

**APPROVED**

---

RARITAN TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL UTILITIES AUTHORITY  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

FEBRUARY 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. Kendzulak, Jr.	Here
Mrs. Robitzski	Here

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

3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

4. **APPLICATIONS:**

None

5. **RESOLUTIONS:**

**REORGANIZATION**

Mr. Watts - At this point in the meeting, we will conduct our Reorganization. I will open up to the members the nomination for the position of Chairperson.

Resolution #2018 - 07 Appointment of Chairperson

Mrs. Robitzski made a motion to nominate Mr. Kendzulak, Jr., Mr. Grand seconded the motion. All were in favor. Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. abstained.

Resolution #2018 – 08 Appointment of Vice - Chairperson

Mr. Grand made a motion to nominate Mrs. Robitzski, Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. seconded the motion. All were in favor. Mrs. Robitzski abstained.

Resolution #2018 - 09 Appointment of Secretary

Mrs. Robitzski made a motion to nominate Mr. Grand, Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. seconded the motion. All were in favor. Mr. Grand abstained.

Resolution #2018 – 10 Appointment of Treasurer

Mrs. Robitzski made a motion to nominate Mr. Grand, Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. seconded the motion. All were in favor. Mr. Grand abstained.

Resolution #2018 – 11 Appointment of Assistant Secretary / Assistant Treasurer

Mr. Grand made a motion to nominate Mrs. Robitzski, Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. seconded the motion. All were in favor. Mrs. Robitzski abstained.

Resolution #2018 – 12 Establishment of Meeting Dates

Mr. LaFerla – I just want to mention that the December 2018 meeting is changed from the third Thursday of the month to the second Thursday of the month; it will be held on December 13, 2018.

Mrs. Robitzski made a motion to approve Resolution #2018 – 12, Mr. Grand seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Resolution #2018 – 13 Designation of Depositories

Mrs. Robitzski made a motion to approve Resolution #2018 – 13, Mr. Grand seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:	Mr. Grand	-	Yes
	Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	-	Yes
	Mrs. Robitzski	-	Yes

Resolution #2018 – 14 Authorization of Signatories

Mrs. Robitzski made a motion to approve Resolution #2018 – 14, Mr. Grand seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:	Mr. Grand	-	Yes
	Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	-	Yes
	Mrs. Robitzski	-	Yes

Resolution #2018 – 15 Designation of Official / Legal Newspapers

Mr. Grand made a motion to approve Resolution #2018 – 15, Mrs. Robitzski seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Resolution #2018 – 16 Appointment of Certifying Officer

Mr. Grand made a motion to approve Resolution #2018 – 16, Mrs. Robitzski seconded the motion. All were in favor.

*Appointment of Professionals*

Resolution #2018 – 17 Appointment of Auditor  
(Contract not to Exceed \$40,000.00)

Mr. Grand made a motion to approve Resolution #2018 – 17, Mrs. Robitzski seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:	Mr. Grand	-	Yes
	Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	-	Yes
	Mrs. Robitzski	-	Yes

Resolution #2018 – 18 Appointment of Bond Counsel  
(Contract not to Exceed \$8,000.00)

Mr. Grand made a motion to approve Resolution #2018 18, Mrs. Robitzski seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:	Mr. Grand	-	Yes
	Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	-	Yes
	Mrs. Robitzski	-	Yes

Resolution #2018 – 19 Appointment of Legal Counsel  
(Contract not to Exceed \$36,000.00)

Mr. Grand made a motion to approve Resolution #2018 – 19, Mrs. Robitzski seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:	Mr. Grand	-	Yes
	Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	-	Yes
	Mrs. Robitzski	-	Yes



Resolution #2018 – 20 Appointment of Special Counsel  
(Contract not to Exceed \$40,000.00)

Mrs. Robitzski made a motion to approve Resolution #2018 – 20, Mr. Grand seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:	Mr. Grand	-	Yes
	Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	-	Yes
	Mrs. Robitzski	-	Yes

Resolution #2018 – 21 Appointment of Consulting Engineer  
(Contract not to Exceed \$162,700.00)

Mr. Grand made a motion to approve Resolution #2018 – 21, Mrs. Robitzski seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:	Mr. Grand	-	Yes
	Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	-	Yes
	Mrs. Robitzski	-	Yes

Resolution #2018 – 22 Appointment of Part – Time Consulting Engineer  
(Contract not to Exceed \$10,000.00)

Mr. Grand made a motion to approve Resolution #2018 – 22, Mrs. Robitzski seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:	Mr. Grand	-	Yes
	Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	-	Yes
	Mrs. Robitzski	-	Yes

