
RARITAN TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL UTILITIES AUTHORITY
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

APPROVED

OCTOBER 20, 2016

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:**

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

Also present were Greg LaFerla, RTMUA Chief Operator / Director; Regina Nicaretta, RTMUA Executive Secretary; Nancy Wohlleb, PE, Mott MacDonald; C. Gregory Watts, Esquire, Watts, Tice & Skowronek.

3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

4. **APPLICATIONS:**

None

5. RESOLUTIONS:

Resolution #2016 - 74 Introduction of the FY 2017 Budget

Mr. Cragin – We made a couple of changes from last month's meeting; the Board has the option of a five percent increase or a seven percent increase. The difference between five percent is it utilizes \$100,000.00 of net position; the seven percent would be a balanced budget using no net position. Operating expenses were cut; \$100,000.00 from sludge disposal, \$22,000.00 from operations OT and \$21,000.00 from the Pension. Sulfur Dioxide came in \$10,000.00 less than what we had expected and we decided to increase Connection Fees from zero to \$75,000.00.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Just to follow up on this; if you recall when we were here a month ago, originally the document we were working with was about a 10.1% or 10.2% increase. So what we did was we went back and looked at the projected budget on where we would be with some of these items by the end of the year. We also talked about potential revenue, if you go back a few budgets, we used to always over estimate on the Connection Fees and they were never realized, we were always over optimistic and those connections never happened. Mr. LaFerla took a close look at it, what's reasonable, what are we confident in, and we should take that credit and between Toll Brothers and Ingerman, there's a high level of confidence that we should be able to get the \$75,000.00 in Connection Fees. Mr. Cragin ran a couple of numbers for me with various percentage increases and recognizing that we may have some potential issues to deal with this year depending on what is found along the Neshanic, my recommendation would be to go with the net position of zero; it is a seven percent increase but with the unknowns that we have I think that's a fair increase.

Mr. Cragin – Just to put it in perspective, that seven percent increase is a \$41.00 per year increase on the user rate which is about \$10.25 per quarter. If the five percent increase were to go through, it's \$29.00 a year and roughly \$8.75 per quarter.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – The magnitude of the proposed annual rate will be with the zero net position?

Mr. Cragin – The user fee would be \$624.00 and if you utilized the \$100,000.00 it would be \$612.00.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – So in looking at that and I always bring this up, where is this Authority in comparison with other Authorities that you represent when it comes to user fees?

Mr. Cragin – I personally live in Medford Lakes and I pay \$175.00 per quarter for just sewer. You guys have a base rate whereas most of my other

clients have a more progressive rate where you pay \$50.00 for the first 10,000 gallons and then you pay more the more you use. It's kind of hard because you are a little bit different but you guys are right on par with where my other clients are.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – My recommendation would be to go with zero net position and the seven percent increase.

Chair Kinsella – Any questions? It seems like a fair way to deal with the situation.

Mr. Tully – Yes.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – As far as the Capital portion that's in the budget and going back to our last meeting; that is something that we're not committed to? We recognize these projects may or may not need to get done but we're not committed to getting them done?

Mr. Cragin – It's the Board's prerogative whether they do that project in this year or if something else comes up and they decide to push it off to the next year but it's a Capital Plan, you're not committed to it.

Mr. Tully made a motion to approve Resolution #2016 – 74, Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. seconded the motion.

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

Resolution #2016 - 77 Policy Concerning Tuition Reimbursement

Mr. Watts – What we tried to do here is simplify it so the Board has discretion now dealing with different employees differently depending upon their status and what courses they are going to take so basically what this says is that you encourage it, you will deal with employees on an individual basis to work out terms of tuition reimbursement.

Dr. Buza – Exactly; I spoke to Mr. Watts as well as to Dr. Dougherty and we'll have a general resolution and we'll have separate employment Agreements with each employee as we decide. Do we bring up Ms. Loudon at this point?

Mr. Watts – We do need to, you and I or with Dr. Dougherty, need to get her squared away soon so we need to get a draft of an Agreement with her.

Dr. Buza – Last time I gave you all the information so whenever you have that done you can email it to me and I'll review it and we'll bring it back to the Board.

Chair Kinsella – What's the time factor?

Dr. Buza – Who would be her contact?

Mr. LaFerla – I think she's been talking to Mr. Kinsella.

Chair Kinsella – Yes, I've been talking to her about it and I told her that we would discuss it this month at this meeting and I think she wants the outcome of how it affects her.

Dr. Buza – This resolution enables us to have a separate Agreement with anybody, including Ms. Loudon, and we did look at her specific request and at this point the terms that we can say that we're agreeing to are to pay for her education, fifty percent of the courses that she takes as approved by us, if she earns a B or better and there will be some other guidelines that we would like to speak to her about. She's already discussed with us the fact that she will provide us with the research that she obtains and works on, her dissertation and all that, we would have access to that, to benefit the Authority and it's users. She will also sign a "Not to Compete" Agreement so that she will stay with us. She offered to stay with us for five years at least from the time she finishes her education.

Mr. Watts – It should probably be a rolling five years, in other words, from when you reimburse her she has to stay for five years beyond that reimbursement or she has to pay the money back. So if she took courses this year, she'd have to stay for five years, if she took courses next year, it would have to be five years from that date. So it would be a rolling five years.

Dr. Buza – We also discussed when she'd get reimbursed.

Mr. Watts – The original minutes showed it could be up to twenty – four months but that seemed rather long.

Dr. Buza – I don't recall it being twenty – four months, I thought we would reimburse her probably as soon as she advised us of her grades.

Mr. Watts – We can just say she'll be reimbursed, I don't think you have to say more than that. When she presents the bills and we know she's enrolled in a course and she's passed the course, she can be reimbursed.

