

APPROVED

RARITAN TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL UTILITIES AUTHORITY
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 15, 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. Hazard	Here
Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	Here
Mrs. Robitzski	Here
Mr. Tully	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:**

None

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I'm going to juggle the agenda a little bit; I'll move right to Citizen's Privilege. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak?

Mr. Dilts – I submitted a letter back in July; I represent Jack Cust. We received approval for a project called The Enclave at Raritan; it's an apartment building adjacent to HealthQuest, which would go on the existing baseball field where the dome used to exist. We received preliminary site plan approval; one of the conditions being the approval of this Board for 41,475 gallons per day of sewer capacity; that's a 138.25 EDUs. We know that the Township itself is in need of affordable housing and in this particular project we offered up more than the prescribed fifteen percent; we gave them twenty percent of the units and we'd like to see if there's anything we can do to get the ball rolling. I did bring a footprint of the plans if you'd like to see them. The real need is that we need the sewer capacity.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – If capacity wasn't an issue, what's your time line?

Mr. Dilts – We're almost ready to begin construction. That's Keith Dilgard, he's affiliated with the project and beside him is Seth Buchanan from Dynamic Engineering.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I'm not looking for a huge presentation but maybe if you have some renderings we can see for all the members of the Board?

Mr. Dilts – I yanked out the one page that is the footprint. The lower side here is Bartles Corner Road and you can enter here by the VHSS Building, you go by what is now the baseball field and you get to HealthQuest. The access roads remain the same. This particular building in grey is the design. What it has, which is kind of unique, every apartment is around the exterior and inside is a wrapped parking garage and you go up to the floor you are living on. There are four floors. HealthQuest is on the left and there's a bridge connecting the two and one of the amenities is to be a member of HealthQuest and never leave your building to get there.

Mr. Hazard – How many units are in there?

Mr. Dilts – Two hundred units. So, forty COAH units will be dedicated. The layout is two hundred ninety-four garage spaces, six accessible spaces, that will be handicapped. There will be fifty – five one bedroom, eight of which will be the low to moderate affordables. There will be one hundred and fourteen two-bedroom units, twenty percent of those would be low to moderate, so twenty-four two-bedroom. A requirement for the affordable housing units that you have to have, three bedrooms, which we would not have had in this building except for the fact you have to have a portion of them for low to moderate, so there will be eight of those.

Mr. Madden – Where would the connection to the sewer be?

Mr. Dilts – We were working with the prior engineer and it would be up to the pump station. There were some issues downstream from the pump station

which we were trying to resolve. We also had an alternative plan to run up Bartles Corner Road and connect up towards Good News Home for Women; there's a line that terminates up there.

Mr. Tully – Run a parallel pipe essentially.

Mr. Dilts – I don't know if we decided or you all decided which way was the best course or the most economical.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – That'll all have to play out in the whole mix but the first thing is to get capacity so you can move forward. My understanding was the Bartles Corner Road was the option that we would be going with based on my recollection. So, this is where we are; obviously, capacity is an issue at the RTMUA. We are looking very closely at it, and we think we may be able to come to some type of conclusion on how do we treat the COAH properties within the Township with the demand that there is with that. Possibly, have it figured out by our meeting next month or the month after. There are some options that we do have that we have to take a closer look at; our engineer is going to take a look at that over the next month and if it's not next month, by the following month.

Mr. Dilts – Thank you for your time.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Before we get too involved here, Mr. Cragin, our Auditor is here to talk about the Budget; there are a couple of scenarios that have been developed with regards to it. I'd like to talk about the appropriations end of this thing and I'll be straight up with you, I'm looking at a number of about \$650,000.00 increase from last year. Again, this is a draft that we have; I haven't completed my assessment of this but I'm wondering if we're overbudgeting for certain things. On the other end, the revenue end of the budget, where do we stand with regards to that?

Mr. Cragin – I'll talk a little bit about the process first. Management comes up with what they feel they need on the expenditure side. Your management has a lot of expertise to say "okay, we think this is going to go up here", I guide them on any expenditures that I'm aware of with State pension costs, health insurance and stuff like that. Primarily, the expenditure side comes from management and then I come in and look at the revenues historically, where I think they're going to be, and what I think you guys need to generate in order to support those expenditures. As far as the expenditures being up \$650,000.00; \$180,000.00 of that is additional, anticipated debt service for the NJEIT clarifier project. Right now, you're project to close on that in May 2019; your first payment could be November 2019, at the very end of that budget. Additionally, there's \$337,000.00 of other Capital projects; the Flemington Tank Rehab, and the appropriation for the new truck. What I will say is, the \$300,000.00, is a split project for the FWWF and Flemington Borough would be responsible for eighty percent of that cost. If you take a look at the Scenario pages, and Scenario One and Scenario Two keep the expenditures the same, it just talks about the revenue; up top you'll see other

