

**LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
AUTHORITY MEETING**

Minutes of Township Authority Meeting held May 25, 2010

A meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Authority was called to order at 6:07 p.m. by Chairman William B. Hawk on the above date in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Authority members present in addition to Mr. Hawk were: William C. Seeds, Sr. and Gary A. Crissman. Also in attendance were George Wolfe, Township Manager; William Weaver, Sewer Authority Director; Jim Wetzel, Sewer Operations Manager; Steven Stine, Authority Solicitor; Jeff Wendle and Kevin Shannon, CET Engineering Services; and Ted Robertson and Watson Fisher, SWAN.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Seeds led in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the March 16, 2010 Authority meeting minutes. Mr. Seeds seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and a unanimous vote followed.

Public Comment

No comments were presented by the public.

Board Members' Comments

Mr. Seeds noted that he had a conversation with Mr. Weaver in regards to sewers, and he questioned why the Authority was not air testing laterals. He noted that Mr. Weaver told him that it was the Authority Board's decision that it was more cost effective to replace the laterals to include the private sewers in the property owner's yards. He stated that he did not recall that conversation or decision. He noted that the Board approved the contract for Ronca to do the sewer work in Raspberry Alley at a recent meeting, for 29 homes at a cost of \$720,000. He noted that it works out to more than \$22,000 per property, and he questioned the cost effectiveness of

what the Authority is doing. Mr. Weaver noted that the price also includes the cost of installing the main sewer line. Mr. Seeds noted that it would take a long time to get that money back in quarterly sewer payments.

Mr. Weaver noted, he mentioned that the Board made the decision not to air test but to replace sewers following Phase I where Mr. Wendle's plan allows repairs to the sewer system. He noted that it was determined after Phase I that the Authority would not be able to achieve its objective to reduce the hydrologic overloads without replacing sewers. He explained that you get a higher level of removal of water from replacement; however, the Authority may not have to replace all the sewers right away. He noted if he was to air test the sewers and only repair those that need it, it has been found through experience in Phase One that it did not work. He noted that you need to replace the sewers in order to get the levels of I/I removal that the Authority needs. He noted that it would be cheaper to repair them and not replace them.

Mr. Seeds stated that he remembered a conversation with the Authority Board members about replacing the line rather than air testing since there is a good bit of cost involved in doing that. He noted that he did not realize that it was a policy for private yards. He explained that he told Mr. Robert Emerick that he found two cleanouts and an old clay pipe in his yard. He noted that it made sense to replace the pipe. He stated that he really didn't care, however it is a lot of money to spend and he questioned how it could be effective. Mr. Weaver explained that Mr. Wendle looked at the project in costs per gallon. He noted that the level of infiltration is so high in that area, and although it looks like it is a lot of money, when you determine all the water that will be removed, the cost per gallon is good. Mr. Seeds questioned how much water would be removed. Mr. Weaver answered that he divided the EDU's, knowing in PC/2D, with the alley being half of that project, he took the flow at the bottom of the line and factored in how many gallons was coming from the homes, and divided it by 29 homes to provide a flow amount per house. Mr. Seeds questioned how many gallons of infiltration would be removed. Mr. Wendle answered that he did not have the numbers for the 29 homes with him. Mr. Weaver noted that there is roughly 5,000 gallons per EDU, and that is why this project is ranked in the top five to be done. Mr. Seeds noted that it could vary from one house to another, and that is only an average amount. He noted that 5,000 gallons for 29 homes would work out to a total of 145,000 gallons. Mr. Seeds questioned if this project as it is planned is cost effective. Mr. Wendle answered that when you line a private lateral versus the cost to replace it in yards is cheaper to replace them.

He noted for the main lines located in the street, it would depend upon circumstances and he would address that later in the meeting. He noted that other difficulties exist, noting that one part of a mini-basin may be more expensive than another, for instance, the tight space for the Raspberry Alley work, so the cost per EDU for the 29 units would be higher, but the average may be substantially lower for the entire mini-basin. He noted that most mini-basin repairs are between \$10,000 and \$12,000 per home which includes the main line and the laterals. He noted that he did not know what the exact costs are for PC/2D. He noted that this may be one of the more expensive stretches of work for sewer work. He noted that a discussion would be held later in the meeting regarding lining versus replacement. Mr. Weaver noted that Ronca held its price for PC4B/6C, noting that it was far below any other contractor. He noted that it was the lowest price that the Authority received in years.

Mr. Seeds noted that the project costs a lot of money and he questioned if it could be spent better somewhere else. Mr. Weaver noted that it would remove roughly 150,000 gallons. He noted that it comes out to the rate of inflation when calculated over time at about 5% to 10% per year in increases.

Mr. Seeds explained that he has clay pipe under his deck at his home. He noted that the Authority would not tear his deck down, as it plans to replace the entire line except for what is under his deck. He questioned if the clay pipe should be videoed. Mr. Weaver explained that he would install a T-pipe with a cap at the deck to determine if any water is coming from the pipe. He noted if water is coming from it and it is significant amount, then he would have to line the pipe. He noted that Dr. Crissman's home had 150,000 gallons per day in overflows. He noted if the overflows are severe, due to the costs per gallon it is more effective to do something to correct the problem. He noted that he would check the T-pipe after a heavy rain to see if there is any water coming from the pipe. He noted, in most instances he can tell the difference between sewer and ground water.

