MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING
THE SOMERSET RARITAN VALLEY SEWERAGE AUTHORITY
MARCH 24, 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 Edward Machala.

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	Absent
Gary DiNardo	Present (Teams)	Reinhard Pratt	Present
Vincent Dominach	Present (Teams)	Frank Scarantino	Absent
Michael Impellizeri	Absent	Edward Machala	Present
Joseph Lifrieri	Present		

Authority Staff

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

Professional Staff

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

*Mr. Wojcicki joined the meeting via Teams at 7:10 p.m.

Minute 4 – Pledge of Allegiance

All in attendance saluted the flag.

Minute 5 – Approval of Minutes:

1. **Board Meeting Open Session Minutes – February 24, 2025**

Ms. Borek requested a correction to her name in Minute 6, No. 1. Mr. Albano requested a correction to a typo on Page 5, wherein it is noted "forced hot air conditioning", remove the word "hot".

With the above two corrections and with the Motion of Ms. Borek, Second of Mr. Albano, the Minutes of the March 24, 2025 Meeting (Open Session) were approved, by the following Roll Call Vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

Minute 6 - Public Hearings - NONE

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

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

1) **Res. No. 25-0324-1** - Resolution Affirming the Emergency Procurement for the Repair of the R2 Incinerator Primary Heat Exchanger

Mr. Machala asked if anyone had any questions or concerns about this Resolution in the Consent Agenda.

Upon a Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Mr. Pratt, the Consent Agenda, with Resolution was approved by the following Roll Call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

Minute 9 – Board Committees – None

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

a) Report on the Advertisement for the Hiring of a Financial Advisor

Mr. Albano indicated that at the last meeting, we talked about hiring a Financial Advisor and we reached out to our Bond Counsel and to our Auditors who gave us several suggestions. We put together an Advertisement that Mr. Anastasio will post and we'll see what happens. We had a pretty good description of the services.

B. Planning Committee (LIFRIERI, Machala, Pratt, Scarantino, Murphy, Dominach) (& Finance Committee)

1. a) Report on Proposals for the Engineering Design of the Proposed New Headworks Building

Mr. Lifrieri stated that since this is regarding PS&S, he will have to recuse himself since he worked there for 40 years but has been retired for 8 years. He doesn't feel he has a conflict but feels he should not be in for the vote.

However, as a Committee Report, Mr. Lifrieri stated that they went out for proposals for the Headworks Building and got a few back. PS&S was the low bidder on the job and their qualifications show that they are capable of performing the work, thus this Resolution.

b) **Res. No. 25-0324-2** – Resolution Accepting the Proposal from PS&S for Engineering Design Services & Design Services During Construction for the New Headworks Facility - Plantwide Mechanical Rehabilitation Project

Mr. Albano stated that while looking at the individual bid, there seemed to be a lot of exceptions that PS&S were putting in. He and Mr. Anastasio spoke about them, and they have all been clarified but there were issues, for instance, if there was bedrock more than 5 feet down, but Mr. Anastasio indicated to him that they have come to an agreement that is not outside the scope. He was concerned that the bids were not staying that way. Mr. Carney clarified that technically, they are not "bids", but they are an RFP, Request for Proposal. The difference is because it is a professional service exception, we have the right to negotiate. The whole concept of a bid and the four corners of its receipt, that all goes out the window. Mr. Albano understands the difference but also indicated in the proposals there seemed like there were things that should be in. Mr. Anastasio stated that in fact, we had a meeting with them and they have clarified that those things are in the scope.

