

APPROVED

RARITAN TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL UTILITIES AUTHORITY
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 17, 2015

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	Here
Mr. Kendzulak, Jr.	Here
Chair Kinsella	Here
Mr. Tully	Absent

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

3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

4. **APPLICATIONS:**

None

5. RESOLUTIONS:

Resolution #2015 - 54 Award of Contract for Purchase of Dry Polymer

\$1.52 per pound / \$26,600.00 total bid (17,500 pounds)

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. made a motion to approve Resolution #2015 - 54, Dr. Dougherty seconded the motion.

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

Resolution #2015 - 55 Award of Contract for Purchase of Inorganic Sulfur Dioxide

\$0.515 per pound / \$30,900.00 total bid (60,000 pounds)

Dr. Dougherty made a motion to approve Resolution #2015 - 55, Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. seconded the motion.

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

Resolution #2015 - 56 Award of Contract for Purchase of Sodium Hypochlorite

\$0.824 per gallon / \$61,800.00 total bid (75,000 gallons)

Dr. Dougherty made a motion to approve Resolution #2015 - 56, Dr. Buza seconded the motion.

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

Resolution #2015 - 57 Approval of Proposal for Janitorial Services

Total Proposal = \$7,120.00

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. made a motion to approve Resolution #2015 - 57, Dr. Dougherty seconded the motion.

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

Resolution #2015 - 58 Employment of Anthony Adams as Wastewater Treatment Operator

Dr. Dougherty made a motion to approve Resolution #2015 - 58, Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. seconded the motion.

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

Resolution #2015 - 59 Changes to Administrative Salaries and Title

Mr. Kinsella – I'd just like to make a comment, with what we had to go through, I feel with Mr. LaFerla here we have a person who not only knows this place better than anybody, he's a great resource for the Authority and we're looking forward to having you as captain of the ship. Everybody's doing a great job.

Mr. LaFerla – Thank you very much.

Dr. Buza made a motion to approve Resolution #2015 - 59, Dr. Dougherty seconded the motion.

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

Resolution #2015 - 60 Authorization for the Purchase of Natural Gas Supply
Services for Public Use Utilizing an Online Auction
Website

Mr. LaFerla – The current contract for gas expires on October 31, 2015 so we went to auction today but they had problems with the auction so we'll have to redo it.

Mr. Kinsella – Did they give you a date?

Mr. LaFerla – It's going to be either tomorrow or Tuesday, they can't do it on Mondays.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – How long do you have to respond to lock in? Isn't it almost instantaneously?

Mr. LaFerla – Pretty much, yes.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – What kind of guidance do you have on "this is a good deal take it" or "this isn't a good deal, don't take it"?

Mr. LaFerla – I called Elizabethtown Gas today and they are charging fifty cents per therm but it's a variable rate; when the auction sort of went through today, the lowest bid was fifty one cents but that's a flat rate.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – As far as the market goes, are natural gas prices projected to come down?

Mr. LaFerla – I'm not sure but the auction they did today would be for only one year. If you could give me an idea of what it's okay to say yes to, that would help.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – I don't know enough about this stuff to guide you; who would be good to ask?

Mr. LaFerla – The guy doing the auctions for us would be the best person to ask.

Mr. Watts – You can designate one Board member and have Mr. LaFerla place a call right before the decision has to be made so he has a comfort level and the Board has some oversight.

Dr. Dougherty – You can call the Chairman.

Mr. Kinsella – Yes, that's okay.

Dr. Dougherty made a motion to approve Resolution #2015 - 60, Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. seconded the motion.

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

Mr. Kinsella – At this point we are going to change the Agenda a little bit; Ms. Lloyd Tubman is here and we can address the budget afterwards so she's not held up.

Ms. Tubman – I appreciate that.

Mr. Watts – Just as a little background, Ms. Tubman sent letters on behalf of two of her clients that are developers who have reservation Agreements. Some time ago, we sent letters to all holders of Agreements advising that it is the position of the Authority that based upon the Permit Extension Act that if the Act is not renewed, if a developer has not met a milestone to extend the Agreement, their Agreement would expire on June 30, 2016. I believe Ms. Tubman is taking issue with that position and has sent letters on behalf of two clients.

