

REGULAR MEETING OF THE MUSCONETCONG SEWERAGE AUTHORITY

Chairman Rattner called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM. Following salute to colors, announcement was made that adequate notice of this meeting had been provided for as defined by the "Open Public Meetings Act".

MEMBERS PRESENT: James Benson, David Hoyt, John Kieser, Melanie Michetti, Daren Phil, Michael Pucilowski, Steven Rattner, Joseph Schwab

MEMBERS ABSENT: Donald Bates, Patrick Kunkel, Daren Phil, Edward Schwartz, John Sylvester

OTHERS PRESENT: Larry Kron, Esq., Lee Purcell, P.E., James Schilling, Fenton Purcell, P.E.

Chairman Rattner open and closed the meeting to the public.

The approval of the Special Budget meeting minutes was briefly discussed. Mr. Schwab noted some minor corrections to the minutes.

The Special Budget meeting minutes of October 2, 2012 were approved as amended on a motion offered by Mr. Benson, seconded by Mrs. Michetti. Roll Call:

Mr. Benson	Yes	Mr. Pucilowski	Yes
Mr. Hoyt	Yes	Mr. Rattner	Yes
Mr. Kieser	Yes	Mr. Schwab	Yes
Mrs. Michetti	Yes		

The Expenditures/Treasurer's Report of November was accepted on a motion offered by Mr. Schwab seconded by Mr. Pucilowski and the affirmative roll call vote of members present.

Mr. Benson questioned the Finch Fuel Oil charge for the emergency generator on the pending voucher list. Chairman Rattner explained that there were additional costs because of the storm. The pending vouchers were approved for payment on a motion offered by Mr. Schwab, seconded by Mrs. Michetti and the affirmative roll call vote of members present.

CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNT	
LTPA (Contract 235 Revised)	\$425.00
Nusbaum Stein (5 Priority Projects - Contract 220)	\$337.50
ESCROW ACCT	\$0.00
OPERATING ACCOUNT	
ADP	\$447.00
Atlantic Tomorrow	\$25.96
Cintas Corp.	\$1,139.13
Fisher Scientific	\$77.49
Finch Fuel Oil	\$8,636.24
Fred Pryor Seminars	\$199.00
Grainger	\$203.26
Susan Grebe	\$142.79
Hackettstown Oil	\$21,182.08
Hess	\$580.20
JCP&L	\$3,211.47
LTPA	\$2,390.00
Lowe's	\$466.41
NJ American Water	\$537.73
Napa Auto Parts	\$159.00
Nusbaum Stein	\$1,125.00
One Call Concepts	\$22.42
PPL Energy Plus	\$15,208.76
Passaic Valley Sewerage	\$15,566.00
Polydyne	\$2,052.00
QC Labs	\$372.00
Quill	\$40.97
R&J Control	\$1,189.00
Shell Fleet Plus	\$597.26
Spectraserv	\$12,780.00
Verizon Communication	\$49.99
Waste Management	\$129.00

The following correspondence for the month of November was received and filed on a motion offered by Mrs. Michetti, seconded by Mr. Hoyt and the affirmative vote of members present.

- A. 11/2/12 L. Kron, Esq. – JoGi Construction – Contract 220 Maintenance Bond
- B. 11/9/12 NJDEP Needs Survey Response to Stanley V. Cach, PE, PP at NJDEP Division of Water Quality
- C. 11/10/12 Cover Letter transmitting Budget to Division of Local Government Services for Review

