

**LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
AUTHORITY MEETING**

Minutes of Township Authority Meeting held August 23, 2016

A meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Authority (LPTA) was called to order at 6:09 p.m. by Chairman William C. Seeds, Sr., on the above date at the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center located at 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Authority members present in addition to Mr. Seeds were: William L. Hornung, William B. Hawk, Gary A. Crissman, Robin Lindsey, and David Blain. Also in attendance were George Wolfe, Township Manager, Steve Stine, Authority Solicitor, Willian Weaver, Authority Director; Tim Nolt, Authority Engineer; Jim Wetzal, Authority Operations Manager; Alton Whittle and Kevin Shannon, GHD; and Watson Fisher, SWAN.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Blain led in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the July 19, 2016 business minutes of the Sewer Authority. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds call for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Public Comment

No comments were provided.

Board Members' Comments

No comments were provided.

NEW BUSINESS

Review of the August 10, 2016 Pennsylvania Department of
Environmental Protection Annual Meeting Presentation

Mr. Kevin Shannon noted that staff met with the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and Swatara Township Sewer Authority (STSA) on August 10th at DEP's office to provide a recap on the activities the Township did in its I&I Program from June of 2015 through May of 2016. He noted they started with the Beaver Creek Basin and provided the recap for the schedule for the first five years of the schedule for the revised correction action plan. He noted that we are ahead of schedule noting that we worked and closed out BC-6 last year and

construction occurred on BC-3/4. He noted that we showed the metering results from sub-basin metering for post rehab that solidified the results from BC-6 and BC-3 and some interim results in BC-4. He noted that although BC-4 is ongoing we have almost had a 70% reduction in peak flows. He noted that we discussed the long-term implementation goals and the fact that we did the Beaver Creek model and have met with the Board to discuss some various alternatives during the year. He noted that we prioritized the mini-basin based on the metering results over the last three years and they are shown on slides 11, 12, and 13 of the presentation. He noted that the low-hanging fruit was in the 2018 to 2023 time period.

Mr. Shannon noted that the Board has seen the tentative schedule for the next five year period showing the cost per gallon removal. He noted the he started to put together a survey Request for Proposal for the BC-2 basins which will be the next ones to do in Beaver Creek.

Mr. Hornung questioned if we do storage, what would the dollars per gallon per day be. Mr. Shannon answered that Mr. Wendle is in the process of looking at that and updating the alternatives with storage for the September 27th rate meeting. He suggested that it would depend on the volume of storage to be done. Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Wendle has provided some numbers in the past, noting that he is maintaining about two and a half to three dollars per gallon. He noted at a conference he attended last year the numbers that he was seeing higher numbers from the larger cities. He questioned Mr. Wendle about his figures as he was seeing numbers around five or six, and Mr. Wendle stated that he would be happy to provide the information as he based it off of another project that GHD did at Hatfield. He noted that we will provide that information at the September meeting.

Mr. Hornung noted if we are up around \$9.38 a gallon, if it was dead even he would do the rehab but if it is up that much more, the basin should have storage. He noted that he would like to look at other options if they are available to determine how we want to go. Mr. Shannon noted for BC-5B, this chart it is out of skew for the rest of them but it is on the table because the plan we presented was to get the flows down upstream of the Beaver Creek Pumping Station initially and it is a small basin in that area. He noted that we will take a closer look to see if it needs to be included. Mr. Whittle noted that BC-5B has a good portion that is PVC pipe that we are metering this coming season so if you consolidate the parts that are actually contributing I&I, the dollar figure will be significantly different. Mr. Weaver noted that there are no houses as well so the dollar amount is inflated because you typically have ten or twelve lots with houses on both

sides of the road, and in this case you have houses on one side of Blue Ridge Avenue. He noted that they tie in the back and most of it is collected sewer that goes under I-81. He noted that we are trying to get a whole area done so we can show the Board and DEP that we have all the sub-basins done and that is the most important thing as it is where you get the most data. He noted that the mini-basin data fluctuates a lot. Mr. Shannon noted if we can eliminate the PVC areas through some metering this season it would reduce the project costs.

Mr. Hornung questioned how many manholes have overflowed lately. Mr. Weaver suggested that it is three. Mr. Whittle answered that we have not had a significant event yet, he suggested that manholes 903 and 170 or 190 and there may be one in BC-2. Mr. Weaver suggested that the BC-2 stopped. Mr. Shannon added the manhole 143 at Blue Ridge Avenue. Mr. Hornung questioned if you bolt the manholes down. Mr. Whittle answered no, as what we were talking about is measured in overflow boxes. He noted if you bolted them down the pressure would be too much and it would go to a basement or blow the manhole apart.

Mr. Shannon noted that slide 14 was presented to the Board at its May meeting and we wanted to share the options with DEP and STSA. He noted that it questions if it would be more cost effective to do storage sooner than later. He noted at some point we will cross the line and that is what we will discuss at the September meeting. He noted that slide 15 shows different scenarios for upgrading interceptors and slide 17 shows the plans for the next season until we meet with them again next year.

Mr. Shannon noted that STSA had provided some comments ahead of the meeting. Mr. Weaver noted that STSA does not have a good understanding of our corrective action plan. He noted that STSA has their own system to operate and they get our reports that contains a lot of information and they don't understand it. He noted that they sent an email through their superintendent Gene Lank, questioning five different items, the first being that in no way did they want storage. He stated that he explained that storage would be helpful but they complained about getting flooded and he explained to them that it would eliminate that problem right away. He noted that they are confused, thinking that when you use storage, it will not help because when you put it back in the system it will make it worse. He noted that we did not get into it at the meeting but he explained that this plan is being reviewed by the engineer and staff noting that the cost per gallon does not make sense after you get past year 2023. He noted that the engineer will be making recommendations to the Board that doing the interceptor improvements and

storage would make sense. He noted that STSA doesn't want us using bigger pipes and flooding them out. He explained to STSA that the bigger pipes would go to the storage tank and we would always meet the consent order with the actual flows at the treatment plant. He stated that by the end of the meeting they started to understand it a little bit better. He noted that he felt like he was being attacked and it was very strange. He noted that he explained to STSA that DEP uses Lower Paxton as the poster child as we do papers that are presented around the country and have had the greatest success rate of anyone in the country that he knows of for removing I&I at the lengths that we are removing them at. He noted that he had to remind STSA that this program will be used around the country as the word gets out. He noted that we are dropping out flows that are unheard of and in Paxton Creek we are eliminating the overflows seven years in advance. He explained to Mr. Lank that it takes a while and normally, in the first five years you don't see it in your system because it is at the top, but as more water is removed, it makes more room in the pipe and we have to get that out also, and it will take eight or nine years. He stated that he showed them how the Paxton Creek flows slowly go down. He noted that it was frightening that they were so upset.

Mr. Hornung questioned if they have new people. Mr. Weaver answered that Mr. Lank has been there for about five years as Mike Krieser retired. He suggested that we have had a lot of wet weather in the last five years. Mr. Whittle answered for this year we had more events than in the last three years. He noted that the number of high level events this year was high, but he suggested that STSA is probably dealing with their own issues for those types of events.