Dr. Buza – Dr. Dougherty and I decided that this would be subject to the approval of Board on an annual basis; so right now we're agreeing to her courses for this year but we would like to review it each year to make sure the courses that she's taking are courses that we feel would help the Authority and our users, she's performing well, all of those types of things so it's reviewed on an annual basis. She will not get reimbursed for incompletes and she gets reimbursed after a course is completed with a B or better. She submits her grades to Mr. LaFerla,

he doesn't have to come to the Board each time, the Contract will say Mr. LaFerla will review the grades and as long as it's a B or better or if it's a Pass / Fail course and she gets a Pass that's okay as well, Mr. LaFerla can okay and authorize the check to reimburse her and it will be on a class by class basis. At least she knows for the year, if we sign a year long Contract with her this time, she knows for this year she can plan out her classes and she'll get reimbursed fifty percent and then maybe we'll do a repeat of the Contract each year, subject to approval.

Mr. Watts – Yes, the Contract really should identify the course because you should really know what it is and the Agreement will identify which course she's approved to take and will be reimbursed for.

Dr. Buza – That's the other reason to do it year by year, because she might not know the courses that will be available and we'll leave a little flexibility in the Contract because she may have to switch the order of what she's taking.

Mr. Tully made a motion to approve Resolution #2016 – 77, Dr. Buza seconded the motion. All were in favor.

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

Chair Kinsella – We have Ms. Gallos from AEA here right now so we'll let her speak before continuing with the Resolutions.

Ms. Gallos – I'm sorry I'm late. I've been going around to all of the Board's and saying thank you for your membership in AEA, the Association for Environmental Authorities. We are forty – five years old this year and RTMUA has been a very faithful member of AEA. Dr. Buza you're still on our Legislative Committee; Mrs. Struening is on our HR Committee and that's a self-learning group; they get together every other month and they have a presentation about an HR related matter, so it's kind of an education thing. AEA is eighty – eight authorities large; most authorities in the State belong to AEA. I'm talking about water and wastewater authorities not parking authorities and so forth. We do have some municipal members as well. We really have a lot going on, we're having our conference in November and one of the things we'll be focusing on is Asset Management that is becoming the real focus of the DEP. The NJEIT funding now includes asset management requirements in the financing documents, the CSO permits which I know don't affect this utility authority but the

CSO permits that were issued in the last couple of years all have asset management components to the permit and the DEP tells us they're going to be building asset management requirements into the NJPDES as well. So the hand writing is on the wall. A lot of our conference agenda is focused on asset management overall, what does that mean, how do you do it? Condition assessment, condition assessment of pipes, condition assessment of force mains and then we're going to have a couple of people from NJEIT and DEP talking about the regulatory side of things and then a couple of presentations in the afternoon about financial metrics and when you're doing financial planning in tandem with your Capital Planning. That's a really useful set of presentations for our folks and we also just became a direct provider of continuing education credits just a year ago and so that makes it a lot easier for us to assign the credit and make sure people with water and wastewater licenses are getting the credits that they need and they can get them at our conferences. We also have a lot of Commissioners attend the November conference because they're down at the League anyway and it's the same week. I've been in the job for five years; my background is I worked at the Board of Public Utilities, in the Clean Energy Program, I have a Master's in Public Administration and I used to work for the Hunterdon County Democrat, years ago. We've really been focused on a couple of issues and I wanted to tell you about them. One is succession planning; it's a concern across the utilities industry not just in the public agency side of things. This idea of who is going to run the systems in the future. To that end, we have done a couple of things, we started our Mentoring Program this year, pairing up experienced folks with less experienced folks and some of the less experienced folks are not twenty – five, they may be people who came into the industry a little bit later, did something else first but at any rate we're trying to pass along that institutional memory that would otherwise go away. Those folks are meeting each other, pairing up with each other for six months and then moving on to someone else and that kind of thing. I think there are thirty or forty people involved, maybe about twenty pairs. The other thing, and this is the big thing, what we're calling the Environmental Professional Academy, and that is a training program for people who are potentially going to move into leadership positions. So there might be people who are in some level of administration, they may be somebody who is in operations but the idea is to give them the 30,000 foot level view of what is involved in running a system. We have four tracks, the first one is Administration, what's involved with administering an authority, a water or wastewater system under the authority model, and then we have Finance, it was a weekly meeting over four or six weeks and now we're starting HR and the last piece will be Operations. The idea is to give these people an overview, not just about this is how a water system runs engineering wise and

design wise but also how you do a budget, what are your responsibilities, how do you lead a staff, how do you deal with community relations; all of these things are all coming into it. This is our first year, we have twenty – five people and their in a cohort so they're going through all of these together. We're giving continuing education credits wherever they're applicable but some of the topics aren't directly applicable to water or wastewater licenses for example but they are very good in giving people an overview. We're really excited about that and we're sure we're going to do it again next year, it may be a little different, and it may be a little shorter, based on the feedback that we get. That's really a big thing and something that we're excited about because we think it's got a lot of potential and promise. We may also do some additional training for people who are in the lead administrative position; executive directors, administrators, superintendents, that kind of thing, but we're still working on that. I'll tell you a little bit about the legislative committee, that's one of our most active functions; I think it's one of our best services to our members. We have a very active legislative committee, we are a 301C6 organization so we are allowed to do lobbying; I am a registered lobbyist in the state of New Jersey and we really are just watching what's going on in the legislature when there are Bills that will hurt or help us, we want to know and get involved. One of the things we were involved in recently, as an example, was a Bill that was introduced by Senator Stack, which would have capped the bills of regional sewer authorities at two percent. Whether you're billing a municipality or you're billing an individual user, your bill couldn't go more than two percent. They didn't define regional sewage authorities in the Bill so for example if you have more than one municipality within your authority, we thought potentially that could affect all of them. Fortunately, we did what we do, we went to the hearing and we had our President Mr. Ruppel from South Monmouth Regional Sewage Authority and a few of the Executive Directors explain the whole idea of self – liquidating, they explained the importance of investing in the infrastructure and how if you can't raise the money you need to run the system then your system is going to eventually fail. I think we told them a lot of stuff they didn't really realize and how different in many respects an authority is from a municipality; authorities have to run their budgets according to GASB standards and municipalities don't, these kinds of things. We were able to get the bill sidelined and we found out the real concern of the legislator who introduced it was his town was part of the regional authority, he had a significant low to moderate income population in the town and he was concerned about how they would handle the burden of capital costs that were being incurred elsewhere in their particular system. What came out of it was a bill that would allow authorities to institute a special rate for low to moderate income users. You are already allowed to institute a senior citizen rate but this would just expand that but it