Mr. Schilling indicated that flow readings for the month of November will be available in early December. As of November 13th, the MSA disposed of 126,000 gallons of sludge to Par Troy Sewerage. The cost is three cents more a gallon going to Par Troy instead of Passaic Valley. Passaic Valley Sewerage is shut down due to Hurricane Sandy and will hopefully reopen before Thanksgiving. Chairman Rattner questioned if the extra three cents a gallon charge would be an expense that FEMA would cover. Mr. Pucilowski said he would submit it to FEMA. Mr. Pucilowski also explained about a FEMA mitigation program to apply for funds to prevent future disasters from happening. Mrs. Michetti suggested that next time the MSA goes out to bid for the sludge removal the authority should set up the base price for hauling to Passaic Valley Sewerage and set up a secondary base price to cover hauling to Par Troy Sewerage or Two Bridges Sewerage facility to save on costs in case Passaic Valley Sewerage should get flooded again in the future. Chairman Rattner noted that the hauler, Spectraserve, was also shut down due to the storm. Mr. Schilling explained that they used secondary haulers for four occasions before Spectraserve was back in business. Mr. Schilling also pointed out that the total for October 2012 sludge was 355,000 gallons.

Mr. Schilling reported that the MSA has filed a police report with the Mount Olive Police for a banking account fraud. There was discussion regarding the bank fraud and how the situation is being handled.

Mr. Sylvester entered the meeting at 7:49 PM.

Mr. Schilling also reported that Hurricane Sandy caused power outages, along with problems with the fuel procurement for the generators, and sludge hauling and disposal. The MSA managed through the storm and he kept in close contact with the NJDEP and the Rock. He also provided hurricane cost data. He stated that the NJDEP was very pleased with how the MSA managed through the hurricane since there were other sewerage authorities that were not as fortunate. Mr. Benson asked about how the water and debris flow through the system into the fresh water was handled. Mr. Schilling responded that there was really not much impact from the rainfall in the area from the hurricane, so there was no impact to the hydraulic profile and performance of the plant. He said the authority did fairly well with managing the sludge. He indicated that the real challenge was procuring fuel for the generators even though he had filled the generators up before the storm.

Mr. Schilling also reported that work on the security gate has begun again. The Township of Mount Olive issued the permits for the work and the Mount Olive Inspector was on site November 5th to inspect the electrical work, so the project is moving forward.

Mr. Schilling also reported that LTPA was on site on November 9th to look at the railing/concrete failures again. They spent several hours doing a very thorough assessment of the situation.

Mr. Schilling also reported that he e-mailed the commissioners the security control plan for the computers as requested at the last meeting. He is seeking approval to move forward with Northeast Computer Company to set up the new computer system. The computer system the MSA currently has is antiquated. He highly recommends getting the system purchased and installed so the MSA can integrate its own data with the new system and have a much more updated system. He again reported to the commissioners that he obtained several quotes to install the new system and Northeast Computer had the lowest price. Mrs. Michetti asked if new computers would need to be purchased along with software upgrades. Mr. Schilling said no new computers would be required and the software is included in the price quote from Northeast Computer. Mr. Pucilowski asked if some of the commissioners had personally used Northeast Computer. Mr. Schilling noted that one or two of the commissioners had used Northeast Computer, but he was only aware of that after he was required to get references. Mr. Pucilowski questioned about the maintenance of the system and if the equipment would remain if the MSA decided to hire another company to maintain the system. Mr. Schilling said that the maintenance of the system was covered under the contract with Northeast Computer and the MSA is purchasing the equipment and will own it. Chairman Rattner indicated that he has no concerns about the hardware and maintenance, but he is concerned about the internal controls as he discussed at last month's meeting and who would be the administrator of the system. Mr. Schilling said that he would like to have the project started and the commissioners could decide who would be the system administrator. There was some discussion as to what the system administrator's responsibilities would be and what kind of access the employees would have on the computer network. Mr. Benson explained how the Borough of Stanhope municipal building's computer system worked and noted that the MSA's system should not be much different. Mr. Hoyt made a motion to go forward with the new computer system project as proposed by Northeast Computer, seconded by Mr. Keiser. Mr. Kron asked exactly what motion is being made and