Resolution #2018 – 23 Appointment of Special Projects Engineer  
(Contract not to Exceed \$30,000.00)

Mrs. Robitzski made a motion to approve Resolution #2018 – 23, Mr. Grand seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:	Mr. Grand	-	Yes
	Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	-	Yes
	Mrs. Robitzski	-	Yes

**END OF REORGANIZATION**

Resolution #2018 – 24 Authorization to Accept Proposal and to Execute Agreement for Engineering Services for Construction Management and Inspection Services Final Clarifiers Refurbishment Project from Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson  
(Proposal amount \$289,150.00)

Mrs. Robitzski made a motion to approve Resolution #2018 – 24, Mr. Grand seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:	Mr. Grand	-	Yes
	Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	-	Yes
	Mrs. Robitzski	-	Yes

Resolution #2018 – 25 Return of L & E Escrow

Mr. Grand made a motion to approve Resolution #2018 – 25, Mrs. Robitzski seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:	Mr. Grand	-	Yes
	Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	-	Yes
	Mrs. Robitzski	-	Yes

6. **Approval of Minutes:** Minutes of January 18, 2018

Mrs. Robitzski made a motion to approve the minutes from the January 18, 2018 meeting. Mr. Grand seconded the motion. All were in favor.

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

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I can do this one for you this time Mr. Grand. The bills totaled \$569,958.63. All appears to be in order. If you go to the last pink page; if you figure we're two full months into our budget, the month of December and January, that's about 16.7% through our fiscal year. Recognizing we did pay some bills from February; we're half way through February. At the lower right corner, bolded, shows we're 21.14% expended in this budget. Last year at this time, we were at 19.72% but a couple things to recognize, we're paying some bills up front, like insurance. I'm comfortable with where we are and recognizing this number will come down when the audit is done and also recognizing that we front pay some big bills.

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

8. **Citizens' Privilege:**

None

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

10. **Adjournment of Regular Meeting:**

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

APPROVED

RARITAN TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL UTILITIES AUTHORITY  
WORK SESSION MINUTES

FEBRUARY 15, 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:**  
  
None
  3. **Unfinished Business:**  
  
None
  4. **New Business:**  
  
None
  5. **Professional Reports:**
    - a) Attorney - none
    - b) Engineer –

Mr. Madden – The temporary flow meter, the time has expired and we feel that we have enough data from the three locations. We got three or four really good rain storm events; we downloaded the most recent one before the meters were pulled. We have to process all the data and I should have something for the Board by next month. The Commerce Street sewer work is done and the sewer has been lined; we just have to pay them.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – That's done, they're out of here? Is there anyway you can look at what we did at Commerce Street before and after? Because that last rain storm happened after it was repaired. Look at those flows that are possibly going into Pump Station #1?

Mr. Madden – Because of the positioning of the meters, we didn't have one on the Commerce Street line; so, it was a combined flow from the interceptor coming from Johanna and Commerce Street, so we were downstream of that. I don't know that we're going to see a big difference, that would have required a lot of infiltration being removed from that one line and I don't think it was severe enough that it would have moved the needle up.



Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – What about inflow?

Mr. Madden – That's what I'm saying; if there were any issues for inflow in that line, we should have been able to see that if it was significant enough. The reason we wanted to do that was two part; there were some leaks there but more importantly the pipe was structurally compromised so it was important to get the liner in there to re-establish the structural stability before further damage happened. The Route 31 Interceptor at the high school; after work this week, they're a little more than half way done. I anticipate they'll be through the bleacher section by tomorrow and then they just have to tie back in.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – What is their drop-dead date?

Mr. Madden – It's kind of a bone of contention between me and the contractor. The actual work should be done by next week. I think we had by the end of the month. If anything, they'll just have some clean up to do. The high school seems to be okay with everything going on out there.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Is there anyway to see, that goalpost that was punched into that line, where infiltration was getting in there, is there anyway to see what was getting in there?

Mr. LaFerla – If it was getting into the old pipe, it's definitely not going into the new pipe.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I know that but is there a way we can tell or observe how much infiltration was getting into there?

Mr. Madden – No.

Mr. LaFerla – No; if there was a lot of it you'd maybe see it at the FWWF.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – In any case, what's getting done there is going to be an improvement but we can't measure the improvement right now.

Mr. Madden – Not unless it had been a very major source. Mr. LaFerla asked us to look at the sludge holding tank and we submitted a report on it; it's not in very good shape.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – We'll talk about that later on.