Mr. Seeds noted that he understands digging up the streets, but he feels sorry for people who will have their yards torn up and trees removed.

New Business

Resolutions 10-11; 10-12; 10-13; 10-14; 10-15; 10-16; and 10-17; Authorizing the sanitary sewer easement condemnation for the PC1A/1C project

Mr. Hawk questioned Mr. Stine if the seven sanitary sewer easement condemnations could be approved together. Mr. Stine agreed that they could be all approved at one time. Mr. Weaver noted that the Board will be asked to review the bid opening for this project later in the meeting; therefore, he felt it would be prudent to prepare for condemnations for the project. He explained that he hopes to be able to acquire the easements, but at this point it may be necessary to condemn properties since there are seven remaining easements. Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. Weaver would be finished with the easements if he secures the seven easements. Mr. Weaver answered yes. Mr. Hawk questioned if all seven easements are worded the same except for the different property owner. Mr. Stine answered yes.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve Resolutions 10-11; 10-12; 10-13; 10-14; 10-15; 10-16; and 10-17; authorizing the sanitary sewer easement condemnations for the PC1A/1C project. Mr. Seeds seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and a unanimous vote followed.

Action on Agreement of Sale with Mark DiSanto and John DiSanto for the sanitary sewer easement in the PC1A/1C project

Mr. Weaver explained that Mr. Stine prepared the agreement for the sanitary sewer easement for the PC1A/1C project for Mark and John DiSanto. He noted that he and Mr. Stine met with Mr. Mark DiSanto to review the easement area. He explained that it is a very small area that passes through the Stray Winds Farm. He noted that Mr. DiSanto had a few concerns relative to construction and some financial considerations that he wanted taken care of prior to conveying an easement to the Authority. He noted that he is comfortable with everything that is proposed in the agreement. He explained that regardless of who is doing the appraisals, the easements costs continues to rise. He noted that he is not happy with what Mr. DiSanto requested in terms of the amount of settlement, but in comparison to what the appraisal is, in the amount of \$15,000 to \$20,000, the price for the stormwater drainage pipe and small section of sewer to cross over a wetland area, the Authority would be saving money. Mr. Weaver recommended that the Authority Board approve the agreement.

Mr. Seeds suggested that Mr. DiSanto is trying to recoup the costs that he incurred with R.J. Fisher. Mr. Weaver explained that is true, however, he is requesting the Authority to install a piece of pipe that is included in his plan for the Stray Winds Farm that he could install himself. He noted that he did not know why he was asking to do this. Mr. Seeds questioned if this would be part of the agreement. Mr. Weaver answered yes, noting that if the Authority does not agree to this, and condemns the property, it would end up paying more based upon the appraisal. Mr. Hawk questioned if Mr. Weaver was comfortable with the agreement. Mr. Weaver noted that he would like to address the issue of the appraisal with the Board at some future meeting. He noted that the Authority is fortunate that it is able to acquire the easements outside of the condemnation process, but the appraisals seem to be very high. He noted, in the next project there are 83 easements. He noted that it would be very expensive if the homeowners did not cooperate.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the agreement of sale with Mark DiSanto and John DiSanto for the sanitary sewer easement in the PC1A/1C project. Mr. Seeds seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and the motion was unanimously approved.

Review of the PC1A/1C Bid Opening and Lining Options

Mr. Weaver noted that all the contracts have been awarded through the Township as part of the sewer replacement program; however, there is an issue with this bid that needs further discussion in terms of which option to choose. He explained that CET and staff met and came up with different combinations to consider. He noted that he was very happy with the pricing for the bids, but it is a difficult decision to choose lining or replacement. He noted that there is an unknown of what the life expectancy would be for a lining project, whereas, PVC pipe replacement will last for 50 years. He noted that Mr. Wendle and Mr. Shannon prepared a chart with a map to help explain the different options, and that it took staff some time to understand the different combinations.

Mr. Shannon noted, in a letter dated May 13, 2010, from CET to the Board of Supervisors, a summary of all the bids received and all the different combinations were listed. He noted that the letter also provided an explanation of the PENNBid electronic bidding process that was used for the first time by the Authority. He noted that there are two mini-basins that are adjacent to one another, PC-1A in the area of McIntosh Road and PC-1C. He explained, through the PENNBid system you can bid groups of items into lots.

Mr. Shannon noted that there are some difficulties in replacing certain sections of the lines along Linglestown Road and Colonial Road.

Mr. Shannon noted that Lot 1 lists all the sewers in PC/1A with no options. He noted that there are two runs along Colonial Road that are in PC/1A and two options were bid, Lot 2 to replace those lines and Lot 3 to line the laterals to the house, but not to include the building sewers. He noted in PC/1C, there are two state roads that are involved. He noted that the base bid for PC/1C is the large area shown as Lot 4, and it is all slotted to be replaced. He noted on Colonial Road, Lot 5 was bid to replace the sewers, with Lot 6 to line them. He noted for Linglestown Road, Lot 7 was bid to replace the sewers and Lot 8 to line the sewers. He noted that Liberty Excavators was the low bidder on all the different combinations. He noted that there is a clear low bidder for any option chosen, and Liberty Excavators prices for any of the combinations were well below the engineer's estimate.

