

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING
THE SOMERSET RARITAN VALLEY SEWERAGE AUTHORITY
JANUARY 27, 2025
(RESCHEDULED TO FEBRUARY 3, 2025)**

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	Absent*
Daniel Croson	Present (Teams)	Philip Petrone	Present
Gary DiNardo	Absent*	Reinhard Pratt	Present
Vincent Dominach	Present	Frank Scarantino	Present
Edward Machala	Present	Joseph Lifrieri	Present

*Mr. Pappas joined the meeting via Teams at 7:03 p.m.

*Mr. DiNardo joined the meeting at 7:20 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 (Teams)
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	Absent

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 – December 16, 2024

With the Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Pratt, the Minutes of the December 16, 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	Yes
Gary DiNardo	Absent	Reinhard Pratt	Yes
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Frank Scarantino	Yes
Edward Machala	Abstain	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

2. Board Meeting Closed Session Minutes – December 16, 2024

With a Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Scarantino, the Minutes of the December 16, 2024 Meeting (Closed Session) were 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	Absent	Reinhard Pratt	Yes
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Frank Scarantino	Yes
Edward Machala	Abstain	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

Minute 6 - Public Hearings - NONE

Minute 7 – Public Participation – Mr. Lifrieri indicated that there was no one present from the public.

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

- 1) **Res. No. 25-0127-1** – Resolution Authorizing an Energy Agent Contract with Gabel Associates, Inc., and Authorizing the Executive Director and in His Absence the Assistant Executive Director/Manager of Engineering to Award a Contract and/or Reject Bids in Response to the Request for Bids for Electric Generation Service Issued on Behalf of The New Jersey Sewerage and Municipal Utility Authority Electrical Supply Aggregation

- 2) **Res. No. 25-0127-2** – Resolution Authorizing the Reissuance of a Non-Domestic Wastewater Discharge Permit to Amneal Complex Products Research, LLC
- 3) **Res. No. 25-0127-3** – Resolution Authorizing the Reissuance of a Non-Domestic Wastewater Discharge Permit to Somerset Tire Service, Inc.
- 4) **Res. No. 25-0127-4** - Resolution Authorizing Permanent Status of Szabolcs Toth as Maintenance Mechanic

Mr. Lifrieri asked if there were any comments or questions about any of the Resolutions on the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Scarantino had a question regarding Resolution 25-0127-2. We are all concerned about the forever chemicals and how they are all associated with all the prescription drugs, is there any special language that we should put in there for approval? Mr. Anastasio indicated not yet. Nothing has been adopted for surface water quality standards. We don't have a limit yet, and we're far from that. It is premature to do that. What we have done is reach out to our IPP permittees and urged them to start testing on their own, but we haven't mandated it yet. We have done several things related to PFAS and we're up to date with it. We have brainstormed that, but it is still too early. We have put them on notice that it is coming and if there is something they can do with substitutions, start looking at it. If you have it, look to reduce it. It is in the very early stages.

Mr. Albano had a question regarding Resolution 25-0127-3. Do we monitor for arsenic? Mr. Anastasio stated that we do, we look for the absence of it. It is an ongoing thing.

With the Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Mr. Murphy, the Consent Agenda 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	Absent	Reinhard Pratt	Yes
Vincent Dominach	Yes	Frank Scarantino	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

Minute 9 – Board Committees –

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

- a) Update on New Administration Building Project – Discussion of a One-Story vs. Two-Story option

Mr. Machala stated that we have two proposals for the new Administration Building. One is for a one-story structure and the other is for a two-story structure. Mr. Anastasio is going to show up some slides and give us the pros and cons of each.

Mr. Anastasio pulled up the architect's rendering of the two-story building vs. the one-story building. He explained that we had envisioned a two-story building that would be approximately 8,000 sq. ft., 4,000 each level. That number comes from the constraints of building on the site outside the current Administration building, which was when we thought it would be an addition to this current building. However, through the Plant Wide Mechanic Rehabilitation Project, we realized that we have to build a new Headworks Building and that is the ideal spot, so we needed to find a new site for the Administration Building, actually a better site. When we had a kickoff meeting with the architects in early December, we had envisioned and put in the RFP the two-story layout. When they came to the kickoff meeting, they said we have a one-story option for you. Subsequent to that, we had a meeting with them in mid to late January and they had sketched out a one-story option that would fit nicely on the site.