Mr. Madden – I don't know if you want to do this tonight but we talked about this last month; just coming up with some ideas to combat flow. Mr. Grand said to think outside the box so I prepared a presentation and I have some handouts. The first page it explains how you go looking for I & I. You find how many basins you have in your system and in your case you want to break it down to 10,000 linear foot sections. You'd have about thirty or thirty-three basins if we did it strictly by that. Once you have that known, the best thing to do is flow metering and you'd put the flow meters in for three or four months and you track everything and you might say "out of thirty basins I'm only getting significant leaks in about twenty of them" so we can eliminate having to do much more with the other ten. What you do with that information is you track both the dry weather and basin infiltration because



even during dry weather there still may be groundwater getting into the pipes. There's a couple ways of doing that; you can do it with night time metering where you block the pipe up and track what's flowing at night but that can get a little costly. Next, what you would do is set up a hydraulic model; and you base it on the dry weather flow, and you start introducing wet weather flows like that and you track it and you'll say "I know I'm going to have a problem here, in my pipeline", just like we did when we modeled the flow on the South Bushkill, we knew those two manholes were going to be problems. Those are the kind of bottlenecks in that whole system, that are subject to the most potential for overflow. Once it gets beyond that downstream, it's fine. With that model, you're establishing the level of service, you can say "I can handle up to a two or ten-year storm" knowing that this is the flow coming in and you see what you want to do. At that point, you make a decision. Are you going to do further evaluations or just go to a project and do a capacity improvement? Going back, you pick the worst of the basins when you start before you start doing other tests to fine tune them; smoke tests, night flow isolation, CCTV & manhole inspections. Those are the four tools in the toolbelt, if you really want to dive into it. If the ACO goes through, this is the stuff they want to see that you are doing. Maybe we can get away with less breakdowns of the basins but they're going to want to see that some effort is being made on each of these areas and that you have a plan to reduce I & I. That was part of that evaluating the whole system. Those are the basic steps, if money wasn't an object, this is the way you'd go.

Mr. Grand – My question is, what is our fiduciary responsibility to really understand where the problems are and do what we can within reasonable, financial limits to increase our capacity? You explained the process of how you would go, would we be able to ultimately decide what prioritizing we would do to start that process? I guess that would also be determined by how much money we have to spend on it.

Mr. Madden – We could probably get away with less metering and we could pick areas. I don't want to just start chasing things; this would be the systematic approach to it. If we're going to do something we can say "lets concentrate over here because we can see signs that this is going to be a problem". The initial metering, we did, does indicate those two sections are areas of concern. Anything we do is going to be consistent with the ACO. Any reduction we can do, I think we will have all that documented. The question is going to come down to what they're going to require because there was some talk about trying to get them to just have us look at the section affected by Flemington directly; that wouldn't include the entire system but I think the DEP is pushing back and wants to do the whole system, that's the indication I got.



Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Because we have capacity related issues, it would be to our advantage to look at the whole system or at least where we definitely know we have problems. All those problems aren't going into the FWWF; we know we have them along the South Branch Interceptor.

Mr. Madden – If you look at the second to last page, it was our out of the box thinking, some ideas that we could aim at handling the issues of capacity. Obviously, reduce I & I is number one. We do know we have some issues. Mr. LaFerla's guys have been out and have identified some areas and we see problems that need to be addressed. Everything you do will improve this. We were just trying to put some pie in the sky things here. The first three are what is called off – line storage, meaning instead of treating it, you capture it, hold it in tanks until the storm has passed and you can run it through the system. That would require a significant amount of tanks. That is something that a lot of places in the country are doing, Washington DC, they are building these massive tunnels to store wet weather flow and then treat it after the rain subsides but it is extremely costly to do that. Maybe you can shave off those peak flows and keep it under that tipping point but every rain storm is different, every intensity is really going to be a different issue. The other thing after that is to increase the plant capacity, it's another very costly option.

Mrs. Robitzski – When you say very costly, what are you talking about?

Mr. Madden – Probably in the ten to fifteen-million-dollar range to 4.5 MGD.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – That's a number I'd like to have a better handle on because that comes up quite a bit; ten to fifteen-million-dollars, although it's a big number, it doesn't seem like that big a number to me to increase the plant capacity. We're at 3.8 MGD, the next step would bring us to 4.6 MGD?

Mr. LaFerla – 4.4 MGD?

