

APPROVED

RARITAN TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL UTILITIES AUTHORITY
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

NOVEMBER 20, 2014

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:**

Chair Del Vecchio	Here
Dr. Dougherty	Absent
Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	Here
Mr. Kinsella	Here
Mr. Tully	Here

Also present were Bruce Miller, RTMUA Executive Director; Greg LaFerla, RTMUA Chief Operator; Regina Nicaretta, RTMUA Executive Secretary; Peter Kocsik, PE, Hatch Mott MacDonald; Richard Tice, Esquire, Watts, Tice & Skowronek

3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

4. **APPLICATIONS:**

None

5. **RESOLUTIONS:**

Resolution #2014 - 59 Amendment to Professional Services Agreement with RTMUA Auditors

Mr. Kinsella made a motion to approve Resolution #2014 - 59; Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Resolution #2014 - 60 Resolution Consenting to the Proposed Water Quality Management Plan Amendment

Mr. Kinsella made a motion to approve Resolution #2014 - 60, Mr. Tully seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Resolution #2014 - 61 Authorization to Accept Proposal for Facilities Planning Report from Hatch Mott MacDonald

Mr. Tully made a motion to approve Resolution #2014 - 61, Mr. Kinsella seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Chair Del Vecchio	-	Yes
Dr. Dougherty	-	Absent
Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	-	Yes
Mr. Kinsella	-	Yes
Mr. Tully	-	Yes

Resolution #2014 - 62 Acceptance of Proposal for Engineering Services Design, Bid and Construction Phase of 30 Yard Line Flemington Sewer at HCHS

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Mr. Kocsik, can you shed some light on this please? I understand there was a meeting with Hunterdon Central representatives and Flemington Borough representatives and engineers associated with this and we were talking about moving a manhole.

Mr. Kocsik – We did meet about two and a half weeks ago here at RTMUA and we prepared a rough plan. One of the major leaks we thought was a leak coming into the sewer system that we noticed during the TV inspection was actually the high school's main connection into the pipeline. Apparently in that 18 inch pipeline they just tapped in a 10 inch sewer line and I'm not sure when. We found that out at the meeting and it was news to us. It's in the baseball field;

the JV or practice field. So we hope to dig that up and put a manhole there so we would have a proper connection for cleaning their sewers or our sewers in the future. The manhole that is roughly under the goal post, they had re-straightened the goal post several times; they didn't have any idea why it was moving but our pipe has a hole in it so they must have put it in there. We can pull that manhole back outside the running track; under the running track they have a fiber optic line for the score board and the lighting; so there are other utilities that surround the facility but we will pull our manhole outside of their facilities. The other manhole by the 30 yard line we can pull that one out also; in doing so we'll have about a 500 foot run between the two manholes that would be outside their facilities. We can go 500 feet on an 18 inch sewer; we'll clean it, cure and replace the liner. Because some of the work can be done outside of the field; the field is used for graduation so it can't be touched before then, maybe some of the work on the manhole in the baseball field, we could do a week or so earlier. We'll need to have close coordination with the school and their contractor. They have an August 25th deadline, there's just not a lot of time for the sewer work to be done in advance. It was a productive meeting, they need a lot of information that we need to get to them, as-built drawings and general information and we agreed to work hand in hand to put together specifications for their contractor. We did discuss the possibility of maybe having a major contractor coming in to do all the work but the discussion turned to how could Authority money go to a school board and back and forth and that didn't seem very practical at all.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Flemington Borough has a sound understanding of what's involved with this?

Mr. Miller – Yes, they and their engineer were at the meeting. Also, I got a hold of Mr. Phillip Greiner who is going to be the new Mayor of Flemington Borough and I've made him aware of it. I asked if they could pay their part in cash. I am having Mr. Kiel come in and we're going to sit down with him and see if we can do our part in cash. Mr. Langhart said we'd have to pay a lot of upfront fees for an NJEIT loan and it's not worth it for a small amount like this. The question is can we do it in cash or will we have to bond for it.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Mr. Kocsik, recognizing that this is going to be a condensed construction phase, it's going to be bam and then it's done, that amount of \$32,000.00; it's almost like "we're not sure" and this amount is coming out of our operating account can you explain that?

Mr. Kocsik – It's a budget where we could do less; when we put it together, that was the high side number and if we can do it for less, we will do it for less but it's the coordination and that we have to put in a by-pass pumping system for flow control while we're doing the lining work and we anticipate having to be somewhat involved with the contract operation. If the Authority wants to have

staff out there watching some of those things, that's one way to cut back on that amount.

Mr. Kinsella – If something goes wrong here, time wise or whatever; who is on the hook for it? Is it HMM? Is it us?

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – With regards to the football field, it sounds like if we're just going to be lining it and filling it in with flowable fill, that shouldn't be that involved with messing up the field. If they're going to peel it up it seems like it should happen fairly quickly.