Ms. Tubman – That is correct; with backup information going back to 2010 when I sent Mr. Watts an explanation of the Permit Extension Act as a tolling statute, meaning it holds everything in place until it expires and by its terms it says that if any extensions are then available at law, those extensions may be granted. For my two clients, one of which has two EDUs only; that's Sunrise Flemington, and Urbach which has forty two EDUs, each of their Agreements were for a two year term, extendable, and in the case of the Urbach resolution, says "will be" extended for three one year periods consistent with the resolution from several years ago saying "from now on, Agreements will be for a two year term with three one year extensions". The Permit Extension Act extended those original Agreements, it did not vicariously exercise any extensions which by statute to which we are still entitled and that is why I'm here this evening. On behalf of Sunrise Flemington, which is very nervous even though it only has two units, I wrote several times, once to Mr. Bruce Miller, once to Mr. Watts at Mr. Miller's direction asking confirmation of the tolling aspects of the statute that were in effect and received no answers. Only as a result of this recent letter saying "had you exercised those extensions they would have expired" so therefore they have expired which brings me here today.

Mr. Watts – As for Sunrise Flemington, your client can get up to five EDUs. So if you get to June 30th and if the Authority's position remains what it is and is correct, they can apply at any time for up to five EDUs.

Ms. Tubman – Okay, I'll put that beside me. The other one affirmatively says "at the expiration of the Agreement, the Authority will grant three one year extensions and that is why I am here.

Mr. Watts – The position of the Authority is that, for the Urbach Agreement, if you take out the full five years, the Agreement would have expired during the life of the Permit Extension Act.

Ms. Tubman – Correct.

Mr. Watts – Not withstanding your characterization which I don't disagree with, the statute is very clear, the tolling provided for here "and shall not extend

the government approval more than six months beyond the conclusion of the extension period" which is December 31, 2015.

Ms. Tubman – That's correct.

Mr. Watts – The position of the Authority is that's the six months they are talking about here; you can't go beyond the six months.

Ms. Tubman – The statute continues to say "nor shall this act prohibit the granting of such additional extensions as are provided by law when the tolling granted by this act will expire" and my position is, I have an Agreement that says you will grant those extensions. If the two year Agreement was tolled and remained in effect and remains in effect until June 30, 2016, your Agreement says you will give us three more one year extensions. It does not say "may" it does not say "in your discretion" it says "will".

Mr. Kinsella – So you're saying with this Permit Extension Act, that it basically creates a situation where time stands still?

Ms. Tubman – Exactly and I explained that to Mr. Watts in the letter, it is very clear in the statute, it is what is called a tolling statute; anything that would have expired, during the Permit Extension Act, is held in place until December 31, 2015 and if there were six months remaining on the Permit, for another six months.

Mr. Watts – That's not how I read it and I'm following the way I read the law and unfortunately I'm following based upon discussions that I had with Ms. Tubman before.

Ms. Tubman – My letter is in your packet and it says it tolls the statute; it does not address available extensions.

Mr. Watts – The Board can take it under advisement and it's obviously not my advice for the Board to change its opinion but I'll look at it more carefully but my position remains as I've advised the Authority all along.

Dr. Dougherty – I'd like to have an opportunity to review the Act and the file of letters and perhaps do that and get some advice from you and take a look and then come back and see if we can't make an intelligent decision. I have nothing before me. I don't have a copy of the Act and I'd like to read it. I have the other part here to read and I'd like to have that opportunity to make an intelligent decision but to do it now without totally reviewing this I think it would be incompetence on my part.

Ms. Tubman – Would anyone like this entire package resubmitted with a copy of the Act?

Dr. Dougherty – Yes.

Dr. Buza – Yes.

Ms. Tubman – Alright, then I will wait to hear back from you. I recognize there are significant policy considerations here and I recognize where Raritan Township's position is, Vis a Vis, the capacity that is floating out there. However

I'm also much more than familiar with the statute that extends Agreements and I would like to ask you to please consider that.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Just out of curiosity, is there any movement at all with the development or ultimately putting these EDUs on line, is there any progress or plans?

Ms. Tubman – There is finally some progress and I can tell you that I was not involved in the initial litigation between the two property owners; it was one tract owned by both, they had a falling out, they went to court and after a long litigation, the court partitioned the property.

Mr. Watts – And the Authority partitioned the sewer capacity.

Ms. Tubman – The one that has perfected site plan approval, one half, that went forward and is still moving forward, I've just recently reaffirmed that portion of the capacity, was dependent upon approval of a master plan road that traversed three other tracts. Those easements are finally acquired, there is site plan approval for one half, the roadway would serve this one too so this one may very well be a viable project.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Site plan approval, what is proposed?

Ms. Tubman – Retail development; this is at the corner of Voorhees Corner Road and Route 202, that's Urbach, behind the veterinarian, by the Reading Ridge shopping center. So I'm not here asking for an indefinite, indeterminate, speculative reservation of capacity, I'm trying to preserve the capacity for something that appears to have become viable after a very long period of time.