indicated that a resolution was prepared to award the contract at the last month's meeting. Mr. Keiser said that he would like to accept the proposal from Northeast Computer for the new computer system and have the Director, James Schilling, oversee the installation and be the administrator of the system. Mr. Kron stated that he prepared Resolution No. 12-40 for the last meeting. The resolution was for the MSA to award a contract to Northeast Computer Repair for server build, setup of office network, transfer of all data to server, setup of network attached storage backup unit, setup of network security hardware device, configure user access to server and other PC's, setup of remote desktop access, software upgrades on terminals, anti-virus software installation on all PC's, etc. in accordance with Northeast Computer's bid of \$6,011.79. Mr. Kron said he could add to the Resolution that James Schilling would be the system administrator. Mrs. Michetti asked if the MSA had to specify that. Mr. Kron said that the commissioners did not have to specify it. Mr. Schwab indicated that the project needed to be started and suggested that the commissioners should get the Auditor's comments so there could be some type of separation and possibly the Chairman should be the system administrator. Mr. Kron stated that the commissioners could have the system setup in accordance with Resolution No. 12-40 that he has prepared, and then the system can be installed and the commissioners could proceed on the other issues. Mr. Keiser asked how the system could be installed and running without knowing who the administrator is. Mr. Kron said the original resolution did not specify who the system administrator would be. Mr. Hoyt said that he would like to make a motion to add that James Schilling would be the system administrator to Resolution No. 12-40, seconded by Mr. Keiser. Mr. Kron said he would revise the resolution to add that James Schilling would be the system administrator. Roll Call:

Mr. Benson	Yes	Mr. Pucilowski	No
Mr. Hoyt	Yes	Mr. Rattner	No
Mr. Kieser	Yes	Mr. Schwab	No
Mrs. Michetti	No	Mr. Sylvester	No

Mrs. Michetti noted that the only reason she was voting no was because she did not believe that the person who would be the system administrator needed to be specified at this time. A motion was made by Mr. Schwab, seconded by Mrs. Michetti to adopt Resolution No. 12-40 as originally prepared without indicating who would be the computer system administrator. The motion was approved by the affirmative roll call vote of members present.

RESOLUTION NO. 12-40

**Resolution of the Musconetcong Sewerage Authority
Awarding a Contract to Northeast Computer Repair
for Server Build, Setup of Office Network, Transfer of all
Data to Server, Setup of Network Attached Storage Backup Unit,
Setup of Network Security Hardware Device, Configure User
Access to Server and Other PC's, Setup of Remote Desktop Access,
Software Upgrades on Terminals, Anti-Virus Software Installation on
all PC's, etc., in Accordance With N.J.S.A. 40A:11-6.1**

WHEREAS, N.J.S.A. 40A:11-6.1 provides for all contracts that in aggregate are less than the bid threshold of Seventeen Thousand Five Hundred (\$17,500.00) Dollars, but more than Two Thousand Six Hundred Twenty Five (\$2,625.00) Dollars the contracting agent shall award the contract after soliciting at least two (2) competitive quotations if practical; and

WHEREAS, the Musconetcong Sewerage Authority (hereinafter "MSA") has received the following quotations for Server Build as described above:

	<u>Total Price</u>
1. Northeast Computer Repair 40 Main Street Stanhope, New Jersey 07874	\$ 6,011.79
2. PC Extras 615 Main Street #294 Stroudsburg, PA 18360	\$ 8,428.62
3. B.K.R. Enterprises 148 Baker Street Dover, New Jersey 07801; and	\$ 9,820.35

WHEREAS, the bid of Northeast Computer Repair is the lowest bid.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Commissioners of the Musconetcong Sewerage Authority that a Contract is hereby awarded to Northeast Computer Repair on its bid Server Build as described in the job description in the total amount of \$6,011.79 in accordance with its bid of September 14, 2012, attached hereto; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the amount of the Contract shall not exceed \$6,011.79 without further approval from the Musconetcong Sewerage Authority, and the Musconetcong Sewerage Authority shall not be liable to pay any amount over and above \$6,011.79 without prior written approval; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that Steven Rattner as Chairman is hereby authorized to execute the Contract with Northeast Computer Repair on behalf of the Musconetcong Sewerage Authority.