would be entirely permissive, not a mandatory thing. That's a kind of a situation that illustrates well what we do which is we get in there, we find out what the problem is and we try to respond to the legislator if we can but also explain our point of view to them. I have to say a lot of times, we oppose bills than support them, we feel like we're playing defense a lot of the time. We are also working on a bill that would reform the way Connection Fees are done and that will actually be great because it will potentially create another revenue source for some of the systems. Our legislative work and our succession planning work, these are just a couple examples of what we're doing and the one other thing I wanted to mention is arsenic. This is another example of a thing we do a lot of; the Hackettstown MUA got its draft NJPDES Permit, it had an extremely low arsenic level, the arsenic parameter is actually something like two orders of magnitude lower than the drinking water standard. We got a call from Hackettstown saying "this is a problem for us, is it a problem for anybody else?" So we emailed everybody and asked if it was a problem. This is a useful role that AEA can play in terms of putting a group together to go to DEP and say "what's going on, we know you are able to test to a much more sensitive level now, so now you're discovering that there is arsenic naturally occurring in the water in New Jersey which is true everywhere and how can we address this?" This is something AEA does a great deal of. We put everyone together and then we don't have one person trying to talk to DEP alone, but we're doing it together. We've also done something similar on a mark – out issue that was a BPU matter where the BPU was requiring water systems to do mark – outs on private property. Electric utilities own their wires all the way in, water utilities do not and we've been involved in some action to try to get the rules changed as far as water purveyors for that mark – out matter. So I just really wanted to give you some updates on what we're doing and I don't know if anybody has any questions, I've left some fliers about the conference and we're also doing an ethics workshop in the morning of November 15th, that's been another matter that our Board was concerned about. You all probably know that there is a great deal of public scrutiny, I think one of the messages we send our authorities is you have to operate at your best because you have to prove to the public you are worth keeping. One of those things is ethics and that's been another thing we've been involved in. We'll be talking about ethics in real world situations, not just what the statute says. I'll leave some newsletters and our directory and if you want more, I can send extras. Any questions?

Mr. Watts – A couple of years ago, there was legislation that would have brought out into the open the procedures by which a municipality that created an authority could dissolve it and it never really went anywhere. It didn't really take the power away from the municipalities but it made them go through some

procedural safeguards like public notice so people would know what was going on, do you have any knowledge of that ever being revived?

Ms. Gallos – That sounds like the Bill AEA was sponsoring, we had wanted to try to push legislation that would basically just slow the process down a little bit because what we have found with authorities being dissolved in the State is that there are sometimes very sincere interests in trying to find efficiencies and that sort of thing but what it really comes down to most of the time is money; a money grab. This is one of the things when we have an opportunity to go to the legislature, we can explain to them, authorities have reserves, sometimes because they have bonds that require they have reserves but also because they are never finished, they are always works in progress, there's always something that needs to be done and they need those reserves and what's the right level of reserve that is enough but not too much, that is an individual systems concern and has to be thought out. That sounds like the Bill that AEA was pushing, that was around when I started.

Mr. Watts – I think they're trying to get some of the Hunterdon legislators to do it but they were sort of hands off and I couldn't understand why; it seems like a legitimate thing, you're not taking away the right of the municipality, you're just putting some safeguards up. At least once with this authority and another one I represent, it was done very clandestinely and all of a sudden we got wind they were going to introduce an ordinance to dissolve us and we had to get to the first reading and object and they could do it very secretly.

Ms. Gallos – That's right. I can tell you about a couple of situations; one is Lower Township in Cape May, they have a situation where some of the towns council members wanted to dissolve the authority I think it was because they had a huge pension liability in their police department coming due in a couple of years and the authority had some reserves and also had some of its own debt that was going to be retired soon. It's not rocket science to look at the municipal budget and the authority budget and try to figure out why they are doing this but we say, and I truly believe this, authorities are a really, really wonderful way to deliver this service, this authority model, and what often happens when an authority is dissolved, when it's turned over to the municipality, the municipality has a whole host of responsibilities and the town administrator as well - meaning as they may be doesn't know, it's not a laser focus on just this one very, very important service to the community and so they take the money; and I'll give you an example, Marlboro, they had a five million dollar reserve, the five million dollars went into the thirty three million township budget the next year, then they had over the next couple of years and I've looked at their Capital Budget myself, one year they put five thousand dollars in their Capital Budget and the next year they put a thousand dollars in their Capital Budget; so basically, things started to fall apart, the drinking water system, the tap water tank needed work and then

they actually had a point where a house burned down because the two fire hydrants nearby did not work. In Delran they dissolved their authority, and subsequently the audits that started coming out of the town and the sewer utility were awful. The audit had the same language two or three years running saying that the township hadn't done its due diligence in converting from an authority to a sewer utility, they were doing things like not monitoring flow meters, they weren't collecting Connection Fee's and that sort of thing. We say that yes, the Authority is a very good model because it is part of the municipality but it is a little bit separated, they're a group of people whose only task is to make that system run properly and give it the kind of professionalism it needs. In Evesham we provided some of that kind of input and in Lower Township and in that case they stopped it. In both instances the Council can vote majority to dissolve the authority, then they have to go to the Local Finance Board.

Mr. Watts – Which has been rubber stamped in the past.

