

RARITAN TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL UTILITIES AUTHORITY
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

MARCH 20, 2018

365 Old York Road, Flemington, New Jersey
(908) 782-7453 Office (908) 782-7466 Fax

1. **MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 5:00 PM**

The meeting of the Raritan Township Municipal Utilities Authority (RTMUA) was called to order stating that the meeting had been advertised in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act setting forth the time with the RTMUA office as the place of said meeting. It was further stated that a copy of the Agenda was posted on the RTMUA office bulletin board.

2. **ATTENDANCE ROLL CALL:**

Mr. Grand	Here
Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	Here
Mrs. Robitzski	Here

Also present were Greg LaFerla, RTMUA Chief Operator / Director; Regina Nicaretta, RTMUA Executive Secretary; Dan Madden, PE, Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson; C. Gregory Watts, Esquire, Watts, Tice & Skowronek.

3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

4. **APPLICATIONS:**

- a) Application for Sanitary Sewer Service Class II – A, Flemington – Raritan First Aid and Rescue Squad (Block 36.02 Lot 19)

Resolution #2018 - 30 Approval for Contract Modification Commerce Street
Sewer Repair

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Mr. Madden, if you could go over this and speak on the TV inspection that was done by our forces and I guess they observed significant inflow coming through various laterals along that line.

Mr. Madden – The crew came in, put the liner in and they cured it and they cut the laterals out to re-establish service, I think there was a total of five or six. They followed up with a subsequent TV inspection a couple of days or a week later and some of the laterals had leakage coming in around them. There is nothing there to prevent that from leaking from that portion of the line; you cut the lateral and have an opening in the tube now so if there's infiltration it's going to come through that point.

Mrs. Robitzski – I don't understand; where is it coming from?

Mr. Madden – The lateral is connecting to the pipe like this; we're lining this pipe here and we have to drill a hole in the liner so the lateral can come through. What's happening is the water is coming around the hole that's drilled.

Mrs. Robitzski – That's not sealed?

Mr. Madden – That can't be perfectly sealed; not without there being a second operation for a lateral liner. We didn't want to get into that because there's one on the market that works really well but they have the corner on the market and it's very expensive to do it with that.

Mr. Grand – Is the inflow significant?

Mr. Madden – I have to look at it better. I don't think it's as bad as it was; we had leaks at the joints that were far worse but the groundwater has been high and it looks like it could be shooting out from the bit I saw.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I have a couple of questions associated with this. That pipe was in bad condition, we had a couple of methods of going through with it; digging up the whole pipe, replacing the pipe and that would have obviously been a significant amount more. The goal was in this project, and this is my impression; the goal would be to address the structural integrity problem of the pipe and also to address any kind of infiltration that was getting through the pipe. When the contractor did the work, you had inspectors out there, and we TV inspected it and found out, Mr. LaFerla, what you're saying is it appears to be significant leakage coming through the laterals. I don't know what that is or what it looked like but obviously as part of the work that was being done out there, you guys reviewed the work afterwards to make sure that at least in accordance with the Contract, the way it was bid, that the work was done in accordance with the Contract?

Mr. Madden – Yes, they did what we expected them to do.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – With that being said, we have the issue around the laterals. I don't know if there are six or ten or how many of them, we do have high water now. Is this common for this type of thing?

Mr. Madden – Yes.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Question one is, did the contractor do the work in accordance with the plans and specifications that we put out to bid?

Mr. Madden – Yes.

Mr. Grand – So the outcome was not totally unanticipated?

Mr. Madden – It does sometimes happen, one of the big criteria's, we didn't want the pipe to collapse, it was in rough shape and we wanted to make sure we restored its structural integrity before further damage happened. That was the driving force behind it. Now picking up capacity, from the benefit of eliminating some of the leaking joints was also a plus but some of it is going to migrate to a different spot now. It may have been coming in all of the time. Before lining, there were definite leaks at the joints, but now the joints in the pipe itself are not leaking. This is a new thing that was created because we have to cut a hole in the lateral or they can't have service. There's always going to be a gap where water can seep through unless we grout the lateral or something else.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – That wasn't part of the scope of this Contract. The contractor did the work in the accordance with what he was supposed to do. If you can talk about the Change Order now.