Mr. Kocsik – The goal post will need to be put back in the same exact spot. We have to figure out a way to support the goal post without putting weight on the pipe.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – The actual work effort, when you're actually out there, I don't think it's going to be that involved in the actual field. The stuff in the JV baseball field and some of that other stuff that is outside of the field of play, that stuff could take time. The last thing we want to have is Central schedules a game or some other event on the field and we held up the whole thing.

Mr. Del Vecchio – The problem is going to be is if they have their contractor scheduled to do the field and all of a sudden we hold up their contractor and they get hung up for extra charges because their contractor is delayed.

Mr. Tully – So coordinating those two guys is going to be paramount.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I don't know if there should be a penalty put in our contract or incentive clause, if you don't get it done, you're going to be penalized but if you get it done early, we'll give you a bonus. What we can't have is our guy saying he can't get in there because of their contractor.

Mr. Kinsella – Mr. Tice, as far as the contract goes, is there a different way to write it?

Mr. Tice – I haven't seen the contract.

Mr. Kocsik – There isn't a contract yet. We did talk about it. They didn't want and I didn't want our contractor driving all over the baseball field when he's doing the manhole and putting ruts in the baseball field or anything like that. They said "we'll give you a path for the contractor's vehicles to access" so now we're off of our easement and we'll be on other parts of the facility on their property. That's one of the things we have to go over, if we access this work site from a different point and we leave tire marks and the school says you left tire marks, fix it or if we have to have by-pass piping on the stadium and pass through the stands and something got left behind. So there is maybe some sort of letter or agreement to work out with the school about accessing their property.

Mr. Del Vecchio – I think we're going to have to have something probably between us and the high school to address any liability or whatever.

Mr. Tice – Get an agreement for if they expect you to return something to the original condition; also get insurance.

Mr. Kocsik – The running track will actually take more time to get done but they can't do the track until the field is done and we have to do the sewer first. Even before that, the first manhole which is opposite the bus depot and the buses are running up to that last day and we have to access that first manhole. There's a lot of coordination to be scheduled; the time window based on what they need time wise and the window for our guys is probably going to be in the two to four week time period. It might be a week or two before school ends, I don't know.

Mr. Del Vecchio – Do we have to wait for them to rip up the field or can we just rip holes in the old field? I'm saying right after graduation; if we have to wait for them to rip the field up before we go out; if we know where the manholes are and that's all we have to access, so we rip a hole in the 30 yard line and we rip another hole by the end zone and we do our work and then their guy can come in after we're done and rip up the rest of the field.

Mr. Kocsik – Its two contractors working in the same spot at the same time.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. - I think you're going to have to see what's in their contract and make sure that both contractors are talking and I think to some degree there's got to be a severe penalty if our guy doesn't perform but by the same token there should be an incentive there to make him get in there and do it quickly.

Mr. Tully – Like Mr. Del Vecchio was saying, what if they hold up our guy from starting and he's not able to finish in his time frame and it's not his fault?

Mr. Del Vecchio – That's what I'm saying, if they say we can't do anything until after graduation, that's fine but if we can go in there the day after graduation and they don't care about the field, as long as we can find the two manholes we need to find in the field, we'll just rip holes in the field and get at the manholes and leave the dirt piled up and then after that their contractor can come and rip out all of the rest of it. But let us get in there first and get our stuff over with. Rather than wait for their guy to come out, rip the field out, then he has to go away and then we have to go in. The goal post is literally on top of the pipe?

Mr. Kocsik – Through it; I think they may have moved it down five or six feet; a steel pipe with a steel sleeve but when they moved it down I think it put weight on our clay pipe and the clay pipe crushed.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Mr. Miller and Mr. LaFerla, if you can follow up, whatever we can do in regards to that \$32,000.00, let's be conscious of that.

Mr. Tully made a motion to approve Resolution #2014 - 62, Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:	Chair Del Vecchio	-	Yes
	Dr. Dougherty	-	Absent
	Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	-	Yes
	Mr. Kinsella	-	Yes
	Mr. Tully	-	Yes

Resolution #2014 - 63 Establishment of Administrative Salaries

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – No offense Mr. Miller but I think when you start getting up there in higher numbers, two and a half percent; you need to start looking at the magnitude, so I'm not going to support this. I don't have an issue with the other employees with it.

Mr. Tully made a motion to approve Resolution #2014 - 63, Mr. Kinsella seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:	Chair Del Vecchio	-	Yes
	Dr. Dougherty	-	Absent
	Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	-	No
	Mr. Kinsella	-	Yes
	Mr. Tully	-	Yes

Resolution #2014 - 64 Adoption of Certified Budget

Mr. Kinsella made a motion to approve Resolution #2014 - 64, Mr. Tully seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:	Chair Del Vecchio	-	Yes
	Dr. Dougherty	-	Absent
	Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	-	No
	Mr. Kinsella	-	Yes
	Mr. Tully	-	Yes

6. **Approval of Minutes:** Minutes of SEPTEMBER 18, 2014
Minutes of OCTOBER 16, 2014

September minutes could not be approved as only two Board members from the September meeting were present; minutes to be carried to the December meeting.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Mr. Miller, what is in the Agreement with Flemington Borough with the high school interceptor, what is the percentage?

