

RAHWAY VALLEY SEWERAGE AUTHORITY

Summary of Minutes – Regular Meeting held October 21, 2021

- Communications
OPRA Request from SmartProcure
Reminder about November 10th Meeting

- Approval of Minutes
September 23, 2021 Finance Committee and Regular Meetings

- Treasurer’s Report
Report for August 2021.

- Executive Director’s Report
Sewer Endorsements, Municipal Reports, and the status of various contracts

- Report of Consulting Engineer
Overview of engineering matters

- Report of General Counsel
Overview of legal matters

- Committee Reports
Reports were given by the Finance and Personnel Committees.

- Unfinished Business
Amendment to the By-Laws – First Reading; and Elimination of September 1st and 2nd Flow Exceedances.

- New Business
The following actions were taken:
Request for Late Submittal of the 2022 Budget; Authorization to File an Application with the NJIB; Award of Contract #2124 – Furnish & Deliver Thermal Oil Rotary Joints; and Award of Contract #2218 – Replacement Polymer Feed System.

- Bills & Claims

OPERATING FUND	01	\$1,157,685.51
BUILDING & EQUIPMENT FUND	02	<u>170,598.50</u>
TOTAL OF ALL FUNDS:		<u>\$1,328,284.01</u>

RAHWAY VALLEY SEWERAGE AUTHORITY
Regular Meeting Minutes – October 21, 2021

The Chairman, Michael Gelin, called the meeting to order at 5:48 p.m

The Chairman read the statement on “Open Public Meetings Law”

In accordance with the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act, State of New Jersey, adequate notice of this meeting was forwarded to the Star Ledger, the Home News Tribune, and the Clerk of each of the eleven member municipalities on February 25, 2021.

If any member of this body believes that this meeting is being held in violation of the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act, please state your objection and the reasons for same at this time. Hearing no objections, we shall proceed with our regularly scheduled meeting.

Roll Call

The following members were present:

Frank G. Mazzarella	for the Township of Clark
Stephen D. Greet	for the Borough of Garwood
Robert M. Beiner	for the Borough of Kenilworth
John J. Tomaine	for the Borough of Mountainside
Robert Rachlin	for the City of Rahway
Loren Harms	for the Borough of Roselle Park
Edward Gottko	for the Town of Westfield
Michael J. Gelin	for the Township of Woodbridge

The following members were absent:

No Representative	for the Town of Cranford
John L. Del Sordi Jr.	for the Township of Scotch Plains
Michael Furci	for the Township of Springfield

The following were also present:

James J. Meehan	Executive Director
Karen Musialowicz	Secretary-Treasurer
Dan Ward	Superintendent
Andrea DeCarlo	Purchasing Agent/Board Secretary
John Buonocore	Chief Engineer/Asst. Superintendent
Janet Thevenin	Environmental Compliance Supervisor
Doug Reno	Operations Manager
Brett Howard	Health & Safety Coordinator
Dennis Estis, Esq.	General Counsel – Greenbaum, Rowe, Smith
Howard Matteson	Consulting Engineer – CDM Smith

Communications

An OPRA Request for accounting records was made by Smart Procure on October 17th and replied to the following day. Mrs. DeCarlo also reminded the Board that next month’s meeting would be taking place on Wednesday, November 10th. She explained that the November meetings are always scheduled a week in advance because of the NJLM/AEA Conferences; however, the Veterans Day holiday falls on the second Thursday of November this year.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Greet made a motion, second by Mr. Harms, to approve the minutes of the Finance Committee and Regular Meetings held September 23, 2021. The motion was approved by those present.

Report of Treasurer

Mrs. Musialowicz stated that a report was forwarded to the Commissioners for the month of August 2021.

Report of Executive Director**Municipal Monthly Collection System Reports**

The following Reports were received since the last regular meeting:

City of Rahway – September 2021

Township of Woodbridge – September 2021

Mr. Meehan stated that more reports came in earlier today; specifically, from Garwood for the months December 2020 through September 2021, and from Cranford for August and September 2021. He commented that reporting is still somewhat light, and he is not sure why, because we had sent a reminder letter out back in August. He stated that Mrs. DeCarlo may need to follow up with the towns to try to get them back on track.

Plant O&M Update

Mr. Meehan reported that the Plant is running very well and is in compliance with all permitting parameters. He stated that microstains were sent out to our consulting company that helps with compliance matters and they agree with all that we are currently doing. He explained that the one thing hurting the plant is not running the Cogen facility; however, we have had some very productive meetings with several of the engineers that are working on this, including three that work for the Authority, one from the insurance company, and our third-party expert engineer. He stated that the group believes they are close to having a draft plan regarding how to correct the issues; however, based on equipment lead times and the time needed to make the repairs, we unfortunately do not expect this to be completed until January. Mr. Meehan stated that he has been trying to push this along as quickly as possible and focus on getting the Cogen up and running again while also trying to avoid legal issues.

Mr. Greet asked how much the Authority is losing each month; Mr. Meehan stated that it is near the six-figure range and asked Mr. Ward to elaborate. Mr. Ward explained that a large part of the loss is a result of having to purchase electricity, which has been very expensive. Mr. Meehan added that we are also missing out on the tipping fees we would normally receive from accepting food waste, so there are several ways we are being impacted; thus, we are eager to get this back online as soon as possible.

Mr. Mazzarella asked if a determination has yet been made on whether or not this was due to a flaw in the engine. Mr. Meehan stated that this has not yet been determined, and reminded Mr. Mazzarella that it is typical for this type of engine to backfire. He explained that at this time, they believe the issues may have something to do with the relief valves, but they cannot say this with 100% certainty. Mr. Ward explained that the

forensic engineer from the insurance company is still working with representatives from Caterpillar to come up with a resolution, and should hopefully have more answers soon. Mr. Meehan stated that the company that installed the relief valves has not shied away from this and is also trying very hard to figure out a resolution. He stated that it seems like they are aware that this issue may be related to them, so we are glad to have their assistance. Mr. Mazzarella asked if the Authority may be entitled to any type of relief; Mr. Meehan stated that we are hoping to be reimbursed by insurance but it is too early to say at this time. He added that the forensic engineer has been busy turning every rock and is working very closely with all parties involved, including our consulting engineer, third-party engineer, Systech, Hoerbiger, and Caterpillar. Mr. Gelin asked when Mr. Meehan expects the Cogen to be back online; Mr. Meehan stated that optimistically speaking, he expects it to be back online in January. He explained that while he was aiming for November or December, the lead times on certain pieces of equipment are six-to-eight weeks; so, the hope is to be back online in January.