Mr. Shannon noted that Combination One would replace everything at a price of \$3.9 million as compared with the engineer's estimate of \$5.6 million. He noted that Combination Eight includes lining all the sewers in Linglestown and Colonial Roads. He noted that it was estimated at \$5.1 million, but the bid proposed was \$3.4 million. He noted that it was expected that the lining would be cheaper, especially in the main-line section since that is where many of the difficulties are located. He noted that there was not much of a difference in the lining of the building sewers and laterals as they tend to be much shallower.

Mr. Shannon noted that the most expensive option would be to replace everything at \$3.9 million as compared to the least expensive option of \$3.4 million producing a difference of \$480,000. He suggested that he could replace everything for an amount that is less than what was budgeted. He recommended awarding the bid to Liberty Excavators at the June 1st meeting, based upon Combination One. He noted that CET could work with staff and the contractor on a hybrid agreement where the contractor would line the harder to access lines and replace the rest of the lines. He noted that the Authority would save money doing it this way. Mr. Wendle noted that the bad lines are not in relation to the condition of the lines, but the difficulty in constructing the lines. He noted that it would be difficult to construct the sewer lines at the intersection of Colonial and Linglestown Roads with all the traffic in that area and the other utilities located in close proximity of the sewer lines.

Mr. Shannon noted if you compare Lots 2 and 3 in PC-1A, for the two runs on Colonial

Road, noting that there is only a \$500 difference between the two options, he would recommend to go with Lot 2 noting that it is only a little more money for replacement. He noted when you compare Lots 5 and 6; the difference is \$130,000 noting that it almost doubles the price to replace the lines. He noted for Linglestown Road the cost difference between the two is more than double the price. He noted that CET reviewed the bids in reference to the most obstacles for digging things up, noting that the area across from the Sheetz Store, the first section on Linglestown Road in the eastern direction would be good to line until you reach the area where the sewer is located in the grass area in front of the office buildings, and there it would be good to replace the lines. He noted that the most difficult area on Colonial Road is from Arooga's to Winthrop Drive, where there are storm sewer and utility conflicts, and it would be better to line that area. He noted that it would be a savings of \$130,000 out of the total cost of \$480,000.

Mr. Seeds noted that the Township has been doing lining for a while and he questioned what the history was for the lining process. Mr. Weaver explained that the Township has been lining for 15 years. Mr. Seeds questioned if there have been any problems. Mr. Weaver noted that there have been mixed results with lining, some good and some not so good. He noted that some areas that were lined had to be dug up, since the lining shrunk and leaked. Mr. Shannon suggested that the lining is dependent on the skill of the installer. Mr. Weaver noted, on Prince Street, he lined the pipes and learned some lessons from that work in that the lines leaked a little bit, but there was still a good amount of removal of infiltration. He noted that the lines work but they do leak, and it is unknown how long the lines will last. He noted that it is still a controversial issue as to which option provides the best service for the money since it is an unknown. He noted that the Township does not have enough long-term experience with lining to make a solid conclusion. He noted, in some instances, due to the utility locations, it would be very difficult to try to dig up those sewers to replace them. In addition there are the traffic control issues for this very busy intersection at Colonial and Linglestown Roads. He noted that lining could be an inferior option, but when you look at the option of digging, it would create many more headaches. He noted that lining got its start by helping with those areas where traffic control was an issue. He noted that it would take a contractor two weeks to line an area that would take a month to dig up and replace with much less disruption.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Wendle what his experience was with lining. Mr. Wendle answered that his experience is similar to the Township's since a good portion of his firm's work

is with the Township. He noted that the cost for replacement for the entire project was \$3.9 million as compared to \$3.4 million, only providing a difference of 14% premium for the entire basin to have new pipe installed that would not leak and would air test. He noted that in some places where the Township lined the sewers, the lining will probably last as long as the basic structure does, however, the space between the host pipe and the liner may leak a little bit. He questioned what impact that leak would have on the entire operation 20 years from now, where the water has worn away at the mechanical seal. He noted that there is no chemical bond to the host pipe, and although the liner will pass an air test, if it starts to leak, over the years the leak will get worse. He noted that the question is how much the Township is willing to pay to replace the pipe and not have to worry about it for 50 years, versus lining the pipe and not have to worry about it for now, and probably have to replace it sooner than later.

Mr. Wendle suggested that 14% is not a bad premium to pay for replacement, however, there are individual sections where there are issues with utilities and it would be better to line those areas. He noted that the price difference between \$600,000 and \$262,000, for a little section would be more than double the price and it might be a better option to line and reap the savings in this area. He noted for an area that only had a price difference of \$3,500, it would be worth doing replacement.

Mr. Wendle questioned if the project should be awarded with some lining options, noting that the contractor is willing to do different combinations, and in this case, it is the same contractor, so the over all option would be to replace all the lines with the exception of certain areas where there are traffic and utility difficulties. Mr. Weaver noted that the contractor would prefer to line some areas and not to do replacement since some lines would be very difficult to replace. Mr. Seeds suggested that the profit margin would be higher with lining. Mr. Weaver noted that the contractor bid the project very low.