Mr. Miller – Twenty eight percent.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – The other thing is the WMP; there was quite a bit of dialog that we had; where do we stand with that? You were going to get documents to Mrs. Wohlleb or Mr. Kocsik or you had gotten something from Mr. Bogen and she hadn't seen it or something like that.

Mr. Miller – She told me the same website and I sent it to the Mayor that basically what they said is the second half of the build out, we're changing our approach, standby and don't do anything and that's where it stands.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – So HMM has everything they need?

Mr. Miller – Yes.

Mr. Kocsik – Yesterday at AEA the person from DEP spoke and they said that there are a few regulations and the WMP in particular where they are introducing new rules, sometime next year where they try to tie development with water supply and to wastewater at local planning and it didn't work statewide.

Mr. Tully made a motion to approve the minutes from the OCTOBER 16, 2014 meeting. Mr. Kinsella seconded the motion. All were favor.

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

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. - The bills totaled \$497,529.11. I talked to Mrs. Struening about some general concerns, if we have any short term concerns with regards to cash flow and she said no we look pretty good from a cash flow perspective. The other thing is if you go to the hot pink page, if you look, and this is for the period ending November 30, 2014; we're not through November yet but it does capture some of the invoices that we've paid so far in November but not all of them and if you took a conservative approach in an eleven month period divided by twelve, that puts us at around 91 or 92 percent. We're a little bit below budget so certainly we're in good shape when it comes to the entire budget year. One other thing, Mr. Miller; Flemington Borough in regards to outstanding bills?

Mr. Miller – One was with the 2010 Revenue Bonds, when we sent them the adjustment, it was something like one percent and they wanted to know why. We sent them the explanation, Mrs. Phipps did it, and it was very well done and Mr. Diehl understood it but Mr. Harris did not so we're going to have a meeting.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Mrs. Struening told me she is in the process of getting a meeting set up, it's something like \$34,000.00 that they owe us. Mrs. Struening is comfortable that it is a fair request. I asked if we could get this squared away before the last borough council meeting of the year.

Mr. Miller – We did get a \$200,000.00 check from them after Mrs. Struening rattled their cage.

Mr. Tully made a motion to approve the payment of bills. Mr. Kinsella seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:	Chair Del Vecchio	-	Yes
	Dr. Dougherty	-	Absent
	Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	-	Yes
	Mr. Kinsella	-	Yes
	Mr. Tully	-	Yes

8. Citizens' Privilege:

None

9. Adjourn into Closed Session by Motion, if Needed

10. Adjournment of Regular Meeting:

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

RARITAN TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL UTILITIES AUTHORITY
WORK SESSION MINUTES

APPROVED

NOVEMBER 20, 2014

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. Kocsik – There are two things I'd like to go over. One of them is Raritan Junction / Costco; the sewer that was installed not long ago, they are modifying the detention basin, they are expanding it so they want to replace the sewer and they came up with an unacceptable plan and we told them they had to re-align it differently. The other thing of interest is Johanna Foods; they sent Mr. Miller a request approximately two weeks ago to endorse a request for an increase in capacity. I believe their current discharge permit expires April of next year and they've been talking to NJDEP who suggested they modify their SIU permit. So we had a letter saying "Mr. Miller, please sign this; Section I, II and III of the Application and by the way we want to increase our capacity from 270,000 gallons per day (gpd) to 331,000 gpd." There was nothing attached to it, no reports; I did a little bit of digging and I believe this past February the Board authorized Mr. Miller to sign an application to modify their plant for odor issues but nothing to do with capacity. Then at the meeting in February there was mention that they should come back with a report on what they would be doing

and some other information and any increase in capacity and until they submitted the full report to us, we wouldn't be entertaining any increase request in capacity. Mr. Miller had a phone call with Mr. Saracini on Monday and asked them to submit their report so it can support their request.

Mr. Del Vecchio – The thing is, if they are looking to increase their SIU and I guess they have 275,000 gpd roughly, what do we have allocated to them, do we know?

Mr. Kocsik – They have 61,000 gpd more allocated on the table that Mrs. Wohlleb has, that's allocation. I don't know if it's paid for allocation or reserved allocation but there's 61,000 gpd. Reading the February meeting minutes they were talking about going for another 150,000 gpd. This particular application they hand wrote on it 270,000 gpd going to 331,000 gpd which is 61,000 gpd exactly. But we don't have any information on the new product lines they are putting in at their plant, like loads or flow.