Mr. Weaver noted that it was like going back 20 years for what we are supposed to do to solve the problem. He noted that he presented the plan to them at the meeting. He suggested that we may have to go over it with them step-by-step to explain what we are going to do, show them the results from each mini-basin and sub-basin, and maybe over time they will understand it.

Mr. Hornung noted that they have an I&I program as well. He questioned if they are working on it and are they getting results. Mr. Weaver answered that he has no idea. Mr. Shannon answered that he did not believe that they were under a consent decree, but they were talking about some sewer replacements that they were doing but they are not as aggressive as the Lower Paxton Township is. He noted that they expanded and upgraded their treatment plant three or four years ago and when they did that they built in peak flow capacity that wasn't there before. He noted that it has been a tremendous help in reducing the overflows all the way up into

Lower Paxton Township. He noted that one of the reasons we are not seeing as many overflows is that they can handle a much higher peak flow at the plant. He suggested that they are still getting use to running the plant in storm flow mode. He explained that after about two days they have some trouble with the process and that is what they are concerned about with storage and the peak flows being released over a long period of time, noting that any more than two days hurts them. He noted that they need to learn their plant.

Mr. Weaver noted that was one issue as they wanted to cut off the connections to Lower Paxton Township. He noted that the told DEP that we should not be allowed any more sewer connections. He noted that we are back 30 years. He questioned Mr. Stine if he had anything to add. Mr. Stine noted that he referenced the agreement as Mr. Lank questioned what the guideline for deciding this is and he told him to read the agreement as it would tell you what you have to do. Mr. Weaver noted that he told their engineer that it would take some time, but new connections are not the issue, as there is no I&I in new connections. He noted that it is more of a tool from DEP to use an enforcement if we are not complying with the consent order which we are. He noted that they made these comments and DEP didn't say anything. He noted that he made some comments in response and after that the meeting went well.

Mr. Weaver suggested that in the next couple months we should go over the plan with Swatara Township. Mr. Hornung questioned if he thought that it would be necessary for the Authority Board to come to these meetings. Mr. Weaver answered that he did not think it would matter as they need to better understand the plan as it evolves. He noted that he does not think that they have had a chance to read it. Mr. Hornung noted if you need help don't be afraid to ask.

Mr. Shannon noted that the next basin we discussed was the Paxton Creek Basin. He noted that slide 20 shows the recap of the schedule to eliminate overflows by 2022 and to reduce the hydraulic overload by 2027. He noted that we are ahead of the schedule. He noted for slide 21, the rows shaded in green are the basins that are complete and several are included in the next five year period. He recently did some Paxton Creek modeling and re-prioritized the basins but it is not included on this sheet. He noted that there have been no wet weather overflows in Paxton Creek in over two years. He explained that metering and monitoring was done in the basin and the work that was done was to close out PC-1GDA/GDB, PC-5D/E and get PC-4C/E out to bid. He explained that is the project that is going on in the Paxtonia area. He noted that PC-4A is a

small basin with over 4,000 feet of sewer to be replaced and it should be ready for bid next month.

Mr. Shannon noted that the map on slide 25 shows the areas that he discussed. He explained that he had basin curves to show the results of the mini-metering in the pvc areas in Paxton Towne Centre and Colonial Commons Shopping Center which the Board has seen at previous meetings. He noted that we went over the flow metering and I&I analysis and basin metering that was done that takes up most of the following slides. He noted that we presented this information to the Board at a prior meeting. He noted that slide 35 shows the proposed metering for next season to finish off the reprioritization of Paxton Creek basin, to include PC-1 and PC-3 mini-basins that have not been metered for 12 years. He noted that they mentioned the Paxton Creek Alternatives noting that we have not made a formal presentation to the Board yet, as we want to get more detail and present it at the rate meeting on September 27th. He questioned when you get to a point where the mini-basin costs per gallon removed is not cost effective, when do we back off of the aggressive replacement schedule and go with storage in conjunction with Susquehanna Township or the City of Harrisburg or both in the next five to seven years. He noted that they did not go into much detail for slides 36 and 37 as they deal with our Paxton Creek program and Swatara is not much interested in that.

Mr. Weaver noted that the remaining basins shown on slide 38 show a bit of a reprioritization in PC-2A which had never been metered well before. He noted that it goes through the southeast corner of the Colonial Country Club, across Colonial Club Drive and up Ranger Road in that area. He noted that it was always too full of water to get any metering results in 2002 and 2003, but now the flows are down to a point where we can meter and we found that they were not good. He noted that we are in the process of reprioritizing the Paxton Creek basins. He noted that we have identified four projects that appear to be cost effective, highlighted in pink.

Mr. Weaver noted that we did not receive any comments from DEP or STSA and John Kerschner apologized as he was not able to attend the meeting therefore there were no comments from the Developer Petitioners.

Mr. Weaver noted that he did not discuss this with DEP but he wanted to point out that at the September meeting Mr. Wendle will have a rate table and analysis to consider for moving forward. He noted that Mr. Wendle planned the rate table with us borrowing \$25 million to \$30

million every three years to do these projects along with Beaver Creek. He noted one of the things we will be studying for the next two years are some of things that we need to analyze on the costs per gallon. He noted that it is the most crucial decision making tool. He noted if you look at all of these, they are high, and as Mr. Hornung mentioned it would make sense to consider storage if you will not get close to the \$3 or \$4 per gallon rate. He noted that he will continue to study these with additional metering and also the dollar per gallon, noting that they are based on old data. He noted that Mr. Whittle is working with staff to ensure that those numbers are good. He noted that it is crucial decision to make going forward. He noted if we don't do storage the other thing that he is nervous about is trying to average \$8.5 million a year in bond spending as that is pretty much what staff can handle at this time. He noted that we tried more than that when we had to spend down the Beaver Creek money and we can't handle it, and the public can't handle it very well either. He noted if we don't do storage at some point in 2021 to 2022, with Paxton Creek and Beaver Creek together when you stack them it will be more than \$8 million a year and more than \$25 million to borrow at one shot. He noted that Mr. Wendle is no longer with GHD as he is a professor at Penn State but he wants to continue to see this project through. He noted that he needs to meet with Mr. Wendle and go over this information so he has a better handle on it going forward for the next ten years of spending.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if the Paxtonia area will be paved by the end of October. Mr. Weaver answered that Doli is moving so quickly that they are almost a year ahead of schedule as it was scheduled to be done in the winter and they will have all that paving done by fall.

Mr. Crissman questioned how often the data is updated and at what point in time do we make a determination that it is having a major impact. Mr. Whittle answered that we are collecting data regularly, but the difference from 12 years ago for when we started the Paxton Creek program and from what Mr. Shannon mentioned earlier, some of the pipes were so filled with flow that we had no ability for I&I to get into those pipes. He noted that the basins that have ACP in them, such as PC-2A is at the bottom of PC, so the pipe is full. He noted that now we have done so much reduction, there is capacity in the pipe, so we need to meter key basins to make sure the flow hasn't increased in those since more capacity is available.

Mr. Crissman noted you need to monitor it to see the removal. Mr. Whittle noted that it was 12 years ago; noting that we did PC-2 this year and will do PC-3 next year. He noted that they are two that are left to do. He noted that it is not a significant ongoing process for the basins.

Mr. Weaver noted that the meters have been put back in place this year and he hopes in the next year to get enough wet weather where we can update all the numbers.

