth the process for sewerage authorities and the rate increases and it requires this Public Hearing that I'm talking about, and it provides how the notice is done, and at least 20 days after Notice, it is all set forth here. This is the process that the Authority follows. The Resolution tonight introduces it so that that advertisement can then be made to put the public on notice that you are going to have a Public Hearing so they can participate in that if they want to, regarding any increase of the rate. So, the Hearing on any proposed rate increase should come before the Budget Adoption.

Mr. Wozniak reworked his numbers and on Resolution No. 24-1028-5, in the second paragraph, the first number becomes \$21,344,483.00. The appropriations do not change for the rate increase so the number in the second line does not change. The third number becomes \$1,483,843.00. So now there is a balanced budget. There are no other changes.

Mr. Lifrieri asked if any further discussion on this particular resolution was needed, and none was noted.

Upon a Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Dominach the following Resolution, as amended, was approved by the following roll call vote.

**Res. No. 24-1028-5** – Resolution Introducing the FY 2025 Budget

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

2. Report on the Renewal of a Flood Insurance Policy on the Storm Control Pumping Station

**Res. No. 24-1028-6** – Resolution Authorizing the Renewal of a Flood Insurance Policy for the Storm Control Pumping Station

Mr. Anastasio stated that at the time of the Finance Committee meeting, we hadn't yet received the quotes for a new flood insurance policy for the Storm Control Pumping Station. As a background: back to Hurricane Irene, 2011, the Station got flooded and we did not have flood insurance at the time. We had to fight tooth and nail to get a FEMA payment for the damage. They whittled it down. The total cost of the rebuild was about \$1.6 million. We got about \$592,000. They told us that we can't make another claim to FEMA unless we maintain a flood insurance policy for \$1.2 million on that station. Since then, the Authority has done that. The premiums have gone up and down and then after Hurricane Ida in 2011, the Station got wiped out again and we rebuilt again, cheaper this time, for about \$750,000 and were made whole by the insurance company. We still need to maintain the policy for another year. A year from now, the contractor for the Storm Control Pumping Station Flood Mitigation Project will be well into the project. If it gets wiped out, we are just going to finish the construction. We're not going to build back what was there and would have gotten destroyed. It looks like we only need this for one more year, which would be now. Earlier today the new quotes for the flood insurance policy. Remarkably, the premium only went up \$292 from last year, especially after all the damage that the country has sustained recently. The premium this year would be \$130,792. The Resolution in front of you, because we didn't know at the time of the Finance Meeting, we asked for \$160,000 not knowing the premium increase would be this small. What I ask is that the Board pass the Resolution authorizing me to bind the policy up to \$160,000. We now know the amount it is and next month we'll have a memorializing resolution with the proper amount. I don't have the name of the insurance company in the Resolution either. This is how we did it last year. We ask them around Labor Day to start shopping for prices and it takes them 2 months because it's the end of hurricane season. This should be the last year for this. Fortunately, the premium is going to be level.

After no further comments, and upon a Motion of Mr. Scarantino, Second of Ms. Borek, 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	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

**Minute 10 – Chairman** – Chairman Lifrieri has no further comments at this time.

## **Minute 11 – Reports**

### A. Executive Director’s Report

#### 1. Update on Main Interceptor & Forcemain Rehabilitation Project.

Mr. Anastasio indicated that we have reviewed a 30% design of the main interceptor design drawings and have provided comments to CDM. We didn’t have a lot of comments. Down at WEFTEC in New Orleans, we had an opportunity to speak to some vendors related to this project, particularly a vendor that provides fiberglass reinforced pipe and an integrated manhole design which is something like a plastic T-fitting that connects to the pipe. It is a new and innovative design, although it may have been around for 20 years, but it may provide some good solutions to some issues that we have with pressures building up in the interceptor. We also have a meeting scheduled with Duke Farms to talk about easement issues and at that meeting, we are going to be learning whether in-house counsel for Duke Farms will be handling the easement work or if they are going to hire outside counsel. Our attorney has worked with us over the spring and summer talking about these Duke easements. We are waiting to get our counsel with theirs so that they can talk and work out all the easement language and get these easements conveyed to us. We need to have these worked out first.

#### 2. Update on the Plantwide Mechanical Rehabilitation Project

Mr. Anastasio indicated that we provided comments on the 30% design for the incinerator belt filter presses. The final clarifier design, the 60% design and cost estimate and looking at a few other things. We talked at the last Board meeting, about the fact that we found a substitute multi-media filter vendor that looks like they can almost have a drop-in replacement for what we have. We are working on having CDM approach them formally to get a quote for what we need.

#### 3. Update on the Storm Control Pumping Station Flood Mitigation Project

Mr. Anastasio stated that if you look at Sherwin Ulep’s report, he has a breakdown of the bids received. We opened bids on October 18<sup>th</sup>. We sold 25 sets, but we only received 7 submittals. The bids are pretty tight except for one outlier on the high end. We are looking at them internally and we are going to be sending them to our counsel for his inspection and look to see if we can ultimately get them awarded at the November meeting. The Planning Committee met tonight, and we discussed the results of the bids received and they are ready to recommend the Finance Committee to move along reviewing the bid results to get this awarded.

#### 4. Update on the Architect RFP issuance for the New Administration Building Project

Mr. Anastasio indicated that also in Mr. Ulep’s report, you’ll see the breakdown of the proposals that we received, and we also had a discussion at tonight's Planning Committee meeting about

those. The lowest proposal is DRG Architects, and the second lowest proposal is KSS Architects. We are going to be talking to both of them and looking at their references and evaluating further. The Planning Committee has allowed us to do an evaluation, and we are going to issue a memo back to the Planning Committee with our findings and we'll go from there. What ultimately will come out is a recommendation to the Finance Committee on which architect we are looking to go with.

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

Mr. Schoettle stated he has nothing further to add unless there were questions. There were none.

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. 24-1028-7 – Payroll**

Upon Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Ms. Borek, 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	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

**Minute 14- Res. No. 24-1028-8 – Cancellation of Checks**

Upon Motion of Mr. Scarantino, 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	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

**Minute 15- Res. No. 24-1028-9 – Bills**

Upon Motion of Mr. Pratt, Second of Mr. Scarantino, 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	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

**Minute 16 – Adjournment of Meeting**

Upon the Motion of Mr. Pratt, Second of Mr. Albano, the Meeting was adjourned at 8:25 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	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

**NEXT REGULAR BOARD MEETING WILL BE HELD ON  
NOVEMBER 25, 2024**