Mr. Del Vecchio – That's part of what I asked you Mr. Miller, a week or so ago; we need to make sure what we have on the books for allocation matches what HMM has in their listing. The question becomes if we and HMM are showing 61,000 gpd that we were holding for them, is it truly an allocation, we need to figure out what that is.

Mr. Miller – When we look at the WQM-007, the one Mrs. Wohlleb prepares quarterly, she has a detailed listing which compares to our detailed listing but ours is really a subsidiary ledger for the money we keep in escrow and by the way we also have the EDUs there. There were seven that didn't agree with capacity, some were very small but all of them were TWA oriented, I don't know if you report something to be connected and I don't know if that's different than what we have for a reason.

Mr. Kocsik – I have talked to Mr. Coe for a little more history on some of this stuff and I'm going to send him an email with what my questions are to see where that 61,000 gpd stems from.

Mr. Del Vecchio – Is that an actual allocation that we've had on the books? Or something we've been holding in space?

Mr. Miller – That's a good question; I think it's been holding in space.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – If its' holding in space is that for them?

Mr. Miller – Well, we've always just sort of said; well, it's sort of like when we lined the interceptor, we got a certain amount back, Mr. Coe said "you've probably got this much" but I only took half of it so the other half is out there; I don't want to specify specific numbers because I don't know them.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – That's different though Mr. Miller.

Mr. Del Vecchio – That's a different story.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – It's 61,000 gpd, we can't just give them 61,000 gpd without going out with a Point Allocation. If they have 61,000 gpd in their name that they've already previously reserved, well then it's theirs and they can use it.

Mr. Del Vecchio – That's what we need to get to, and I don't care if the chart is done for billing, we need to know what is formally allocated to all of the properties; not what we're holding, not what we think we have, what is actual allocations on the books. Whatever we have should match what HMM is showing on the quarterly reports. If there's any plus or minus there, we need to know what the plus or minus is and figure it out and get it straightened out so that the number we report is the total allocation that's been given out to all these blocks and lots and its correct. There was one you told me about an allocation which they had on their books that you said we already got back; we need to get that straight. Their report and our report need to match all the time.

Mr. Miller – Really our report should just be financials, it should have nothing to do with EDUs and theirs should be the one...

Mr. Del Vecchio – I don't care if you make it a combined report, an EDU report, but the reality is we need to know that they're reporting, that we've got an allocation out there of 600,000 gpd for all of these sites and we're showing on the books that we've got allocations of 600,000 gpd not 598,000 gpd, not 620,000 gpd; it needs to match.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I'm jumping a little bit ahead here Mr. Miller, on the next to the last page of your report, you have "Reserve Capacity Agreements Tracking System" and you say "the reserve capacity agreements have been updated through October 2014 and proved and reconciled with the corresponding escrow subsidiary ledger accounts as of October 31. There are 67 individual reservation accounts reserving 367,234 gpd or 1,224 EDUs. There is currently \$929,752.91 in escrow for reservations." So is that 61,000 gpd reflected in this thing here?

Mr. Miller – No, because they are Reservation Agreements. So if the 61,000 gpd belongs to them it's already been allocated. Do you know the answer to that, Mr. LaFerla?

Mr. LaFerla – I don't know anything about EDUs.

Mr. Miller – Well, you take the readings. Do you say "oh this flow is over" their limit like you do with Readington Township?

Mr. LaFerla – No.

Mr. Miller – But you know that Readington Township is a 125,000 gpd and if they reach 130,000 gpd they are 5,000 gpd over.

Mr. Del Vecchio – What I am saying is there are 67 reservation accounts, so that's 367,234 gpd that are reserved. But, my understanding is that the total

allocation is based on the report that HMM has which is somewhere like 679,000 gpd.

Mr. Kocsik – Which also includes Johanna Farm's 61,000 gpd anticipated flow to be connected.

Mr. Del Vecchio – So we need to know the 367,234 gpd that's here should line up with what they've got there and then all the rest of it between this 367,234 gpd and 690 something, we need to know what all of those are. If it's capacity that we got back but they are showing that it's still reserved, then they need to fix their sheet because they're showing it right now as there is no room for capacity, and all of a sudden if there's 60 or 70,000 gpd that we find that's a difference to the plus, then we need to know that. I understand that you're worried about the dollars, dollars are great, dollars are important but we need to know the overall flow because the plant runs on flow. We should have a master list of all the reservation accounts and then below that all of the other allocations that are not reservations so that the total reservations and allocations add up to the same number on both sheets.

Mr. Miller – I'll just formally reconcile theirs with ours and find out what the difference is. As I said, I think there are nine accounts and all but one of them are TWA's.

Mr. Kinsella – I will say one thing; that it should be done soon, very soon.

Mr. Del Vecchio – Yes.

Mr. Kinsella – There are other things out there that weren't out there before and it's information that's got to be rectified and soon.

Mr. Del Vecchio – I would say it's got to be all done by the next meeting.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Just for my understanding, this Johanna Foods, it's different than a Reservation Agreement, it's like Lipton. The concern I have is this 61,000 gpd, do they have it? Is it for them?