Ms. Gallos – Yes, but I have a sense that is changing a little bit. We've met with Mr. Cunningham who is the Director of the Division of Local Government Services and kind of made the case of "look, if they're dissolving the authority, you really have to look at because they are going to take the money that has been collected from rate payers and they are going to use it somewhere else and sometimes the taxpayers and the rate payers aren't the same group. So then you're having one group subsidize the other". They've also got one of the Commissioners from Ocean County Utilities Authority on the Board now. So Evesham voted to dissolve it's authority, they went to the Local Finance Board and it's the first time that it was four to one to approve it and that one on the Board "gets it". The previous one, I think it was Lower Township the Local Finance Board stipulated that they could dissolve the authority but they could not use the funds or reserves for anything but the water and wastewater systems. From our point of view, we'd rather see an authority but to me even that's a victory to be able to say they get this idea that you shouldn't be using the money for other purposes. In fact we did some research at one point where we just looked at municipal budgets and we looked at about one hundred of them and maybe sixty or seventy of them had water or wastewater utilities or departments and some of them were involved with authorities and we added up how much money was transferred, in just that hundred we looked at, over a three year period it was eighty million dollars. It's a problem but I think we're making some headway on the issue. I'll leave you to the rest of your meeting and thank you for having me.

Resolution #2016 - 78 Authorization for Termination of Environmental Maintenance Bond, Coppola Services, Inc.

Mr. Tully made a motion to approve Resolution #2016 – 78, Dr. Buza seconded the motion. All were in favor.

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

Resolution #2016 - 79 Authorization to Accept Proposal for Engineering Services from JMT for Phase I of Pump Station #1 Sewer Basin Evaluation

(Proposal = \$6,750.00)

Mr. Tully made a motion to approve Resolution #2016 – 79, Dr. Buza seconded the motion.

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

Resolution #2016 - 80 Approval for Contract Modification #1 Woodside Farms Pump Station Rehabilitation

Mr. LaFerla – There’s a report on the table for everyone from Mr. Coppola; and there’s also one there for Commerce Street.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – In reading the minutes from the last meeting, you guys worked with the utility company with the easement, said this is where we’re going to put it, this is where it’s going to go and we secured the right – of – way to accommodate that and when it was time to build it they said “we want it somewhere else” which created a major problem with us because we didn’t have that right – of – way and that’s what blocked up this whole thing for some time.

Mrs. Wohlleb – Yes.

Chair Kinsella – Was there a meeting at some point where this could have been worked out early on?

Mrs. Wohlleb – We invited them to the Pre – Con and they didn't show up. We did have correspondence and because of whatever they were doing internally it went beyond our local contact into the larger AGL Resources group. It went through multi – layers and we just didn't have a guy on their end being diligent despite us and the contractor following up.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Did we send letters to the utility company saying “your delaying our contract”?

Mrs. Wohlleb – It was part of the email correspondence; I didn't actually issue a letter.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I don't know if it's worth fighting it or do we pass this expense onto the utility company and send them an invoice as a result of a lack on their part. Was there any kind of a Utility Agreement between us and them?

Mrs. Wohlleb – You did sign paperwork once they were committed to coming out.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Did they renege on the terms of that Agreement?

Mrs. Wohlleb – I would have to take a look at that.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I think we should because if they didn't perform on that Agreement and we're getting stuck here, perhaps they should be picking up the tab on it.

Mrs. Wohlleb – Mr. Watts is that something you should look at?

Mr. Watts – Yes.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – When you look at it, we're taking a hit on about \$50,000.00.

Chair Kinsella – Somebody's got to be responsible for this. I don't think this should all be on us to pay for this delay.

Mr. Watts – I think the issue here is with Pact Two and the question is do you want to approve it, you have to pay Pact Two, and then we deal with the gas company later because Pact Two isn't part of the problem. You can hold them up but I'm not sure that's what you want to do. We contracted them, they did the work, they provided the service, we owe the money, and then it's up to us to try to get reimbursed by the utility company. That's what I would recommend.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Did Pact do their due diligence in corresponding with the utility company and not get a response.

Mrs. Wohlleb – Yes, which is why it fell to us and they came to us and said we need help.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – And you looked at our Contract documents?

Mr. Watts – The delays weren't caused by the contractor.

Mrs. Wohlleb – If the delay is caused by the contractor he doesn't get anything, if the delay is caused by the utility and in this case it's a situation where the cost to the authority to acquire additional easements was the reason why we didn't just let the gas company do what they wanted to do and reroute the gas

line. The Contract does have language in there that suggests where it's not clear that it's the contractors issue, he does have some validity. He certainly has validity with the time extension.

Chair Kinsella – I think we're going to have to pay these guys but I think we should we go after the utility company.

Mr. Watts – If you think there is any claim whatsoever against Pact Two then you shouldn't pay them. If you're convinced at this point that it's all with the gas company I recommend you pay them and we go after the gas company.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Can you look at the Contract and determine...

Mr. Watts – I would say for another month just to make sure, you can always sue Pact Two later, but it's better to not to have paid them when you're going to sue them. It's better that we look at it and I can advise you if I think you have any claim at all and you can decide how to move forward.

TABLED

Roll call vote:	Dr. Buza	-
	Dr. Dougherty	-
	Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	-
	Chair Kinsella	-
	Mr. Tully	-

Resolution #2016 - 81 Employment of Travis Beatty as Wastewater Treatment Operator

Mr. Tully made a motion to approve Resolution #2016 – 81, Dr. Buza seconded the motion.

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

6. **Approval of Minutes:** Minutes of September 15, 2016 Meeting
Minutes of October 10, 2016 Special Meeting

Mr. Tully made a motion to approve the minutes from the September 15, 2016 meeting. Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Tully made a motion to approve the minutes from the October 10, 2016 Special Meeting. Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. seconded the motion. All were in favor.