Collection System O&M Update

Mr. Meehan reported that Ms. Thevenin had sent him a very detailed email identifying the areas which the IPP Department will focus its efforts on in the coming year. He stated that IPP has done a lot more in this past year than it has done in a while, and that they have also been performing lots of off-hours sampling, which is important because the biology of the Plant is often touchy during this time of year. He explained that this may be caused by industries wanting to dispose of waste before year-end; but we continue to do the best that we can with the limited resources that we have.

Alternative/Special Projects

As reported last month, the Authority received the DLGS' approval to move forward with amending the Waste Management ("WM") Agreement to include the gas-to-pipeline project. Mr. Meehan reported that Rick Sapir has begun drafting language which will continue to be worked on. Also, at the request of WM, the DEP was scheduled to tour the Plant yesterday to discuss the project as well as some of the issues we are currently facing. Unfortunately, the DEP had to reschedule at the last minute. Mr. Meehan stated that he had met with the gas company again which is still very much interested in the project; and another meeting was scheduled with them, but it is being postponed until further discussion takes place between the Authority, Rick Sapir and WM. He stated that the next step is to negotiate the specifics of the amendment, and he is hoping to move this along quickly as time is of the essence.

Biobot Sampling for Coronavirus

Mr. Meehan reported that the recent data shows approximately 50 new cases per day in our area. He stated that Biobot has requested another purchase order if we wish to continue sampling past the end of the year. While we are receiving quality data, it is comparable to what is being reported in the news; therefore, we will probably continue to sample until the end of this year, and then reassess our needs at that time.

Amendments to the Authority's By-Laws (First Reading)

A resolution is on the agenda for the Board's consideration. The proposed amendments include a change in meeting start times to 5:30 p.m., the elimination of Agenda Work Sessions, and a requirement that Commissioners attend meetings in-person or be

considered absent. This matter was tabled at the September meeting; therefore, the first reading is on the agenda under Unfinished Business.

NJIB Loan Application for Contract #189 – Headworks Bar Screens Project

The Authority intends to file a loan application with the New Jersey Infrastructure Bank for this project; a resolution authorizing same is on the agenda. Mr. Meehan stated that the total amount of the loan is roughly \$4.7M; however, this total includes a lot of contingency money which we hope we will not need to borrow.

Contract #2124 – Furnish & Deliver Thermal Oil Rotary Joints (Rebid #1)

The following bid was received on October 14, 2021:

<u>Vendor</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Komline-Sanderson Corp. Peapack, NJ	\$204,700.00

Komline noted in its bid an exception to the two-year contract term, specifying that it would only agree to a term of one year. The bid was found to be in order, and action to award in the amount of \$124,400.00 for a one-year term is on the agenda.

Mr. Greet asked why the award amount is \$124,400.00 for a one-year term. Mr. Reno stated that the bid specification requested pricing on new equipment as well as for rebuilding the Authority's current equipment. As the cost for rebuilds was nearly 80% of the price to purchase new, we decided not to include the rebuilds, totaling \$80,300, in the contract award. Mr. Estis asked if the rebuild component was listed as an alternate; Mrs. DeCarlo explained that there were three items in the bid specification, and our bid document language allows us to award some, all, or none of the items. Mr. Estis asked why the award is only for one year if the bid spec listed a term of two years; Mrs. DeCarlo stated that Komline had included an exception in their submittal, stating that they would only hold this pricing for one year. Mr. Ward explained that the purpose of this contract is to have spare parts for the Dryer on hand, as we cannot wait until the Dryer goes down to order parts, especially given the current supply chain issues. He also added that the plan is to order these parts as soon as the contract is awarded, so it really will not matter if the term is for one or two years. Mr. Harms asked how the vendor is able to state that it will only agree to a one-year term when pricing was submitted for a two-year term as requested in the bid package. Mr. Buonocore stated that the issue is the amount of time that Komline is willing to hold its pricing on the items being requested. Mrs. DeCarlo stated that the representative from Komline explained to her that due to the fluctuating prices over the past several months, some of their quotes at this time are only valid for 15 days. Mr. Harms stated that it makes sense that the reason for awarding a one-year contract is because they will only guarantee pricing for one year; however, this was not made clear initially, and it would have been less confusing if it were explicitly stated that the bidder could only guarantee its pricing for one year. Mr. Mazzarella asked about the legality of awarding the contract for less than two years; Mr. Estis stated that the only potential issue would be if another vendor argued that it would have submitted a bid if the bid spec listed a term of one year. Mr. Meehan explained that this is the only vendor that supplies these items; Mr. Ward added that this is the second time that this went out to bid, and no bids were received the first time. Mr. Gottko stated that since the Authority had already gone through two rounds of bidding, it could always just negotiate and award a contract now anyway. Mr. Gelin agreed, adding that the pricing would likely increase.

Contract #2218 – Replacement Polymer Feed System (Rebid #1)

The following bid was received on October 14, 2021:

<u>Vendor</u>	<u>Amount</u>
GP Jager Inc. Boonton, NJ	\$62,400.00

The bid was reviewed and found to be in order. Dan Ward recommends award to GP Jager in the amount of \$62,400.00 for a two-year term. The number of units was doubled since the last bid; therefore, this represents an increase of 109% from the previous contract. Action to award is on the agenda under New Business.

Monthly Reports

The Monthly Operations, IPP, Flow Rights, and User Charge Reports were received and forwarded to the Commissioners for review.

Report of Consulting Engineer

Howard Matteson, Consulting Engineer from the firm CDM Smith, submitted the following report for work activities for the month of September 2021 and through the date of this report.

Mr. Matteson apologized for not being able to attend the meeting in-person. Mr. Gelin asked if the amendment to the By-Laws regarding in-person meeting attendance would apply to the professionals as well; Mr. Estis replied no, stating that this would only pertain to the Commissioners.

A. Retainer Services

During the period, CDM Smith prepared the monthly report for September 2021 and attended the September 2021 Board Meeting.

B. Miscellaneous Engineering Services

During the period, CDM Smith performed the following:

- Strategic Capital Plan – Continued to coordinate with staff on same-short term and long-term prioritization.
- Mass Balance – Completed draft mass balance memorandum. Mr. Matteson stated that the Capital Plan and Mass Balance are projects that he and Mr. Buonocore have been working on and a lot of progress behind the scenes has been made, and there will be major progress being made in the coming weeks.
- Lennington Street Siphon – Coordinated with staff on the use of a purchasing co-operative to facilitate this project. Mr. Matteson stated that since finding that this could be purchased through a co-op, we should be able to get it in motion quickly. Mr. Matteson asked Mr. Buonocore if a timeline for this work has been established. Mr. Buonocore stated that he is currently waiting on the contractor to develop its bypass pumping plan so that they can provide pricing on this; and stated that he hopes to get this on next month's meeting agenda. Mr. Meehan stated that this project could be impacted by the cold weather so hopefully it can begin before winter sets in.