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – That was predicated on "oh, you have this extra clarifier there". One of the things, and I remember we had this discussion once before, and it may not have been with this group here, what about modifications to the plant itself? Is there a bottleneck at the plant that limits us to 3.8 MGD that if we take care of that bottleneck, maybe the next bottleneck is at 4 MGD and we pick up 200,000 gpd just by addressing the bottleneck? I don't know where the bottleneck is.

Mr. Madden – I think there's a couple of areas. In the old report I was reading through, they identified you need more primary, the grit system is too small and the aeration tanks. The clarifiers are good but it's the rest of it.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – How involved would it be to do that?

Mr. Madden – That's what I'm talking about with the ten to fifteen million.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Would that get us to the 4.6 MGD? The other thing that I'm looking at, even if there were a couple of bottlenecks, if we took care of



one bottleneck, maybe it wouldn't be all that expensive, and maybe we could pick up a little bit of capacity.

Mr. Madden – Depending on the ACO, we're going to be forced to treat whatever's coming down the line from the plant, I don't know what the number is going to be on that. If the number is over 1.35 then we are definitely looking at modifying the plant. I don't know what they're going to tell you. They're limited to 1.35 now which on a rainy day they're over that. That's just one of those issues; that ACO is going to drive a lot of those decisions.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – In any case, what we're doing now; we've already initiated work. We're already moving in that direction.

Mr. Madden – Some of the things we may end of doing is putting a relief sewer in from that wet weather facility to that 42-inch interceptor, that might be part of that but I don't know.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – There was a number that I think someone did come up with, that was somewhere between thirty and forty million dollars, for the parallel line.

Mr. LaFerla – Yes, plus expand the plant to the 4.4 MGD was included in that price; I'm pretty sure.

Mr. Madden – The other items on the list; a relief sewer for the South Bushkill Interceptor, this past week it had the overflow. If we're not going to do enough to reduce the I & I, you have to do something there.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – That to me doesn't seem like it's all that expensive of a fix. I'm assuming that a lot of that is based on the geometry that is creating that problem in the pipe. If we did something with that, and we eliminated the manholes blowing their lid...the reason we're concerned with the Bushkill now is we know those two manholes are blowing their lid. If they weren't would we be concerned with the Bushkill now?

Mr. Madden – They're pushing the envelope there with that flow. The bigger issue is why didn't they do this in the first place. I have to think there was a reason they have them in the angles they do. I don't know the whole history. We can try to smooth that transition out or do an analysis of that.

Mr. Grand – I'm prefacing this with I'm new at this. The way you would think of this is you would go to the root cause of this. It sounds like on this list there are things we could do to increase capacity but the root cause, is that not I & I? From the standpoint of a return on your investment, and low hanging fruit, start there. Because if we don't fix that, we can spend a lot of money down the line but we're still getting the I & I which is giving us less capacity.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – The problem is that a lot of that I & I, you're not going to be able to fix. It may be sump pumps that people have discharging into the system.



Mr. Madden – It's the most expensive thing to try to reduce. I think there has been studies that show that seventy – five percent of I & I actually comes from house laterals. From your house to the street; your house to the main sewer line. It could be from sump pumps, tree roots, things like that.

Mrs. Robitzski – They're leaking?

Mr. Madden – Yes, you'd have to go onto private property to get that fixed. I think there's a county in Delaware where they actually had a program where they fixed right up to the house. It cost them a fortune but that was their way to try to combat it.

Mr. Grand – So there has to be a way to do things within our control, as long as it's reasonably, financially appropriate to address them. Then we would have to go to the Township and say "we want to go down this route, we need the Township Ordinance to be changed to go this route".

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – When you start talking about going onto people's properties or having them fix their laterals, it's a problem.

Mr. Grand – If we can break it out to what we can control versus what we can't. Do we have an idea of how they're split?

Mr. Madden – Short of a major illegal connection, like say a storm sewer connected into the sanitary sewer, that would be great because it would solve a big chunk of your problem but short of that, probably, on the line itself, the average is going to be twenty - five percent of the I & I is coming from our lines and the other seventy – five percent is coming from house laterals.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – This is one of the things that we talked about, first, when we were looking at this; we noticed the spike at Pump Station #1 after it started raining, which in my mind, indicated that there was an inflow issue not that far away. Is that consistent with the last storm?

Mr. Madden – It does go up very quickly; rapid ascent to that height is indicating that there is some kind of inflow. As the storm ends, it's going down slower than normal, if it was just that we wouldn't get that slower decline. One of the last things I had on here was sump pump removal.

Mrs. Robitzski – Why do you have removal by RTMUA?