Mr. Madden – Originally it was leaking at the joints so we needed to grout them. We were going to use what is called a pre – liner but the leaks were excessive enough that they would have trouble curing the pipe properly. Grouting the joints helped that, so, there was a little bit of a change there. The rest of it is just an adjustment of unit items. We had an overrun on the police for the control of traffic; they guess at how many hours it is going to take to do the project and how much they'll need the police, sometimes they require one policeman in one car sometimes they require two; this required two.

Mrs. Robitzski – The additional five thousand dollars, is that over what the bid was?

Mr. Madden – Yes, the net increase was from the final adjustment of quantities, some were high and some were low. The final Contract value was \$60,856.40 and it was originally \$54,100.00. You previously approved the grouting which was in the amount of \$3,206.00.

Mr. Grand made a motion to approve Resolution #2018 - 30, Mrs. Robitzski seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:	Mr. Grand	-	Yes
	Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	-	Yes
	Mrs. Robitzski	-	Yes

Resolution #2018 - 31 Amendment of Resolution #2017 – 16 for Appointment of Auditor and Awarding of Contract
(Contract not to Exceed \$49,000.00)

Mrs. Robitzski made a motion to approve Resolution #2018 - 31, Mr. Grand seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:	Mr. Grand	-	Yes
	Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	-	Yes
	Mrs. Robitzski	-	Yes

6. **Approval of Minutes:** Minutes of February 15, 2018

Mr. Grand made a motion to approve the minutes from the February 15, 2018 meeting. Mrs. Robitzski seconded the motion. All were in favor.

7. **Adjourn into Closed Session by Motion, if Needed**

Chair Kendzulak, Jr. – We will be going into Closed Session for purposes of discussing potential litigation matters with NJDEP regarding the ACO / FWWF Permit and a Contractual Matter with HCRHS and we don't anticipate taking any formal action at the conclusion of Closed Session.

Mrs. Robitzski made a motion to adjourn into Closed Session for the above stated purpose and Mr. Grand seconded the motion. Closed Session was from 5:21 pm – 6:21 pm.

8. Treasurer's Report / Payment of Bills:

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. - I can do the Treasurer's Report. The bills totaled \$767,332.68; all appears to be in order. It is a very high number but there is an explanation for that. We had to pay the Pension payment and it was \$252,766.13 so that is why this is inflated but this should be the only payment we make for this, this year, for the Pension.

Mrs. Robitzski – There also looked like there was a lot of overtime and something about the FWWF.

Mr. LaFerla – FWWF was online a lot during the past three weeks because of all of the rain. The diesel and the gasoline are high because we had power outages and generators had to run for a number of days; and that's also why the overtime is over what it normally is.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Some of the things like the pension and insurance, that we pay, those are paid upfront so those numbers get closer to the 100% earlier on in the year. The FWWF, I saw there were four discharges this month and typically, I think in the last few years we've only had four or six a year.

Mr. LaFerla – Not only did we have the four discharges; but there were a few days where it was filling but never discharged and we have guys there then too.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – If you go to the last light green page, we're at 33.63% versus 33.09% of where we were on the budget last year. We're a little bit above but again, these are pre – audit numbers so that should go down a bit and we're about three and a half months through the year which would be about 29 – 30% so we're okay. Personally, I'm okay with where we are in the budget. The one thing I'd like to do is hold the payment to JMT, I'd like to take a closer look at that and I'd like to carry that to the next meeting.

Mr. Grand made a motion to approve the payment of bills. Mrs. Robitzski seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:	Mr. Grand	-	Yes
	Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	-	Yes
	Mrs. Robitzski	-	Yes

9. Citizens' Privilege:

None

10. **Adjournment of Regular Meeting:**

Mrs. Robitzski made a motion to adjourn the Regular Meeting. Mr. Grand seconded the motion. All were in favor.

RARITAN TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL UTILITIES AUTHORITY
WORK SESSION MINUTES

MARCH 20, 2018

365 Old York Road, Flemington, New Jersey
(908) 782-7453 Office (908) 782-7466 Fax

1. **The Work Session** of the Raritan Township Municipal Utilities Authority will be called to order upon the adjournment of the Regular Meeting.