Mr. Seeds questioned what the history of lining is for the industry. Mr. Wendell answered that the original lining was done to fix a structural problem. He noted that they stopped some major leaks, but were not installed to pass air tests and to be air tight. He noted that there is the problem where the service laterals connect to the pipe and how to maintain that seal. He noted that the Township did that with T-liners or new flow, sealing the area off and lining up to the service lateral. Mr. Shannon explained that there are questions as to how well the PVC to PVC or liner to liner will stay knit to each other. He noted that they will come apart. Mr. Weaver noted

that lining was more an urban issue where it was used for major sewers under buildings and this is how lining first started, but then it started to creep out to suburban work. He noted that major cities did lining 20 years ago, but most suburbs only recently started to do lining. He noted that Mike Kreiser who recently retired from Swatara Township, would never line anything however he felt that it was good to try it because you would never know how well it worked until you did some lining. He noted that someday they may come up with a good chemical that will bond to the host pipe and then you could line everything, but until that time it is not waterproof. Mr. Wendle noted if you line with a resin and put a T-liner to go into the service lateral, those two liners may knit but they are not knitting to the host pipe chemically. Mr. Weaver noted that the exception is for the manholes where there is the space between the pipe and the liner. He noted that the Township developed a material that they put in the liner so it is inverted and activates the chemical resin to put an extra seal at the manhole to stop the water from moving through the open space. He noted that it was included in the specifications for the bid. He noted that lining is good for some applications. Mr. Seeds questioned if the Township would get 50 years out of lining sewers as it would for replacement. Mr. Weaver suggested that the Board could pick a neighborhood and line the entire project and this would provide a study area to determine the life of a lining project. Mr. Seeds noted that this has not been done anywhere in the Township. Mr. Weaver answered that it has not been done, and it may be a consideration for a future project.

Mr. Wendle noted that PC5C was bid for total lining versus total replacement and it was more expensive to do total lining so the bid went for replacement. He noted that he wanted to have an opportunity to try this but the bids were more expensive to line it.

Mr. Shannon noted that for this project, he only bid the hard areas for the options of lining versus replacement and not the entire project, expecting lining to be cheaper. He noted for the PC-4B/6C, Asylum Run, and all the jobs funded by Pennvest, the only instances of lining occurred for a large pipe in Earl and Curvin Drives that had no laterals. He noted that he did not want to deal with a possibility of a leak at the connection. He noted that Brightbill Park was lined as he did not want to cut the trees at the ballfield. He noted that there is always space where leaks could occur at the laterals and if the seal at the main breaks then there would be more infiltration. He noted cutting into a liner could provide a source for water to infiltrate.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the recommendation would include both replacement and lining work. Mr. Weaver answered yes. He noted that staff is in agreement with CET that the

combination would work. Mr. Wolfe noted that he does not have a final price to present to the Board tonight since there has been no recommendation on what to line. Mr. Seeds noted that the project would not exceed \$3.9 million. Mr. Shannon recommended awarding that project based on Combination One that is the highest amount with the understanding the staff would be negotiating change orders to reduce the price by lining at least seven areas. Mr. Stine noted that it would be okay to do that; it would be appropriate to do a change order to change an area from replacement to lining. Mr. Shannon noted that he would work to reduce the amount by adding lining and not increase it. Mr. Weaver noted that this is an instance where the contractor would want to line more since they would save more money.

Mr. Wolfe noted that this would be an agenda item for the Board of Supervisors at their June 1, 2010 meeting. Mr. Wolfe noted that the recommendation would be to use Combination One, with a not to exceed amount of \$3.9 million.

Action on the proposed PENNDOT Agreement for the Nyes Road project

Mr. Weaver noted that the Authority received an agreement from PENNDOT for the Nyes Road project which is currently under construction. . He noted that the correct amounts were not included in the agreement. He noted that Jared Hockenberry from CET reviewed the agreement and found that the numbers do not correspond with what was provided to PENNDOT. He suggested that the agreement could be approved conditioned upon the amounts being corrected as provided by CET or it could be sent back to PENNDOT and have them change the agreement. He noted that this would require scheduling a special Authority meeting to do this.

Mr. Hawk questioned if PENNDOT knows that the numbers in the agreement are wrong. Mr. Weaver noted that he has not spoken to PENNDOT yet. Mr. Shannon suggested that the numbers put in the agreement were based upon CET's estimate, but now they have received bids from a contractor so the numbers are now known. Mr. Crissman questioned if the new numbers could be inserted in the agreement. Mr. Weaver answered that PENNDOT would not allow that. Mr. Weaver suggested that the Authority could act on the agreement conditioned that it be changed to the new numbers. Mr. Stine agreed that this could be done. Mr. Weaver noted that CET knows what the correct numbers should be.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the PENNDOT agreement for the Nyes Road project with the corrected numbers inserted. Mr. Seeds questioned if the Authority could act on

this agreement. Mr. Wolfe explained that the PENNDOT agreement is between PENNDOT and the Authority, however, the awarding of the bids are done by the Township under the management agreement, noting that the Township runs the day-to-day operations of the sewer system to include the construction projects. Mr. Seeds seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and a unanimous vote followed.