- C. Digester Covers and Waste Gas Burner Replacement – Design, Bidding, and Construction
No activity during the period.
- D. Influent Bar Screen Replacement
During the period, CDM Smith performed the following:
- Continued to make minor revisions in anticipation of submission of plans and specifications to the New Jersey Infrastructure Bank. Mr. Matteson stated that a resolution regarding this is on tonight's meeting agenda.

Mr. Meehan asked Mr. Matteson if the Strategic Capital Plan will be ready to distribute by next month's meeting. Mr. Matteson stated that he was able to make a lot of progress earlier in the week and he can commit to having a draft form of the plan ready by the November meeting, however it will still need to be updated thereafter.

Report of General Counsel

Dennis Estis, General Counsel from the firm Greenbaum, Rowe, Smith & Davis, submitted the following report for the period September 23, 2021 through October 21, 2021.

1. Revisions to the Underlying Agreement

As previously reported, I prepared a form letter to each Municipality so that each could proceed to introduce the necessary Ordinances to approve the Revised Agreement and to terminate the Clark Settlement Agreement. I also made modifications to the Revised Agreement of a non-substantive nature in order to conform the document to what was previously agreed. It is my understanding that a copy of the Revised Agreement was transmitted to each Municipal Clerk.

Mr. Estis stated that he assumes none of the Municipalities have to date adopted their Ordinances; Mrs. DeCarlo replied that she has already received copies of the adopted Ordinances from five of the towns, and confirmed that several others have also adopted their ordinance or are currently in the process. Mr. Gelin stated that Mr. Estis should send the towns a letter, not an email, to explain why an amendment was necessary as well as the procedure for making the amendment. Mr. Estis stated that he would be happy to do this. Mrs. DeCarlo stated that some of the towns have expressed frustration with the amount of communications they are receiving as it is causing them a great deal of confusion; therefore, they are not going to be happy about having to restart the process, especially since many of them have already adopted the ordinances. Mr. Estis stated that he can explain in a letter to the towns that the changes being made are very simplistic but had to be made, and stated that he will provide the process for amending the ordinances. Mr. Gelin stated that he reviewed the changes and they were in fact minor; however, he is concerned about the amount of communications being sent to the towns.

Mr. Estis stated that he received comments to the Revised Agreement from Clark's attorney. He stated that he reviewed the comments and found that some of them are appropriate, and therefore, the Revised Agreement should be further amended

to reflect said comments. He added that none of the revisions were of a substantive nature; but since we will be operating under this version of the Agreement for a long time, it would make sense to get it right from the start. He stated that he provided a red-lined version to the Commissioners to show what the changes were; and noted that he did not agree with all of the comments, he approved roughly 60% of them. Mr. Gelin stated that he agrees that some of the revisions made sense. Mr. Estis stated that he will prepare a letter for Mrs. DeCarlo to send to the Municipalities; Mr. Gelin stated that this letter should come directly from Mr. Estis as Mrs. DeCarlo has already been dealing with the frustration from the towns. Mr. Mazzarella stated that he instructed Mrs. DeCarlo to send the Commissioners a document listing only the revised areas of the Agreement to make it easier for the Commissioners to focus on the revisions. He also added that the Ordinance was on Clark's meeting agenda this past Monday; however, it was tabled due to the ongoing discussion between Mr. Estis and Clark's attorney. He added that it would be placed on Clark's next meeting agenda for approval.

Mr. Tomaine stated that he just found out about these changes and has questions on the procedure for making said revisions. Mr. Estis stated that it will be simple for the six Municipalities that have not yet adopted the Ordinance. Mrs. DeCarlo stated that to her knowledge, nine of the Municipalities have already adopted the Ordinance; she just has not received copies of the Ordinances from all of them yet. Mr. Estis stated that the nine Municipalities will then have to adopt a revised Ordinance with the amended text and it will be very simple. Mr. Tomaine stated that a procedure for revising the Agreement was added to the new version of the Agreement. Mr. Estis stated that this process will not need to be followed as the new Agreement has not yet been approved by all of the Municipalities and therefore is not in effect. Mr. Tomaine asked if since we are still being governed by the 1995 Agreement, the proposed amendments will first need to be approved by the Board prior to being sent to the Municipalities. Mr. Estis stated that under the revised Agreement, the answer would be yes; however, there is no provision in the 1995 Agreement requiring the Board to approve the amendments first. He stated that while the Board passed a resolution to approve the changes a few months ago, that was strictly voluntary and not required by the Agreement.

Mr. Tomaine stated that since the Board had initially approved the revisions which were then passed on to the Municipalities, the Board should now have to approve any amendments to those that were previously approved. Mr. Gelin agreed, stating that many of the Municipalities have already adopted their ordinances, and any subsequent changes should have been brought to the Board for approval first. Mr. Estis stated that the Board is welcome to adopt a resolution approving the revisions and include it with his letter to the Municipalities, this way the towns will know that the Board agrees with said revisions. Mr. Tomaine stated that this should have been done as it is consistent with the way the Board handled revisions previously; Mr. Estis stated he did not feel it was necessary as the changes are non-substantive. Mr. Tomaine stated he was only made aware of the changes yesterday, so he is not sure how the entire Board feels about the revisions that are being proposed. Mr. Estis suggested that any Commissioners who are not in agreement with the changes can voice their opinions and the Board can adopt an amended resolution; however, this will delay the process significantly. Mr. Gelin

stated that he has reviewed the revisions and they are in fact non-substantive; therefore, making said revisions is only going to cause further confusion while not actually changing the Agreement. Mr. Estis stated that the Board can pass a motion today to approve the revisions and they can then be sent out to the Municipalities for their approval.

Mr. Harms asked why the Municipalities would need to adopt new Ordinances if the revisions being made are not of substance and are only minor wording corrections. He stated that his Town's Council has expressed frustration as they have already received two different versions of the Agreement and were confused on how to move forward; and they should not need to pass a new Ordinance given the non-substantive nature of the changes. Mr. Estis stated that the Municipalities will have to pass a new Ordinance; Mr. Harms stated that this is only going to confuse them even more, and asked what will happen for the nine that have already adopted their Ordinances. Mr. Estis stated that he is going to have to send them a very simple Ordinance to approve the amendments. Mr. Harms stated that this needs to be figured out and put in final form because it is only delaying the process further. Mr. Estis suggested that he can send out the Ordinance early next week with a letter explaining exactly what the issues are and what the changes consist of. Mr. Mazarella asked if the new Ordinance would require a first and second reading; Mr. Estis replied absolutely. Mr. Harms stated that this would likely be delayed by the holidays if another two months are needed; Mr. Estis stated that because of this he would suggest that the changes are sent out immediately. He also added that if a Town's council passes this on first reading this year, but the second reading is delayed until next year, they will need to start the process all over; therefore, he is asking for the Board's authorization to proceed at tonight's meeting. Mr. Harms added that there is always the possibility that a Municipality will not agree to the revisions.