Mr. Miller – I don't know, I'll find out. It's not a reservation, it's not on the sheets Ms. Nicaretta does.

Mr. Del Vecchio – That's what I'm saying, we need to know. The question becomes we need to have that all listed; you can have all these and then underneath have all the other allocations, so we know exactly where it all is. There's 697,000 gpd there, then there should be 697,000 gpd here. If they've already got the 61,000 gpd then there isn't a problem signing the SIU because they already have it. If they are asking for 61,000 gpd more and it's already in their contract and on the books, it's not a problem. If it's not on the books, then they have to come to us and ask for an allocation and we need to know that we have capacity available.

Mr. Kocsik – I saw the February meeting minutes and Mr. Coe making reference to a Point System.

Mr. Tully – I thought then they were talking about asking for 150,000 gpd.

Mr. Del Vecchio – Yes, they were looking for 150,000 but I don't know exactly what they have.

Mr. Tully – Was that 61,000 gpd part of that 150,000?

Mr. Del Vecchio – We need to know that.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – To your knowledge Mr. LaFerla, on what's flowing out of there, where are they? Does this 61,000 gpd ring a bell?

Mr. LaFerla – Not to me.

Mr. Del Vecchio – That's the only SIU permit we have. SIU is Significant Indirect User; it's to a large industrial site that discharges into a municipal Authority.

Mr. Kocsik – Its' pretreated wastewater that comes to us; the State regulates that.

Mr. Del Vecchio – It's the only one that we have. We should know if the permit is for 273,000 gpd; how much do they have in the contract allocated to them.

Mr. Miller – So there is a limit to what they can send us.

Mr. Kocsik – They have a monthly average allowance; they can fluctuate and they have a daily maximum load. You could look at the monthly reports for the past year or two and see how they've been.

Mr. Del Vecchio – We need to know what they have; not by the SIU permit but by contract that we have allocated to them.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. - Did this have to go through the Planning Board or anything like that? Or is it internal?

Mr. Kocsik – The other TWA had a municipal signature on it.

Mr. Miller – They signed it, I signed it but it was just for the odor control piece.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – So this is a new TWA for the increase in flow?

Mr. Kocsik – Yes, they are adding facilities for juice manufacturing; my question is if they are adding load, because it's citrus juices coming in, are they adding a load to the wastewater that we should be aware of? Even though the State is going to monitor their site, you'll probably want to know what kind of discharge they are going to have with BOD and DMR and everything else. The Authority needs to know that they aren't putting in additional pretreatment or treatment facilities. Their consultant will put together a full report on what they're putting in, how they are treating it, what the actual flow is going to be, what quantities and times etc. but it did not come with the request.

Mr. Del Vecchio – Above and beyond the request we need to know what do we have contractually; their SIU permit, they've had that for years but contractually they may have had more allocation then what was in their permit, they just never moved on it and now they may want to move on it. If they don't

have it, then it's a matter of we can't sign it so then it goes out to a Point System and we give them an allocation. I think we need to go through and figure out the whole 690 something and hopefully a bunch of things that we find like you did find and make the numbers match and then come up with whatever the plus or the minus is and as Mr. Kinsella said, I think we need that by the next meeting.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – What's Johanna Foods timeline for this?

Mr. Kocsik – I know their permit expires in April and usually you have to start six months in advance, that's probably what spurred this.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I guess the worst case scenario they don't have it; then we would have to go through a Point System allocation which is going to take a long time, which would derail the whole thing.

Mr. Del Vecchio – That's why I think the first thing we need to do is get all this stuff straight and know what we have, we should have file with all of the stuff we have with contracts, that should be an allocation file with all these oddball things, stuff that's not the run of the mill.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Mr. Miller, it should be easy enough for you to at least check Johanna Foods out and know if they have the 61,000 gpd or not; we could know that tomorrow. I think if we wait a month and if Johanna Foods is an issue and they don't have that allocation, I think we need to move things up instead of waiting a month to find out they don't have the 61,000 gpd.

Mr. Del Vecchio – If they don't have the 61,000 gpd that will not be good because it's going to put their plans back a little bit and we'll have to figure out what we're doing. I agree with Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. that we need to check that out tomorrow.

Mr. Kinsella – How long should it take us to figure out that 300,000 gpd disparity between HMM and us? That should be a priority.

Mr. Miller – I think it's because of how a TWA is reported; it doesn't say "this is the capacity".

Mr. Del Vecchio – I understand that but what I'm saying is their numbers are creating whether or not we have capacity. We need to have something here that says how HMM got that number. Some of it is paid allocations and I understand that, that's 300 and something thousand gallons, now if they are holding so many gallons for the Lipton site, that's a contract, not an allocation. We need to know that. If we have a contract with Johanna Foods for additional capacity that's already there then we need to know that. We should have a list that says "here's all the paid allocations and here's all the contractual allocations we have" and it should add up to 697,000 gpd and it agrees exactly with HMM's number.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Mr. Miller, how long will it take to do that? It can't take a month, is it possible to have that done by next week?