reserves and Capital Projects, the number is \$337,000.00, down below under "Intergovernmental Revenues – Flemington Share of Current Year Capital Outlay", the \$240,000.00 is realized as a revenue because you can't directly offset that since we have to bill Flemington for that so the net effect is \$60,000.00 on there but it pushes up your expenditures by \$300,000.00, the net effect is only \$60,000.00. Those are the two main things that make it look like that appropriations have been pushed up significantly but if you take that \$300,000.00 out and the \$180,000.00 for the debt service out, that's already \$480,000.00 of it. That addresses why appropriations looks like it's up \$600,000.00 but the clarifier project has already been discussed and you are working through on that and then the Flemington Project obviously, you wouldn't be paying the entire amount of that. Scenario One and Scenario Two, are similar on the expenditure side, there is no difference, the only difference is how we approach budgeting our revenues and how we approach what the projected increase would be for this year. I gave you the option between Scenario One and Scenario Two. I'm going to draw your attention to the bottom where it talks about the percentage increase. On Scenario One, the percentage increase is 1.81% which breaks down to about \$1.00 per month. If you look at where we are going with projected 2020 and 2021, it leaves a bigger increase like 4.3% in 2020 and 3.5% in 2021. That's just based on where we think the debt service will go on the clarifier project, expenditures going up, year after year. Scenario Two, includes an increase of about \$1.50 per month. All it does is evens out the projected increase over the next couple of years. I think Scenario Two may be the better option because it levels out the debt for the clarifier project in 2020. You never know what is going to happen with your infrastructure; something could break, and you may need a bigger than projected increase. If you try and level it out now, hopefully if that happens, we won't be talking about a seven or eight percent increase like we had a couple of years ago. If you start where you already think you're going to need for and something major breaks or unanticipated expenses come up, it levels out the hit.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – As far as assumptions with other revenues, i.e. Connection Fees and other stuff; that was one of the other things that got us in trouble a few years back where we had these big estimates that we were going to bring in all this money in Connection Fees and it never materialized.

Mr. Cragin – I usually like to stay low on the Connection Fees because they are revenues that are out of your control. You can't control when those people are going to connect and when you're going to realize those revenues. I looked over the last couple of years and increased it this year to \$75,000.00; historically you've been \$100,000.00 over the last couple of years. While I like to leave those numbers relatively low, I think \$75,000.00 is a realistic number.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I feel that \$75,000.00 is a good number.

Mr. Cragin – Scenario One is a little more aggressive with the revenue estimates.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – How much of our surplus are we getting into?

Mr. Cragin – There's no surplus budgeted currently.

Mr. Hazard – What's the current surplus?

Mr. Cragin – It depends on how you look at it. You're still in a deficit because of the GASB 68 and this upcoming year we'll be adding GASB 75 and that's going to be another liability we'll have to include and it's going to push it further into a deficit.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – There's something here that we're subject to but the Township is not.

Mr. Cragin – Those are real estimated costs. The Townships doesn't record them on their books but does note it in their financial statements. GASB 68 is pension and GASB 75 is the health insurance, paying for retiree's health benefits.

Mr. Hazard – We have to record those liabilities with GASB 75 starting this year.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – So, they are starting with the Township too this year.

Mr. Cragin – Disclose them or record them?

Mr. Hazard – They have to be disclosed; part of our budget will show those liabilities.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – When do we have to introduce the budget?

Mr. Cragin – Introduction of the budget should be at the September meeting. That's why we're here in August to discuss where you'd like to see the budget go and what we need to do from here. I think a couple of years ago we were a little bit behind and we ended up introducing it in October so we get in here in August to discuss where you would like to see the budget go.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – So, it's not the end of the world if we end up introducing it in October.

Mr. Cragin – The State has made comments when it's been introduced then, you'd need to lay out the reasons why.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – We should be looking to get it taken care of in September.

Mr. Cragin – Yes.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – If for some reason it has to get pushed it can.

Mr. Cragin – I would recommend trying to comply with the State statutes. I think we've moved it on the fly too; if there's some small issue where you still want to make an adjustment, you can still introduce it at the September meeting, I make the adjustment and we send it to the State.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Any questions?