2. **Correspondence:**

a) William Lane, PE of Menlo Engineering to Regina Nicaretta of RTMUA regarding NJDEP Wal-Mart Sanitary Sewer Flow Criteria

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Mr. Madden, can you discuss this please?

Mr. Madden – There has been contention about big box stores and their flow because their criteria is very general and with DEP it's 0.1 gallons per square foot for just about everything. Some of these box stores like Home Depot and things like that have done their own studies independently and have come up with a number and apparently Wal-Mart got this number approved by DEP as the average flow per square foot which is about half of what you would normally see. So, they are looking for that credit on the Wal-Mart part.

Mr. Watts – If it's approved by DEP, we go by DEP guidelines so if it's a DEP guideline then the Board should seriously consider adopting it.

Mr. Madden – To get this approved, they would have to prove to the DEP that the flows in their stores per square foot are a certain level.

Mr. LaFerla – We did this for something like Home Depot or Lowes.

Mr. Madden – Home Depot has done studies like this also.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – This is an acceptable design flow from DEP and being it is an acceptable design flow from DEP we should use it.

Mr. Madden – This will just apply to Wal – Mart; this flow criteria is specific to Wal – Mart.

b) Kenneth Diehl, Licensed Operator of Flemington Borough to Douglas Speeney of NJDEP regarding Overflowing Sanitary Sewer Manhole

Mr. LaFerla – This is just an FYI.

3. **Unfinished Business:**

None

4. **New Business:**

None

5. **Professional Reports:**

a) Attorney –

Mr. Watts – I raise the issue about the Flemington Debt Service. If you recall, back at the end of January, I did a number of calculations to see if we backed out projects that were funded by the bonds that did not benefit Flemington, were Flemington's calculations correct and they didn't need to pay us as much as we thought they needed to pay us. I did an analysis and sent it to Mr. LaFerla and we did the same thing for the second bond issue, for SCADA and they were both sent to the auditor. The answer from the auditor was "whatever you agree upon with Flemington is acceptable" which is not what we asked him. I asked him to approve or disapprove the way I did the calculations so we know what the correct amount is; I want to know what the correct amount is to bill them and that can be calculated.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – This is my understanding on what's going on; we redid the Agreement with Flemington in 2013 and these two bond issues were pre – that Agreement and Flemington had been paying based on the old Agreement and that's how they think they should be paying until those bonds are retired. In 2013, we redid the Agreement with Flemington and there was language in there that said...

Mr. Watts -The new service Agreement superseded all prior Agreements.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Flemington is contesting and saying "we feel we should be paying based on the old service Agreement" and we're saying "no, now that the new service Agreement went in, you have a greater share in this". That's the difference between the two positions.

Mr. Watts – The issue is, are we invoicing them for some projects that they should not be invoiced for. That's what I wanted the auditor to look at my analysis and say "no, you're wrong or yes, you're right" because that may show us that we're not that far apart. I just said "I think these projects should be backed out, so they should be paying debt service on a particular amount. What is that? What should they be paying?" The same

for SCADA, but he didn't answer it the question. The Agreement is very detailed. Now we're saying that we have a new service Agreement that says "you have to pay twenty – eight percent". There was a different understanding before, it was a lower percent. Again, we may have been billing them at the lower percent for projects that they shouldn't be paying for. If we back out projects that don't belong in, and bill them at the twenty – eight percent, we might be at the same point. I need him to tell me if the analysis is correct.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – We'll look to get that from you?

Mr. Watts – Yes, I'm sorry I don't have that for you right now.

b) Engineer –

Mr. Madden – We're continuing to monitor the flows and look for I & I in the system. We're meeting kind of regularly with Mr. LaFerla and the operations guys to go over what's being seen, where do they go, what do they see, and they're coming up with some things; we're just kind of amassing the data right now. As far as the flow metering; I'm almost done finalizing that report, I'll have it in a couple of days. What we're finding and what we're suggesting as the next step is to do smoke testing in the Flemington Fields section and the line next to Commerce Street. There's two reasons; Flemington Fields is showing to be the place with the lowest hanging fruit. It may be just the sump pumps, we don't know for sure, there might be other things in there that are causing it but we do an analysis on the extraneous flow per inch of pipe per mile so you break it down to that point and that's coming up with the highest number.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – You'll have something for us at the next meeting?