Mr. Whittle noted for the sub-basins, they are required to be metered every year as part of the consent decree to ensure that they do not get worse.

Mr. Weaver noted that slide 41 for Spring Creek shows that we have to be at 4.5 mgd for the interceptor agreement with Swatara noting that it allows for a peak of 6.5 mgd. He noted that Swatara stated that they had a concern since they agreed in the consent order that we could go between 4.5 mgd and 6.5 mgd but they wanted to make sure that we understood that 4.5 mgd is the goal. He noted that he agreed at the meeting and told them that we will meet 4.5 mgd. He noted that he and Mr. Whittle agreed that they have a lot of data and they want to start reporting this data differently to Swatara and will meet with them about it. He noted that the 4.5 mgd is actually a 24 hour continuous peak, so we can go over it for most of the day but we can't go over for a complete day. He noted that you take 24 hour readings and if you go over for the whole day then you would have a problem. He noted that this shows that we are over at 5.3 mgd but it is not what is in the agreement that we have. He noted that it is only for a couple of hours and we would have to have 5.31 mgd for a 24 hour period and we have never done that before. He suggested that we are in compliance with the Intermunicipal Agreement and we are also in compliance with the consent order that says that we have no overflows. He noted that it also says that we need to reduce the hydraulic overloads so Mr. Whittle had done a model and one of the concerns that he has with that model is that what it is showing is based on the newer data and we should be seeing higher flows that what is on the table. He noted that he is concerned about the area between end of the old restrictor and going up past the Osteopathic Hospital Grounds at Dartmouth Street. He suggested that GHD should analyze what areas we need to clear and have staff look at it on a regular basis to verify the model in the field. He noted that staff will pop the manholes and see if what they see is actually what is shown on the model. He noted, so far we are having good results in Spring Creek and under the 4.5 mgd and should be in good shape.

Review of 2017 Draft Authority Budget

Mr. Weaver noted that he would like to review the narrative quickly as it is pretty early in the year so he does not have all the information from all the other municipalities. He noted for revenues he has a good handle on the interest income, PLGIT interest, BAB Bond subsidy, and

the City of Harrisburg settlement. He noted that he sees no change from 2016 except that the City of Harrisburg settlement was cut in half as the number for 2016 was \$556,000 as we are in the last three years of that as it was reduced to \$371,200. Ms. Lindsey questioned if we receive it once a year. Mr. Weaver answered yes. He noted that the sewer rental is based at an increase of \$9 a quarter noting that Mr. Wendle will go over that in September.

Mr. Seeds questioned why you keep referring to the meeting in September, do you mean the third week of September. Mr. Weaver noted at the May meeting it was discussed the Mr. Wendle will meet on September 27th to meet with the Board. Mr. Wolfe noted if you looked at the Items of Interest there is a meeting listed as tentative for the 27th.

Mr. Weaver noted as far as the operating revenues for 2017, there is no change other than the increase in sewer rental as the tapping fees and escrow reimbursement are the same. He noted with the increase in the sewer rental, the total operating fund revenues are budgeted at \$16,083,951.

Mr. Weaver noted with expenses he does not see anything in 2017 that the Board has not seen in prior years as all the line items under administration are standard. He noted that for operations facility, the utilities etc. have not changed but there is a purchase of a new truck to replace truck 75 that will be purchases under COSTARS.

Mr. Weaver noted for operations there is no change other than a slight decrease in pump station maintenance since we have decommissioned the Gale Drive Pump Station. He noted that we are looking at demolishing the Gateway Pump Station later this year or early next year resulting in a further reduction for that line item.

Mr. Weaver noted for transmission, Swatara Authority will get him a budget in early to mid -October so he will have this revised for the November meeting. Mr. Crissman questioned if it will remain pretty much the same. Mr. Weaver answered that they have not had any major increases over the past four or five years. He noted for the Capital Region Water, (CRW), he is showing a rate increase of 15%. He noted that he has met with Gary Shambaugh who is the rate consultant along with Jeff Wendle and Scott Wyland representing the municipalities as part of the suburban parties who will negotiate a new Intermunicipal Agreement with CRW and a new rate. He noted that we have no rate and with the change in guard he is hoping to meet soon to get a better understanding of what their position is. He noted that he budgeted for a 15% rate increase for now but the rate that Harrisburg is showing is 25%. He noted that their consultant

did a rate analysis and they provided it to us last year noting that the 2016 rate increase was to be 20% but we were able to negotiate it to about 4%. He noted that he has no idea what it would be. He noted that the next step is to get Mr. Stine and all the other attorneys who are part of the suburban group to agree to send a letter to CRW challenging their rate study. He noted that will start the process in the next few months. Mr. Seeds noted that he did not think we would do much better than with the team that is working on this and we should have a good outcome.

Mr. Weaver noted that there has been some changes in the debt service as we added the Series 2016 principal and interest, noting that we only made half a payment in 2016. He noted adding those two together it has increased the debt service schedule by about \$1 million. He noted that the total expenses for 2017 are over \$16,472,110.

Mr. Seeds questioned what is projected for I&I next year. Mr. Weaver answered the capital improvement budget it is \$8,775,000. Mr. Seeds noted that is less than this year. Mr. Wolfe answered that it is significantly less than 2016. Mr. Weaver suggested that last year it was \$9.5 million noting that we are looking to borrow \$25 million every three years, averaging \$8.5 million a year. He noted that this is where we are supposed to be.

Mr. Weaver noted that there are no changes in the budget other than the debt service, the purchase of the new truck, and the CRW rate. Mr. Seeds noted that it shows a \$9 a quarter increase.

Ms. Lindsey questioned for the fines for DEP, how many we paid this year as you budgeted for eight fines. Mr. Weaver answered that we only had three overflows. He suggested that eight would be standard for the next five to six years, and after that if the entire Township is like Paxton Creek, we should be at zero.

Mr. Weaver noted if you look at expenses compared to revenues we do have a deficit as the expenditures are \$16,472,110 with revenues of \$16,083,951. He noted that the projected deficit was in Mr. Wendle's rate table for what we looked at during the last meeting. He noted that we will look at it again in September. He noted that the reason is the CRW rate increase and the 2016 bond issue increase. He suggested going forward we do have a few years in a row where we don't have a deficit and we will have a few years where we will have a deficit. He noted that we discussed using the surplus \$8 million to offset the deficits over the next ten to fifteen years.

Mr. Seeds noted that obviously we could raise the rates more to take care of the deficit but we have some cushion to help.

Mr. Weaver noted the capital budget is \$8.7 million and there are no changes other than the change in mini-basins. He noted that we always have two mini-basins under construction and one mini-basin under design. He noted for 2017, BC-2A will be under design and PC-4C/E and PC-4A will be under construction. He noted that he will have a final budget in November after receiving more information from CRW and after discussing future rates with Mr. Wendle in September.

Mr. Seeds questioned if there are any changes in GHD's budget. Mr. Weaver noted that there is a slight increase in the size of the BC-2 project as it is projected to be a \$10 million project so the engineering fee looks inflated by \$300,000 since it is such a large project. He noted that we are doing two projects in one. Mr. Weaver noted that there is no increase in GHD's fee schedule. Mr. Whittle noted that GHD has not gotten its 2017 rate schedule yet noting that we will have that for the November meeting.