Mrs. Robitzski – There are some places where the proposed budget is significantly higher than the estimated projected year end for 2018; what is that based on? Like the sludge.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I had that highlighted too. If we're projected the sludge through the end of this year's budget, we're at \$555,000.00 but we're budgeting \$640,000.00; that's a substantial difference and the question is why?

Mr. LaFerla – The percentage increase for 2019. ACUA has a five percent increase this year.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – The other thing is the electric. We're projecting \$281,000.00 but we're budgeting \$355,000.00. Is there an unknown?

Mr. Tully – If you look at the actual for 2017, it was \$352,000.00, so it's only going up \$3,000.00. So, it's not that much more.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – As far as the next budget meeting, when is it?

Mr. LaFerla – We don't have one planned.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – We can look to get one planned, to go over it further; I can pass on my comments. If I'm available I'd be glad to go but we can obviously only have two commissioners.

Mr. Hazard – I'll set one up right after Labor Day. If you have questions or comments send them in.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – When it comes to infrastructure and issues that are going on; we're pretty aggressively, over the past year, looking at I & I issues.

Mr. Tully – That's why we bumped up the emergency line quite a bit.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Now we're looking and we hope we find something and if we find something, we're going to need to address it and chances are these things may not be cheap.

Mr. Cragin – As far as Scenario One with a lower increase this year and a higher one later or Scenario Two where it's more level, is there any preference? You would be okay with a little bit higher this year and then flatten the increase out?

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – If there's some kind of steady thing. As far as Mrs. Robitzski said, I think we need to give an explanation on why is the rate going up. The ratepayers are due an explanation of why the rates are going up.

Mr. Cragin – We're working on the clarifier project.

Mrs. Robitzski – Growth in the Township, we need to provide capacity, an aging system that needs constant maintenance.

Mr. Cragin – I will try to bring a budget that you will want to introduce at the September meeting.

Mr. Hazard - I'll send an email out tonight and we'll look at doing a budget meeting on September 5th. It might not be a bad idea to have Mr. Cragin at the meeting.

Mr. Cragin – Just include me on the email.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Just to move things along, Mr. Hutchins has been waiting here patiently. I'd like to go into Closed Session to discuss Contractual Matters between Raritan Township and Raritan Township Municipal Utilities Authority - Raritan Township Shared Services; we do not anticipate any official action will need to be taken once we come out of Closed Session.

Mr. Tully made a motion to adjourn into Closed Session for the above stated purpose and Mr. Hazard seconded the motion. Closed Session was from 5:36 pm – 6:22 pm.

5. RESOLUTIONS:

Resolution #2018 - 60 Amendment to Section 62.0 – Business Travel of the Raritan Township Municipal Utilities Authority Personnel Policy Manual

Mr. Grand made a motion to approve Resolution #2018 - 60, Mr. Tully seconded the motion.

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

Resolution #2018 – 61 Approval of and Authorization to Sign Wastewater Treatment Capacity Agreement Raritan Township for the Provision of Affordable Housing

Mrs. Robitzski made motion to approve Resolution #2018 – 61, Mr. Grand seconded the motion.

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

6. **Approval of Minutes:** Minutes of May 17, 2018
Minutes of July 19, 2018

Mr. Grand made a motion to approve the minutes from the May 17, 2018 meeting. Mr. Hazard seconded the motion. All were in favor. Mrs. Robitzski and Mr. Tully abstained.

Mr. Tully made a motion to approve the minutes from the July 19, 2018 meeting. Mrs. Robitzski seconded the motion. All were in favor. Mr. Grand and Mr. Hazard abstained.

7. **Treasurer's Report / Payment of Bills:**

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Mr. Grand, do you want me to handle this? The bills totaled \$474,562.07 and all appears to be in order. If you go to the last orange page, you'll see that we're at 69.74% of our budget so far this year. If you look at it, we're a little conservative here; we completed eight months of our fiscal year as of July 31st, that's about 67%. If you look down below, you'll see where we were at this time last year, we were at 72% of our budget so we're okay.

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

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

8. **Citizens' Privilege:**

Previously addressed.

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

Previously addressed.

10. **Adjournment of Regular Meeting:**

Mr. Tully made a motion to adjourn the Regular Meeting. Mr. Hazard seconded the motion. All were in favor.