Mr. Schilling also mentioned that the AEA conference has been rescheduled for January 15 and 16, 2013. The administrator has distributed a memo with a checklist attached. There was some discussion about who would be attending and the allotment checks that were previously issued.

Lastly, Mr. Schilling reported on the overtime hours. He indicated the overtime hours were high because of Hurricane Sandy.

The Repairs and Maintenance Report was accepted on a motion offered by Mr. Schwab, seconded by Mr. Benson and the affirmative vote of members present.

Lee Purcell, P.E. indicated that Mr. Kron would report on the request for the NJDEP appeal process and stay. Mr. Kron noted that nothing had changed.

Mr. Purcell discussed the NJDEP request for a needs survey. LTPA had finalized the draft letter to the NJDEP with the listing of anticipated projects.

Mr. Purcell discussed the NJDEP Asset Management Program. He indicated that it is going to become much more important to have an asset management plan in place so that the Authority can predict, with a certain degree of accuracy, what operating and mechanical equipment is going to fail and when. He explained that preparing the plan would be an undertaking, but it would help the MSA be able to set aside funds with some predictability to plan and budget for future failures of the plant's operating and mechanical equipment.

Mr. Purcell reported on the closeout of the NJEIT Project No. S340384-08. The closeout is depending upon the maintenance bond from the contractor, JoGi Construction. Mr. Kron has sent a letter to JoGi demanding the maintenance bond and specifying that the MSA will hold, in escrow, 2% of their last payment until the maintenance bond is received. Mr. Kron has also contacted the insurance company to find out why the maintenance bond has not been received and will follow-up with the insurance agent.

Mr. Purcell also reported on the water service from the Borough of Stanhope for Pump Station No. 6. LTPA will be requesting quotations from three plumbers. The plumber will be required to apply to the Borough of Stanhope for a plumbing permit. Mr. Schilling asked about the permit from the State. Mr. Purcell indicated that the thought Mr. Schilling would apply for the State permit. Mr. Schilling said he would not get the permit for the installation, but he would get the permit for the backflow preventer.

Mr. Purcell also reported on the electrical inspection of the newly installed security gate. The inspector wanted to inspect the circuit breakers that had been installed by CFM under Contract 235. LTPA gave the required information to Mr. Schilling for the inspector. Mr. Schilling said they had received final approval for the project.

Mr. Purcell reported on the handrail repair at the MSA Treatment Plant. A second meeting was held on November 9th, attended by Mr. Schilling, MSA Director, and John Black and Jim Demitriou of LTPA. They made a second thorough inspection of the handrails that are in need of repairs and took digital images of the defects which are of concern. Mr. Purcell explained that they had made a previous inspection on October 22nd and LTPA had written a memorandum for last month's meeting on that inspection and the remediation work that is required. He further explained that the memorandum was to inform the commissioners of the work that would be required and the costs associated, and not for permission to be authorized to proceed with the work. He also stated that LTPA does not intend to have the work performed exactly the way it was performed 10 years ago. LTPA provided the commissioners with the exact number of places that are in need of repair and a breakdown of the engineering costs that will be associated with repair, as he understood was requested at last month's meeting. He said the engineering costs would be a lump sum of \$25,000.00 which would include services to do the investigation, the design, the bidding, and the construction supervision on a part time basis. Fenton Purcell, P.E. was present at the meeting to give a detailed presentation of what the findings of the second inspection were, as requested of LTPA at the last meeting. Fenton Purcell passed out pictures taken during the construction to the commissioners for their review. He also passed out a sketch showing the locations in need of repair. He discussed some of the locations that needed to be repaired and pointed out which locations were most in need of repairs. He noted that he could provide the commissioners with a PowerPoint presentation on a flash drive if they would like. He had also prepared a table that showed the railings with the most problem areas and exactly what work would be required for each area. He indicated that MSA personnel could do some of the work such as re-grouting, caulking, chipping and patching around some of the railings. Mr. Schilling noted that he was concerned about the structural integrity of the work if the MSA personnel does the work versus a qualified contractor, and would the work last more than 10 years. Fenton Purcell said if the work is done carefully and properly it should hold up more than 10 years, but the concrete will eventually deteriorate in any event. Mr. Schilling indicated that his point was can the MSA personnel do this work properly and will LTPA be on-site to provide the overview that is needed for the work to be done properly by the employees and not by a qualified contractor or mason. Mr. Purcell said he did not believe this work needed to be done by a mason and if the chipping and patching work were done by the MSA employees 81% of the work would be done and the MSA would save money. He said if the re-grouting, caulking, chipping and patching work were put out to bid along with the more severe problems it would cost the Authority more money. There was some discussion about the cost percentages and if the MSA employees should do some of the