Upon a Motion of Mr. Albano, Second of Ms. Borek, the Consent Agenda, with Resolution was approved by the following Roll Call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

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

Minute 10 – Chairman – No Comments

Minute 11 – Reports

A. Executive Director's Report

1. Discussion of Potentially Changing Regulatory Landscape for PFAS & Impacts on the Proposed Administration Building Location – CDM Smith Presentation

Mr. Anastasio stated that as we know, we are preparing to build the Administration Building in a part of the site right off Polhemus Lane and I learned a new fact. The NJ American Water is building a PFAS Treatment Plant for their surface water plant, which is our neighboring plant, the Raritan Millstone Water Treatment Plant. This issue is moving very fast, and I thought that we are really moving on this Administration Building. What if we have to build a PFAS Treatment Facility? I don't envision it, but we would have to end up making drinking water. What if that did happen and it was forced upon us. I felt like we need to press pause and take another look to make sure we won't need that land or what the land would be like for that. I had a discussion with Tom Schoettle, and he has some resources he can offer and that we can do a 50,000-foot analysis of this and get to the point where we can reason whether or not it is safe to build a building there. He put a couple slides together and is going to walk us through the thought process.

Mr. Schoettle prefaced this by stating that they have done hundreds of hours of engineering backup for this. There is still a lot of uncertainty and what will be required for treatment of the effluent for PFAS. You heard a few months ago from Jim Cosgrove about new receiving water standards that may or may not be promulgated by NJDEP. There is probably a long legal road to go down before those standards can come into effect and would affect our effluent. But they are going to start testing for PFAS at drinking plants, that's a certainty. It is good to be prepared. We have the good fortune of having recently done a PFAS treatment system here in NJ for one of our other clients who has a drinking water plant. I'll also preface that what you are going to see is we scaled up what this is going to look like from a drinking water treatment perspective

which ironically, the drinking water standards are probably less stringent that what our standards would be from wastewater. The drinking water plant that Mr. Anastasio referred to, if they would take Raritan River water, treat it to drinking water standards and then discharge that same water back to the Raritan River, they would be in violation of our exceedance permits right now. It doesn't make any sense, which is why I think there would be a lot of litigation. When you see what I am going to present, just take it with an order of magnitude perspective as opposed to this is exactly what this is going to be.

These are some of the things the regulators are going to be looking at. It is a quick summary of what we heard from Jim Cosgrove. This is promulgated by anticipated adoption of the surface water quality standards which is based on a lot of things. Ecological standards, the health and well-being of aquatic organisms in the Raritan River, etc. They are talking about, for the various species of PFAS, five ng/L, these are parts per trillion. We can't even effectively measure a lot of this right now. We are talking about standards. You can see what the proposed receiving water standards are here, they are very small numbers compared to what the drinking water standards are. You have the NJ standards and the Federal standards, which are also somewhat in flux. The new administration is taking a look back at these, which were all put in place by the prior administration and there may be some changes. We are already seeing some regulatory backsliding and some changes in the structure. Just to put some perspective on what we're talking about on both the drinking water side and these tiny little numbers are equivalent to where you see the 14's and 13's for the drinking water side, so a lot more stringent on what the water received. Mr. Anastasio stated that he did some quick math. For PFOA, our standard is about 24,500 times more stringent than what the water plants will have to treat down to.

Mr. Pratt asked, the PFNA and PFOA, do you know if they are specific PFAS chemicals or are they categories? They are categories of chemicals. The reason for the questions is, and I credit the Authority, the Canadian government sent me a list of more than 100 PFAS chemicals and they want to know which of them are in our products. The only reason I even heard of PFAS was because of this Authority.

Mr. Schoettle continued, there is a lot of regulatory uncertainty here and also likely to be some legal objections to any kind of standard that gets promulgated in the near future, so just to be clear on that before we go on.