Mr. Madden – We're thinking outside of the box. It might be something you want to offer your ratepayers. "You get rid of your sump pump and we'll pay you x dollars to do it" or something like that. Something to just get them out of there.

Mr. LaFerla – If we went into Sun Ridge and we ran those sump pumps out to somewhere else like a manifold, that would help a lot.

Mr. Madden – One of the things we heard last month from the Township Business Administrator was that in Sun Ridge, all of the sump pumps are connected into the sewer and that threw up a red flag. Mr. LaFerla has said that you can see the clear flow coming through. I don't know how they're set up but maybe by some blessing, all the sump pumps are connected to one lateral and



then you could just deal with the one lateral from each of the buildings and find a different place for it to discharge to.

Mrs. Robitzski – How do we find that?

Mr. Madden – I'm asking the Township for plans. I've talked to the assistant engineer.

Mr. LaFerla – This last storm, Pump Station #1, only had one pump running. (many people speaking at one time)

Mrs. Robitzski – It sounds like Sun Ridge is low hanging fruit.

Mr. Grand – If we had an effectual relationship with Raritan Township; could we talk to them about that? That we think we could maybe get a substantial amount of capacity increase by addressing this issue. What is the best way to deal with them with that? We can't do it without the Township's blessing.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – What Mr. Madden is doing now; if we can get plans and we can identify that all of these laterals go into one big lateral then we have an opportunity of intercepting it and directing it into our storm sewers. I think the first step is first get the plans and then maybe through TV inspections that we've done there, we may be able to figure that out and then have a game plan. Years ago, Mr. LaFerla, you were able to confirm that there was some stuff that shouldn't be going on from Sun Ridge through your TV inspections.

Mr. LaFerla – We sat at a lateral and you could just see clear water coming out and then it would stop for a little bit and then come out again and so on.

Mr. Madden – It's not only a problem in Raritan Township, it's everywhere. The one thing the Township did say was they could do the ordinance but they couldn't inspect it. Do you want to take your forces and do that?

Mrs. Robitzski – They didn't say they couldn't; we don't want to allocate extra resources but I think it's negotiable especially when you're inspecting for CO's anyway.

Mr. LaFerla – The thing is though, if you don't give them a place to put it other than the sewer, and their basement starts filling with water, what are they going to do? They're going to reconnect into the sewer.

Mrs. Robitzski – Ninety percent of people will run it out into their yards, right? I'm not saying it's a great solution and everyone has to worry about drainage and grading and the neighbors. But if it's an ordinance, it's like any other ordinance.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – With Sun Ridge, it wouldn't really be practical at that point. I think what Mr. Hutchins, the Administrator was saying is that if you implement an ordinance like that, it includes Sun Ridge too. You can't not include them and say "everyone but Sun Ridge". I don't know if an inspector turned their eye to it or what.

Mr. Watts – I think it was inspected and allowed to go through.



Mr. Madden -- Just publishing the ordinance, there will be a group of people who just want to do the right thing. I don't know what the percentage is but maybe people are just ignorant to it. Maybe some of them don't even know their sump pump is connected to the sewer. I think it would be great if you had an ordinance, at least it's there. But it's only as good as the enforcement.

Mr. Madden -- Also on the list is buy back of capacity from Flemington Borough and the Raritan allocations. I don't know, people have been paying into it for so long they may be reluctant.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. -- There's an effort to facilitate communication between the RTMUA, the Township Planning Board, the Township Committee, the Borough of Flemington and the County; we're a reactionary entity at this point. We have no road map in front of us, i.e. the Wastewater Management Plan (WMP) which has always been "just eighteen months" from getting done since God knows how long. The question is do we expand the plant, do we not expand the plant? What should we do and we don't know because we don't know what kind of development we're supposed to accommodate in the future. The other thing which you brought up is Flemington. Flemington has 1.08 MGD and Mr. Madden, you said they're falling around 600,000 gpd? So, there's another 400,000 gpd; granted we know they want to develop and have specific areas they want to develop but if you look at their buildout, is there going to be any excess leftover? If there is, maybe there's an opportunity there that serves as a win win, where we get the capacity back and they get compensated for that. I don't know, but what you would hope with this communication and hopefully facilitation is that the number shakes out. Who knows, maybe they do need 1.08 MGD but we've been here for how long now? I don't know how it shakes out with wet weather.

Mr. Madden -- That's the biggest question I have in my mind, how is this ACO going to affect this number, because are they going to allow them to put more in, when they have these wet weather flows that are six or seven times the average?