Township Reports

Paxton Creek Second Paxton Creek Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

Review of the revised construction schedule and discussion on inspector shortage

Mr. Weaver noted that the Authority, after years of planning, is implementing the many projects of the corrective action plan (CAP). He noted that the construction schedule shows the amount of inspectors that will be needed to oversee the various projects that are ongoing, and he is experiencing an inspector shortage. He explained that every job requires a full time inspector to ensure that the pipe is installed and constructed properly, and that the contractor is paid properly. He noted that the inspector must observe the work and file the proper paperwork.

Mr. Weaver explained that PC 4B/6C has multiple crews; therefore more than one inspector is needed. He noted that due to the aggressive schedule, most contractors have two to three crews for some of the projects. He noted that two inspectors are needed for this project, using one staff inspector and one supplied by CET, Inc., however, the CET inspector is only on loan to the Authority for a limited amount of time, and there will be a shortage for this project. He noted that Rich moved his crew to the Raspberry Alley project, and this project should last for roughly a month. Mr. Seeds questioned if the contractor started this project on Monday. Mr. Weaver answered yes, and Mr. Wolfe explained that they are almost halfway down the alley.

Mr. Weaver noted that the Township employs five inspectors, Benny, Rich, John, Frank, and Dan. He noted that John is assigned to PC-3B, and Benny and Dan are assigned to BC-IA, with Bob White from CET working the Linglestown Pump Station, and Dan and Frank are jumping around between different projects. He noted that he has no inspectors for the PC-1A/1C project, which was thought to start in July but now it will probably not start until August. He noted that Liberty Excavators normally does not perform sewer work, but they are very hungry for work. Mr. Wolfe noted that they have worked for the Township before. Mr. Weaver noted

that he has a shortage of inspectors to complete the work and he is uncertain as to when some of the projects will actually start. He noted that ARA will start next week, which is the area of the Colonial Park Mall and the apartment complex off of Colonial Road. Mr. Seeds questioned if the work was completed under Sears. Mr. Wolfe noted that they only did the sump pump removal. Mr. Seeds noted that the work was completed by the mall owners. Mr. Weaver noted that Frank will be the inspector for that location and Autumn Oaks is also starting next week. He noted that he is short at least two inspectors and explained that he, Mr. Wolfe, and Mr. Hogentogler met earlier today to discuss the possibility of hiring an inspector. He stated that he needs to determine what staff Mr. Wendle could provide to the Township and there is also the option of rehiring for a part time basis, a recently retired employee, Eugene Schrader. He noted that he needs three inspectors. He noted that the salary of the inspectors was built into the costs for each project. Mr. Seeds suggested that it would cost more to use a CET employee than a Township employee. Mr. Weaver noted that it is true; however, there is the issue of what to do with the employee if there is some down time in projects or in between projects. Mr. Weaver noted if the Township hires someone, they incur the advertising costs and interview time for one year's service. He noted that the shortfalls for inspectors would end in June of 2012 in order to achieve the EDU removals that are needed every year. He noted that the PennVest work has created the shortfalls in staff.

Mr. Weaver noted that the work in Raspberry Alley is going well

PC4B-6C – Irene Drive paving and clear water revisions

Mr. Weaver noted that Ronca is working in the area of Irene Drive and there are a paving and clearwater issues. He noted that there is a paving issue regarding dust. He explained that the sewer that had to be replaced was 24 feet deep, and when this was done Irene Drive collapsed. He explained that he will be preparing a change order for the Board to consider since Ronca has asked for additional costs since the road was previously blasted, and when they started to excavate, it caved in and they lost the entire road. He noted that the roadway is currently stone, and it creates a large dust problem for the neighbors, some of whom are staff, Cindy Fasolt and Steve Musser. He noted that a resident came into his office and expects the Authority to pay for her brake job for her vehicle. He noted that the Authority had a similar problem with dust in the 1F-1I project. Mr. Wolfe noted that this will be viewed on the upcoming Road Tour next Tuesday night. Mr. Weaver explained that this Thursday, Ronca will be spreading a

Pennz suppress chemical that was installed at the landfill and Blackberry Alley, used to control dust. He noted that this was Mr. Robbins idea, and he has proposed to do a road reclamation project for Irene Drive and pave it immediately. He noted that paving was not included in any sewer bids and it can be completed by staff much cheaper. He noted that this is not the normal means to complete the work as he would complete all the PC-4B/4C sewer work first, which would take over a year to complete and then pave the roads at one time. He noted that he is proposing to pave Irene Drive as a stand alone since it is in such bad shape. Mr. Wolfe noted that the work would be done through the Public Works Department but funded by the Authority. Mr. Seeds questioned how you would be sure that the roadway would not cave back in and that it would be compacted enough not to be a problem in the future. Mr. Weaver explained that base material will be installed so if there is a problem the street could be overlaid at a later date. He noted that Mr. Robbins has inquired if Ronca is compacting the stone as he is worried about street settlement. Mr. Weaver noted that Ronca completed SC-IF/1I and PL-5C and they have not had any problems with road settlement yet. He noted that based upon the Township's experience; there have been no problems with road settlement and total road replacement to date. He noted that they have never experienced a 24-foot deep sewer line, and he has major concerns for this project. Mr. Seeds questioned how long Irene Drive was. Mr. Wolfe noted that the area that collapsed is 835 linear feet. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Robbins would bid this work out. He noted that it would be included in other projects bid by the Township, but the Authority would pay for this work.