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

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. - The bills totaled \$530,043.44. All looks to be in order. If you go to the last orange page, I'll go through with the percentages. As of through September 30th to be conservative, we're ten months through our fiscal year, and that's about 83.3% and you can see we're at 82.1% which is a good thing, we're below. The comparison of where we were last year at this time, we were at 84.77% so in comparison to last year percent wise to our budget we're in better shape too.

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

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

8. **Citizens' Privilege:**

None

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

10. **Adjournment of Regular Meeting:**

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

RARITAN TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL UTILITIES AUTHORITY
WORK SESSION MINUTES

OCTOBER 20, 2016

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

APPROVED

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

2. **Correspondence:**

None

3. **Unfinished Business:**

None

4. **New Business:**

None

5. **Professional Reports:**

a) Attorney –

Mr. Watts – This is something that Ms. Nicaretta brought up, she received a request from Mr. Dilts for one of his clients where the property has already changed hands, the property has a reservation of seven EDUs, our procedure is before property exchanges hands the parties have to come here and get approval for the transfer of the capacity with the property. They didn't do that; typically the Authority has relaxed that requirement and approved them after the fact, the only thing I would recommend if you are thinking about doing that again is that you require from the new owner proof that the seven EDUs are truly required for development of the property.

Ms. Nicaretta – I spoke to the engineer for the project yesterday and he didn't realize he had to do an Application for Sewer Service and he was going to submit one within the month.

Mr. Watts – You might not want to take action on approving the transfer until you get that report.

b) Engineer –

Chair Kinsella – I have a question, the Motor Control Center, the numbers there, can you explain them to me?

Mrs. Wohlleb – The Motor Control Center project, the vast majority of the work is done. When we set out to do the job, there was an issue, the building roof drainage, the area in that back quadrant of the building, there's really no where for that drainage to go and the roof leader system that was put in when the building was built, in working with the authority's operators, found it was completely clogged with grit; it's a four inch line that's not maintainable. So as part of this project we included a component directing the drainage away from that part of the building with the investment in the electric gear, we didn't want a situation where we had ponding water over there, you don't have a lot of pitch or grading away from the building so we didn't want that situation of water getting into the electrical building so we took that as an opportunity and the operators agreed when we did the design for this work we install a new drainage system. Because we are funding this project through the NJEIT, it's their requirement where you install piping and they feel that those items shouldn't be in a lump sum bid, that you should have break out unit prices for them. We prepared the Contract to have quantities such as pavement removal, excavation, stone, select backfill, soil removal, pipe and these are all things you hear per cubic yard, linear foot, per ton, square yardage etc. We knew that running that drain line, you'd be crossing oodles of electrical conduit and other utilities that run between the blower building, the maintenance building, and other parts of the plant and with the documentation we had for the treatment plant, we showed along the drainage pipe route all the different crossings. We didn't have good elevation data so with the information we had we built into the quantities a little bit of the contingency in case we needed to drive the pipe a little bit deeper. That's how we prepared the prices plus followed all the Trust guidelines with regard to pay widths. The contractor bid the job, the contractor assigned his unit values to this aspect of the project and he did indeed have to drive the piping deeper and he opted to dig a narrower trench than the maximum pay widths. In some areas he was ordered to dig wider because of utility crossings so the way the Contract is and its practice to only pay a guy for what he digs and we held the maximum quantities. So when he prepared his most recent Payment Application he contacted our office because he wants to renegotiate his unit prices. Even though he's assigning individual unit price values, in his mind he assigned x amount of dollars, and he spread it out over these unit prices, he followed the requirements for minimum bid pricing but he saying there are actually less quantities than is actually going

to be payable versus what's in the Contract documents, he wants to renegotiate; he feels he's entitled to it. We said "show us how you're entitled". The only thing he presented was something about with the DOT you're allowed certain negotiations; we told him we're not the DOT. With NJEIT / DEP, there's no requirement that we have to; it's entirely up to the owner, I met with the contractor, I reviewed with the inspectors the units and while we are in agreement with what he has constructed, he was actually miscalculating his quantities at the time of his Pay Application and we corrected him where it was appropriate and where it stands right now is with that aspect of the project, he's thirty – two percent below what he put in his bid. What he was trying to contend with me is that "I'm more than twenty – five percent below, I'm going to follow a DOT aspect and I want to renegotiate" but I told him if we were only twenty – five percent low we wouldn't be having this conversation. I think where we are is where we are and there is no reason for me to recommend to the Authority an adjustment in unit prices. I don't recall for any project where we've ever done that.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Basically what's in the Contract, we uphold what's in the Contract. Sometimes contractors win and sometimes contractors lose. I'm sure he wouldn't be here saying "hey, I made a killing on these items so I'm going to give you a break".

Mrs. Wohlleb – He said he wanted to meet, so okay, the contractor is entitled to a meeting, so I spoke with Mr. LaFerla and asked if he was willing to meet with Mr. DeMaio and he said yes even though he didn't agree with Mr. DeMaio. We met with him and I heard what he had to say and I said "I still don't see any change in position and I wouldn't recommend a change order" so that's where we left it. Mr. LaFerla said he'd take a look himself and if he felt there was anything different he would call me but it doesn't sound like he thought there is.

Mr. LaFerla – No.

Mrs. Wohlleb – That's where we're at. What its amounting to right now is order magnitude of about \$40,000.00 back to the Authority in addition to as I mentioned in the report there are other credits that need to be finalized. Right now that Contract is about eleven percent over so to get back that amount of money which is completely justified, your back down to seven percent and that's pretty good. He's going to be paving next week. He is winding up. What I told the contractor last week was we don't even have final quantities; you're making guesses as to what you're actually going to dig, you'll do your next Pay Application, you'll give me your final quantities, you'll meet with Mr. LaFerla and have your formal response.