Several of the Commissioners expressed that if the changes are non-substantive, the Agreement should be left as-is. Mr. Estis stated that while the changes are not of substance, they do make a difference in the Agreement overall. He stated that both the 1995 Agreement and the revised Agreement include a provision that treats Clark differently from the other Municipalities, as originally agreed to in the 1994 Clark Settlement Agreement. If every Municipality agrees with the Ordinance to terminate the Clark Settlement Agreement, that provision would no longer be valid. The only way to remove this one paragraph, he stated, would be to revise the current version of the Agreement. Mr. Estis stated he just needs the Board's approval to move forward. Mr. Harms stated that since the revised version was only sent out yesterday, he has not yet had the chance to review it.

Mr. Buonocore stated that Mr. Estis said he had only agreed to a portion of Mr. Dugan's comments; and asked if Mr. Dugan had accepted the comments that were rejected by Mr. Estis. Mr. Estis stated that he had not yet heard back; Mr. Buonocore asked if there is a possibility that this would then not be the final version of the Agreement, and Mr. Estis replied yes. Mr. Estis went on to explain some of the comments that he did not accept and the reasons why. He explained that he had replied to Clark's comments last week and does not think he has received a response yet. Mr. Mazarella stated that Mr. Dugan received Mr. Estis' comments this past Monday, which was the day of Clark's Council Meeting; so naturally, he

did not have time to review the comments prior to the meeting taking place and therefore the matter was tabled. Mr. Mazzarella also reminded the Board that he had to abstain on last month's resolution regarding this matter so he would have to abstain from voting on this at tonight's meeting as well.

Mr. Harms asked why this would be sent to the other Municipalities when Clark has not even agreed to the changes yet. He stated that the Municipalities should not have to go through this process if they are going to have to go back and change it again. Mr. Estis stated that he will not send anything out to the Municipalities until he is fully in agreement with Mr. Dugan. Mr. Harms stated that Roselle Park had planned for this to be on its November meeting agenda so that it could then be adopted at its December meeting; however, he is going to advise them not to move forward at this time as it is not clear what is going to happen. Mr. Estis stated that since Roselle Park has not yet adopted the Ordinance, they will only need to adopt the Ordinance that includes his revisions. Mr. Harms stated that he understands; however, he needs his governing body to have a full understanding of what we are doing prior to asking them to act on it. He added that he thought the Agreement had been finalized but apparently it is not if Clark's attorney is still making revisions; therefore, he will not instruct his town to move forward until Clark agrees. Mr. Mazzarella stated that this would have been done earlier if Clark had received a response from Mr. Estis earlier than minutes before its Council meeting on Monday. He also stated that he will know if Clark is going to approve the revisions by the first week of November. Mr. Estis stated that he will call Mr. Dugan first thing in the morning to see if he is in agreement, and will advise Mr. Harms accordingly. Mr. Tomaine that there is still a chance that Clark does not end up agreeing to the revisions; Mr. Estis assured the Board that if Mr. Dugan agrees to the changes, the Council will proceed according to his instruction.

Mr. Tomaine stated that if things go awry at Clark's Council meeting and they do not end up agreeing, the Commissioners are going to be the first ones to hear from their towns asking what is going on. He stated that most of the Municipalities have already acted on this and are under the impression that the issue is now behind them; however, the Agreement is still being worked on and therefore has not even been finalized.

Mr. Estis stated that he would discuss the changes that he had made with Mr. Dugan to determine whether or not they are acceptable, and will suggest that Clark and Roselle Park proceed to adopt the original Ordinance regarding the revised Agreement. At that point, it can be discussed by the Commissioners whether or not the additional changes should be made; and a letter can then be sent out to the Municipalities explaining why these changes are needed.

Mr. Tomaine stated that since most of the Municipalities have finished this already, the discussion with Mr. Dugan should be that Clark should move forward with adopting the Ordinance as originally proposed. He stated that since the changes are non-substantive, we should wait until the changes go into effect and then decide if additional changes are needed at that time. Mr. Estis stated that if Mr. Dugan agrees with his changes, he will suggest doing exactly that.

Mr. Harms asked Mr. Mazzarella if after speaking with Mr. Estis, Clark's attorney will discuss the changes with Clark's Council. Mr. Estis stated that all of the changes were suggested by Mr. Dugan. Mr. Harms asked if Mr. Dugan will be the one to make the final decision on whether or not these changes are acceptable; Mr. Mazzarella stated that the Council looks for Mr. Dugan's guidance before rendering any decision, therefore, Clark's Council will move forward if Mr. Dugan agrees to the changes.

Mr. Estis stated that he will contact Mr. Dugan in the morning; and if Mr. Dugan agrees to adopt the original Ordinance and revisit the revisions in January, he will advise Mr. Harms that Roselle Park can proceed.

Mr. Greet asked if this requires an amended Ordinance or if it can just be done by Administrative Change to an existing Ordinance; Mr. Estis stated that he believes an amended Ordinance will be needed since some of the changes are of substance.

2. Excess Flow Rights

Now that the metering year has ended as of September 30, 2021, we need to review the excess flow chart in order to determine which Municipalities have exceeded their flow rights and what action must be taken.

Mr. Estis stated that three of the Municipalities have exceeded by 14 days, one has exceeded by 15, and Springfield has exceeded by 42. Since the new Agreement has not yet taken effect, he stated that letters will be sent out to these five Municipalities as the metering year that just ended will need to be dealt with under the terms of the current Agreement.

3. Local Contracts Law/Open Public Meetings Act

No change.

4. Siphon – Rahway – Union County Park

I need to discuss the issue of the easement with John Buonocore and Howard Matteson, and then speak with Kevin Campbell at Union County since Mr. Campbell has raised questions regarding Green Acres and the easement.

5. Occidental Chemical

No change.

6. Metro Compliance

Communications have continued over the past two months between Janet Thevenin and representatives from Bollywood. Bollywood provided additional information regarding maintenance of the proposed system. Immediately prior to the September meeting, Ms. Thevenin held a meeting on September 23rd with representatives of Bollywood and discussed numerous issues relating to its treatment system plan and proposed maintenance. At the meeting, it was made clear that Bollywood had to address all of Janet's comments from her September 22nd letter in writing and it had to be done before the truck wash facility could re-open. Bollywood has now advised that it is proposing to invest more than \$100,000 in improvements, as well as to install a water recycling system. We are awaiting additional information on the proposed system.

7. OUTFRONT Media Billboard Lease
I am removing this from future reports.
8. By-Law Revision
No change.

Committee Reports

Mr. Gelin stated that another Commissioner is needed to fill the vacant position of Engineering Committee Chairman. The Commissioners decided to appoint Edward Gottko as the Chairman of this Committee.