The decision we want to get to is: is building the Administration Building on this site a smart thing to do in light of some of the uncertainties. That is the question we are trying to answer here. I mentioned the treatment plant we just wrapped up in Plainfield, NJ. This was an old treatment plant on the site, with a finished water storage tank, it's a groundwater treatment system. It is primarily treating volatile organics, the stuff that typically contaminates drinking water and ground water. It is an air stripper so you are blowing air through it, your volatilizing those volatile chemicals, they go up in the air and you're done. They had some PFAS hits, so they were required to meet the NJ drinking water standards. This building was the building that

was added. It represents a 12 MGD PFAS treatment system for drinking water. There are 20 carbon vessels. The building is about 120 x 150 feet and it was about a $46M construction cost project. The reason it was a little more expensive was because we, at one point and because of a variety of things including COVID, had to activate a number of those treatment units to provide temporary treatment as we were constructing the facility. We took delivery early on a lot of those treatment system and set them up outside. What was happening was the groundwater was starting to rise and they had to dispose of it. They were starting to flood people's basements so we had to keep the wells running. A question arose: the carbon vessels, how big is an individual one? It says 20 but just for approximate size and visualization. (Mr. Schoettle showed what they looked like.) There are 20 in a building, and they are 12' diameter. How often do you have to change them out? In one year, they already changed out the entire 20 of them.

Going back a little. This is drinking water. So, the water is relatively clean. What happens is you get the volatile organics out here, not a whole lot left in the organics, this is what we call an absorptive treatment system, so the chemicals get absorbed onto the carbon and the carbon gets saturated. They take the carbon out and put it through a rotary kiln at a very high temperature, it burns off the PFAS and you get the carbon back. Wastewater has a lot of dissolved solids, even your clean wastewater, 30 ml/liter which is going to attach itself to that carbon before any of the PFAS gets to it, it is going to suck up all the organic matter that is in your effluent flow already so you'll have to do some pretreatment before it even gets to the carbon or some other technology. But, for scale-up purposes, we built our example around carbon. There are other technologies which I will talk about, some a little bit more proven. With wastewater effluent, the rule of thumb is anywhere between 2 and 10 times. So if you scale up the 12 MGD to your flow, to create a carbon footprint, it would be anywhere between 2 and 10 times more than it would be for drinking water because all of the other stuff, even though you meet your permit with BOD and CBOD and all the other organics that are floating around in your very clean effluent, that's going to absorb onto the carbon before the PFAS gets there. You are at a significant disadvantage because of that. It will require a lot more. There are other technologies out there but for the purposes of this discussion and the ease of scaling it up, we did this around carbon. Probably if this ever comes down the road, we will consider one of the other technologies before we consider carbon because it is not the go-to remedy but the other remedies are more exotic and more expensive so it might require a small footprint. The key is until there is destructive technology, we talked about the engineered bugs that can eat the PFAS, we're not quite there yet. The person that invents that will never have to work another day, nor will his great-great-grandchildren. That is right now, the "golden grail". There are some concentration technologies and other things we can look at. Just keep this in mind. 120' x 150', 20 vessels and that's drinking water. What you are thinking about is scaled up to your peak flow, 2 to 10 times that.

There are two rows of 10 vessels, they vacuum out the carbon then they blow carbon back into the vessels. It is really big. What is the manpower involved? Normally Calgon will come out to do it. You wouldn't do all 20 at one time. You'd do two and a couple weeks later, you'd do two more depending on how big. I think they already told you there would be one carbon truck a

day, coming in and out (for the plant next door). Would we need additional staff? Yes, because along with this there would be some other type of prefiltration and more treatment that we are doing. We'd be looking at a couple of acres. What would we tell the DEP if we didn't have any more room to grow? We'd have to do an eminent domain. This is treatment technology 101.