Draft Revisions to the Standard Specifications for Sewer Extensions

Mr. Weaver noted that there is a memo from GHD regarding stone backfill costs for developers who would be using stone backfill in lieu of dirt backfill. He noted that the trenching specifications have also been included in the packet. He explained that he wanted to discuss two issues with the Board this evening, the first being the current specification that is very old and has not been revised since 2011. He noted that staff would like to stay current with the standards that are in the sewer industry and with what has been learned by staff and the engineer through working the many projects. He noted that we don't have that information yet as Ms. Smith, Mr. Wetzell and Mr. Shannon recently met today to finalize the specifications. He noted that he will have the readable format for the Board in the near future. He noted that the specifications are over 72 pages long and he will provide a summary of the revisions.

Mr. Weaver noted that he received direction from the Township Manager and Public Work's Director as they would like to see stone backfill for trenches for developer installed sewer extensions. He noted that Ms. Smith did a cost analysis of what the cost would be for the developer to implement this policy. He noted that the issue is that in the last ten to fifteen years, we have had some road settlement in the Township in certain developments and staff has found

this. He noted when his staff does a mini-basin they have some roads that were built in 1972 as well as the 1980's and 1990's that used dirt backfill.

Mr. Weaver noted that the estimated cost for stone backfill was prepared by GHD showing the most recent development using Stray Winds Farms, Amber Fields, and Shadebrook. He noted that they did it for the entire development and for the latest phases. He noted that the total costs for Stray Winds Farms, Phase II, would be \$150,000; Amber Fields, Phase 8A, \$50,000; and Shadebrook, Phase I, \$140,000. He noted for the entire development of Amber Fields, it would be \$469,000 and for Shadebrook it would be \$373,000. He noted the cost per lot for Amber Fields is \$2,400 and for Shadebrook it is \$1,176. He noted for Stray Winds Farm for Phase II is \$3,200. He noted that this would be the cost per lot if the Township and Authority changed their standards to start using stone backfill.

Mr. Weaver note that he has a Manager's group that he participates in with 30 Authority Managers from Lancaster and Dauphin Counties, and he posed this question to that group and out of all the municipalities none required stone backfill. He noted that he wanted to present this information to the Board to start the process to see if the Board wants to change it specifications to use stone backfill. He noted that he also included the revisions that would be required to enforce it at the Township level. He noted that HRG has reviewed it and has provided the standard that would need to change for the Township.

Mr. Weaver noted for the technical part, if you use dirt, you can't compact it properly as it varies throughout a trench. He noted if you take a development and you walk the trench and try to figure out how to compact it with dirt, you can't do it as it changes all the time. He noted that the testing is different. Mr. Nolt explained that we use a standard proctor on all stone backfill so we are able to call up the quarry and they can provide the density of the material, so we are working with a known material. He noted that the compaction testing can tell us what the in-place density is to compare it to get a compact percent. He noted that we typically get close to 100% compaction. He noted when you are working with a native backfill it is changing every so often and very difficult to get a proctor on that as you would need to run a test for each different soil type.

Mr. Weaver noted that is part of the issue we are having with sewer trenches but what happens over time the trench settles so Mr. Wolfe and Mr. Kline approached him about using stone backfill. He noted that staff supports using stone as it is easier to test.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the stone would be under the road, hard surfaces. Mr. Weaver answered yes and for right-of-ways that are off the street he would allow dirt backfill.

Mr. Seeds questioned if it is \$2,400 per lot. Mr. Weaver answered that it would vary for each development as there are different factors for the size of the development and the length of the pipe. He noted that it would vary \$500 to \$1,000 for each developer but he does not see it as being an excessive cost for each lot. Mr. Seeds noted that he would argue on the side of the developer as we are always looking at affordable housing for all age groups and their argument will be a little here and there and all the requirements government puts on us and it is putting the cost of infrastructure and homes up where they are no longer affordable. He suggested that you will get kickback from the builders associations if you talk about those kinds of costs. Mr. Weaver noted that you will get more than a little bit of kickback, you will get a lot.

Mr. Wolfe noted that you are doing the opposite with the sanitary sewer replacement projects at this time and when we asked our engineers if they would recommend allowing the Authority to put dirt back in instead of stone and they unequivocally said no.

Mr. Seeds noted if you haven't heard anything back on this yet, you will. Mr. Weaver noted that the developers will fight this to the bitter end.

Mr. Hornung questioned what other Townships do. Mr. Weaver noted that he reached out to them and they permit dirt backfill. Mr. Nolt answered in new development areas they allow native backfill but in a project where they are replacing existing sewer, they do what we do. Mr. Wolfe noted that this does not make sense. Mr. Seeds noted that we would only ask them to do what we are doing.

Mr. Weaver noted that issue with dirt backfill is it will work if you have 15 to 20 years. He noted that he spoke to many people and he does not know anyone who does not support stone backfill. He noted that there is no engineering that has been done on this but if you take a 14 foot trench, it could settle a foot a year. He noted that there is no exact science to that and some of the things he is hearing back from the developers is to require a five-year maintenance agreement.

Mr. Hornung questioned rather than make them fill the entire trench with stone, could we add a certain percentage of stone backfill requirement, and it would reduce the problem. Mr. Weaver answered probably not as you have to have it all the way to the surface. He noted if it moves at all, then the road is damaged. He noted that it is a Board decision but at the staff and

engineering levels there is a lot of argument to substantiate the need for it. He noted that we would be the first in the area.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if other Townships have not done it as they are afraid of the backlash from the builders. Mr. Weaver answered that it is hard to say as he has to get more information to see if they are seeing the same things that we are seeing with trench settlement. He noted that it is not full scale but he has not studied it much. He suggested that Mr. Kline would know better than he would. He noted if you go to Autumn Ridge Development, Phase I is part of the sewer replacement project and we replaced laterals and building sewers that failed with trench settlement. He noted the Estates at Forest Hills, a brand new development has trench settlement. He noted that he has been working in one area three times. He noted that he does not know how large an issue this is in the Township.

Mr. Hornung questioned what the impact will be when the trench settles, and what would happen if the pipes start to leak. Mr. Nolt answered that we typically require stone around the pipe so it would be above the one foot requirement. Mr. Weaver suggested that legally this is a Township issue and not a Sewer Authority issue. He noted that we don't own the street, only the pipe. He noted that the Township owns the road and that is what is failing.

Mr. Hornung questioned if it would motivate the developer not to put the pipe in the street or do we require that it must be put in the street. Mr. Weaver answered that is interesting as he has not thought about that. Mr. Wolfe answered that it could affect the design as we don't require that it be located in the street and it could affect the overall design of the system. Mr. Hornung noted that they could be located off to the side of the road.

Mr. Weaver noted that he recommends that sewers be designed in streets as the standard but he is not the Township. Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Weaver suggested an extended maintenance warranty for longer than 18 months. Mr. Weaver noted that is an option but what happens if the developer goes bankrupt. He noted that Mr. Dave Chilson pointed out to him that you can get a two or three year maintenance bond but it goes away after three years but what happens in five years when the road continues to settle. He noted that there is no way to have a good answer.

Mr. Hornung noted if you have to come back and rehab the road forty years from now is it easier to dig it up when it is stone or more difficult. Mr. Wetzel suggested that it would not make much of a difference. Mr. Seed questioned if it would be more difficult to dig up stone. Mr.