RARITAN TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL UTILITIES AUTHORITY
WORK SESSION MINUTES

AUGUST 15, 2018

365 Old York Road, Flemington, New Jersey

(908) 782-7453 Office

(908) 782-7466 Fax

APPROVED

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) George Dilts, Esq. of Dilts & Koester to Gregory LaFerla, Chief Operator / Director of RTMUA regarding Enclave (Block 9 Lot 17.02)

Previously Discussed

b) Michael Mangin, Mayor of Raritan Township to Gregory LaFerla, Chief Operator / Director of RTMUA regarding Sewage Capacity for Affordable Housing Developments and other Proposed Projects

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – This had to do with the I & I. The Capacity Sub – Committee did meet earlier today to talk about this particular subject.

c) Dan Madden, PE of JMT to Gregory LaFerla, Chief Operator / Director of RTMUA regarding Contractor's Application for Payment (Rt. 31 Interceptor Sewer Relocation)

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Item 2 D also has to do with this, do you want to just touch base on this Mr. Madden?

Mr. Madden – I met with Mr. LaFerla and Mrs. Struening because there was some confusion on paying the contractor. That's why I tried to break it all down; there were some over runs. Part of the problem is we're waiting to get money from the school before we pay the contractor. This is to clear up what's due from each party and the contractor is due roughly \$91,000.00 and I think you're waiting on \$21,000.00 more or less from the school.

Mr. LaFerla – I just heard from Ms. Corbin today that she is going to be sending us a voucher so that money should be here by the end of next week and we can cut a check. But there's still that \$13,000.00 for lighting that still hasn't been settled.

Mr. Madden – You're making payment today for...

Mr. LaFerla – We're making payment for what we owe and what the high school gave us; the only thing they're left that they're owed is the

\$21,000.00, which we're getting the check next week and then there's the lighting and the \$10,000.00 retainage that the high school is still holding because of the lighting.

Mr. Madden – I would just like to tell the contractor he's going to be able to get this \$21,000.00 before the next meeting. Does it have to go to another meeting?

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Basically, we've authorized the payment, it's just a matter of us getting reimbursed by the high school.

Mr. Watts – You can direct Mrs. Struening that upon receipt of the payment from the high school, in turn, a check can be cut to be sent in the same amount to the contractor.

Mrs. Robitzski – What about this issue; are we resolving it, the electrician issue?

Mr. Madden – There's still a discrepancy between the breakdown of the cost of what was damaged versus what they were paying their electrician to do other work that was not part of the contractor's work. That whole bill is \$13,000.00. Part of that \$13,000.00 was caused by the contractor. So, we're trying to figure out where that number is.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Are we close to settling it?

Mr. Madden – They've given a little bit back but the contractor is saying it should be more and the discrepancy now is about \$10,000.00. We're trying to negotiate it.

Mrs. Robitzski – Do we have to be in the middle of that? Can we just close this out?

Mr. Madden – The contract is with us, so no.

Mrs. Robitzski – This has been going on for months.

- d) Dan Madden, PE of JMT to Gregory LaFerla, Chief Operator / Director of RTMUA regarding Application for Payment (Rt. 31 Interceptor Sewer Relocation)

3. **Old Business:**

None

4. **New Business:**

None

5. Professional Reports:

- a) Attorney - None
- b) Engineer –

Mr. Madden – We've been continuing to review the flow data; we've had a lot of rain events this past month; crazy deluges that have caused a lot of problems. The flow goes way up and then drops down.

Mrs. Robitzski – Have you found anything from that?

Mr. Madden – We did some smoke testing last month and we did find a major break in the storm sewer leaking into the sanitary sewer. That needs to be fixed.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Where is that crack?

Mr. Madden – I'm told it's at the four or five o'clock position but Mr. LaFerla may know better.

Mr. LaFerla – It's more towards the top; like I said, it's a fifteen-inch pipe, once it stopped raining, only the top three inches of the pipe was showing. That thing has to be full for it to be leaking into the ground to leak into our pipe. When we have the TV camera on the lateral, there was groundwater leaking in too, our pipe needs to be fixed.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Mr. Madden, can you touch on the smoke testing.

Mr. Madden – All of the South Main Street section has been tested. Mr. LaFerla's guys had the equipment and were doing it. They're planning to jump over and do Flemington South next.

Mr. LaFerla – Flemington Fields.

Mr. Madden – We worked with Ms. Carmeli on creating and Inflow and Infiltration Plan as part of the ACO.

6. RTMUA Reports:

- a) ADMINISTRATIVE / OPERATIONS REPORT

- 1. Chief Operator / Director's Report –

Mrs. Robitzski – Number seven, Summit Custom Spray Dry?

Mr. LaFerla – We've been trying to get them to come in because we get a lot of flow from them; it's different colors, and we've been waiting for some information from them, some testing that they were supposed to have done for over a year now. We just can't get them to the table so we got the

DEP involved and they stopped over and talked to Summit and as soon as they left, the guy from the DEP called me and as soon as I hung up with him, the guy from Summit Custom Spray Dry called me. Supposedly, hopefully, we'll be moving in the right direction.