The difference is 8,000 square feet for the two-story option and 6,900 square feet for the one-story option. Mr. Anastasio brought up an architect's rendering which would be on the extreme eastern portion of the site which comes down to a point. We would be utilizing some space that would be out of the flood plain and don't have many uses for anything else. There are other areas within the flood plain that could be used for future tankage. This is a nice spot for the building.

The one-story is 1,100 square feet smaller but we feel it would be very adequate for what we need to use it for. Several of our people currently in the 600 Building would be moving into the new building. That creates office space down there that could be utilized in the future. Even with the one-story building, we would have some excess office space to use in the future. We all liked the one-story option. There is no elevator, no stairwell, and that square footage on the floor is now usable for additional office space and is a little more efficient and simpler construction. The building would be a slab construction. We don't need a basement, and it wouldn't be a suitable location for a building with a basement because we're on the edge of a flood plain. This is the general layout, and we had a more thorough discussion with the Planning Committee and the consensus was for the one-story building.

We want to run it by the Board to see if the Board is on board with the one-story option. We have to start looking at the intricacies of the site and being on the edge of the flood plain. The footprint is a little bigger, but the engineers feel they can make the one-story design work. Inside a flood plain, you cannot bring in new soil, but you can rearrange existing soil in a flood plain. We might have to change the grading a little bit to fully support the one-story building. So, we are striving for a one-story design, should the Board decide that is a better option. It would probably suit our needs for decades.

Mr. Lifrieri stated that if we are going to go with one-story, which he agrees with, it looks better and the lighting inside can be much more conducive to a good environment for the people that work in the building. But he wants to make sure that the foundation and the framing are adequate to allow for a second-story, or at least a portion of a second story, should we need it in the future. I'm talking 30-40 years from now. It would be nice for those Board members that

are they in 40 years, that if they want to expand their building and just go up vertically. With a little planning now, we can get that done for the future.

Mr. Albano mentioned a case with the New York Polytech Library which was built with that very same thought in mind, about 50 years ago. When the time came to wanting to expand the building, the building codes had changed, and that option was no longer viable. That may happen here, but we don't know. It didn't have the foundation to support it. I think a small footprint on a two-story building would be better. Mr. Lifrieri stated that it would be darker there. To have more natural light coming in would be more conducive to a good working environment. Mr. Anastasio stated that speaking for the staff, you see what we're working with now, so anything would be an improvement. We would strive for the one-story design, making sure that all the civil engineering would work, versus the two-story. We are looking for direction from the Board. The Planning Committee's recommendation is the one-story but is there a feeling that it should be two-story? Mr. Albano asked, is there going to be storage space above, like an attic storage? There are going to be windows, where it looks like a dormer in a cape house, they will allow a lot of natural light to the interior of the building. Maybe the ceiling would be above the window level but above that would possibly be the grid ceiling. We haven't discussed that.

Do we have any cost estimate of one versus the other? All I have is talk about cost per square foot. They gauged it at \$500-550/square foot with a caveat that it could be as high as \$700 because of the escalation in supplies. They didn't make a distinction but when we first met with them, they said getting rid of the elevator is simpler. It would have to be recertified every year. And the stairwell would use up some valuable floor space that could be used for offices. It is not really 8,000 versus 6,900, it's probably more like 7,800 versus 6,900 because you would lose a couple hundred square feet in those spaces. Mr. Dominach commented that in the last couple of years, when we've gotten cost estimates for small buildings like this, it is about 10-15% cost savings on a smaller office building, under 10,000 square feet. The elevator is \$250,000-300,000 plus the cost of maintaining it. You probably don't have the sprinkler system in the one-story since the egresses in the one-story are equal distances. In a two-story, you definitely have to install sprinklers. Mr. Anastasio stated that with two means of egress and one level, we don't have to put sprinklers in, but we would if we went with two-story because there are people on the second floor. Sherwin Ulep confirmed this as well. There are definitely some pluses there. Tony Tambasco is working on getting prices from state contractors. We have to install sprinklers in the basement of the 600 Building. That building is 25'x 310' and it is going cost a lot of money and this building would be similar. We haven't really gotten price quotes, but it is probably going to be a couple hundred thousand dollars. Mr. Dominach mentioned that they were getting prices for a library and it is a huge cost. Mr. Anastasio stated that we have sprinklers in several of our buildings and we have to maintain the communication system, the sensors, etc. It is an ongoing thing and there are always repairs needed. The single story is simpler.