Mr. Watts -- The State would endorse it, so if it was contrary to the Service Agreement, that would control it.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. -- How would that work, Mr. Watts? If they're typically flowing 600,000 gpd but we know when it rains it's 600 million gpd?

Mr. Watts -- We'd be hard pressed to take build out right away. If they started flowing 950,000 gpd dry weather, in wet weather you'd be inundated. That's why they need to be fixing their I & I much more quickly than they want to.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. -- Is there anything else there besides the ACO to control their development with the flow? Recognizing that needs to be corrected.

Mr. Watts -- The only thing it addresses is they have to do I & I studies and they have to fix so many feet of pipe every year.

Mrs. Robitzski -- That number was pretty small.



Mr. Grand – Is there any leg we have to stand on to require them to do that?

Mr. Watts – They can send us 1.08 MGD of dry weather flow. I suppose if their wet weather flow is four times that we could say they can't do that anymore because they are upsetting our plant. If it causes plant upsets, they're responsible for it.

Mr. Madden – Is it 1.08 MGD, dry weather or any weather? Or that's just the max that they're allowed to send?

Mr. Watts – That's the max they're allowed to send.

Mrs. Robitzski – But they're already blowing the system away.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – But it's getting treated at the wet weather facility. It goes on line after?

Mr. LaFerla – At 1.35, we start filling over there, then depending on the rainstorm...

Mrs. Robitzski - ...That doesn't mean they're overstepping their Agreement; we can't say "you're sending us all of this extra".

Mr. LaFerla – No, we take 1.35 back here and the rest goes to the FWWF.

Mr. Madden – If the ACO says it's 1.08, we put a restriction in that line that it's 1.08 and if you get a rainstorm where does it go? Does it overflow in Flemington? What if they take it offline?

(many people speaking at one time)

Mrs. Robitzski – On your list, what is number twelve, the Developer Assessment for Repairs or I & I Improvement?

Mr. Madden – Let's say a developer wants capacity and we'd say "okay, go remove it from I & I". Other places do it; have them fix it. Meter before and after to prove to us that what they said was taken out.

Mrs. Robitzski – Do you need an ordinance to do that? How would you do that?

Mr. Watts – You would tell them "there's no capacity in the plant, if you want capacity you can do a study and if you can show us you're removing as much as you need then you can have that." We've never had a need to do that before because we haven't had people demanding capacity when we haven't had any. It would simply be part of a Reservation Agreement saying "if you do this and show us that you can find 20,000 gpd, that you've removed from I & I from the system, then we'll grant you that capacity at the plant."

Mrs. Robitzski – Does it then come down to us saying there's no capacity versus someone else saying there could be. How do you define that?

Mr. Watts – We would make that decision.

Mr. Grand – It would be a quid pro quo. Isn't there something at the State where if they put roads in or a development that for every tree you take down you have to plant at least one or two trees back? It could be kind of like that; for every amount that you need, you have to find some.



Mr. Watts – This was never necessary when there was capacity at the plant. Once you run out of capacity that's the way you could address it.

Mr. Grand – The other option is the developer makes some kind of contribution to build capacity; either it comes to us and we address it through I & I or the plant or whatever. If twenty – five percent of the I & I is something that is controllable and seventy – five percent is not; is there a methodology starting from the low hanging fruit, is that something we might consider starting through either TVing or something?

Mr. Madden – That's what I'm saying; if you go back to the first description, on the presentation, this is the procedure you follow to get rid of that twenty – five percent.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I think one of the other things is just walking the lines and looking at the manholes because you guys did it along the creek and you saw where there was a storm sewer or a drain or a manhole or an open grate manhole tied into our sewer. When the creek opened up, this open manhole let it flow right in. That was a substantial amount of flow that was getting in and those are what we're looking for. How did we leave it with the manhole inspections?

Mr. Madden – We weren't directed to go forward with it yet.

Mr. LaFerla – There's stuff in the back under the Discussion.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I saw that, I didn't know who's that was.

Mr. LaFerla – That was our guys. We've had that for a while.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – How old are those observations?

Mr. LaFerla – Within the last year, 2017.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I view that as low hanging fruit. What I'm interested in, is all the rain that we've had, and the different storms that we've had, and your analysis of what that's done; what is the next step and where do we go from there. I know we were talking about smoke testing, do we have to put in another meter somewhere, where do we go? Do you anticipate to have that next month?

Mr. Madden – Yes.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – The only thing is; with what Mr. LaFerla's done and if there's any work you think needs to be supplemented with that low hanging fruit, that if it's a matter of getting inspectors out from JMT to walk the lines and do whatever we talked about for \$5,000.00, to me that's cheap labor; lets' get it done and move forward with it. Look at what Mr. LaFerla has done; I see we have leaking manholes and we have issues with roots and we've got stuff like that going on. I don't know what that means as far as the magnitude.