I am going to show you an example of what it is going to look like on your site. There are "novel medias" which are kind of like engineered clays that are used because of their high surface area so a lot can stick onto this. A number of companies are making them. We see that more prevalent in the drinking water community. Then there are ion exchange units which are engineered resin. The ultrapure water guys have been using this forever. Basically, you are stealing electrons from these PFAS chemicals and breaking down the chemical bonds. We haven't used a lot of these in wastewater yet, that I'm aware of. Nobody has really had to do this yet or wastewater so there is a lot of testing going on. There are also some physical/destruct treatments. We've been testing foam-fractionation separation technology at the Bayway Refinery for some time. If you are in the wastewater treatment business, you are all familiar with dissolved air flotation. It was a very predominant technology for sludge thickening. It is also used in water treatment where you blow microbubbles, in this case ozone, into your wastewater and it creates an uplift. Instead of settling, which is what the clarifiers do, it floats everything up to the top. It turns out that PFAS is like soap. When you blow air through soap, you get bubbles. You concentrate on that and skim it off and you deal with that but you are never with that foam fractionation. You'll never get down to the limits we're talking about. It's impossible. If you can do this in combination with some kind of electro-oxidation destruction which is a fancy way of saying let's put a lot of energy into it and start ripping the molecular bonds apart, that's where the industry is going. Then you have the biological stuff and then there's the membranes, reverse osmosis, that takes everything out. But it's very expensive, takes a lot of energy and takes a lot of room. The example I gave you is based on carbon; it is the simplest way to proceed and I think the answer would be the same with any of the technologies.

So, the answer to all this is, you don't have enough room on the site. I took the floor plan for your proposed administration building, scaled it down to where it would be and how it would fit on the site. It looks like the right scale. Also shown is what you would need if you were to do a vessel, which I bumped up to 200,000 square feet, so that box is 200,000 square feet. When we did the math on how much carbon you would need, you'd need a pump station because you now have to pump your effluent through the carbon. There are gravity systems. You could put carbon in a gravity filter like we have here but that would require even more space. It doesn't include pretreatment. It would include some pumping so this yellow box represents what you would need which is about 4 acres. In that area currently there are old aeration tanks and the old final clarifiers which you don't use currently. It would be a very messy proposition to try and fit this there. Don't forget you have to get pipes into it, out of it, you have to get trucks in and out as well. Theoretically, you could maybe break this up into two different boxes. The point is, this is not going to buy you much because you're not going to split this up into 2 different boxes. I think it is safe to say, and it is my recommendation to the Board, is proceed with the proposed

administration building because in the future, it is not going to hinder any planning that you would have around this issue until we know more and until we have a better technological solution. This is just not going to work on your site. A question arose, with those carbon vessels being so large and heavy, would you ever design two stories? No, there would be all kinds of maintenance issues. They are heavy so for that building to support that much weight, the vessels are filled with concrete with water in them, it wouldn't work. There is an opportunity to utilize some of the adjacent space, but you would have to take that space. You could, theoretically, put it on top of the adjacent landfill. I don't think I would want to take on the liability of the landfill by taking ownership of it. That would be a mistake. The adjacent land is a superfund site. Next to you, at the rear, is the recycling plant. A discussion ensued about the possibilities of where to put it if we need more land. That's the message here. We scaled it up to provide for some margin of error for purposes of illustrating the rough magnitude of what we're looking at.

A question arose, what if we got more reasonable numbers from the State. These numbers you showed are from the State. The numbers that I showed are the proposed water quality receiving water quality standards that the State is contemplating at this point, to go into the river. It is obvious that the State is more concerned about something other than human beings. They are concerned about the aquatic habitat over there. The bioaccumulation of PFAS in fish and things that people are going to eat because every step up the food chain, you're concentrating the PFAS in the human body. Wouldn't it be easier to force the drinking water companies to clean up to those levels rather than a sewage treatment plant to clean up to those levels? Since they don't have the BOD that we have. That is correct. They have their drinking water standards and they are going to comply. That's the reason they are building this plant over in Raritan Millstone and the reason Middlesex Water Company built that plant in Plainfield, because they have a responsibility. They are not responsible for cleaning up the river. There is PFAS in rainfall, so it probably exceeds those discharge standards. It is mostly coming from the consumer products and the rain. Do we know what the PFAS levels are in the Raritan? All we know is that it has been declared an impure waterway with respect to PFAS. We're not sure the State has done a study on it.