6. RTMUA REPORTS:

a) ADMINISTRATIVE / OPERATIONS REPORT

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

b) COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

None

7. Discussion:

a) Peggy Gallos AEA

Previously discussed.

b) 3rd Quarter 2016 Capacity Evaluation

Mrs. Wohlleb – Similar to past quarters, and we're almost thirteen years into the DEP's Capacity Assurance Program (CAP), we do our quarterly reporting to them, we are required to report our three month average daily flow to the plant and then based on that actual flow and also taking into account committed flow, the State defines committed flow as your unconnected Treatment Works Approved flows. The State requires you prepare form WQM – 007, based on that form and in this past quarter, we flowed about two and a half million gallons per day, we have an anticipated flow from our TWA unconnected flow of almost one hundred thirty thousand gallons a day so our committed flow in the eyes of the DEP for this quarter is almost two point seven million gallons a day. So when you compare that to three point eight million gallons per day is our permitted treatment capacity, we have the better part of one point one million gallons a day capacity surplus. Also typical of our previous reports, we take that analysis for Authority information purposes and we evaluate the other allocations that don't fall under the need to get a Treatment Works Approval permit; with this report we have taken into account, the expiration of the Permit Extension Act, we also have reviewed what the Authority's Certificates of Compliance where Connection Fees have been paid and we've also looked at our bulk customer's Flemington

Borough and Readington Township and taken a look at their flows as compared to what our Agreements are with them and on that basis, if you go to the colored chart that takes up two pages, we show that we have a total anticipated flow of about three hundred twenty two thousand gallons a day when you then add up remainder capacity of Linque the Flemington Borough Contract, the Readington Township Contract, the grand total suggests that our total allocations are just over one million gallons a day so now when you compare that to our actual treatment plant flow this past quarter, we have a total committed flow of nearly three point six million gallons a day suggesting that we have about two hundred thousand gallons a day of capacity surplus. The remaining documents just show our historical trend with the graph at the end and some of the backup data that was used. The only other thing of note is that despite the past quarter which did encompass the July storms, this part of Hunterdon County is in a drought watch.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – If we had a wet quarter that two hundred thirteen thousand could go in the other direction. This is just a snapshot for a quarter. When you really look at really evaluating the plant capacity you really have to look at it over a period of time like a year or two or three years to say this is generally where we are in terms of capacity.

Mrs. Wohlleb – Right, you do have the State which tells you right now under the NJPDES rules they want you to look at this on a quarterly basis; there are changes proposed to change the essence of the Capacity Assurance Program, that rule has not been adopted, it was proposed, there were a number of comments that came in from the private and public sector, and about a week or so ago an updated rule proposal change was published. I have not had time to study it in detail but from scanning it, it suggests that the State is starting to take a look at trying to match how you examine actual plant flows compared to why you get into a Capacity Assurance Program to begin with. The thought initially was to take a twelve month average, and if that average suggested that you're at your treatment plant capacity, meaning you're at a hundred percent for twelve months and it's a rolling twelve months, then you have to go into a CAP, and if you can prove for thirty – six consecutive months that you're not at a hundred percent then you're no longer in the CAP so that was the rule proposal last year. After the public comments the DEP has now changed that and their proposing under the CAP it is when you flow twelve months at ninety – five percent, your actual flow, not your committed flow, your actual through the pipe flow, is at ninety – five percent of your permitted flow then you should enter into the Capacity Assurance Program. Then you follow certain procedures of what you're going to do to prevent you from going to a hundred percent, when you've proven that you've dropped below the ninety – five percent you still have to be in the CAP unless you've proven a reduction below.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – So we were put into the CAP because we exceeded eighty percent. From our standpoint we need to look at what's already allocated or reserved which is what your report goes through. That stuffs not flowing yet. For this snapshot we would have two hundred and thirteen thousand gallons of excess capacity but that could change depending on how much rain we have.

Mrs. Wohlleb – What the State is trying to do is look at it on a quarterly basis which is just a snapshot; when you talk about the longer term planning like you do with the Wastewater Management Planning, the State is now trying to recognize looking back five years. The funny thing about the last five years is we're still going to capture 2011 which was a very wet year. We had 2008 and 2011 which were very wet, but the trend has been this, flows have been very, very low everywhere.

c) Raritan Township Development

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – So this kind of leads into, there's a meeting where some of the Capacity Sub Committee will be meeting with representatives from the Township. In our packet, there's a sheet, 136 EDUs that are being returned; 70 EDUs due to the Permit Extension Act and 66 EDUs from the Flemington Trade Center. The Township will ask how much capacity do you have to go out on a Point System Allocation, we aren't in a position to go out on a Point System yet because of concerns with the interceptor and our pipes that we want to try to resolve. When it comes down to the perspective of the plant, this was already previously committed. Just for the purpose of discussion with the Township if we were going to go out, as long as we were able to address the issues along the conveyance system is there a problem saying we could go out with all this capacity right here; all of the 136 EDUs? I know in the past when Mr. Coe would make recommendations, he'd go through the evaluation and analysis and he would say "this is where we are but as a safety factor let's cut it in half". But if we went back a month or two ago, this 136 EDUs was already in there. For the purposes of discussion with the Township, if we go out with a capacity allocation, so long as we address the issues with the conveyance system, is there a problem saying we can go out with the whole 136 EDUs?

Mrs. Wohlleb – It's a matter of your policy. I did review past correspondence and you're correct that whatever was considered going out on a Point System for was whacked in half and that was the policy as far as I know with all prior Point System allocations. If the question is, based on what came back, could we turn it right back around, you could but you would be deviating from you're past policy.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Policy in the past, if I recall, there were other issues and considerations that were evaluated as far as what is the actual flow, where

are we, what do we look like, and things like that and that was a safety factor. If you go through, looking back six months or before, we were on the hook for all of this anyway.

Mrs. Wohlleb – Right, if it's simply a matter of what you want to put right back out there, what was already out there, then yes.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – So you don't see an issue to do that?

Mrs. Wohlleb – No.

Mr. Watts – You know it's a real number.

Chair Kinsella – I think that number is a valid number. How do we allocate it?