Chairman: Are there reports from any of the following Committees?

Committee	Chairman	02/2021 – 02/2022 Committee Members		
Engineering	Edward Gottko	Michael Furci	John Del Sordi	(Cranford Rep.)
Finance	Stephen Greet	Loren Harms	John Tomaine	Robert Beiner
Legal	John Tomaine	Frank Mazzarella	Edward Gottko	(Cranford Rep.)
Personnel	Frank Mazzarella	Robert Rachlin	Stephen Greet	Loren Harms

Engineering Committee (Edward Gottko, Committee Member)

No report.

Finance Committee (Stephen Greet, Committee Chairman)

The Finance Committee has reviewed the Bills & Claims List, and action to approve is on the agenda under Bills & Claims.

Legal Committee (John Tomaine, Committee Chairman)

No report.

Personnel Committee (Frank Mazzarella, Committee Chairman)

Mr. Mazzarella reported that the Personnel Committee met earlier this evening to discuss staffing realignment and succession planning. He stated that this matter is on-going and another meeting will be held next month; and more information will be shared at that time.

Unfinished Business

Mr. Mazzarella offered two motions and one resolution.

1. Motion to take from the table Resolution #21-47 regarding the By-Laws.

Motion: Mr. Mazzarella

Second: Mr. Gottko

All Commissioners were in favor with the exception of Mr. Tomaine, who opposed; the motion was approved.

2. Resolution #21-47 – Amending the Authority’s By-Laws (First Reading)

Motion: Mr. Mazzarella

Second: Mr. Harms

Discussion: Mr. Mazzarella started by saying that he holds all of the Commissioners in the highest regard; and their willingness to serve on this Board to represent their respective municipalities speaks volumes and deserves applause. He then explained that a former Commissioner had an issue which did not allow her to attend meetings physically, so the Board had allowed her to call in. Following that, any Commissioner that had an issue attending was allowed to attend by phone. Fast forward to COVID-19, he stated, we were forced to do meetings via Zoom and telephone and that was necessary at the time, but he feels it has been overstated. Mr. Mazzarella explained that the Board used to have 24 meetings per year; however, this has now been reduced by half. He stated that it had become more of a norm than an exception for Commissioners to call in rather than attend in person, but he believes a Municipality cannot be properly represented from over the phone. He stated that it is essential for Commissioners to voice their opinions in a face-to-face setting with their peers and offer input, guidance, denial on issues, and their votes. He stated that over the phone, the towns are not given the right representation that they should be given; for that reason, he feels it is essential that if a Commissioner is not present at a meeting in person, they are considered to be absent just like they would be on a Town Council or any other board. In fairness to the Commissioners, however, he feels that for informational purposes they should be given the opportunity to listen to the meeting over the phone without any discussion or voting since they would be considered absent.

Mr. Gelin agreed, stating that he does not see how a Commissioner can fully represent his or her community when not physically present. He stated that the Commissioners were appointed to be fully committed to this Board, and they need to take this commitment seriously to adequately represent their towns.

Mr. Greet explained that he has a conflict with the November 10th meeting as he is also on a Planning and Zoning Board which is meeting the same night. That being said, he asked how this would be perceived. Mr. Mazzarella stated that he shares this concern as he is also on a Planning and Zoning Board and has conflicts on certain dates; but he will be absent either at the Planning Board meeting or at the Authority’s meeting. He stated that he is not aware of any other governing body which allows its members to be present over the phone.

Mr. Beiner stated that he has no problem with Commissioners attending remotely, as the Board is given a verbatim script of exactly

what is going to be said at the meetings. He stated that the Commissioners should try to attend in person; however, in this COVID environment, they should not attend physically if they are not feeling 100% well. He stated that a Commissioner staying home and phoning in would be the better option in this case, especially being that they would have the script in front of them to follow along. He also stated that depending on his work schedule, he may not always be able to get to the Authority by the time its meetings begin at 5:30 p.m. Therefore, if he so chooses to, he should be given the option to phone in. Mr. Gelin stated that if a Commissioner chooses to phone in, they would be considered absent. Mr. Beiner stated that he disagrees with this, but if the majority agrees with this, then change the rules. Mr. Gelin stated that we want to have a strong Board that is physically present and active at its meetings. Mr. Beiner stated that if someone is sick but is well enough to follow along with the agenda over the phone, they should be considered in attendance. Mr. Gelin stated that this is not allowed on the Planning Board or any other board that he is aware of. Mr. Beiner stated that he is only concerned about this Board; for which Commissioners are given a verbatim script. He stated that most Commissioners do not ask questions because Mr. Meehan and Mr. Buonocore explain everything and he does not feel he should tell them how to fix things; Mr. Gelin stated that this should not be the case as Commissioners are expected to give their input.

Mr. Tomaine stated that the current version of the Commissioners Handbook includes a resolution from 2019 that is very supportive of telephonic participation at meetings. He stated that this resolution includes voting and also cites the Open Public Meetings Act, and that the resolution is currently in effect. However, the current resolution being proposed is vaguely mandating in-person attendance, which is in conflict with the existing resolution.

Mr. Gelin stated that Commissioners should not be allowed to attend meetings remotely, they should either be here or be considered absent. Mr. Mazzarella pointed out that there are a number of meetings a Commissioner may be absent from before impacting his compensation, so there is already some flexibility in this policy. Mr. Harms stated that Commissioners need to be present at 10 meetings to receive their full amount of compensation; Mr. Tomaine stated that this is not stated in the resolution. Mr. Gelin stated that the resolution may need some fine-tuning and asked for the Vice Chairman's thoughts on this. Mr. Mazzarella stated that he is open for discussion, and believes that some flexibility may be needed; for example, as Mr. Beiner stated, Commissioners who are sick should stay home, however they would be considered absent. He also stated that Commissioners have the ability to be absent on a number of occasions without any decrease in compensation. However, he stated, he does believe that this governing body requires face-to-

face debates, and does not believe the Board can have a spirited debate when some its members are not present and there are various background noises coming through the phone.

Mr. Tomaine repeated that the proposed resolution is clearly in conflict with the existing resolution; Mr. Gelin stated that he understands and we will make the necessary changes to reconcile between the two. Mr. Gelin stated that this should be changed to not allow for attendance to be counted when a Commissioner is participating over the phone. He stated that this is the intent because Commissioners should not be allowed to be considered present when they call in just because they do not feel like coming.