Nolt answered that it would depend on where the trench is. He noted if we are moving the trench a little bit the stone may fall in more than the soil would.

Mr. Seeds noted if he was hand digging a ditch he would sooner dig out dirt than stone. Mr. Wolfe noted that we don't hand dig trenches.

Mr. Weaver noted that he can get more information for the Board but the next step would be to have the Township look at this for a possible ordinance revision. He noted that the Authority had it in its standards so we can do stone backfill tomorrow, but there was a conflict with the Township Ordinance and that is why he never enforced it. He noted that he would have the standard revisions for the next meeting.

Resolution 16-10; Relinquishment of a temporary construction easement

Mr. Weaver noted that this is a relinquishment of a temporary construction easement that is required for the Amalia and William Lamparter property. He noted that it was a condemnation that we have prepared and they have now signed the agreement. Mr. Stine explained that these people were never connected to the sewer in the first place.

Ms. Lindsey noted that it states that it is replacing a building sewer on certain land owned, she suggested that it does not sound correct. She questioned if we normally put an address in and questioned certain land owned. Mr. Weaver noted that it is most likely in the original taking that the temporary construction easement was on that certain land that they owned. Ms. Lindsey questioned where the address is. Mr. Stine noted that an exhibit will be attached to the document and it contains the address and the tax parcel number. He noted that he has the information. Mr. Weaver questioned if it for The Feed Store. Mr. Stine answered yes. He noted that they had no sewer service there. He noted that he recommends that the prior condemnation for the Lamparter's be relinquished and Mr. Stine is ready to make it happen.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve Resolution 16-10; relinquishing a temporary construction easement for the Lamparter Property. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and unanimous vote followed.

Draft agreement establishing a tapping fee re-imbusement part

Mr. Weaver noted that we have a draft agreement establishing a tapping fee re-imbusement part for the Union Deposit Corporation located next to the Sportsman's Golf Course in Susquehanna Township. He noted that the interceptor goes through Lower Paxton

Township, therefore it requires the Township to enter into a sewage extension agreement to construct the interceptor with developers who applied for a tapping fee re-imbusement part. He noted that GHD has prepared Exhibit A and B which calculates what the reimbursement would be. He noted that Mr. Stine has prepared the sewer extension agreement. He noted that it does not require any action at this time as he only wanted to show it to the Board as he will mail it to the Union Deposit Corporation for their consideration. He noted if you look at Exhibit B they are entitled to a fee for every connection made into the interceptor of \$171.

Mr. Seeds questioned if that is per EDU. Mr. Weaver answered yes. Mr. Seeds questioned if that was with Donco. Mr. Whittle answered no. Mr. Weaver noted that is with the Union Deposit Corporation. Mr. Nolt questioned if it is for a certain period of time. Mr. Weaver noted that it is for ten years and it would be part of the agreement. He noted once he receives the comments from the Union Deposit Corporation, and they sign it we will present it to the Board for its approval.

TOWNSHIP REPORTS

Update on mini-basin construction projects BC-3A/B/C, BC-4A/B/C, and PC-4C/E

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Nolt will provide an update on the current construction projects.

Mr. Nolt noted that BC-3A/B/C was done by R-III Construction working in the area commonly referred to as the Blue's. He noted that the work is 100% complete at this point and he is working with GHD to get the final paperwork completed and closed out. He noted that a final adjusting change order and final payout will be coming in a few weeks.

Mr. Nolt noted BC-4A/B/C is using M.F. Ronca and Sons in the location of Allentown Boulevard and Jonestown Road between South Mountain Road and the Beaver Creek Interceptor. He noted that the contractor is in work zone #4 which is the area of Jonestown Road. He noted that they are working near the Paxtonia Elementary School. He noted that we had them slated to do the work when school was out around June 13th but they started to do the work around July 18th. He noted that we had some deep sewer at Jonestown Road and Lopax Road that was 18 feet deep, so with wide trenches, concrete base, and the deep sewer, they made decent time and hopefully, with the weather they should be finished with paving so they will not impact the first day of school, Monday August 29th.

Mr. Weaver noted that Ronca may have to come back as they have to put a scratch coat down and that will make it drivable but the overlay paving may not be done on Friday. He noted that their goal is to get it done, but if it isn't done, we don't want to rush these people to make mistakes with the overlay. He noted if they have to come back we will address that at our meeting Thursday afternoon. He noted once they get the scratch coat on the road it is drivable.

Mr. Crissman noted if part of the plan on Thursday is if you are unable to complete it would someone be in contact with the school district so they can coordinate their transportation. Mr. Weaver answered yes noting that we have been in contact with them. Ms. Lindsey questioned if they could work on the weekend. Mr. Weaver answered yes but we would have to pay their overtime rate. He noted if they ran behind they would have to pay their own overtime.

Ms. Lindsey noted that they were to start on June 13th and they never started until July 18th, so they are behind. Mr. Weaver answered that it was not totally their fault as the window to do all the work was to get the sewer in and let it sit for 30 days. He noted that they were willing to pave the street without letting it sit for 30 days and finish the sewer work on schedule. He noted that there was some negotiations with the contractor based on some old schedules that are still occurring. He noted that there will be more negotiating going forward.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if you can pave to the end of October. Mr. Weaver answered yes, but he hopes to report that they finish this on Friday but we won't know until we get there. He noted that he is pushing the contractor but we don't want to rush him and have him make mistakes. Mr. Crissman noted that you have flexibility with school holidays. Mr. Weaver noted that the most important thing is to get the base paving down and once you do that scratch coat it will be drivable and fine.

Mr. Nolt explained that we were able to save the three sycamore trees at 6290 Jonestown Road. He noted that we did not encounter any roots in the trench itself as we were performing construction and the homeowner signed a waiver for responsibly. Mr. Seeds noted that we will not know if the trees will live for about a year or two. Mr. Nolt explained that Dr. Lacasse inspected the trees and recommended one foot for every inch of diameter separation for the trees which would amount to 36 to 40 feet separation from the trees. He noted that the property owner signed the waiver. Mr. Seeds noted that there are only three trees and they stick out like a sore thumb since the other trees were removed. Mr. Nolt noted that we did removed three trees.

Mr. Nolt PC-4C/E is under construction with Doli Construction Corporation working in the areas surrounding Lakeside Marina, and Paxtonia between Atmore Street and Umberger Streets and Jonestown Road between South Johnson Street and South Arlene Street. He noted that they are moving very rapidly and are ahead of schedule. He noted that they started April 28th and are already approaching the 40% complete mark for mainline sewer. He noted if they continue at this pace, they may finish construction a year ahead of the May 2018 completion date.

PennDOT Mountain Road Project-Sewer Replacement

Mr. Nolt noted that this is not a mini-basin project. He explained that the PennDOT Mountain Road project is being constructed by Pennsy Supply for resurfacing of North Mountain Road and the subcontractor is Wexcon who is replacing about 1,200 feet of sewer in Mountain Road.