work as was being suggested by LTPA. Mr. Kron asked if the work required was within the scope of the work that the MSA employees normally do at the plant and is it part of their actual job or not. Mrs. Michetti said that if the work is not done properly by someone who is qualified it will not hold up for 10 years, maybe only 5 years. She said that the MSA staff works with pumping equipment and piping at the plant, not concrete. She reiterated that the Authority wants the work done to last. Mrs. Michetti also asked if any of the areas in need of repair would involve taking any of the treatment plant equipment off-line and if that is the case, how many areas are there. She stated that the NJDEP would need to be notified and that is considered an emergency. Mr. Kron said that he believed that the emergency repair matters should be done now. Fenton Purcell said that all the points in need of repair are shown in his presentation. Mr. Kron asked Mr. Purcell which points would he classify in need of immediate repair or emergency repair. Mr. Purcell pointed out the areas on his sketch, which were approximately 9 locations. He suggested that if the work cannot be done immediately the areas should be stabilized with plywood or something so concrete would not fall into the tank or pumps. Fenton Purcell again pointed out the areas that are most in need of repair. Mrs. Michetti reviewed and discussed the sketch in comparison to the pictures and the numbered list. Mr. Kron said he could prepare a resolution designating that the work be done immediately in the areas that are in need of emergency repairs. Fenton Purcell listed the numbered areas in need of immediate repair, which included areas labeled as P1, P9, P10, P17, P26, P27, P28, P29, P30. A motion was made by Mr. Rattner for the Plant Director to obtain a contract to have the repairs completed to those specific areas in need of immediate repairs, seconded by Mr. Keiser. Mr. Keiser asked what the repairs entailed. Fenton Purcell said they need to do the design before he can answer that question and at this time he is presenting examples of things that could be done. Mr. Schwab asked what are the emergency repairs that have to be done. Fenton Purcell answered that all of the concrete has to be chipped out down to the viable concrete, form and pour the concrete, and if the post is not setting properly in the existing channel it should be removed and replaced, but that cannot be determined until the concrete is chipped out. The other option would be to use a plate and weld the aluminum to the plate and use four screws that do not go into the new concrete. Mr. Keiser said he preferred the plate option and discussed some of the areas in the plant that have plates when the initial inspection was done by the Engineering Committee. The work involved with the plate option was discussed. Mr. Keiser asked for a plan with all of the locations and the costs involved. Lee Purcell, P.E. stated that LTPA prepared the plan with an ordinary magnitude of cost of \$100,000.00 to do the remediation of what LTPA determined at the on-site inspection on the November 9th. He said these options are what he is suggesting. He also noted that when the final design is finished they would have a better cost estimate. Included under the \$100,000.00 ordinary cost magnitude would be the budget of \$25,000.00 for LTPA to perform the engineering services, which would be the investigation, design, bid period, and part time construction supervision. He noted that LTPA had prepared a breakdown of the costs for the different aspects of the work. He then discussed the emergency repairs. Mr. Keiser asked what is included in the lump sum \$25,000.00 engineering cost and would the MSA get a contract for the work. Mr. Benson said the nine areas that need immediate repairs should be addressed first. Mr. Purcell said that LTPA's evaluation would be to try to protect the areas in need of immediate repairs by keeping the concrete from falling into the mechanical equipment areas where it could harm people and equipment. He said the areas could be stabilized immediately with plywood and clamps to protect the areas so they do not create a problem. Chairman Rattner asked if the areas in need of immediate repair should be repaired now and suggested that maybe the Authority should call a local mason to do the work. Mrs. Michetti suggested contacting the contractor working on site presently on the security gate and asking for a proposal for a permanent solution for the concrete work being required for just the emergency repairs. Mr. Kron said that could be accomplished. Mr. Purcell would have to certify that the repairs are actually required emergency repairs and then certify the work. He could then prepare a resolution. A special meeting could be held to approve the resolution and authorize the work. Mr. Purcell said that the contractor would have to look at each of the nine critical points separately. Then LTPA could evaluate what the contractor is proposing in terms of acceptability from a structural standpoint and a cost standpoint. Soliciting several quotes from local masons was discussed. Mr. Purcell explained that a breakdown was prepared for the lump sum proposal for engineering services as was requested by the commissioners at the last meeting. LTPA broke down the proposal into four categories. There is an investigation period which would require 30 man hours, most of which has already been accomplished. There is a design period which would require 30 man hours to prepare the design, plans and specifications to go to bid. The bid period would require approximately 15 man hours in terms of responding to bidders' questions, receiving bids, evaluating the bids and recommending the award. The fourth part would be the part time inspection of construction. The contractor could perform the preparatory work to do what is specified and LTPA could evaluate the work before it is performed to make sure it will be done properly. The four categories come out to 150 man hours at an average billing rate of \$170.00 per hour to total \$25,500.00. Mr. Schwab asked where the contract administration, which would include bill payments to the contractor, would be covered. Mr. Purcell said the contract administration is covered under the construction inspection period. Chairman Rattner asked if the breakdown into man hours was based on the 178 repairs, which would include the caulking, chipping and patching. Mr. Purcell said LTPA can prepare the chipping and caulking to have it done by the contractor and they can incorporate it into the bid documents, but he thinks the authority could save money if they do that work themselves. Someone asked if that includes the emergency areas. Mr. Purcell said the breakdown is not answering to the emergency situation and suggested that at this time the MSA should try to contain those areas by protecting them so that LTPA can do the design and get a publicly bid contract that will assure that the work is done correctly. Mrs. Michetti said that the nine emergency areas could be covered under the present budget. There was some discussion about having a mason contractor do the work on the nine emergency areas and immediately soliciting quotes from local contractors. Mr. Purcell said John Black of LTPA would be able to be present to meet with the prospective masons. Mr. Keiser question Mr. Kron if the commissioners needed a resolution. Mr. Kron