Mr. Meehan stated that it is difficult to set parameters on why someone can or cannot participate; and he understands the value of having Commissioners call in at certain times. For example, he stated that Mr. Greet is sometimes out of town but when he is involved in a specific committee or concerned about a certain issue, he has been able to call in and voice his concerns. However, Mr. Meehan stated, it is very hard to decide under which circumstances a Commissioner is allowed to call in and participate. Mr. Mazzarella added that it is also very difficult to understand those who are present over the phone; Mr. Meehan agreed, and stated that while we would prefer to have everyone physically present, it may be a bit extreme to never allow a person to call in. For that reason, he stated, it may be more appropriate to put limits on call-ins. Mr. Gelin stated that it is not fair for those Commissioners who are committed to serving their towns, who have a voice, and spend their time preparing for and attending the meetings in person, when other Commissioners are not as committed. Mr. Meehan stated that given the number of different viewpoints amongst members of the Board, it would probably be best to go with what the majority of the Commissioners agree with.

Mr. Mazzarella suggested that if a Commissioner has a concern about a certain topic to be discussed at the meeting but is unable to attend, he can submit his concern to Mrs. DeCarlo via email and she can read it aloud at the meeting. Mr. Gelin stated that this does not happen on other boards, but some of them do have alternates in the event that a member is sick, which is always an option. Mr. Harms stated it would be very difficult finding alternates for all of the towns; Mr. Greet added that an alternate Commissioner who only attends one or two meetings would not be well-informed on what is going on at the Authority.

Mr. Mazzarella offered a motion to amend the resolution to state that a Commissioner who cannot attend a meeting will be allowed to call in and listen; stating that face-to-face interaction is needed to represent the communities.

Mr. Estis stated that the resolution needs to be revised based on this discussion; however, before revising it, he wants to be sure that the changes correspond with the beliefs of a majority of the Commissioners.

Mr. Harms stated that the Commissioners are already allowed two absences; and suggested that they should also be given two opportunities to call in throughout the year without being marked absent. Mr. Mazzarella agreed that this may be a nice trade-off. Mr. Greet stated that this may be an appropriate solution, and commented that Mr. Tomaine made a valid point as well; however, he suggests that this matter be tabled for the time being. He suggested that all the Commissioners review the By-Laws and come up with additional solutions until they are able to come to a compromise.

Mr. Estis suggested that anyone wishing to submit suggestions regarding this matter send them to him via email. Then, he stated, he would prepare a resolution containing possible alternatives which the Board would discuss and vote on at its next meeting.

Mr. Gelin stated that this is not how a Board should function, stating that just as the Executive Director is required to show up or else he would not be compensated, the Commissioners should be held to the same standard. He stated that the Authority's By-Laws should be strictly written and should not favor one Commissioner over another. Mr. Harms explained that his suggestion was only to help out those Commissioners who have trouble attending; and stated that he has not missed a single meeting in his four years on the Board, however he has no problem paying a Commissioner who calls in for a meeting, as we have all agreed in the past that we are not here for the money. Mr. Gelin stated that the problem is not about the compensation but the varying level of commitment amongst members of the Board.

Mr. Mazzarella stated that it is essential that Commissioners attend every meeting although they are allowed two meetings that they can miss. However, he does agree that for those two meetings, the Commissioners should be given the option to call in. If this does not work out, we can always update the resolution further to provide for 100% in person meeting attendance, but it is at least important to get the ball rolling on making these changes rather than having them bounce back and forth over the next several months. Mr. Meehan stated that as Mr. Estis suggested, the Board will be given two or three alternatives at next month's meeting which they will vote on, and the option favored by the majority will be passed.

Mr. Harms stated that he would like to table this matter until next month's meeting, Mr. Gottko seconded the motion. The motion to table was approved by all but Mr. Mazzarella, who opposed.

Mr. Gelin asked if the resolution currently being proposed could be altered to remove the portions regarding attendance requirements, this way we would at least move forward with the updates to the meeting time and schedule; Mr. Estis replied yes, and stated that a motion regarding same should be made.

Mr. Mazzarella made a motion to approve Resolution #21-47 with the suggested changes. Mr. Greet seconded the resolution, and the motion was approved by those present.

RESOLUTION #21-47

WHEREAS, Article XI of the By-Laws of the Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority ("Authority") provides that the By-Laws may be amended by "introducing the proposed amendment at a regular meeting" and having it be voted upon on second reading at the next regular meeting; with two-thirds vote of the entire authorized membership being required to pass the amendment on second reading; and

WHEREAS, the Commissioners of the Authority have determined to amend Article V of the Authority's By-Laws, specifically to change the start times of regular meetings of the Commissioners from 6:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.; and

WHEREAS, the Commissioners have determined to amend Article V of the Authority's By-Laws to eliminate all references to Agenda Work Sessions and negate all such sessions.;

~~WHEREAS, the Commissioners have determined to amend Article V of the Authority's By-Laws to update its policy on remote meeting attendance.~~

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Commissioners of the Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority that Article V of the By-Laws shall be amended on first reading as follows:

"The regular meetings of the Commissioners shall be held on the third Thursday (or as otherwise scheduled) of each month at 5:30 p.m. or immediately following the Finance Committee meeting...as the place of such meeting. Special meetings shall be held...a quorum at any meeting. ~~Commissioners shall make every attempt to attend Regular Meetings and/or Special Meetings in person, otherwise they will be considered absent.~~"

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the proposed amendment shall be considered at the November regular meeting unless otherwise set forth at that time.

Mr. Mazzarella stated that as he brought up at the September meeting, he would like to discuss the possibility of eliminating flow exceedances that occurred as a result of Tropical Storm Ida.

3. Motion to eliminate flow exceedances on September 1st and 2nd

Motion: Mr. Mazzarella

Second: Mr. Harms

Discussion: Mr. Estis stated that he reviewed the list of exceedances and found that only two exceedances were caused by this storm. Mr. Buonocore stated that the impacts of this storm were seen on September 1st and 2nd. He stated that while all of the towns violated,

it did not cause any of the towns to hit 10 exceedances. He explained that the two towns that have 10 or more exceedances were already in that position prior to this storm. Mr. Buonocore explained that the exceedances would not be taken out of his report but they would be removed from the calculation.

The motion was approved by those present.

New Business

Mr. Harms offered two resolutions.

1. **Resolution #21-70** – Requesting Late Submittal of the 2022 Budget to the State of New Jersey

Motion: Mr. Harms
Second: Mr. Rachlin

The motion was approved by those present.

RESOLUTION #21-70

WHEREAS, the State of New Jersey, Department of Community Affairs, Division of Local Government Services, requires that the Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority ("Authority") file its Annual Budget by November 1st of each year; and

WHEREAS, due to delays in receiving the necessary information to complete the 2020 Audit, the Authority's estimated revenues and appropriations were not able to be accurately forecasted at the time the Budget was to be legally introduced; and

WHEREAS, the Authority will not be able to approve its Year 2022 Budget for submission to the State until after its October 2021 meeting.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority hereby requests a postponement of the submission of its Year 2022 Budget from November 1, 2021 to as soon as possible thereafter.