Mr. Hornung questioned if it needs to be replaced or are they automatically replacing it. Mr. Weaver answered that it was part of the mini-basin and since it was part of PennDOT's project we let them do it. Mr. Hornung questioned if we have to reimburse them. Mr. Weaver answered that they will send us a bill after it is over, but sometimes it takes PennDOT two years to bill us. Mr. Hornung questioned if it is reasonable. Mr. Weaver answered that Ms. Smith is getting a copy of the contract costs for us. He noted that we normally try to track our costs with PennDOT's contractors to do some value engineering so we will have an answer in September.

Mr. Nolt noted that there are sections to the north and south of Route 81, noting that north of Route 81 we have six runs with two crossings at Mountain Road. Mr. Hornung questioned how deep is that work. Mr. Wetzel answered that it was deep in that area, about eight to ten feet deep. He noted in front of the piano store it was closer to 12 feet deep.

Mr. Nolt noted that the only portion that they have completed at this point is the center area as the remaining work will be completed a night work due to the impact on Route 81.

Update on design of the PC-4A Mini-Basin Design – Creek Drive Area

Mr. Weaver noted that the PC-4A Mini-Basin Design is ready to be bid in late November. He noted that we have at least one project in design and two under construction. He noted that the only thing remaining at this point is to finalize the design for the properties on the north side of Creek Drive.

Mr. Seeds suggested that we already discussed this at the May meeting. Mr. Weaver answered that we mention it briefly.

Mr. Weaver noted that the properties on the north side of Creek Drive are in the PC-4B Mini-Basin. He noted that PC-4B was done in 2014 but these ten properties were not completed due to the cost involved. He noted that the photo show that the sewer runs underneath the creek and through their retaining walls. He showed pictures of the retaining walls along the back of the properties and the location of the cast out cleanouts at the observation T. He noted that sewer main goes under the creek and up the wall. He explained that all in the past we installed the T but we did not replace the sewer. He noted that we went back during a wet weather event and checked the ten T's and have found no leaking. He noted that staff was very surprised about that as the sewers go underneath the creek. He noted that we have not been able to locate the record drawings, thinking that the pipes are encased in concrete. Mr. Wetzel answered that he did not find anything showing that they are encased in concrete. Mr. Weaver answered that we think that they might be and that may be why they are not leaking. He noted that after they follow underneath the creek they go under the retention walls and up to the houses on Creek Drive. He noted that the properties sit very high and the sewer may be encased in concrete under the creek and that is why they are not leaking. He noted that the only information that he can provide to the Board at this time is that none of the sewers are leaking.

Mr. Weaver noted that GHD provided three options to consider with the first one being to do nothing at this time. He noted that the second option would be to provide a lateral in the front of the house instead of going under the wall and the creek. He noted that we could provide a lateral stub to each house so they could hook on in the future. He noted that we would have to lower the sewer because it was not built to pick up those houses as their service goes out the back of their homes. He noted that the cost to the Authority would be \$69,900. He noted that the ten property owners do not want Option 2 as they don't want to put in a grinder pump. He explained, at a cost of \$152,000, it would cost roughly \$15,000 for each home to install a grinder pump. He noted that we don't have to do anything as they are not leaking but as a courtesy it would cost the homeowners \$25,000 to \$35,000 to replace their lateral to go through the wall or run it out the front with a grinder pump, it would be a significant cost if we don't do these improvements. He noted that he was looking at an option for the Board to consider that would be fair having the Authority take on some of the costs. He suggested if the Authority took on the

cost of \$70,000 and the homeowners would take on the cost of \$159,000 for the cost of the grinder pumps.

Mr. Weaver noted that option three would be to do directional drilling across the creek, instead of going through the walls at \$30,000 to \$40,000 a house, to consider drilling under it. He noted that he meet with Zimmerman Construction and found that there was not enough room to directionally drill underneath the creek as they need to be 50 to 60 feet back, however they got creative and suggested not going across the creek, but rather drilling behind their homes. He noted that we came up with the idea to directionally drill from the mainline on Earl Drive and Top View Drive to connect to the ten homes through their backyards. He noted that this is Option 3. He noted that he met with Zimmerman Excavating who would start with the driveway. He noted that we would directionally drill behind all the houses and set manholes. He noted that the last two properties are somewhat complicated as they would take more analysis if you would choose this option as there are some things in the way that would make it hard to do. He noted that Zimmerman stated that they could do it as it would cost \$187,000 which would be cheaper than Option 2 if you combine the costs of \$70,000 and \$152,000 for the grinder pumps. He noted that you are looking at \$225,000 in dollars spent for Option 2 and Option 3 is cheaper. He stated that we have never done this before but Zimmerman tells us that it will work. Mr. Seeds questioned if we would need grinder pumps and you would pick up their basements. Mr. Weaver noted that they would drill under the ground and under sheds, etc. and then we would hook the houses on a shared lateral.

Ms. Lindsey questioned what the residents said about Option 3. Mr. Weaver answered that he has not met with any homeowners but we know that they don't want grinder pumps because Bob Emrich met with two homeowners during a house inspection. He noted that seven of the ten properties have finished basements so he assumed that if you have a finished basement you probably have a bathroom in the basement and they will want to keep it.

Mr. Seeds questioned who would be responsible to maintain the combined lateral. Mr. Weaver answered that it would be owned by the Authority and we would have to get easements to do this.

Mr. Weaver noted that there is no decision to make tonight but he wanted to present the information to the Board to get any negative feedback. He stated that he will have more information for the September meeting.

Mr. Seeds noted if we do nothing, maybe five years from now we could have a lot of I&I and then have to go back and dig the street up. Mr. Weaver answered no. He noted that the costs per gallon is where we keep looking at that table. He noted that we would never replace those laterals, noting that it is not a I&I issue because, if they were leaking, Mr. Wendle would say it will cost \$40,000 to replace the lateral as it is leaking 1,000 gallons. He noted that we would be at \$150 a gallon and you don't do that, you would store it. He noted that Mr. Wendle would recommend that you don't replace the laterals. He explained it is more of a maintenance issue in that you have members of the public who are not going to get their laterals replaced, and if they fail five to fifteen years from now, and we don't do something now we will have a huge problem on our hand.

Mr. Seeds questioned how old are the current lines and what material are they made out of. Mr. Weaver answered that the sewer is ACP pipe underneath the creek. Mr. Wetzel answered that it what our records show. He noted after it goes underneath the creek from the creek to the house, we are not sure what it is made out of. He noted that it is not the Authority's responsibility to maintain private sewers. He noted that Mr. Stine will tell you that you have an obligation to meet the consent order but it does not require you to replace the building sewers. He noted that it is something the engineer can decide upon based on the cost per gallon issue. He noted that this is information the Board needs to consider.

Mr. Seeds noted that we need to make a decision because if we are going to do it we need to decide to do it before this year. Mr. Weaver explained that we need to make a decision in September as we are working to get the project out to bid. He noted that he will get more information for the Board

Mr. Weaver noted if the Board has no objections, he would like to send a letter to all ten property owners and meet with them to see what options they like. Ms. Lindsey noted that was a good idea. Mr. Crissman agreed.

Mr. Seeds suggested that they would want to pick Option 2. Mr. Weaver noted if he was a homeowner he would want to have the Township provide him with a new sewer.