Mr. Madden – We can do the smoke testing partially in house.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Whatever is the most cost-effective way to do it and let's do it sooner than later.

Mr. Madden – We need drier weather to do that though. We discussed the Route 31 Project, the Commerce Street Project and the manhole inspections.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – The manhole inspections, did you find anything, you guys went out two times, did you find anything?

Mr. Madden – We found a few minor things but nothing of great value; we didn't find one great big one. We looked at Pump Station #2, it was reported it had significant infiltration there. We went over there yesterday and there was a decent size leak in there. We'd have to get a proposal to fix that.

Mr. LaFerla – What happened was we had to pull one of the pumps to rebuild it and when we pumped down the wet well to pull the pump we notice a lot of infiltration coming in. We told Mr. Madden about it and they were going to walk lines yesterday anyway so they looked at that too.

Mr. Madden – I'll investigate the different ways to address it and I'll present them at the next meeting. The developers; the Islamic Center finally got under the road. Creekside is continuing; they've asked us to meet with them for an issue they have with the location of their gravity sewer on Case Boulevard because of an existing high-pressure gas line. They want to push it off road a little bit; we'd have to see how we can do that.

6. RTMUA REPORTS:

a) ADMINISTRATIVE / OPERATIONS REPORT

1. Chief Operator / Director's Report
 - a) Overtime Recap
 - b) Septage / Greywater Recap
2. Laboratory Summary
3. Maintenance Summary
4. Readington Flows

b) COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

7. Discussion:

a) Sludge Tank Repair Prices

Mr. Madden – We inspected the sludge holding tanks and there are some holes that need to be repaired or is it time to replace the tank; I'm giving you various options of things to do. To replace, I think you should wait to see if there's potential to expand the plant.

Mr. LaFerla – We can't wait too long because like I said ACUA is closing down, they close twice a year and we will still only have the one sludge holding tank. There's other ways to get rid of our sludge but it's going to explode the sludge line. It's not something that we can wait on to get fixed.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I don't want to take something that we don't know, ultimately, I'm talking about the long-term solution. I guess the question is does it make sense to do a band-aid for the time being and get

that taken care of to buy us some time. We don't have a Wastewater Management Plan, we have no idea what we're going to be doing and I don't want to do something we don't need to.

Mr. LaFerla – My question is, if we just replace those panels, is it structurally safe to use?

Mr. Madden – There's two that are on the bottom.

Mr. LaFerla – The upper ones I'm not worried about.

Mr. Madden – It's basically a bolted panel and they would put it back together and it would be fine.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – We're looking at the \$10,000.00 - \$14,000.00? How do we go through and get a contractor to do this?

Mr. Madden – It's a specialty item, it's not like everybody has the pieces.

Mr. Watts – If it's between \$10,000.00 and \$14,000.00, we can simply accept proposals or quotes if it's under the \$17,500.00 and you pick the lowest one or cost and other factors considered.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Can we move on this and get it taken care of?

Mr. LaFerla – As long as it's structurally safe, that's all I'm concerned about. I do have a question; it's \$14,000.00 for the panels, does that include putting them in or is it just for the panels?

Mr. Madden – It's for all of it but I'll verify that.

Mr. Watts – If the proposals come in over \$17,500.00, you'll have to go out to bid.

- b) Board of Commissioner's Authorization for Mr. LaFerla, Mr. Sciss and Ms. Loudon to Attend 2018 NJWEA Annual Conference & Exposition in Atlantic City may 7 – 11, 2018

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – As long as the money is in the budget, I'm okay with it; I don't know about everyone else.

General Consensus

8. **Adjourn into Closed Session by Motion, if Needed**

9. **Adjournment of Work Session:**

Mr. Grand made a motion to adjourn the Work Session. Mrs. Robitzski seconded the motion. All were in favor. The Meeting ended at 6:52 pm.