2. **Resolution #21-71** – Authorization to File an Application with the NJIB for Contract #189 – Headworks Bar Screens Replacement

Motion: Mr. Harms
Second: Mr. Rachlin

The motion was approved by those present.

RESOLUTION #21-71

WHEREAS, the Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority ("Authority") intends to file an application with the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection and the New Jersey Infrastructure Bank for the Contract #189 – Headworks Bar Screens Replacement.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that James J. Meehan, Executive Director, be and is hereby authorized to act as the Authorized Representative of the Authority in all matters related to the projects undertaken pursuant to the above referenced New Jersey Environmental Infrastructure Loan to be executed with the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection and the New Jersey Infrastructure Bank; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Authorized Representative may be contacted at Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority, 1050 East Hazelwood Avenue, Rahway, New Jersey 07065, 732-388-0868 extension 215.

Mr. Gottko offered two resolutions.

1. **Resolution #21-72** – Award of Contract #2124 – Furnish & Deliver Thermal Oil Rotary Joints to Komline-Sanderson Corporation

Motion: Mr. Gottko

Second: Mr. Harms

The motion was approved by those present.

RESOLUTION #21-72

WHEREAS, the Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority ("Authority") solicited bids for Contract #2124 – Furnish & Deliver Thermal Oil Rotary Joints, Rebid #1, and received bids on October 14, 2021; and

WHEREAS, the Authority received one bid which was reviewed by the Purchasing Agent and found to be responsive and responsible; and

WHEREAS, the bid was received from Komline-Sanderson Corporation ("Komline") of Peapack, NJ, with a total amount of \$204,700.00; and

WHEREAS, Komline noted in its bid an exception to the two-year Contract Term, specifying that it would only agree to a term of one (1) year; and

WHEREAS, the Plant Superintendent and Purchasing Agent recommend the award of this contract to Komline-Sanderson Corporation; and

WHEREAS, the Secretary-Treasurer of the Authority, who is the Chief Financial Officer, hereby certifies that the necessary funds for said contract are available in the Annual Budget.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Commissioners of the Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority hereby authorize the award of Contract #2124 – Furnish & Deliver Thermal Oil Rotary Joints to Komline-Sanderson Corporation for a term of one (1) year and the amount of \$124,400.00; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Executive Director is hereby authorized to execute said contract.

2. **Resolution #21-73** – Award of Contract #2218 – Replacement Polymer Feed System to GP Jager Inc.

Motion: Mr. Gottko

Second: Mr. Greet

The motion was approved by those present.

RESOLUTION #21-73

WHEREAS, the Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority ("Authority") solicited bids for Contract #2218 – Replacement Polymer Feed System, Rebid #1, and received bids on October 14, 2021; and

WHEREAS, the Authority received one bid which was reviewed by the Purchasing Agent and found to be responsive and responsible; and

WHEREAS, the bid was received from GP Jager Inc. of Boonton, NJ with a total amount of \$62,400.00; and

WHEREAS, the Plant Superintendent and Purchasing Agent recommend the award of this contract to GP Jager Inc.; and

WHEREAS, the Secretary-Treasurer of the Authority, who is the Chief Financial Officer, hereby certifies that the necessary funds for said contract are available in the Annual Budget.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Commissioners of the Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority hereby authorize the award of Contract #2218 – Replacement Polymer Feed System to GP Jager Inc. for a term of two years and the amount of \$62,400.00; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Executive Director is hereby authorized to execute said contract.

Bills and Claims

Mr. Greet offered one motion.

Motion that the following bills and claims be ordered paid.

Motion: Mr. Greet
 Second: Mr. Rachlin

The motion was approved by those present.

BILLS AND CLAIMS LISTING

BUILDING & EQUIPMENT FUND

CHECK	DATE	VENDOR	LINE/ACCT	AMOUNT
1010	10/21/21	CDM SMITH, INC.	140.2	10,972.50
1011	10/21/21	G.M.H. ASSOCIATES OF AMERICA	140.3	31,384.00
1012	10/21/21	PRECISION ELECTRIC MOTOR WORKS	127.0	62,590.00
1013	10/21/21	REINER PUMP SYSTEMS, INC	127.0	55,969.00
1014	10/21/21	SPECTRASERV INC.	140.3	9,683.00

Total Building & Equipment Fund Checks: 5
 Total Void Checks: 0
 Total Void Check Amount: \$0.00
 Total Building & Equipment Fund Checks Paid: \$170,598.50

OPERATING FUND - MANUAL

CHECK	DATE	VENDOR	LINE/ACCT	AMOUNT
392	09/29/21	RAHWAY VALLEY S.A. - PAYROLL	01/02	206,647.54
393	10/04/21	NJ STATE HEALTH BENEFITS	03/04	115,938.06
394	10/14/21	RAHWAY VALLEY S.A. - PAYROLL	01/02	207,164.12

Total Operating Fund Manual Checks: 3
 Total Void Checks: 0
 Total Void Check Amount: \$0.00
 Total Operating Fund Manual Checks Paid: \$529,749.72

OPERATING FUND

CHECK	DATE	VENDOR	LINE/ACCT	AMOUNT
1336	10/07/21	BANK OF AMERICA	27	995.93
1337	10/07/21	DELTA DENTAL OF NEW JERSEY INC	03	6,993.06
1338	10/07/21	ELIZABETHTOWN GAS	22	1,515.64
1339	10/07/21	HOME DEPOT CREDIT SERVICES	32	2,259.51
1340	10/07/21	NJ MANUFACTURERS INSURANCE CO.	17	12,940.00
1341	10/07/21	NJ MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION	35	86.50
1342	10/07/21	STAPLES CREDIT PLAN	27	385.64
1343	10/07/21	UGI ENERGY SERVICES, LLC	22	42.21
1344	10/07/21	UNUM LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY	03	1,101.33
1345	10/07/21	VISION SERVICE PLAN	03	1,430.13