The purpose of this discussion was to reinforce the fact that by building the proposed Administration Building, and relocating the Headworks Building, that we are making the right decision to proceed with the things that are in front of us right now, such as the Phase I Plant Upgrade, and the Administration Building and all the other things that are going on now. We can worry about PFAS down the road because it is a bigger problem than what we solve by eliminating scope from those projects. So, I recommend going ahead and build the proposed Administration Building where proposed because it is an awkward space and perfect for an administration building. It is as far away from the stinky part of the plant as you can get, it is the front door to the plant and close for the customers. It is not good for any sort of treatment processes but the location of the building we have designed can fit in this wedge-shaped area.

Mr. Anastasio indicated that we are just looking for an affirmation from the Board and they understand what we know about the situation and we're not shooting ourselves in the foot by building the Admin Building there. If everyone agrees, we'll go ahead with the Admin Building, as planned.

A question was raised, is our concern mainly with the logistics of it or the future expenses of building this and then possibly having to build that? Or is it not going through the expense of building the Admin Building because we may need to build this? Mr. Anastasio stated that if we have to build this, it is probably going to cost about $200M. The Admin Building is just a blip on the radar screen. It is more the space constraints. This is a small site and an old plant and it's broken up. We had always talked about some of the land on the hill, depending on what we're allowed to do with sludge management in the future, whether the State or Federal government will outlaw combustion so that would kill the incinerator. Hearing that no matter what we do, we don't have enough land. We'd have to find an offsite solution anyway. We're not hurting ourselves by building the Admin Building. Thirty years ago, the Board talked about building a new Admin Building because space was tight, they even had plans all drawn up. Through Tom's analysis, we're not hurting ourselves by building it there. If the Board agrees with that, we'll get an affirmation on the minutes that the Board agrees and continue with this project. Everyone agreed.

On another matter, Mr. Machala wanted the Board to see that on the table are two Wave Awards that the Authority received at the AEA convention. Congratulations to Ron and the staff for all their hard work going towards earning this. Mr. Anastasio stated that the AEA has several categories of Wave Awards. There are individual awards and then there are also awards for Authorities for best management practices, forward thinking, etc. I nominated the Board and Staff for a Best Management Practice Award for the Storm Control Pump Station Relocation/Flood Mitigation Project. The AEA chose to give us one. Then to my surprise, one of our participants nominated us for a Mutual Aid Award that we were happy to hear about. We ended up getting two of these awards at the conference in Atlantic City. We do a lot of good things here and probably don't get enough recognition for it and I thought it was a good idea to put us in for the pump station and we greatly appreciate the thoughts for the Mutual Aid Award. Mr. Carney stated that these are not easy to get, they are not just handed out. This is serious congratulations to the Authority.

Mr. Anastasio commented that the pump station is the best management practice type of project. We came up with a novel solution with the pumps being almost 1,000 feet away from the electrical connection and the controls for those. It was an interesting solution to a tough problem. When I wrote up the narrative that we had to rebuild the pump station three times, that pushed us over the edge.

2. Update on Plantwide Mechanical Rehabilitation Project

Mr. Anastasio stated that progress is continuing. We're reviewing 30% design of several aspects of the project. There are a lot of details to this project. We have already talked about the Headworks Building and now we're going to get that piece moving. That has to be designed and integrated into what we're going to be doing. In addition, all the other things CDM Smith is dealing with regarding this project, including 30% design of the sludge storage facility, the odor control system, the dewatered sludge building and the multi-media filters. There is a lot going on right now and we are deep in the design.