Mr. Del Vecchio – Next week is the holiday.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – How many days can it take to just pull the contracts and look at them?

Mr. Miller – I'll start on it tomorrow, see how it's going to give you a feel for it.

Mr. Del Vecchio – What we may end up finding is that there is enough disagreement between the two that we end up finding 40 or 50,000 gpd of capacity that their report has eaten up that's not contracted for which would lower their number. It shouldn't just be incumbent on them, our numbers should match theirs. I know we're tracking dollars but we need to track all of the contracts and everything else.

Mr. Miller – Ms. Nicaretta used to give it to Mrs. Wohlleb every quarter and the money has always right on the penny, there are no problems with it. I presume Mrs. Wohlleb isn't just sweeping it aside.

Ms. Nicaretta – Mrs. Wohlleb doesn't care about the money; she's just seeing what's on reservation in addition to whatever numbers she has. She just wants to make sure our reservations match hers in addition to the other numbers she has and uses.

Mr. Del Vecchio – I'm sure the reservations probably agree, but the problem is the reservations are only 367,000 whatever gallons per day and there's another 330,000 gpd that are floating around by contract. We know a bunch of it is on the Lipton property; that's an entry on a spreadsheet, block and lot, Lipton, this much capacity there and at least we know it's there. Go through and find all of those and it should tally up to HMM's number. If it doesn't, then we need to find out where the disparity is. In some cases we may have gotten some capacity back and they don't know it. We need to make sure the two spreadsheets match and then we might find out we have capacity.

Mr. Miller – I'll look at it.

Mr. Del Vecchio – I remember from the February meeting Johanna Foods was looking at 150,000 gpd but I don't know what we have contractually with them; if it's 61,000 gpd more than what their SIU permit is showing, then we can sign the SIU permit for the 61,000 gpd because then they are just going for the full amount of their contract.

6. **RTMUA Reports:**

a) Administrative Report –

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Mr. Miller, the “SEC Continuing Disclosures” section; Raritan Township’s bond rating was downgraded from AA+ to AA, can you enlighten me on this? How does that apply to us? Ultimately they back us. We don’t have a bond rating ourselves?

Mr. Miller – Yes we do. We had an AA+ until we said “oh, by the way” and they said “oh, yes” and they downgraded us.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – When did we get downgraded?

Mr. Miller – In the early spring; but they got downgraded in the early spring and they never notified us.

Mr. Kinsella – Who is they?

Mr. Miller – They being Standard and Poor, they are the only one of the three that rates us. They left us at AA+ and then Mr. Langhart came across it because they are also Flemington Borough’s bond counsel, I mean Raritan Township’s bond counsel, and he said “wait a minute, this isn’t right” and the SEC with this DCCM thing, where you have to report everything, we had to report we were downgraded.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Us? RTMUA was downgraded?

Mr. Miller – Yes.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Where does that say that in here? Basically it says Raritan Township was downgraded.

Mr. Miller – They were downgraded and we are downgraded along with them just because they were downgraded and they back our bonds.

Mr. Del Vecchio – Because Raritan Township was downgraded, we are downgraded.

Mr. Miller – Yes, that’s correct.

Mr. Kinsella – We’ll have to pay more interest.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – That should be reflected in here in your report; it just says Raritan Township was downgraded.

Mr. Miller – Yes they were.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – But what about us, it doesn’t say in here RTMUA was downgraded.

Mr. Miller – No, it doesn’t, I’m sorry, we were downgraded too. Actually it’s a Continuing Disclosure we have to report when the people guaranteeing us have a change and that’s what we’ve done. As far as I know we could still be, we are an AA+, I checked it, all but two of our bonds are still at AA+, the 2010 bonds, they actually break them into about fifteen or twenty tranches when they sell them and if you go online and go into the rating agency, you’ll see the

CUSPID numbers of all of our bonds, two thirds of them are rated at AA+ today, I checked earlier this morning, and some of them are rated AA. It makes no sense.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – You spoke to Mr. Langhart on this?

Mr. Miller – Yes.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Can you do me a favor? Get an email from Mr. Langhart basically saying “yes, Raritan Township’s bond rating was dropped from AA+ to AA however RTMUA’s bond rating remains at AA+” and also ask him what the impact is with the Township’s rating being downgraded, how does that apply to us?

Mr. Miller – Actually, the institution doesn’t get the rating, the bonds do. If you look right now on EMMA, you’ll see our bonds and as I said there are tranches, I think there is about fifteen of them, for the 2010 bonds, and this is all it concerns, and when you look down there, you’ll see AA+, most of them are AA+.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I just want you to get in touch with Mr. Langhart so it clarifies for me that Mr. Langhart says that “RTMUA bond rating remains at AA+, however Raritan Township was downgraded to AA”. Ultimately, if we fail to pay, they are the ones that have to step up so I can understand why we would want to be interested in the Township being downgraded. I just want to make sure our bond rating is still AA+ which you are saying it is.