- a) Overtime Recap
- b) Septage / Greywater Recap
- 2. Laboratory Summary - Okay
- 3. Maintenance Summary - Okay
- 4. Readington Flows –

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Did we initiate that dialog with Readington yet?
Mr. Watts – Not yet. I think we should initiate something with them saying “even though your flows are down now, we believe you should take steps to do I & I work”.

- b) Commissioner’s Comments:

7. Discussion:

- a) Board of Commissioners Authorization for Mrs. Struening and Mrs. Hallinger to Attend the Harris Spectrum User Meeting in Hershey, PA (September 20, 2018)

Mr. LaFerla – It’s for one night, they’d have to stay overnight, it’s about \$189 per night for them. It’s for the whole billing system, it’s worthwhile for them to go.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I don’t have any problem with this; is everyone okay with them going?

General consensus

- b) Board of Commissioners Authorization for Mr. LaFerla to Attend the AEA Annual Meeting and Conference in Atlantic City (November 13 – 14, 2018)

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – This is the yearly, regular one; I don’t have a problem with you going to this. Is everyone okay with this?

General consensus

c) RTMUA I & I Plan

Mr. Madden – We discussed a preemptive plan to present in lieu of having to do everything in the first three years; to spread it out over several years.

d) Clarifier Bid Results

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – We had an engineer's estimate of \$2,000,000.00 and the bids came in at \$3,200,000.00. In going through and looking at this, from what I'm reading from our engineer, Mott MacDonald, the prices have changed since they generated the estimate. These bids were pretty tight though. The question is how do we make up this gap? What do we do? Do we rebid?

Mr. LaFerla – There's an email after this from Mr. Langhart regarding NJEIT.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Yes, about where we go. I guess there's a mechanism where we go back to the NJEIT. Financially, is Mr. Cragin aware of this here?

Mr. LaFerla – Yes.

Mr. Hazard – The closeness of the bids though, five or six of them are all within...

(many voices speaking at once)

Mr. LaFerla – The contractor that was the low bidder, we've had him here before, we've had no problems, he's very easy to work with, he's a good contractor. I would hate to go out and rebid it and not get him.

Mr. Tully – If there was a bigger discrepancy I'd say "okay, rebid it" but the fact that they're all within five percent of each other.

Mrs. Robitzski – How was our estimate so off?

Mr. LaFerla – The estimate was two years old.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I think we all agree the real cost is what was bid here. They are very tight.

Mr. LaFerla – The first two are only \$10,000.00 apart.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – How do we go through and make the gap here?

Mr. LaFerla – You would pass another resolution to go for the \$3,800,000.00 that Mr. Langhart would prepare it for the September meeting.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Make sure Mr. Cragin is aware of this number.

Mr. LaFerla – Do you want me to have Mr. Langhart prepare the resolution?

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Yes.

- e) Email from Christopher Langhart, Esq. of McManimon, Scotland & Baumann, LLC regarding Bond Resolution for Final Clarifier Refurbishment Project

Discussed above.

- f) Chemical Bid Results

Mr. LaFerla – We went out to bid and these are the results.
Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – We'll award next month.

- g) Janitorial Proposals

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – This is the same one we have now; his price stayed the same.

- h) Mowing Proposals

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – We only received the one proposal; this is who we have now and his price stayed the same also.

- i) Revision of Personnel Policies and Procedure Manual and Employee Handbook as Required by JIF

Mr. Watts – These are things that were reviewed internally, I reviewed them and JIF insures us and JIF demands this so I don't think you have a lot of wiggle room.

Mr. LaFerla – It needs to be passed at the next meeting because it's due by October 1st.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – We had some questions and discussions we want to have in Closed Session with regards to this issue. Some questions came up that we'd like to talk about further and I'd like to discuss them in Closed Session.

Mr. Watts – It's Personnel Matters so you can do that.

- j) Final Draft of Budget

Previously discussed.

8. Adjourn into Closed Session by Motion, if Needed

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – We will be going into Closed Session to discuss Personnel Matters and Flemington Contractual Matters; and we do not anticipate any official action will need to be taken once we come out of Closed Session.

Mr. Tully made a motion to adjourn into Closed Session for the above stated purpose and Mrs. Robitzski seconded the motion. Closed Session was from 6:56 pm – 8:13 pm.

9. Adjournment of Work Session:

Mr. Hazard made a motion to adjourn the Work Session. Mr. Tully seconded the motion. All were in favor. The Meeting ended at 8:14 pm.