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Emerick did an inspection on a home located at 5059 Irene Drive and requested Mr. Wendle to inspect the location to determine how to solve the problems for this address. He noted that the homeowner was very angry about the situation at her home. He noted that anytime there is an internal issue with an illegal connection with a sump pump or a foundation drain or any kind of clearwater system, it is the responsibility of the homeowner to remove it; however the Authority will reimburse the homeowner. He noted that the homeowner must hire a plumber and the owner was very angry with the plumbers providing the quotes as well.

Mr. Weaver explained that the homeowner's wall caved in when the home was first build. He noted that the builder reinforced the wall and the foundation drains were connected to the sewer to keep the basement dry. He noted that the entire perimeter of the foundation has

foundation drains that feed into the sewer system. He noted that they also have their washing machine feeding into an open sump pump that also has clear water. He noted that the basement is finished and paneling would need to be removed to change the washer machine connection. He suggested that it is a doable project, however the foundation drains are connected and one has a back up sump pump. He noted that the sump pump lines ventures out to the street. He noted that the house connections is between the two homes but does not connect on Irene Drive, rather on the line coming from Circle Drive.

Mr. Weaver noted that the first legal challenge is that the Authority needs to change its building sewer agreements, noting that he never anticipated agreeing to replace a sewer and to disconnect an illegal clearwater system. He noted that the Authority's contractor will not touch this project. He noted that once this is disconnected, it could flood her basement and he cannot do anything with it since there is no agreement for the homeowner to hold the Authority harmless. He explained that she stated if the Authority disconnects the illegal connections and her basement floods, she will sue the Township. He explained to her that the Authority would not do the work unless she holds the Township harmless. She noted that her basement is fine now since it is draining, but she questioned if she would have a problem once all the water is removed. Mr. Weaver noted that he explained to her that she is probably one of the only homes in the area that has this extensive drainage system so she would be the last one to have a problem as long as the Authority connects her drainage system somewhere else. He noted that normally the people who do not have the extensive drainage systems get water in their basements. Mr. Seeds questioned if the homeowner will allow the Authority to fix the problem. Mr. Weaver answered no, not until the Authority comes up with a solution that she is happy with. He noted that she is not very happy with the hold harmless provision either. He noted that she has enough water flow that it could fill her pool in a few minutes. He noted that the sewer replacements are in locations that are very wet and have clearwater systems, such as Devon Manor. He noted that the highest ones on Mr. Wendle's chart from the metering data also have the highest sewer flow. He explained that Mr. Wendle has a solution.

Mr. Wendle noted that the homeowner would have to connect her washer machine directly into the sewer lateral, noting that the connection is three quarters of the way up the basement wall, and this would remove it from the sump pump area. He noted that the water would continue to drain to the one corner and when the sewer is dug up to determine where the

lateral connects to the sewer, he would take an elevation shot on the line that comes from the foundations drains, noting that the street falls off in this location. He explained that there is a storm sewer inlet in that direction and it could be easily handled by running a gravity line down her front lawn, and then a clearwater line to tie into the storm sewer at the catch basin. He noted that the storm sewer that is downstream at the catch basin will be replaced as part of the project. He noted that the street falls off at a good rate in that direction, but if the line cannot get into the catch basin by way of a gravity line, he could get it into the storm sewer through a wide connection further down the trench. He noted that he would be diverting the flow, taking it down to the street and tying into the storm sewer and then her foundation drains would tie into the storm sewer. Mr. Seeds questioned if the homeowner owns the land involved. Mr. Wendle noted that the water would not run in front of the next door neighbor's land, so he would extend the storm sewer up to in front of her home so it could tie into her house and extend it to the storm sewer that is being replaced. Mr. Seeds noted that there would be no cost to the homeowner for this work. Mr. Weaver noted that the homeowner would be reimbursed if she can get a plumber to tie in the washer machine. He noted that it would be a simple project.

Mr. Seeds questioned who would do the clearwater system. Mr. Weaver explained that the Authority would do this work. Mr. Weaver noted that this is new territory as Mr. Stine had stated in the past that hold harmless agreements were not necessary since the plumber would be doing the work. He noted that the difference is that the property owner has already threatened to sue the Authority if there is a problem. He noted that the Authority would be disconnecting a illegal connection using the Authority's contractor. He noted that he would like to have a hold harmless agreement, and he proposed that an amendment be done to the building sewer agreement to make the homeowner sign a separate hold harmless agreement with regard to the groundwater, or use the hold harmless that is already in the resolution. He noted that the resolution never referred to the disconnection of illegal foundation drains. Mr. Seeds noted that the Authority is going to have to guarantee the homeowner that it will get rid of the groundwater before she would sign off on the work. Mr. Wolfe questioned why the Authority would not tell the homeowner that it is her responsibility. Mr. Stine noted that, otherwise, the Township would file suit against her for illegal discharges. Mr. Weaver noted that the resolution states that the Authority will provide reimbursement for removing groundwater. Mr. Stine stated that is if the homeowner is unwilling to do it. Mr. Weaver noted that the homeowner said no at first, trying to

imply that the Township installed the foundation drains. He stated that he thinks she will sign the agreement, but it was a painful process. Mr. Wendle noted that her daughter advised her that she did not have any choice. He noted that he told her that he could not state that she would have water in her basement. He noted that he explained to her that he would connect the foundations drains to the storm sewer and the water would flow away from her house. He noted that her question to him was if he could guarantee that she would never have any water in her basement and he answered that he could not guarantee that. He noted that she was not going to sign the agreement and he stated that her only alternative was that since she has an illegal connection she would have to rectify the problem. He noted that her daughter stated if this was the only way to solve the problem, then her mother should sign the agreement. He noted that it was left at this point.