Dr. Buza – The Agreement you were referring to with the language extending the three years, that's in this packet?

Ms. Tubman – Yes, there is an Agreement.

Mr. Watts – That's consistent with our Reservation Agreements, a two year term and three one year extensions.

Dr. Buza – But she said it was written differently than the other one, right? It says "shall"? I want to see that the difference in the language.

Ms. Tubman – I will send you both; and my letter underlines and quotes the provision and statute, I want to try to make it very clear to all of you.

Dr. Buza – I will definitely take a look at it myself and confer with counsel.

Ms. Tubman – I will wait to hear back from you. Thank you.

Mr. Kinsella – We'll move to Citizen's Privilege.

Mr. Mangin – Just to let you guys know that Tuesday night we passed resolution 15 – 211, we closed tax liens on a certain number of properties for the Township which also involved liens for the sewer for RTMUA. There will be a check coming for \$49,760.00 for tax closures. That was approved so I'm sure she is going to be sending that out pretty quickly. Also, we went through an Executive Session and talked about compensation and levelling

compensation. There will have to be a change in the ordinance because it occurred prior to us; prior to this group and we are looking to amend the ordinance and it looks favorable at this point.

Mr. Kinsella – Thank you.

Mr. Kiel – When will that occur; 2016?

Mr. Mangin – I would say that it would happen this year, 2015. Depending, we have the first reading of the ordinance and then the vote comes in on the second reading of the ordinance. I would say it will take two to three months.

Resolution #2015 - 61 Introduction of the FY 2016 Budget

Mr. Kiel – I actually have copies of the Budget and I apologize for them not being given to you sooner but a couple of things happened, I was out last week and then also on Monday, the State issued a brand new budget and they said they were not accepting any budgets unless you used it so I had to go and completely redo everything. So as a result I had to make some verbiage changes in the questions so literally today, we were still going through answering some of the questions. What you have in front of you, I will say it's still a draft. Other than that, please, if you see something that's not correct in there, a typo or anything please let me know. Assuming you do introduce this tonight we're not going to send it up to the State just yet, we still want to proof read it. That being said; there are a couple of issues we need to address with this budget. Obviously you have seen the projected rate increase that we used for this budget; it's seven percent. Most of you have been here the past few years and know the situation. Commissioner Lori, the past few years we've been trying to get the rates up to where they should have been. For the past few years the savings have been going down and down and what that had to do with was the 2010 Bond; previously there weren't any bonds and then all of a sudden you have \$300,000.00 you have to come up with each year to pay this debt. So we've been slowly rationing up the rates to where they should be in order to pay this debt and we've had two more debt issues since then so as a result we've had multiple rate increases. Percentage wise, they sound worse than they really are, one year we had a ten percent rate increase; dollar wise it was like \$10.00, ten percent sounds like a lot per quarter. What you see right now is where we stand right now. After talking with Mrs. Struening and Mr. LaFerla, that's the recommendation from management as to what the rate increase should be and you can see that it's seven percent. One thing I do want to point out here is down on line 73, you see \$28,197.00; this is what we've been trying to get to for the past five years. We are finally projecting a net here. For the past few years we've been using our savings to the tune of a few hundred thousand dollars each

year. This seven percent rate increase is finally getting us to the point where we are breaking even. If you look, next year we project four percent, then three percent and we're actually projecting a net income and what that's going to do is replenish all the savings that you used. Now in the past you were up to three million dollars in savings and that's where you need to be for any kind of emergency so you don't have to go out for the NJEIT emergency loans. This is the way to slowly get you there. Seven percent is a lot but seven percent gets us to where we need to be if you want to start making a net income this year. This is something where the Board needs to make a big decision and you'll have to have a rate increase to get there. One other thing, in the past you've had significant Connection Fees, and you were pretty much living on those Connection Fees, you had that you would be receiving a million dollars each year for a long time. Those Connection Fees are drying up; you have to raise rates significantly to make up a million dollars and that's what else we've been trying to do. In the Budget right now, you can see last year we budgeted a hundred thousand in Connection Fees, this year I have \$75,000.00. We've been lowering that twenty five percent each year. I think right now we're where we need to be with the Connection Fees. Just to give you an idea; right now you're at \$96,000.00 in Connection Fee connections for 2015; so we're right below the budgeted amount. In the past, the budgeted amount was always significantly higher and we were never meeting the budget. I think now it's a more realistic number, I think \$75,000.00 is a realistic number for next year. Ultimately you want to be at a spot where you have zero budgeted for Connection Fees because they are hit or miss; you never know if a development is going to come in or is postponed for a year or two. A development postponed for a year has a significant impact; you can go from receiving \$100,000.00 a year to receiving none. So you do want to be in a spot where you have zero budgeted for Connection Fees and that's where most Authorities are right now. I'm more than happy to answer any questions now; I can easily change my assumptions to try to project how long it would take to get to that net income.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – Has someone looked at that \$75,000.00? Obviously with Mt. View at Hunterdon going up I have to believe that's a big generator for the Connection Fees. I don't know what else is going on as far as single family homes. Are we fairly close? How many units would it take to get to \$75,000.00?