Mr. Madden – Mr. LaFerla and I have been working heavily on this the last month knowing this is a biggy.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – So, we'll have by next month, we'll have some kind of plan on what the next steps are.

Mr. Grand – Will that plan be in some order of priority and range of magnitude or cost?

Mr. Madden – We'll look for the cheaper, most beneficial solutions first.

Mr. Grand – Should we be thinking about holding off on other expenses until we resolve this because we might have to reallocate resources? To the extent that we budgeted for certain things to happen, should we put a hold on some of those things?

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – That's probably something we should look at. To see what we can possibly put off that we don't need to do. We're only two or three months into our budget, we might be able to say "this can wait until next year" on some things. Maybe funnel money into a certain direction.

**6. RTMUA REPORTS:**

a) ADMINISTRATIVE / OPERATIONS REPORT

1. Chief Operator / Director's Report

Mr. LaFerla – Mr. Diehl said that Flemington is going to put their eighty percent in next year's budget for the FWWF job. I need a commissioner for the meeting with the DEP, Ms. Carmeli asked for one. It was going to be Mr. Kinsella and Dr. Buza but not now. Can anyone attend it? They're trying to set it up at the end of March, March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 27<sup>th</sup>, 28<sup>th</sup>, or 29<sup>th</sup>, those are the dates they're working on right now.

Mr. Watts – It's just a meeting with DEP to hammer out the final parts of the ACO. DEP likes to have someone from the Board there, not just the professionals.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – What is our plan? What are we ironing out?

Mr. Watts – Before we go to the meeting we're going to have Ms. Carmeli and Mr. Tyler at our next meeting and hopefully get something from them so we know what the open issues are before we go down there.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Are we and Flemington on the same page?

Mr. Watts – I think so.

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



b) COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

7. **Discussion:**

a) Manhole Inspections Proposal & Other Information

Mr. LaFerla – These are some of the things that the guys found while they were TVing; there's manholes on there, lines that have infiltration and roots. We did get in touch with Dukes Roots; we have roots in the line that goes through the high school and the Flemington Block area some that go to the Flemington Plant, some that go to the convent up by Harmony School Road. We're going to have Dukes Roots come out and clear them.

Mrs. Robitzski – Are these things you can fix, this infiltration?

Mr. LaFerla – Yes. We wanted to talk to you about having met with Pierce Equipment. They have a thing that we could get, it's about \$7,000.00, Mr. Madden can explain it better.

Mr. Madden – There's a new technology out, it's a repair sleeve that basically, if you have a hole or a joint that's leaking you can put this unit in the pipe and expand it against the walls of the pipe after it's pulled into place. It kind of attaches to your camera. It inflates this bladder that pushes it into position and there's a ratcheting system, so as you push it out, it holds against the side walls of the pipe.

Mr. LaFerla – It repairs holes in the pipe, if water is leaking from the joint, it will seal the joint, you won't have the leak. A lot of these on this list here, are pretty much, just that.

Mrs. Robitzski – As opposed to what? What's the other option?

Mr. Madden – The other option is to do a lining or a grouting. It's definitely cheaper than a liner. The sleeves I think are about \$550.00 apiece for an 8 – inch pipe. The technology is very new so I just caution that; it's very new. My big concern is that it could free up and come loose and cause a blockage. I don't think that's a problem but I don't know. This is one of the newer technologies that people are looking at.

Mr. LaFerla – It's something that if we got it, we would have it and while the guys are out there TVing, they find something and they fix it. The guy is up in Branchburg, he has them in his shop, we'd call him and say "we need whatever" and have it. It's something where if you find something and before you leave at the end of the day, it's fixed.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – So, we'll get more information on that. The infiltration observations; I saw number four, Neshanic Interceptor heavy infiltration in manhole 17-14. Do we have photos of that?

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – How many of these things here are within that Neshanic Interceptor.

Mr. Madden – A lot of them are up in the far reaches; by the library.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – As far as repairing them, can our forces repair them?

Mr. LaFerla – Depending on if we got that machine.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I'm assuming the manhole itself is damaged?