Mr. Weaver noted that no action is needed to be taken at this time, but he wanted to point out some of the issues that he runs into. Mr. Hawk noted that he would like to drive by this home on Road Tour. Mr. Weaver noted that he is speaking to Mr. Stine about a mechanism to protect the Township from liability in case her basement ever floods.

Update on the Township I/I Crew activities in PC-1A, 1C, and 2C

Mr. Weaver noted that the I/I Crew has been very busy in Paxton Creek conducting air testing in IA, IC, and 2C since the current system is only ten to 15 years old. Staff developed a plan to do a sampling of testing and not do a full PVC rehabilitation. He noted that a crew tested 35 houses and 29 to 30 of the homes passed. He noted that he decided that it was not worth spending the time to air test in the PVC areas, and he would like to present to DEP a revised approach to the CAP which would take an amendment to the consent decree. He noted that he would meet with CET to come up with a new plan noting that it would save a lot of time to do sampling. He noted, out of the 35 homes that were tested, five failed; therefore he would not replace the sewer lines. He noted that his crew was to do all the PVC work and were not doing any digging. He stated that they would like to do more digging, especially since the Authority purchased a new mini-excavator. He explained that he could take some of the contractor jobs, and put his crews in the neighborhood and let them dig. He noted that he bid the last project that way, taking out the building sewers for PC-1A, and having staff do this work. He noted that they are digging them now and everything seems to be going okay. He noted that he would show the

Board members this on Road Tour. He stated that he is saving money using the Authority crews.

Mr. Weaver noted that he finally received a revision for the restrictor, however Dan is currently doing inspections and no metering for Spring Creek therefore he is backlogged on data processing. He noted that CET needs to process the data on the last wet weather event when there was 3.5 inches of rain over a Sunday evening. He noted that the modeling looks fine in terms of removing the restrictor but he had overflows above 1F and 1T during that event. He noted that he does not know what caused that. He explained that he installed meters but has not had a chance to process the data. Mr. Shannon noted that the Swatara Township Authority finally modeled the Spring Creek and Paxtang interceptors correctly, and just as they were getting the results, the May 19th storm event occurred with overflows. He noted that he needs a chance to remodel it, and since there were five extra meters in Spring Creek, he is hoping to be able to figure out what the problem is.

Mr. Crissman questioned how long it would take to analyze the data. Mr. Shannon answered that the annual report is due to DEP June 30, 2010; therefore, Dan is working overtime to analyze the metering data to get it to CET, as they only have a month to six weeks before the report is due. Mr. Wolfe noted that the annual report is a requirement of the Authority consent obligation, and suggested that the revisions would be discussed during the August meeting.

Mr. Weaver noted that there were overflows above the restrictor and above the replacement work that was already completed. He noted that he limited the overflows with the sewer replacement work above the restrictor. He explained that the model shows that the Authority has a certain amount of capacity, around 6.5 million gallons that could be pushed through to Swatara Township Plant. He noted that the capacity is currently 4.5 million gallons; however he feels that the Authority could push through 6.5 million safely. He noted that he hasn't had any overflows since the replacement work was done and then the May 19th event occurred. Mr. Hawk noted that it rained very hard over Sunday night. Mr. Weaver noted that it could mean more work in the Spring Creek Basin, noting it is the oldest part of the sewer system, built in the 1950's.

Sewer Authority Account Balances

Mr. Weaver explained that he has not heard from Mr. Smida regarding the status of the PennVest Loan settlement. He noted that the account balances are shown in the report and there

has been no PennVest spending yet. He explained that the PennVest funds are a direct transfer from PennVest to the contractor and they will not show up in the Sewer Authority Accounts. He noted more will be discussed on this during the Budget process.

Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Weaver did a very good job, meeting with the residents of Raspberry Alley last week in Linglestown. He noted that he was expecting more problems from those present at the meeting. He noted that regardless of what would have been done, the road needed to be replaced.

Engineers Report

Mr. Shannon noted that CET is in the process of getting the NPDES Stormwater Permit renewed for the wet-weather treatment plant and conveyance system improvements for Beaver Creek. He noted that South Hanover Township will not provide a stormwater consistency letter for the plant. He noted that his staff was to speak to Mr. Steve Frey from the Conservation District to see if that was a critical issue. Mr. Wendle explained that he is asking the Conservation District if they could ignore the fact that they do not have a consistency letter for the Stormwater plan in South Hanover Township or he could request an extension. He noted that he did not want to have the stormwater permit expire, especially if the treatment plant is approved, otherwise he would have to go through the entire process all over again.

Mr. Wendle noted that at least he is asking for an extension since there is nothing the Authority can do about South Hanover Township's refusal to write the letter.

Mr. Wendle questioned Mr. Stine if he heard anything more about the hearing for the appeal with South Hanover Township. Mr. Stine answered that his brief is due June 7, 2010.