3. Update on Main Interceptor & Forcemain Rehabilitation Project

Mr. Anastasio indicated that with regard to Duke Farms, we're getting to the point where we really need to work this out with Duke Farms. Building the new sewer line out into their farm fields rather than along the river, through the grove of historic sycamore trees, they want a narrative from us, which they could have told us 6 months ago. We are preparing that for them with the anticipation of getting to meet with them. The whole goal is to get our counsel, Mr. Carney, to meet with their counsel to work out the terms of what the easement would be. Then jointly approach the federal government NRCS and the Department of Agriculture. Duke Farms is in favor of it but dealing with the Dept. of Agriculture is not going to be quick or easy. We've been talking to them for a year and half, knowing that this would be a long lead item, but we have yet to get Mr. Carney together with their counsel. Hopefully we're getting closer. I think they've hired a special counsel to deal with this. We hope we can have a meeting scheduled for next month. Mr. Carney stated that there is also an easement with PSE&G they had asked us to start working on. We really want to see if the other one is going to go first, before we put all the work into PSE&G. I'm not worried about PSE&G. We've done that before.

The pipeline design is done to some extent. We're now getting into the review of the geotech reports and starting to work on some of that. We need to nail down this pipeline thing because that affects some of the wetlands permitting work. A commissioner asked if we are going to have to do some archeological studies along the new route in Duke Farms? Potentially. It was previously disturbed, at least 10' off the pipeline. I believe we won't have to do it along most of the alignment where we're ripping up the old pipe and putting in a new one. Our past work has proven that the archeology in the flood plain is of limited value because of the turbulence over the years. It puts it out of context, all their artifacts being shallower in the soil above newer artifacts. We'll have to let that play out but we're not going to look at it yet until we nail down the easement. We really have an interest in working this out with Duke Farms because of the number of trees that we would have to plant to compensate for the trees we would take along the river. They would have to be planted in a similar fashion, in a similar type of area. Possibly

several thousand trees. Just for the storm control treatment facility, we were looking at 2,000 trees, and this is a larger area. We're striving to remain patient.

Mr. Murphy asked how far along in the Duke property does it go, from the Nevius Bridge, east to west? Mr. Anastasio indicated that from the Nevius Bridge, what we call the new line, would be a couple hundred feet in. The old one is right along the riverbank. They are currently doing some work right along the river. Everything they do is with a conservation in mind. I was wondering if that has anything to do with us. They tore out all non-native trees or plants, that whole wetland area and are now planting new ones. They have fenced it off, maybe to keep the deer out. All the trees are brand new. They are doing a lot of work in there and if we're going to get in there, we need to get in there quickly. They took bids for the replacement of the trunk sewer that crossed just upstream in the dam and the bids came in extremely high. So, they may be backing off to see the best way to proceed.

4. Update on the Storm Control Pumping Station Flood Mitigation Project

Mr. Anastasio indicated that we are in the early stages of this. We are working out the schedule of values for the project and the project schedule. Sherwin has looked at some submittals for the fire alarm system for the pump station. We obtained a zoning permit from Bridgewater Township for the project and now the contractor has submitted for building permits. They are working on getting their submittals together for the pump control and enclosures and switch gears.

B. Engineer/Consultants – Thomas Schoettle, P.E. (CDM Smith) Engineer's Report for February 2025

Mr. Schoettle indicated he had nothing more to add unless anyone had any questions.

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.

Mr. Albano wanted to make everyone aware that our Assistant Chief Plant Operator, Tim Wojcicki, passed his S3 Wastewater Treatment Plant licensed operator test last week. That is a huge accomplishment. Also, we passed our DEP inspection. Both are significant accomplishments.

Minute 13 - Res. No. 25-0324-3 – Payroll

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

Roll Call Vote:

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

Minute 14 - Res. No. 25-0324-4 – Cancellation of Checks

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

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

Minute 15- Res. No. 25-0324-5 – Bills

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

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

Linda Hering commented that she got an email this afternoon regarding the Financial Disclosure Statements. She will be sending an email about it in the next couple of weeks and they are due by April 30th.

Minute 16 – Adjournment of Meeting

Upon a Motion of Mr. Machala, Second of Mr. Pratt, the Meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

All in Favor Voice Vote:

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

NEXT BOARD MEETING WILL BE HELD ON APRIL 28, 2025