Ms. Nicaretta – The Connection Fee is \$4,296.00

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – So roughly fifteen to twenty units would have to be built to get you there. I don't know how many more there are at Mt. View.

Ms. Nicaretta – They could have that.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – So it's realistic. I'm glad to see that Connection Fee number going down in the Budget because it had put us in a situation where we couldn't reach it. I certainly agree with the plan that we're taking to start

rebuilding this. We're roughly at about half a million dollars to fall back on if there's an emergency. You're saying that an Authority of our size should have about three million dollars of quick cash to have in case of emergency.

Mr. Kiel – That three million dollars also includes your short term receivables that we always factor in. I think it's approximately \$250,000.00.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – So we're getting closer but we still have a ways to go. Just for the heck of it, can you take that seven percent and put in zero, as if the rate was flat and we didn't do anything. What does that do to the whole Budget? So that puts us over a quarter of a million dollars in the hole and that just projects on out. That seven percent puts us on the positive side.

Mr. Kiel – Yes, that's the reason and also because we were looking at next years and we won't need such a large increase. Once you use that seven percent, you're pretty much breaking even and don't have to do those large increases again. At that point you're just keeping up with inflation of operating expenses; using the seven percent now, you can get away with having your two percent increases a year just to keep up with salaries, benefits and everything else that might go up.

(Various percentages and results were discussed)

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – How do we compare to other Authorities or Municipalities?

Mr. Kiel – When we looked at this last year, you are average and lower than one or two.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – My recollection was we were kind of in the middle.

Mrs. Wohlleb – Compared to some of my other clients, you seem to be average; in terms of looking at rates, a lot of Authorities seem to be in the same general position that they tried to hold rates for a number of years and were also faced with some increases but now they can begin as Mr. Kiel is saying look to go a little bit each year but have come over a hump.

Mr. Watts – Lambertville and Clinton are very similar.

Mr. Kiel – One thing I did build into this for 17 and 18, assuming you did do another NJEIT; I did do a projected debt service in here of \$55,000.00 for the next year. It's really a question of are you going to do debt service and pay \$50,000.00 a year or are you going to try to pay a couple of hundred dollars out of pocket. I am still projecting you do \$30,000.00 out of pocket but what you said is a big thing, I have \$55,000.00 and \$75,000.00, obviously depending on what you do, that's going to greatly affect the amount you have to pay back. I don't know right now if you're looking into going into another NJEIT or if you have any other projects on the horizon and what the dollar amount is. I do have your Capital Budget but obviously the timing of it is significant. We're assuming that in 17 you are going to do another program but as far as when those payments come on line, I don't know.

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. – If we can stretch things out another year or two years before we incur additional debt, the better. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. Kiel – That is true. The other thing that is not factored in here is in the 17 and 18, is obviously with personnel shuffling, there will be some savings there, maybe not in 16 because there are compensated absences that have to be paid out but you will see a decrease there. The seven percent right now gets you to where you want to be; you can do the five or four percent but it has a compounding effect, the less you do now, the more you have to do later but that's the decision you have to make. You don't typically use your whole budget.

Mrs. Wohlleb – Something that I was going to bring up was in this years' NJEIT Program, there have been some changes that I'm sure you're aware of; like the loans now go to thirty years, there's principle forgiveness again. There are changes to this program and I am curious how that bears impact in your projections for the next couple of years because according to the Capital Program, there is a need to proceed with projects.

Mr. Kiel – The two years I put in for the payments, it would be with the assumption of going out for the 2012 size issue that you did and the total principle amount was \$2.1 million. So I did that where you saw the seven percent, that is assuming you do another 2.1 million dollar loan issue; I did it based off of current issue, the way they are currently structured. So I guess the answer to your question is no, I didn't try to figure out debt schedule based on thirty years or the new structure. The way it stands right now, if you introduce the Budget tonight, it's set with the seven percent.