Mr. Watts – Your procedure is to do it by way of a Point System; there isn't any other way to do it. I recommend a Capacity Sub – Committee meeting at some point to discuss the Point System.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – The other thing; and Mrs. Wohlleb, this has to do with up north, with HealthQuest and that area there; the concerns with that pump station and we had talked about there are issues with capacity and additional flows tied into that pump station that could overtax it and we were talking about the diverting of flow and a separate line running out toward Lipton or Diamond Nation, a dedicated line that if there was any future development that it would take the flow out of there and not go to that pump station. The issues with that particular pump station obviously is when its wet, is that when that pump station becomes a problem?

Chair Kinsella – Are the pumps undersized?

Mrs. Wohlleb – There's a couple issue there. As background, this is where the existing dome is, near HealthQuest and because of the proposed Enclave and Villages development, the dome would come down and the Enclave and the Villages would go there, each represent proposed residential affordable housing projects. Recently, we had met with Mr. Cust's professional staff to outlay to them what our concerns were in addition to hearing from them their proposal to try and establish flow for what's there. They picked a time last summer and did some metering and they're trying to say "you're billing me x but through my meter study I'm only using y, so I therefore have more capacity than the billing shows."

Chair Kinsella – It was a dry situation though.

Mrs. Wohlleb – It was dry but also something, and it was discussed at a prior Capacity Sub – Committee meeting, it was something that could not be accepted. When we met in May, there was discussion that perhaps the HealthQuest facility itself may have been over allocated, they felt there were some unique circumstances, the past correspondence in the file for the project when it came on line so many years ago suggests that. So where we left that last May was that the developer's engineer was going to perfect their projected

flows and try and produce different data just associated with the HealthQuest facility so they could actually make a determination as to what their proposed flows would actually be.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – So they're looking to demonstrate that they're allocated x and that they are flowing less than x so therefore they should be able to get the difference or use it as a credit.

Mr. Watts – We would not normally ordinarily even consider that but the fact that this is a unique use and may have been as Mrs. Wohlleb said, over allocated in the beginning, I think the Sub – Committee said we should take a look at it before we just flat out said no.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – And we never got that data?

Mrs. Wohlleb – We never got that data. Also at that meeting, once we had those flows we'd see what the impact was on the pump station and the developer's engineer wanted to take it upon themselves to do their own evaluation of the pump station. They did OPRA twice, I think for pump station data?

Ms. Nicaretta – Yes, we just received a recent one.

Mrs. Wohlleb – We said "fair enough, if you want to take a look at it, that's fine. We'll review it; we'll review it with the Authority. If we agree or disagree we'll go to the next point." What we had explained to them is that there's two pumps at that pump station and the way the current DEP rules are; one pump is supposed to do the job and the second pump is only called upon if that pump fails. Because of all the redevelopment that's occurred in the last eight to ten years in that area, there's been an increase in pump run times and we think, though we have not looked at all the pump data, that there are times in dry weather when the second pump is called. So we have that suspicion and by now we would have liked to have seen if the developer's engineer agreed, based on their review of the data, but we also know that in wet weather, two pumps do run. The impact on the downstream sewer is that, when the DOT was doing their roadwork in the Minneakoning Road vicinity, they wanted to get the sewer out of the paved portion of the Route 31 right – of – way; they proposed a sewer outside of the pavement. The contractor had expressed a concern to us because they had popped a manhole lid and thought there was a force main there and we said no it's a gravity pipe but it was flowing full on a dry day.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Coming from where?

Mrs. Wohlleb – Coming downstream of the Route 31 pump station and the gas station that was Getty and is now Triton, apparently they had some sort of pump station that discharges to this gravity sewer and also the Hunterdon Orthopedic Institute discharges into there and some gravity flow. It was suspected that the onsite pump station was doing more. Mr. LaFerla was going to investigate that.

Mr. LaFerla – We did go out and look and when we looked it wasn't really running anything. It was a dry day.

Mrs. Wohlleb – Unless we caught it in wet weather the fact that the pipe is flowing full, it had to be coming from the Route 31 Pump Station. What we found out on a few of the houses that are between the Deli Works and where the Democrat is, that office building, a few of those older homes, the DOT put in, in 1998, 1999 or 2000, they put in one way valves because the laterals for those houses are flat so if that pipe is flowing full, to prevent that lateral from backing up, those valves are in place. When the DOT was trying to get the sewer out of the road what we said was "don't abandon the old pipe, leave it." What we effectively tried to do was, for free, get a parallel pipe right there, so that we assured ourselves that we wouldn't have any issues with the lateral and maybe it would open itself up as a possibility if the Route 31 Pump Station is indeed pumping such that it is causing the downstream line to flow full, at least in a section of it, we'd have a free parallel line, so that would alleviate some of that bottleneck. What we're trying to do, is as soon as we can get information from the developer's engineer, it would be to take a look at the pipe slopes, try and get some field information to verify those slopes and pipe diameters and see how far that potential bottleneck carries. That pipe does open up to a fifteen inch so it so it doesn't carry for very long.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – So here's the thing, a couple of questions; what is the net increase in EDUs that Mr. Cust is looking for?

Mrs. Wohlleb – I think with the full development, if he does the two buildings, he's probably at least one hundred fifty to two hundred gallons per minute more.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – How many EDUs?

Mrs. Wohlleb – I don't remember.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – If the question comes up, can we accommodate these guys and what's involved with that? The other thing question is, how old is this pump station? I think the DOT built it for us, if I'm correct?

Mrs. Wohlleb – It's not that old; it was designed in the 90's but didn't get constructed until 2006, it's only about ten years old. I think for the whole development they were doing about 78,000 gallons per day so that would be the average daily flow, so maybe 260 EDUs?

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – We don't even have that with the capacity that was given back.

Mrs. Wohlleb – They have a reservation of 24 EDUs from the last Point System.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – The question is, what is the net that they are looking for?