Mr. Shannon noted that the last project to be bid in the five-year Paxton Creek CAP is PC-2C/2D. He noted that it was delayed a little due to the Raspberry Alley project. He stated that he hopes to bid the project in the fall..

Mr. Wendle noted if the Township would be permitted to do sampling, he would also like to do metering of the areas to ensure that the sampling is born out by the fact that the pipes are PVC and that there is little or no infiltration. He noted if that is the case, and if those lines don't have to be replaced, then the Township should realize substantial savings by using the Authority crew to dig building sewer replacements as opposed to contracting the work. He suggested that it would be a substantial savings over time, if DEP will allow the sampling and metering, then the

crews could be diverted to the sewer building replacements full time. Mr. Weaver noted that it was estimated that that contracted work would cost \$75 million.

Mr. Seeds noted that for the North Mountain Road project, PENNDOT owed the Township \$6,400 and the Township owed PENNDOT \$5,500. He noted that this item was tabled at the last meeting held in May 2009. Mr. Weaver noted that nothing can be done at this time on this matter since Karl Wink from PENNDOT is so backed up with all the projects. He noted that Mr. Shannon stated that Mr. Wink will look into all these different projects and they will meet again. Mr. Seeds questioned if it needed to be tabled again. Mr. Weaver noted that it will be tabled for a while.

Mr. Seeds noted that the Swatara Township Intermunicipal Authority was to be amended to define each party's total maximum flow allowance. Mr. Wendle noted that he started to work on that issue yesterday. He explained that the current agreement states that the Authority has a reserve capacity in the treatment plan equal to the annual average flow. He noted when they designed the upgrade, the Engineer's Report showed that the annual flow was what the plant currently has but they also give a maximum monthly flow, a peak hourly flow, and his statement is that there is a need to revise the agreement. He noted that the old amendment had an exhibit that showed how all the municipalities would pay for the plant upgrade, which is no longer applicable since it was done 25 years ago. He noted that it needs to be updated to include the current upgrade to the Treatment Plant. He noted that this is a basis to amend the agreement and to delete the language that states if the Authority is over its capacity, for the first month, a warning is given, but for two consecutive months, restrictions would be placed on the Authority. He noted that a new reserve capacity needs to be based upon the maximum monthly flow rather than annual average flow since some months would be over and the plant is designed to handle that. He noted that he requested proposed language from Mr. Jones of how this can be changed to allow a maximum monthly flow. He noted that the Authority receives a warning if it is over 3.7 million gallons, and it happens at least once a year. He noted if the Authority was to take its share of the monthly maximum flow, it would update the number to 5.2. He noted that the Authority has never been over 5.2 in the last several years. He noted that they have asked him to add language that protects the annual average flow since it is an issue. He noted after reviewing the last several years of data, the Authority had a maximum amount of 6.1 a few years ago. He noted that that month would have exceeded the allowed amount, but that year the Authority had

a relatively low average annual flow. He noted in 2009, there was nothing over 4.5, but it showed a higher average annual flow. He noted that he needs to ensure that the language would not permit the Authority to have a 5.2 month, and to protect the Authority to ensure it was not over on the annual average basis. He suggested that the Authority will receive more monthly maximum flow to deal with.

Mr. Wendle noted that Swatara Township Authority may be prepared to offer 100,000 gallons of the recently purchased West Hanover Township's capacity at the price that they paid for it. Mr. Seeds suggested that they are waiting to see if a large shopping center will be built. Mr. Stine suggested that Verdelli, the food processor, would want more capacity. Mr. Wolfe noted that the large plaza is slated for the area of the old Tyco/Amp campus. He suggested that it would not be a large sewer generator. Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Bill Jones told him that Swatara's Zoning Department told him that it would be okay to sell some of the capacity to Lower Paxton Township.

Mr. Seeds questioned the status for the upgrade to the Swatara Township Treatment Plant. Mr. Weaver noted that he just received the report on that. He noted that the Township will receive some reimbursement on what it paid for the treatment plant upgrades, partially due to STA receiving a grant and also the costs came in below what was estimated. He suggested that it may be in the amount of \$300,000 to \$400,000. He noted that it is unknown until the project is completed. Mr. Seeds questioned when the project would be completed, and would it allow more flow from Lower Paxton. Mr. Wendle noted that is what he is working on this and that the numbers would be based upon what he was given by Swatara Township.

Mr. Weaver noted that the original contract for the plant upgrade was \$19,224,000 and the balance to complete is \$10,816,000. He suggested that they are halfway done with the project. Mr. Seeds noted that the Township paid \$14 million toward the project. Mr. Weaver explained that the Township's portion of the project is 56.9%. Mr. Wendle suggested that the overall project cost \$22 million. Mr. Weaver noted that the monthly report provided by Mr. Gerald Miller is very detailed.

Mr. Weaver noted that the Springford Village Plant will have its power shut off as part of the Nyes Road project. He noted that it will be down for seven hours and he had to make arrangements for an emergency generator. He explained that the work will be done this week.

Solicitors Report

Mr. Stine had nothing to report other than his brief for the South Hanover Appeal is due June 7, 2010.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Crissman made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Mr. Hawk seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 7:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Authority Secretary
Gary A. Crissman