Dr. Dougherty made a motion to approve Resolution #2015 - 61, Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. seconded the motion.

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

6. Approval of Minutes: Minutes of August 20, 2015

Dr. Dougherty made a motion to approve the minutes from the August 20, 2015 meeting. Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. seconded the motion. All were in favor. Dr. Buza abstained.

7. Treasurer's Report / Payment of Bills:

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. - The bills totaled \$503,726.58; all appears to be in order. The expenditures look reasonable; if you look at the last page, it says 73% expended, and this is through August which is nine out of the twelve months, we did pay some bills in September so we're right on budget or a little under budget.

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

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

8. Citizens' Privilege:

Addressed previously.

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. Dr. Dougherty seconded the motion. All were in favor.

RARITAN TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL UTILITIES AUTHORITY
WORK SESSION MINUTES

APPROVED

SEPTEMBER 17, 2015

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

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

2. **Correspondence:**

a) Lloyd Tubman, Esq. of Archer & Greiner to RTMUA Board of Commissioners regarding Block 65 Lot 7, Sunrise Flemington, LLC and Block 72.23 Lot 31.01, Sol & Ada Urbach Trustees

Addressed previously.

3. **Unfinished Business:**

None

4. **New Business:**

None

5. **Professional Reports:**

- a) Attorney - none
- b) Engineer –

Mrs. Wohlleb – Just an update on the Ingerman Project; at the time I wrote the Engineer's Report, I was anticipating the Application would be on this meeting Agenda and that would be for the Ingerman Project to proceed with the Authority authorizing signature and submission of their TWA Application. They pulled their Application as result of a conference call we had last week. My firm, in taking a look at mapping they had prepared, suggested that they reconsider connecting to RTMUA using a gravity connection as opposed to what they were showing up until that point, construction of a pump station which ultimately RTMUA would have to take over. They had asked to see our standards for pumping station construction and they hemmed and hawed over it but did agree to endeavor to try and develop a site plan for a pumping station that would meet

our standards. They sent us something, I looked at it, and Mr. LaFerla looked at it; we didn't like it and they were really being extremely stubborn about it but in asking for some additional topographic mapping I think that they can do a gravity connection. They seem to have fallen off the planet now; we last heard from them on Friday when they said they were pulling the Application, giving the impression that they may actually be in agreement that gravity may indeed work. I think what they probably need to do is have their engineer maybe go out and do some additional survey work to confirm it and there's the potential I think to get one easement to get them back on Junction Road. To make a long story short, I don't have Application materials that I am reviewing I decided to defer reviewing anything related to a pump station until I know for sure whether or not I can either rule out or they are moving forward with the gravity connection to the force main which is our preference. I just wanted to update you on that project specifically.

6. RTMUA Reports:

a) Operations Report

1. Chief Operator's Report –

Mr. LaFerla – The only thing is we had a meeting with Tyler and Carmeli about the Flemington Wet Weather Facility (FWWF), Ms. Carmeli gave me a couple dates and she wants one of the Commissioners to sit in on the next meeting.

Mr. Kinsella – Where is the next meeting?

Mr. Watts – It will be here or Flemington, it will be local.

Mr. LaFerla – The dates available are September 22nd, October 5th or October 6th at 9:00am or 9:30am.

Dr. Buza – I can do October 6th unless someone else would rather go?

Mr. Watts – We can have it here on Tuesday, October 6th at 9:30.

Mrs. Wohlleb – Ms. Carmeli will need to confirm with Flemington for that date then?

Mr. LaFerla – I have to get back to Ms. Carmeli with which date was good for one of the Commissioners and then she'll confirm it for all.

- a) Overtime Recap - ok
- b) Septage / Greywater Recap – ok

2. Laboratory Summary - ok
3. Maintenance Summary - ok
4. Readington Flows - ok

b) Commissioner's Comments:

None

7. **Discussion:**

a) HCHS Meeting Memo

Mr. Kinsella – This should be discussed in Closed Session.

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

Mr. Watts – I think it would be appropriate to consider a motion to go into Closed Session for the purpose of discussing Personnel Matters and Contractual Matters involving HCRHS and we do not anticipate any official action will be taken once we come out of Closed Session.

Dr. Dougherty made a motion to adjourn into Closed Session for the above stated purpose and Dr. Buza seconded the motion. Closed Session was from 6:20 pm – 7:12 pm.

9. **Adjournment of Work Session:**

Mr. Kendzulak, Jr. made a motion to adjourn the Work Session. Dr. Dougherty seconded the motion. All were in favor. The Meeting ended at 7:13 pm.