Mr. Wolfe noted, if you think doing nothing is the approach you may considering doing, he would not send a letter. Mr. Hornung noted at this point he would suggest doing nothing. He noted that we are going to spend a \$250,000 on a bet that they are going to fail, and they will fail sometime. He noted if one fails it would be catastrophic, but then we are just back to where we

started from, when you put the lines behind the houses. He noted that he is not sure that he is convinced at this point that we should do anything.

Mr. Seeds questioned if it would cost a lot more to do it ten years from now. Mr. Weaver answered that it will not cost us anything. He noted if the property owner wants to maintain basement service, they would have to put in a grinder pump and they would have to build their own laterals in the street that we will not provide them. He noted that the \$15,000 cost for each house would rise to \$25,000 to \$30,000 that it would cost the owner. He noted that he only wanted to see if the Authority wanted to consider helping these people in any way while we are there. He noted if you don't do it now it is too late to do it later.

Ms. Lindsey suggested that it is not fair to the residents if we don't do it now. Mr. Hornung noted that it is not fair to rest of the rate payers to pay \$4 million to repair someone sewers that are not broken. Ms. Lindsey noted that we are replacing everybody else's sewer. Mr. Hornung noted that we are not, we are only replacing the ones that have failed. Mr. Blain noted that historically we only replace lateral and sewers of individuals that have failed as we want to eliminate the I&I going into the system. He noted that this situation is completely different as they are not leaking or failing, and it is private sewer. He agreed, as he does not see why we would want to spend any money on this. Mr. Hornung noted that it does not make sense to replace sewers that are not leaking. Mr. Weaver noted that we are working in selected mini-basins and you have the right to do it but you don't have to. Mr. Hornung noted that you installed the T's and the sewer is not leaking, then we don't do it. He noted that he has a problem with changing the policy if we start replacing sewers that are not leaking. He noted if you wanted to do something to help the residents in the future then you start a precedent and if it leaks ten to fifteen years from now, we would kick in some money for it. He noted that he did not know if you could legally do that. He explained that he has talked to other people in the Township that want their sewer replaced and he says no as it doesn't need to be replaced. He explained that they will ask what if it breaks in five years then he tells them that it is their problem. He noted the reason we are doing this is because we used to try to force the residents to repair it at their costs and we ended up in court too much and we couldn't meet our schedule for what needed to be done, so the only way to get the schedule done and meet the DEP requirements was that we had to go in and pay for it. He noted that we were forced to pay for it in order to meet our consent decree. He noted that we are not being forced to do this to meet our consent decree.

Mr. Weaver noted that the good news is that there have been no blockage complaints. Mr. Wetzell noted that we have never had any problems there.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the Earl Drive Streambank work would affect the sewers in the stream. Mr. Weaver answered no. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would have no effect on any of this.

Mr. Seeds questioned what staff's recommendation is. Mr. Weaver noted that his recommendation was option 2, to put in the lateral so if it ever failed it would not be an issue as it is a small cost to the Authority as it would only cost \$69,000. He noted that you would have to lower the sewer to get first floor elevation and they would not have a basement service anymore. Mr. Weaver noted that the cost to tie into the lateral would be \$4,000 to \$5,000 to run a lateral out to the street. He suggested that Option 2 is reasonable and he would recommend that you do that but you don't have to. He noted that it is a lot of money.

Ms. Lindsey noted that Mr. Weaver stated that they would not have basement service anymore meaning, if they had a bathroom they couldn't use it. Mr. Weaver answered that they would have to install up-float toilets and grinder pumps. He noted that they used to be about \$5,000 to install but now they are closer to \$10,000.

Mr. Nolt noted that he would agree with Mr. Weaver concerning Option 2. He noted if he was in this situation with one of those houses, he would much rather have the option of having first floor service out front and putting in a grinder pump to pump up to it rather than trying to get a contractor to replace a lateral down the back.

Mr. Wolfe questioned how do you install a lateral in Creek Drive and install a lateral for each property when they all have functioning sanitary sewer service and no reason to switch. He noted that they may not switch for 30 years. Mr. Weaver noted that is true. He noted that it could be a wasted expenditure.

Mr. Blain questioned what if we decide to do Option 2 and they decide to connect and we find out that this project is not right as there are issues with the connections. He noted that now we will have to spend more money when we didn't have to spend the money in the first place knowing that the sewer system was fine the way it was. He questioned if you put yourself at risk by actually taking something that is not broken and trying to fix it. Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Stine would have to answer the legal standpoint, but from an engineering and technical one, with building the sewers, we haven't run into a lot of issues. He noted legally you don't have to do this. Mr. Blain noted that is his point; legally we don't have to do this but we are now doing

something we don't have to do and may find out after we have done it if someone tries to connect through the front and there is a lot more work involved, we may have to spend more money when we didn't have to do it to begin with.

Mr. Wolfe noted if we find ten years from now, half of the building sewers fail, why can't we install this proposed line from the rear yards at that point in time. Mr. Weaver noted that you can do that as it is an \$187,000 project. He noted the complication with Option 3 is you have to get all ten property owners to agree and if not, you have to condemn it. He noted that you could do nothing and staff would certainly support that, but Option 2 is a good option. He noted if you have all the sewers going out the back, you do nothing, five sewers crack and the water is gushing in, we could have five people come to a Board meeting to find out why it didn't replace their sewers when we are doing all the other ones that are leaking. Mr. Blain noted we don't do that now all over the Township. He noted that they come to find out when their new line will be put in. Mr. Weaver noted that we tell them that we will do it if it is in the selected mini-basin and we tell them when it is going to happen. He noted in this case, they are the selected mini-basin but they are not leaking. He noted that Option 1 or 2 are a reasonable approach as you could do nothing and let them put in their own grinder pump for \$25,000 in the future.

Ms. Seeds questioned what GHD thinks. Mr. Shannon answered if there was a clear cut option we would have all agreed with it. Mr. Weaver answered it is not easy. Mr. Hornung noted if you replace it later and it breaks do we go back and replace it. Mr. Weaver answered that we have not done this for a scale of ten properties. Mr. Hornung noted that all ten won't fail, maybe one will fail, so if you have a selected basin and you finish the basement off and after you leave, if within a year someone's lateral fails, are we going to go back and fix it. Mr. Weaver answered that it depends on how much water is coming in as someone from GHD would have to make the calculation on the dollar per gallon, so we don't know the answer to that until we know how much is leaking. Mr. Whittle answered that we did it for a couple of underslab issues. Mr. Weaver noted that he can't answer as he has never had an issue like this one before.

Mr. Wolfe answered that we have gone back for underslab issues. Mr. Hornung questioned not just a straight lateral. Mr. Wolfe answered that he is not aware of one that has failed after we completed a mini-basin. He noted if one would fail... Mr. Hornung noted that he is talking about one we tested and did not replace. Mr. Weaver answered that we replaced them

all, as we haven't had a Creek Drive situation in the Township yet. He noted that this is the first one.

Mr. Hornung noted when you do a mini-basin are you replacing every lateral. Mr. Weaver answered yes. Mr. Nolt noted unless it is a PVC area where we will test it, but if it is not a PVC area we are replacing all the building sewers and laterals. Mr. Hornung noted that he was misinformed as he thought you only put the ones in that need to be replaced. Mr. Weaver answered that we replace them all.

Mr. Weaver noted that we know that it is asbestos cement under the creek but we don't know what it is after it get out to the other side of the wall up to the house. He noted that they are not leaking and we don't have to do anything.