said the resolution could be prepared after the contractor provides the information for doing the emergency work. Then the balance of the work that is needed would not be an emergency resolution and if the price is over the bid statute the MSA would have to go out to bid for that work. Mr. Purcell said the cost of the repair for the nine emergency areas may be a significant part of the project. Mr. Kron advised Mr. Schilling to get quotes for the nine emergency areas and then get separate quotes on the balance of the work. If the quotes are under the bidding statute then the MSA can award the project without bidding. Mr. Kron stated again that he can prepare the resolution for the emergency repairs and the commissioners can approve the resolution at a special meeting and the resolution for the other work can wait until next year. He advised that the MSA should get the emergency work done now. Mr. Rattner withdrew the motion he made previously. Mr. Purcell stated that LTPA needs to be reimbursed for the work they have already done and for the costs of the work that needs to be done. He said that LTPA needs to: 1) certify the emergency, 2) LTPA needs to be out in the field with Mr. Schilling when the contractors come to the plant to look at the nine areas in need of the emergency repair, and 3) LTPA needs to evaluate what the contractors say about the work and their qualifications to do the work. Mr. Benson noted that there are two separate issues, the time that LTPA has expended already and the time that will be required. Mrs. Michetti said that LTPA should invoice the MSA for the time that has been expended. Mr. Kron said that LTPA should submit a payment voucher for the work they have already done and then submit another payment voucher for the work that will be required to get the emergency resolution prepared.