Mr. Miller – The bonds that I saw were rated AA+, I’ll make a copy of it and send it to you and you can see the ratings or I can give you the URL.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I don’t want that, I want something from Mr. Langhart that says we’re still AA+. You’re right Mr. Kinsella, we’re going to pay more interest if we’re downgraded.

Mr. Kinsella – Yes, we will.

Mr. Miller – I don’t think so but okay.

b) Operations Report

1. Chief Operator’s Report –

Mr. Del Vecchio – I was interested in this Ms. Marita Nash of HMC calling about Ebola.

Mr. LaFerla – That got me too a little when she called and asked me what I wanted her to do with the waste before they sent it down the sewer. They are working on a contingency plan in case someone here happens to come down with Ebola and waste from them is in the toilet.

Mr. Kocsik – Wastewater Environmental Federation (WEF) is about to issue a nationwide advisory to wastewater and water utilities on Ebola. They

haven't published it yet, it's supposed to be out in November and I haven't seen it yet. The upside is that virus cannot survive in wastewater and can't survive many hours outside the body. That doesn't mean that plumbers and people working in hospitals won't be in touch with it so there is that advisory that is coming out.

Mr. LaFerla – I looked around after she called and didn't find anything like that out there yet either.

- i) Overtime Recap - ok
- ii) Septage / Greywater Recap - ok
2. Laboratory Summary - ok
3. Maintenance Summary - ok
4. Readington Flows –

Mr. Del Vecchio – Another question I have is on the Readington flows. They make no sense. Readington is averaging 50, 60 and all of a sudden last month they're at 23 and Hedgerow is 340 plus thousand.

Mr. LaFerla – I saw that. I just put it in the report so there was a number there. I did call and I think there's something wrong with the meter over there.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – How do they pay Mr. Miller?

Mr. Miller – They pay fine.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – No, I mean is it based on flow?

Mr. Miller – Yes, based on flow and reservation, and if they go over their reservation which is 125,000 gpd.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – So with this number here that's coming in, what are we going to invoice them? What's the value of that invoice?

Mr. LaFerla – They bring in their tapes from their pump stations. For some reason the meters down there are always going out.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – So what do we do with this? Now we have this number of 343,000 gpd how are we going to reconcile or resolve this?

Mr. LaFerla – They bring in all of their flow tapes and Mrs. Crown goes over them and we basically go by their flow tapes which is going to be different from that number.

Mr. Del Vecchio – Let me ask a question; we reconcile monthly with the flow tapes?

Mr. LaFerla – No, they bring in the tapes quarterly.

Mr. Del Vecchio – So we won't reconcile this until the end of the year?

Mr. Miller – Yes.

Mr. Del Vecchio – These are on their flow meters which means all of the numbers here may be totally meaningless. What we should be doing here, is have a line after each quarter of what the reconciled amount was so we know what each flow meter is. If I'm looking at this, it's a total waste of time.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I'm missing something. Basically, we have a flow meter that says they sent us 343,000 gpd and what are these flow tapes? Where is that number coming from?

Mr. LaFerla – They have a chart down there and it comes off the chart.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – So what's the difference between the chart and this number here? Is it something that's sent to us electronically and they don't match?

Mr. LaFerla – Most of the time they don't match. They will calibrate their meters and it works okay for a little while and then not.

Mr. Del Vecchio – The flow tape, do they have a wet well that it's coming off of?

Mr. LaFerla – Yes, there's one in Three Bridges and one in Hedgerow.

Mr. Del Vecchio – So the tape is the level on the wet well. You have a flume in there?

Mr. LaFerla – Yes.

Mr. Del Vecchio – The flow meter is where?

Mr. LaFerla – On a pipe; like I said sometimes the numbers don't match.

Mr. Del Vecchio – Instead of trying to fix the flow meter, take the measurements off the flume if the flume is accurate.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Who maintains that over there?

Mr. Miller – Their collection system people over there, I can't think of his name.

Mr. Del Vecchio – If what we're really using for billing is the flume, then just put a totalizer on the flume.

Mr. Kocsik – Most Authorities who use meters for billing, they are the ones responsible for those flow meters. If you're billing someone and that data is being used for the bill, and you rely upon them to maintain it, operate it and calibrate it...

Mr. Del Vecchio – We maintain the flow meter for Flemington so we know what their flow is. I don't know that we need to maintain Readington's flow meter but it would be nice to have an accurate totalizer on it.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I remember a while ago where it was fairly common for Readington to exceed that 125,000 gpd capacity for a while. It seems like it's gone down and it's very rarely that they go over now.