So, the egresses would be in the front and the back of the building and there are a couple steps in, along with a handicap ramp. The flood plain elevation is 47' but he'd like to see the floor at 52'. Now is the time to go up a little more. We have to work it all out, but we'd have two driveways with parking.

The roof would be a metal standing seam roof and the siding would be like a brick wainscot 3-4' high and the rest would be a hardy plank siding or a metal panel. It would be economical and

durable and would look for many years. Nothing fancy but looks very nice. We haven't gotten as far as the height of the building.

Mr. Anastasio asked if we could have the minutes reflect that the Board favors us to strive for a one-story at this time and barring a problem, we can continue to move in that direction? All agreed. We just wanted to give everyone an early update.

Minute 10 – Chairman – Chairman Lifrieri wished everyone a Happy New Year. He thanked the Board for allowing him to be the Chairman for the last two years and wishes the new slate of officers the best of luck.

Minute 11 – Reports

A. Executive Director's Report

1. Update on Plantwide Mechanical Rehabilitation Project

Mr. Anastasio stated that we continue to make progress. Moving forward in several areas of the design project. Progress is being made in the multi-media filter and are quite far along on the final clarifiers. We are close to 60% design there. We are also homing in on the selection of the pumps for the pump station, where we plan to procure these pumps through the PVSC Co-Op. We are also working on some structural and fire code requirements for the sludge loading building that is included in this project.

2. Update on the Main Interceptor Rehabilitation Project

Mr. Anastasio stated that work continues to be done on this project. We are still working on getting a meeting with the staff and attorney for Duke Farms to discuss obtaining the new sewer easements along the alignment of the existing Interceptor Relief Sewer, constructed in 2005. We have received the 30% design for the pipeline, which is all the more reason to meet with Duke Farms and the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) to discuss the new sewer easement within the areas of the NRCS wetlands easements, which Duke Farms conveyed around 2010. Should the obtaining of the new sewer easement not be a viable option, we will then abandon this concept and resort to rehabilitating the existing 1958 interceptor sewer along the southerly bank of the Raritan River. Also, at this point, we are looking to schedule the Hobas Pipe factory tour sometime in April or May, which is expected to coincide with the opportunity to witness field installation of this pipe.

3. Update on Storm Control Pumping Station Flood Mitigation Project

Mr. Anastasio stated that the project kickoff meeting was held on January 7th with the contractor, Coppola Services, Inc., and the Notice to Proceed was issued that day. Our design engineer and

field inspection engineer were present, along with the SRVSA staff. We had an opportunity for all project participants to introduce themselves and we discuss various aspects of the project, such as contact information, point of contact representatives for all parties, work hours, project schedule, access, etc. We also discussed the initial phase for the contractor is to get the vendors on board and to begin preparing the equipment and materials submittals. We have also made contact with Somerset County regarding the American Rescue Plan funds grant of \$3.8 million, and to notify the County Counsel and other representatives that the project has been awarded and is underway. The County Counsel has informed me that once we begin payments to the contractor, we can then apply to the County for reimbursement against the grant amount.

4. Discussion of Professional Staff Qualifications/Proposals for 2025 (**Closed Session- Personnel Matters**)

This topic will be covered in the closed session.

B. Engineer/Consultants – Thomas Schoettle, P.E. (CDM Smith) Engineer’s Report for December 2024

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. 25-0127-5 – 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	Yes
Edward Machala	Yes	Joseph Lifrieri	Yes

Minute 14- Res. No. 25-0127-6 – Cancellation of Checks

Upon Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Machala, 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. 25-0127-7 – Bills

Upon Motion of Mr. Scarantino, Second of Mr. Machala, 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 – Adjourn to Closed Session

Res. No. 25-0127-8 – Resolution Authorizing Closed Session for the Purposes of Personnel Matters Discussions Regarding the Recommended 2025 Professional Appointments

Upon Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Mr. Scarantino, the Meeting was adjourned to Closed Session at 7:32 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

Minute 17 - Open Session reconvened at 7:53 p.m.

Minute 18 – Adjournment of Meeting

Upon a Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Scarantino, the Meeting was adjourned at 7:54 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 BOARD MEETING WILL BE HELD ON
FEBRUARY 24, 2025**