Mrs. Wohlleb – I don't know, they have to give us updated information.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I'd like to know what is the net that they are looking for, and the other argument that they may make and maybe there's merit to it, is, in reality, they're not using everything that they were allocated and maybe that needs to be evaluated and maybe they can demonstrate that from an engineering perspective.

Mr. Watts – They realize they can't do the whole project; they wanted to do it in phases.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – It's not only issues in wet weather, we know there's issues at that pump station.

Mrs. Wohlleb – We suspect it. There is SCADA and there is a flow meter however, because you don't have variable frequency drives (VFD's) which allows you to pace your pumping based on what's actually coming in, there's no influent meter, it's only an effluent meter so all we can look at are run times, which again, we did not review because the developer's engineer wanted to do it, we didn't want a double effort, it was agreed at that meeting that they would look at it. Another option would be because we forced the DOT to keep the other line existing, we could let the station discharge where it is.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – How many feet of that parallels?

Mrs. Wohlleb – Probably about three or four hundred feet; you'd probably have to go another seven or eight hundred feet,

Chair Kinsella – That's under the road?

Mrs. Wohlleb – No, that would be off pavement, you'd have to go in front of the Democrat building and there's another stream crossing on Route 31 where you have the start of the fifteen inch. The bottom line is we're waiting on the developer's engineer.

Mr. Watts – Again, I think you should have the Sub – Committee make recommendations to any changes to the Point System, you'd have to adopt it, and once you do that, then you have to send out written notices to everybody who sent a letter asking for additional capacity and at the same time you put it into the Democrat saying "we're going to be accepting applications" and you have to put a time limit.

d) Capacity Sub - Committee Recommendation

Mr. Watts – This has to do with the creep of usage. The Sub – Committee met on October 14th and basically what was discussed was there are now users who have crept above the 8,000 gallons per day usage and they'll have to be notified that they have to apply for a Treatment Works Approval which shouldn't be difficult to do but the second item is the most important and it was the feeling

of the Committee that when the current commercial surveys have been returned, and analyzed, the users at that point will be told whatever their usage is, is going to be the maximum that can be transferred with property assuming the new owner of property requires that much. So it will sort of be frozen. The committee specifically didn't take a position on the fact that they're not going to tell the users you can't ever creep up one or two more for your own usage you just can't transfer more than what you have on the latest survey. I think the best way to handle it is to wait until all of the surveys come in and then letters can be directed to be sent out to all of the users explaining this policy.

Chair Kinsella – I think we stated that in order to facilitate this whole thing with the people who are over the 8,000 gallons per day is we would help with the paperwork, we wouldn't just throw it all on them. They have to sign some documents; we would present them with everything and make it easier for them. They'll have some fee's they'll have to pay to the State.

e) HCHS Sewer Main

Mr. Watts – You see my letter, I didn't receive any response and then I got an email from another attorney in the firm, I had sent my letter to a different attorney in the firm, this is why I love the Board of Education using a national law firm with their headquarters in south Jersey; but I haven't heard back.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – This goes back to our other meeting, we have to put it out to bid to meet their timeline but is it too late? It's not doable now. What's so frustrating is we had the meeting with them earlier this year and I thought everything was pretty much ironed out with them and now nothing got done.

Dr. Buza – We did our part.

Mr. Watts – I was a little slow at one point but when they got rid of Wilentz's law firm and got this new law firm in, it was months before they ever got back to me.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – The question is, do we get a letter from Mrs. Wohlleb saying "after reviewing the timeline for this and these were the parameters and goals that we were going to meet it is now unachievable at this time". When we met, it was outlined when we were going to need the information by and unfortunately it's not done by them and after reviewing it these were goals that we were going to meet and have them done by but there's no way this thing is doable by their timeline.

Dr. Buza – I think Mrs. Wohlleb can write a letter and say we were prepared to do it...

(many voices speaking at once)

Mr. Watts – Maybe we should just say that...

(many voices speaking at once)

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – It's not like this discussion happened like it did the first time a year ago, when they said we need to get this done, we need to get this done immediately. We sat down with them and at that time and said it's not doable this year, earlier this year we sat down in plenty of time in advance to make sure that their schedule could be met with graduation and football this year.

Mr. Watts – I think this is an engineering timeline matter and it should come from Mrs. Wohlleb to their engineer.

f) Readington Township Flows

Mr. Watts – I did send a memo that I think everyone has so I think there is language in the Agreement although it doesn't say what happens if they flow in terms of penalty it does give us openings to go to them and say that we need to readdress some issues for this Agreement because they've agreed to enter into any subsequent Agreements as necessary to avoid this problem.

Mr. LaFerla – The first two numbers, a new guy went out and took a reading off of the wrong meter. I found that out recently; they are wrong.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – So basically the 159,647 and the 340,095 are wrong? Maybe we don't have to do anything then.

Mr. LaFerla – Yes, they are wrong; they are definitely wrong numbers.

g) Board of Commissioners Authorization for Mr. LaFerla to attend the AEA Annual Meeting and Conference in AC (November 15 – 16, 2016) AND Prospective Commissioner & Attorney Attendance

Dr. Buza – If I can get off work it may be worth me going.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – If we have representation there from a commissioner I think that's great.

Ms. Nicaretta – Mr. Watts, are you going?

Mr. Watts – No.

Mr. LaFerla and Dr. Buza were authorized to attend the Conference.

8. Adjourn into Closed Session by Motion, if Needed

Chair Kinsella – We will be going into Closed Session to discuss Personnel Matters; we do not anticipate any official action will need to be taken once we come out of Closed Session.

Mr. Tully made a motion to adjourn into Closed Session for the above stated purpose and Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. seconded the motion. Closed Session was from 7:16 pm – 7:31 pm.

9. Adjournment of Work Session:

Dr. Buza made a motion to adjourn the Work Session. Mr. Tully seconded the motion. All were in favor. The Meeting ended at 7:32 pm.