Mr. Hornung questioned if you knew that they were asbestos clay to the laterals in any other basin would they be replaced. Mr. Weaver answered that we would replace them, but the reason we are not recommending it here is because it would cost \$20,000 to \$30,000 per house, and we can't recommend to the Board that you spend that kind of money for 30 feet of pipe. Mr. Hornung noted that we would build storage in this particular case. Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Wolfe is correct in not meeting with the property owners at this point as maybe the board wants to look at it again in September. He noted, at this time, we will count on doing nothing. Mr. Wolfe noted that he is assuming that Mr. Weaver would be able to put a camera in the sewer to find out what it is. Mr. Hornung questioned Mr. Weaver if he could do that. Mr. Weaver noted that there are a lot of bends but he did not know how far up he can get. Mr. Wolfe suggested if you can do one to determine what it is made out of it would be good to confirm that they are encased in concrete. Mr. Nolt noted that we would have to test pit one of them in the creek. Mr. Wolfe noted that maybe we might get lucky and find out that none are encased in concrete and it would change all of our thinking. He noted that it would be nice to know. Mr. Weaver noted that the issue is that there is no maintenance, no blockages or leaks. Mr. Wolfe questioned why you want to do something with them. Mr. Weaver answered that he doesn't as he is suggesting that Option 2 is a curtesy to the ten property owners, if you want to do that, because you can't do it five years from now. Mr. Hornung questioned why. Mr. Weaver answered that the sewers are already built at a higher elevation. Mr. Wolfe noted that you can't do Option 2 but you could do Option 3. Mr. Weaver noted that Option 3 is more money. Mr. Wolfe noted that Option 3 is more money to us and less to the property owners.

Mr. Seeds noted that he would want to do Option 3 or nothing. Mr. Hawk agreed.

Mr. Hornung questioned, if it is asbestos cement pipe will we replace it. Mr. Weaver answered if it is cost effective, but we have two scenarios here. He noted that we replace asbestos cement pipe and it is not cost effective then we look at other things such as storage. He noted if we would get an estimate to replace all ten laterals across the creek and up the hill it would be close to \$500,000.

Mr. Hornung noted, after listening to what you are saying, he would have to go with Option 2. Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Blain said it best, if it isn't broke why fix it. He noted that you can monitor it and see where you are. Mr. Hornung noted that the \$70,000 is an insurance policy that eventually... if it is plastic you can film one and find that it is plastic then we do nothing. Mr. Weaver answered that they are not plastic as they are 50 to 60 years old. He noted that it was built in 1970's. Mr. Shannon suggested that it could be cast iron.

Mr. Wolfe noted that we don't know so let's find out what we can. Mr. Weaver answered that he will have staff TV a few lines. Mr. Wetzel noted that he would look for one of the properties that might have an outside clean out.

Mr. Seeds requested that this be done before we meet in September.

Mr. Weaver noted that GHD will need some direction for how to complete the design.

CFA Grant Application for the Trunk A Project

Mr. Nolt noted, in your packet, you have a Commonwealth Financing Authority (CFA) Pennsylvania Small Water and Sewer project guideline instructions for this grant package. He explained that he is looking to apply for a grant as the CFA has \$22 million that they made available for projects between the cost of \$30,000 and \$500,000. He noted that they require 15% match so the most that we could request would be \$425,000. He noted when staff became aware of this program we looked ahead with GHD for what we have coming up. He noted that the next scheduled mini-basin project is PC-4A which does not fit this program since the maximum costs are \$500,000. He suggested that PC-4A will probably cost three to four times that amount but another project that might fit it better is Trunk A. He noted Trunk A is behind the Sheetz on Linglestown Road where we have an existing 15 inch line that comes down and was replaced as part of PC-1G/IH Forest Hills project. He noted that it is a bottleneck as we have a 15 inch line coming into a 12 inch that runs down under the bridge. He noted we replaced the sewer at the top

with 15 inches a couple of years ago but it empties into a 12 inch pipe that goes underneath Linglestown Road. He noted that we were considering this project before we knew about this grant and it fits the program. He noted that we have been in touch with Department of Community and Economic Development to get some additional information as they expect it to be a very competitive program having about 500 applications that are due by October 31st.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Nolt was looking for approval to go ahead with it. Mr. Nolt explained that he needs to put together a resolution for the Board to act on. He explained that we are introducing it at this time. Mr. Seeds noted that we could approve it in September.

Mr. Crissman questioned what our financial commitment is. Mr. Nolt answered that it is similar to the H2O Pennsylvania Grant package that we had a couple of years ago. Mr. Crissman questioned what the match is. Mr. Nolt answered that it is a 15% match. Mr. Nolt answered that there is a \$100 application fee and he will need some help from GHD to get the information together. Mr. Crissman questioned if the 15% is budgeted in the event we receive the grant. Mr. Wolfe answered yes. Mr. Hornung noted that we probably budgeted 100% to do the project so if we get 85% of the funds we will be way ahead.

Act 537 Plan Special Study-Letter from PA DEP

Mr. Weaver noted that he received a letter regarding the 2007 special study that was submitted to the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) for a task activity report for the Blue Mountain Parkway and the Mt. Lou San area. He noted that a special study was done just for that area. He explained that the task activity report was approved in 2007 but it was never pursued as Mt. Lou San reached out to the Township informing the Township that it would take care of its own problems. He noted that GHD stopped the process and never completed the report, but DEP reviewed their files ten years later and sent the Authority a letter stating that they needed an update. He noted that he met with Mr. Wendle and Mr. Shannon and found that they have a report that is 75% completed. He noted that we don't need to do anything as they are on on-lot areas but they are recommending that the Township adopt an on-lot maintenance ordinance that requires property owners to maintain and pump their tanks.

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Wendle is questioning if we need to complete the report. He explained that the he has a phone call into DEP on this question before he sends the letter as tomorrow is the deadline, asking if we need to complete the report or if we can withdraw it since

it is not a mandatory DEP action. He noted that we decided to submit the scope and they approved it, but now we are saying we don't need to do it. He noted that he had not received an answer from DEP, but if the answer is that we still have to do it then he will send them a letter tomorrow with the schedule.

ENGINEER'S REPORT

Mr. Shannon noted that most of the topics have already been discussed so he will open it up to the Board if it has any questions. Mr. Seeds noted that he has no questions.

Mr. Hornung questioned Mr. Weaver if you tap into the Authority sewer line do we require it to be tested. He noted that most other Township's don't do that and he questioned if it was worth making them do it. He questioned what the likelihood is of someone putting in a tap and it leaking. Mr. Weaver noted if you are talking about a tap into a main sewer, cutting the main, the care of the workmanship of the person who is doing it, if they don't get the pipe clean and they get something in there and it results in a little bit of annular space then water will come in, so it depends on the workmanship. He noted that it puts a lot of pressure on our inspector if you don't require the air test as he needs to be watching everything the contractor is doing. Mr. Wetzel noted that he knows that the test will be required so he will take the precautions necessary to make sure it is down correctly.

SOLICITOR'S REPORT

Mr. Stine answered that he has no report.

Adjournment

Mr. Blain made a motion to adjourn the meeting, and the meeting adjourned at 8:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by:

William L. Hornung
Township Secretary