The Engineer's Report was accepted on a motion offered by Mr. Benson, seconded by Mr. Hoyt and the affirmative vote of members present.

Mr. Kron discussed the statute for a qualified purchasing agent. He stated that the statute requires the hiring to be done by resolution and to set up the purchasing agent as a position and not as an independent contractor professional. Mr. Kron said he discussed the matter with Fred Knapp, Esq. According to Mr. Knapp, the issue is that, under the MSA union contract the union can claim this position as being a member of the union. He said that it depends on the way the contract is drafted up between the MSA and the union. Basically, anybody that is not a confidential person with the Authority can be considered for the union and become part of the union, so what Mr. Knapp suggested is that Mr. Schilling talk to the union and have them agree that they will not claim the part time position to be a union member position. If the union does claim it as a union member position there will be issues about the benefits that the union members have. Mr. Sylvester asked why the qualified purchasing agent is not considered as a professional service. Mr. Kron said it is not created that way under the statute. The statute is created as saying that a municipality has to hire a purchasing agent by ordinance and a governing body. An authority has to hire by resolution. Mr. Benson noted that it is not an administrative position. Mr. Kron said that is the way the statute is set up, not as compare to a lawyer or engineer which is already in the statute. Chairman Rattner said he reviewed the statute. He said that professional services is when you have a specific service with a specialized skill that a license is required or some sort of special designation and asked how does the qualified purchasing agent position not qualify. Mr. Kron said that the position has to be set up and the statute says the position has to be set up by resolution. He advised the commissioners that they should set up a part time position of a purchasing agent by resolution. Mr. Benson noted that a resolution setting up the position must be prepared. There was some discussion about the administrator and director positions and the purchasing agent position, which would not be considered as a confidential position. Mr. Kron said the position must be set up first and then the commissioners could appoint somebody to the position, but there could be union issues. Mr. Rattner said that Mr. Knapp advised it may not be a problem and it would be good to have a resolution for professional services for a number of reasons. Mr. Kron said that there was a draft agreement to the union for review and if the union signs the agreement then there will not be a problem. Mr. Schwab asked, if the part time position was to be considered a union position, what would be the consequences and costs? Mr. Kron said that the MSA would have to pay for benefits. It was decided to contact the union and see if they would agree to sign the agreement.

Mr. Benson announced that the MSA is going to get a \$4,000.00 increase in its joint insurance dividend this year.

Chairman Rattner asked if the Engineering Committee would like to report on the status of hiring a backup engineering firm. Mr. Pucilowski said that they have a list of six engineering firms that could be the possible backup. They are sending out requests for proposals and will wait for replies. After they receive proposals they will do some interviewing and let everyone know what they decide. Chairman Rattner asked Mr. Kron if a motion would be required to solicit proposals. Mr. Kron said the commissioners need to authorize Mr. Schilling to obtain proposals from the engineering firms. A motion was offered by Mr. Keiser to authorize Mr. Schilling to receive proposals and fees from the six engineering firms that have been chosen by the Engineering Committee, seconded by Mr. Schwab. Mr. Benson asked if the motion was limited to the six listed engineering firms. Chairman Rattner indicated that at the last meeting he asked if anyone wanted to add any other firms to the list and there were no responses. Roll Call:

Mr. Benson	No	Mr. Pucilowski	Yes
Mr. Hoyt	Yes	Mr. Rattner	Yes
Mr. Kieser	Yes	Mr. Schwab	Yes
Mrs. Michetti	Yes	Mr. Sylvester	Yes

Motion made by Mr. Sylvester, seconded by Mrs. Michetti and the affirmative roll call vote of members present, Chairman Rattner adjourned the meeting at 9:37 PM.

Respectfully Submitted:



Susan Grebe,
Administrative Assistant