Mr. Madden – The manhole will require a different repair. There are companies you can hire to do that or you can buy your own equipment and do it yourself but it depends on your comfort of level to do that.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – If it's there and we know about it and it's relatively easy to take care of it; even if we put out a small contract for whatever, like \$20,000.00, to address these things, then let's look to do something like that. We were talking about walking these manholes along the Neshanic, is there any low hanging fruit, are there manhole lids that are off, those are the things that I'm interested in that I want to get taken care of. I don't remember where we ended up at the last meeting with that. I think you had a proposal for \$5,000.00 so long as you had a body from the RTMUA to pop manholes. I'm not adverse to that; to me that's a little expense and let's move forward with that.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – As far as the money goes; I talked to our auditor and he didn't see a problem with it. I think one of the issues that we had was the concern with the Commerce Street project. We had to fund that through the engineering budget or account. I said "the money was in last year's and we didn't appropriate it" he said that money from last year was never spent so it's still in the same pot that you had so he didn't see an issue with that. That doesn't mean we just open our wallet here and go crazy but to me for \$5,000.00 and one of our people assisting, let's go through and do it and maybe we'll get lucky.

Mrs. Robitzski – So that would add to this list of observations.

Mr. Madden – We might want to see the stuff on there to see how to fix it.

Mrs. Robitzski – So what's the next step to repairing all of these?

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Well, that's something Mr. Madden and Mr. LaFerla are going to have to figure out. Obviously, if our forces can do it, any of these issues, let's do them.

Mr. Madden – There's a couple of pretty good leaks.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Mr. LaFerla will have to evaluate them and say "our guys can handle these". Let's put together some bundle and identify these and take care of them.

Mrs. Robitzski – Does someone need a class? What's this paper in here for?

Mr. LaFerla – That's another thing. Mr. Clerico of the line crew mentioned it. There's a way to grade them, none of our guys has the training, so when we send the tapes to Mr. Madden, there's an extra expense because they go through



them and they grade them. I'd like to send our TV guys to this course; it's about \$1,000.00 apiece.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – As long as you stay within the budget.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. - So, I guess we should ask for a motion to pass Mr. Madden's January 18, 2018 proposal.

Mr. Watts – You can't pass a resolution in the Work Session.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – No, but I'm saying we can okay it and then memorialize it at the next meeting.

Mr. Watts – You can direct them to do it and pass a resolution at the next meeting. You have to do a resolution if you're spending money.

Mrs. Robitzski – Where does this get paid out of, general engineering, a budget line item, someplace else?

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – It's going to come out of our pocketbook but it will get charged to the engineering account which is already hit. Mr. Cragin from Bowman said he didn't see an issue with this.

(general consensus)

b) Sludge Tank Evaluation

Mr. LaFerla – We've been having problems with the sludge holding tank. The tops had holes in it for a while but it didn't matter because we didn't fill it. During the summer the guys noticed some on the bottom so we emptied it really quickly and had Mr. Madden's guys come out and take a look at it and this is the report. There aren't any prices with it; he's still trying to get prices but this is something that has to get done. It's not going to get done by then but ACUA is closing mid-March to end of March beginning of April and we only have the one tank to hold it. It's going to be close but it's something that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – What's our backup when ACUA is closed?

Mr. LaFerla – We usually just hold it here and we don't usually have a problem. If we had to, we could have Plainfield Sewage Authority come out with a truck and they'll take liquid sludge for us. We do have backups.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – What is the magnitude of some of these options we're talking about?

Mr. Madden – A full replacement is probably between half a million and...

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. - ...so it's significant. What about salvaging what we have.

Mr. Madden – If we take the plates out and replace those sections; it is glass lined so it makes it a little more complicated, it's not easy to weld that.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – So, we'll get more information on these various options. Here's another thing; we can replace this thing but should we replace it to if the plant capacity is increasing, should we replace it with a bigger tank?

Mr. LaFerla – If we were going to replace it, I would replace it with a bigger tank. I would put in one at least like the second one, which is about double the size.

Mrs. Robitzski – Can you fix it and still put another tank in there if you needed to or is that wasting money?

Mr. LaFerla – You could put another one in there if you had to.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Okay, so you'll give us more information next month.

Mr. Madden – Yes.

c) Signing of Documents (Signatories Sheet)

Ms. Nicaretta – I need the Chairman to stay after the meeting to sign documents.

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

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

Mr. Grand made a motion to adjourn into Closed Session for the above stated purpose and Mrs. Robitzski seconded the motion. Closed Session was from 7:03 pm – 7:13 pm.

9. **Adjournment of Work Session:**

Mrs. Robitzski made a motion to adjourn the Work Session. Mr. Grand seconded the motion. All were in favor. The Meeting ended at 7:14 pm.