Mr. Miller – The guy who runs it over there, I can never remember his name.

Ms. Nicaretta – Scott Jesseman.

Mr. Miller – Mr. Jesseman said one time, “We have bad readings because the flume had all crud under the bottom. We’ve had trouble with that”. Maybe that’s why they were over.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – At one time though, it was fairly common that they exceeded that 125,000 gpd and it’s been very rare lately though it has been fairly dry but it doesn’t seem to have been an issue for at least the last year or two.

Mr. Del Vecchio – It should be fairly simple to put a transmitter on the recorder there and just have it converted into a totalizer or gallon flow and you could send it over here and add it into the system so you could see the reading on the screen of what’s coming out of those two stations. It is flow coming in here, you’re not talking big bucks for either one of those; it might be a couple of thousand dollars for the transmitter and if you’re going to do it by radio it might be another thousand dollars or so for the radio.

Mr. LaFerla – The guy from Allied is coming here next week so I’ll talk to him.

Mr. Del Vecchio – Ask him if it’s possible if we wanted to put in a digital readout and transmitter and send it into the SCADA system and then have it totalized here, then at least we can see how their flow varies, graph it on our system, we can see what’s coming in plus that would let you see when you have rain if all of a sudden their flow goes up just like we’re trying to do with all of the other pump stations. That wouldn’t be a major expense; the major equipment is all there it’s just a transmitter and basically an analyzer digital convertor.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – When we were going through the negotiations with Flemington on the Agreement, there was a question that had come up and Mr. Coe had said that maybe where the meter is, it may not in the appropriate place, maybe it should be moved. What ever happened with that?

Mr. Miller – That was the question I had on the Facilities Planning Report; when you’re looking at Flemington, things like what happened the other day, the tanks filled but didn’t go on line. Those tanks were drained back and that was never measured, any of it?

Mr. LaFerla – No.

Mr. Del Vecchio – When you pump back from the tanks, it pumps back passed the flume?

Mr. LaFerla – What’s draining out of those tanks, is not being measured. What’s coming out of that filter when its running is not being measured but it’s coming back here, the backwash.

Mr. Del Vecchio – So you’d have to move the flume further downstream.

Mr. LaFerla – Moving the flume is not going to help. It doesn’t go out through the flume to come back here. There is a flow meter there that was there originally, it broke and for some reason, and we’re going back ten or fifteen or more years ago, they wanted something like \$70,000.00 for the flow meter, I

don't know why, it's never been replaced and it's still sitting there, it doesn't work, it's no good. When we first took that place over that's how we measured the flow of what is in the tanks when it goes off line and we drain it back. The microscreen was never measured.

Mr. Del Vecchio – When we drain the microscreen or the tanks, is it pumped or is it a gravity line?

Mr. LaFerla – From when we had the construction, there are pumps in there now.

Mr. Del Vecchio – When they push it back to the plant, the question becomes, what kind of flow meter that was and does the line run full, that you can use something like a magnetic flow meter or is it a big line and the line only runs partially full?

Mr. LaFerla – It's a big line, it only runs partially full. It's not a flow meter that's not capturing it; it doesn't go through a flow meter.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Should we be putting in a flow meter to capture it?

Mr. LaFerla – If you want to charge Flemington with what we're treating for them, sure you should and for the backwash for the microscreen too. There's a lot of flow there that they aren't getting charged for. Like Mr. Miller said, Monday three long tanks filled up, it stopped, we drained it back and they have three long tanks for free.

Mr. Kinsella – What's the gallonage of that?

Mr. LaFerla – About half a million gallons, I'm pretty sure.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Mr. Miller, what's that equate to in dollars that you are saying we're not charging them? What's the dollar value on that?

Mr. Miller – I think it's about \$2.00 per thousand, for them \$1.75 per thousand. I'm not sure.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I'm just wondering how much because if you're talking about \$10.00, it's not worth it.

Mr. Miller – You're probably talking in the thousands.

Mr. Del Vecchio – The thing is if it's going to cost us \$10,000.00 to put a flow meter in...

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – They have to pay for it.

Mr. Del Vecchio – The thing is, especially on the backwash, that water is going to be nasty and trying to measure flow on that is going to be a pain.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I remember Mr. Coe talking about that, that maybe we could move stuff because we weren't really capturing everything. I just don't remember the details.

Mr. LaFerla – The backwash is taken out of the tank.

Mr. Miller – So the backwash back washes into the tank, is that what you're saying, am I right on that?

Mr. LaFerla – No, it comes directly here.

Mr. Del Vecchio – It may be that you have to put in two flow meters, one for the backwash and one when they pump the tanks. You have to decide what the right kind of flow meter to put in there is.

c) Commissioner's Comments:

7. **Discussion:**

None

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

9. **Adjournment of Work Session:**

Mr. Tully made a motion to adjourn the Work Session. Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. seconded the motion. All were in favor. The Meeting ended at 6:28 pm.