CHECK	DATE	VENDOR	LINE/ACCT	AMOUNT
1346	10/21/21	ADVANCED POWER DISTRIBUTION	32	6,595.00
1347	10/21/21	AGGRESSIVE ENERGY, LLC	19	176,276.78
1348	10/21/21	ALL AMERICAN SEWER SERVICE INC	21/32	11,697.25
1349	10/21/21	ALLIED FILTER COMPANY	28	199.72
1350	10/21/21	AMERICAN WEAR	32	1,822.36
1351	10/21/21	APPLIED ANALYTICS, INC.	32	7,496.66
1352	10/21/21	AQUAFIX, INC	29	10,342.55
1353	10/21/21	ATLANTIC ANALYTICAL LABORATORY	41	825.00
1354	10/21/21	B & B DISPOSAL	32	675.00
1355	10/21/21	BELLA GINA	49	259.44
1356	10/21/21	BEST LINE EQUIPMENT, INC	28/32	2,439.17
1357	10/21/21	BGIA, INC.	17	39,444.00
1358	10/21/21	BIOBOT ANALYTICS, INC	32	1,560.00
1359	10/21/21	BOWCO LABORATORIES, INC.	32	63.00
1360	10/21/21	BRIDGESTONE HOSEPOWER, LLC	32	461.56
1361	10/21/21	JOHN BUONOCORE	15	221.46
1362	10/21/21	BUYWISE AUTO PARTS	35	28.34
1363	10/21/21	CDM SMITH, INC.	05/06	38,272.41
1364	10/21/21	CANON FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC.	16	747.48
1365	10/21/21	CITY OF RAHWAY - UNITED WATER	33	5,578.09
1366	10/21/21	CORROSION PRODUCTS, INC	32	3,677.73
1367	10/21/21	CSL SERVICES, INC.	30	10,706.26
1368	10/21/21	ELIZABETHTOWN GAS	22	13,562.48
1369	10/21/21	ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCE ASSOC.	40	401.12
1370	10/21/21	EXAMINETICS, INC.	31	1,600.00
1371	10/21/21	FEDEX	48	591.13
1372	10/21/21	FREEHOLD WELDING, INC	32	1,750.00
1373	10/21/21	GOVCONNECTION, INC.	27	1,734.24
1374	10/21/21	GRAINGER	28/31/32/42	5,370.39
1375	10/21/21	GREENBAUM, ROWE, SMITH & DAVIS	07	2,742.50
1376	10/21/21	HACH COMPANY	40	516.54
1377	10/21/21	HARTFORD STEAM BOILER	32	105.00
1378	10/21/21	HATFIELD SCHWARTZ LAW GROUP	08	962.50
1379	10/21/21	HAWKINS, DELAFIELD & WOOD LLP	08	11,280.00
1380	10/21/21	HAYES PUMP INC.	32	3,230.00
1381	10/21/21	HYDRO SERVICE & SUPPLIES, INC.	40	4,043.52
1382	10/21/21	INDEPENDENT OVERHEAD DOOR CO.	32	4,110.00
1383	10/21/21	INTELEPEER CLOUD COMMUNICATION	11	439.21
1384	10/21/21	JERSEY ELEVATOR COMPANY INC.	32	390.56
1385	10/21/21	LAWSON PRODUCTS, INC	32	1,565.11
1386	10/21/21	MAGIC WAND COMPANY	32	562.08
1387	10/21/21	MAIN POOL & CHEMICAL INC	29	2,376.00
1388	10/21/21	MCCLOSKEY MECHANICAL CONTRACTO	32	310.80
1389	10/21/21	MCMASTER-CARR SUPPLY CO.	32	355.28
1390	10/21/21	MIDDLESEX WATER COMPANY	33	1,279.26
1391	10/21/21	MILLER MECHANICAL SERVICES	28/32	470.00
1392	10/21/21	MORTON SALT, INC.	32	1,663.15
1393	10/21/21	MOTION INDUSTRIES, INC.	32	155.84
1394	10/21/21	NAVITEND	27	66.25
1395	10/21/21	COLOGIX	11	294.00
1396	10/21/21	NJ ADVANCE MEDIA	12	161.20
1397	10/21/21	STATE OF NEW JERSEY	31	257.00
1398	10/21/21	NJ MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION	35	71.50
1399	10/21/21	STATE OF NEW JERSEY	02	615.70
1400	10/21/21	OFFICE CONCEPTS GROUP, INC.	49	170.87
1401	10/21/21	ONE CALL CONCEPTS, INC.	32	18.59
1402	10/21/21	POLYDYNE INC.	23	26,818.00
1403	10/21/21	PRAXAIR DISTRIBUTION, INC.	32	604.63

CHECK	DATE	VENDOR	LINE/ACCT	AMOUNT
1404	10/21/21	PRIMEPOINT, LLC	16	1,078.60
1405	10/21/21	PSE&G COMPANY	19	61,536.54
1406	10/21/21	QUALITY CONTROLS, INC.	32	8,188.73
1407	10/21/21	RADWELL INTERNATIONAL, INC.	32	1,403.84
1408	10/21/21	RARITAN SUPPLY	32	4,978.32
1409	10/21/21	ROYAL BATTERY	28	250.00
1410	10/21/21	SAKER SHOPRITES, INC.	40	26.94
1411	10/21/21	SCIENTIFIC WATER CONDITIONING	32	565.00
1412	10/21/21	SECURADYNE SYSTEM INTERMEDIATE	27	1,132.79
1413	10/21/21	SHALLCROSS BOLT & SPECIALTIES	32	95.17
1414	10/21/21	SHERWOOD-LOGAN & ASSOCIATES	32	36,590.00
1415	10/21/21	SIZTO TECH CORPORATION	32	518.55
1416	10/21/21	SKYLINE ENVIRONMENTAL INC	31	3,000.00
1417	10/21/21	SPRUCE INDUSTRIES, INC.	32	1,163.56
1418	10/21/21	THOMAS SCIENTIFIC	40	451.20
1419	10/21/21	UGI ENERGY SERVICES, LLC	22	14,556.38
1420	10/21/21	ULINE, INC	32	342.96
1421	10/21/21	USA BLUEBOOK	42	1,007.30
1422	10/21/21	VERIZON	27	1,778.19
1423	10/21/21	VERIZON	11	132.19
1424	10/21/21	VERIZON WIRELESS	11	1,368.92
1425	10/21/21	W. A. BIRDSALL & CO.	28	194.60
1426	10/21/21	WAGE WORKS INC.	03	95.00
1427	10/21/21	WASTE MANAGEMENT OF NEW JERSEY	25/26	46,130.20
1428	10/21/21	WB MASON COMPANY, INC.	13/32	462.23
1429	10/21/21	WHIRL-AIR-FLOW	28	1,162.80
1430	10/21/21	WINDSTREAM COMMUNICATIONS	11	1,942.12

Total Operating Fund Checks: 95
 Total Void Checks: 0
 Total Void Check Amount: \$0.00
 Total Operating Fund Checks Paid: \$627,935.79

OPERATING FUND	1-01	\$1,157,685.51
BUILDING & EQUIPMENT FUND	1-02	170,598.50
		=====
TOTAL OF ALL FUNDS:		\$1,328,284.01

Open the floor to the Public for questions or comments

None.

Adjournment

As there was no further business, on motion of Mr. Harms, second by Mr. Greet, the meeting adjourned at 7:39 p.m. The motion was approved by those present.

 Chairman

Andrea DeCarlo

 Andrea DeCarlo, Board Secretary

Attachments:
 Report of Treasurer 08/2021
 Flow Rights Report 08/2021
 Flow Rights Report 09/2021
 User Charge Report 09/2021