

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP AUTHORITY

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2011

MINUTES OF RE-ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Call to Order

The annual re-organizational meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Authority was called to order at 6:18 p.m. by Chairman Pro Tem Steven Stine on the above date at CET Engineering Services, 1240 North Mountain Road, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Authority members present were William B. Hawk, William C. Seeds, Sr., William L. Hornung, Gary A. Crissman, and David B. Blain. Also in attendance were George Wolfe, Township Manager; William Weaver, Sewer Authority Director; Steven Stine, Authority Solicitor; Jeff Wendle, Kevin Shannon, Barry Wampler, Alton Whittle, Nancy Adams, and Jodi Reese, CET Engineering Services; and Ted Robertson and Watson Fisher, SWAN.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Seeds led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Election of Chairman of the Board

Mr. Blain made a motion to nominate William Hawk as Chairman of the Authority Board. The nomination was seconded by Mr. Crissman. A unanimous vote to approve William Hawk as Chairman of the Lower Paxton Township Sewer Authority followed.

Election of Vice Chairman, Secretary, Assistant Secretary and Treasurer

Mr. Crissman made a motion to nominate William Seeds, Sr. as Vice Chairman, himself as Secretary, and David Blain as Treasurer and Assistant Secretary. Mr. Blain seconded the motion, and a unanimous vote followed.

Appointment of Solicitor

Mr. Hawk made a motion to appoint Steven Stine's Law Office as Authority Solicitor.

Appointment of Engineer

Mr. Hawk made a motion to appoint CET Engineering Services, Inc. as Authority Engineer.

Establishment of Regular Meeting Schedule for Authority Board Meetings

Mr. Hawk made a motion to approve the regular Authority meeting dates of the fourth Tuesday, in the second month of each quarter at 6 p.m. at the Municipal Center.

Mr. Hawk call for a voice vote to approve the appointments and meeting dates, and a unanimous vote followed.

BUSINESS MEETING

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 18, 2011 business meeting. Mr. Blain seconded the motion and it was followed by a unanimous vote of approval.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Chairman/Board Member Comments

There were no Chairman/Board member comments.

Old Business

There was no old business.

New Business

Resolution 2011-01 Establishing new Standard Specifications

Mr. Weaver noted that this resolution amends specifications for building sewers, for the installation, repair, maintenance, and connection of private sanitary sewer facilities connecting buildings and other structures to the public sanitary sewer system. He noted that the standards have not been amended since 2002. He explained that the amendment is quite lengthy, noting that CET Engineers prepared a summary sheet listing some of the highlights of the changes to the specifications. He noted that it includes new standards for manholes, trenching, utilities, and submittals. He noted that there was one significant change and he received no comments from the plumbing industry for this item.

Mr. Weaver noted that Jim Wetzel was unable to attend the meeting as he broke his leg a few weeks again and has been on sick leave.

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Wetzel was instrumental in preparing this document and since he was out on sick leave he was unable to ask him how many plumbers use Schedule 40 pipe. He noted that Schedule 40 solvent welded pipe is no longer permitted to be used for laterals or building sewers. He noted that over the past ten years, it was found that the PVC pipe comes apart and one of the reasons it did was because it was not installed properly with the correct primer and glue. He noted that it is a more rigid pipe but he found that the Schedule 40 pipe is more of a problem than the Schedule 35 since it was so rigid it would break easier. He noted that it is staff's recommendation not to permit the use of Schedule 40 pipe as it was found that problems are more prevalent using that type of pipe.

Mr. Seeds noted that this has to deal with outside the house and not inside the house. Mr. Weaver noted that it is a permissible use by building code standards, however, the Authority has the right to establish its own specification and there is a good reason for that.

Mr. Hawk questioned if the normal working hours for the Authority are 6:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. that allows staff to get an early start on work. Mr. Weaver answered that is the summer hours. Mr. Wolfe noted that those hours are probably in violation of the Township's Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Weaver noted that it was changed to 7 a.m. Mr. Stine noted that the document shows that the hours were changed from 7 a.m. to 6:30 a.m. He questioned if the time was correct for the resolution but wrong in the summary. Mr. Weaver answered that the resolution does not specify any times. Mr. Seeds questioned what time the Public Work employees start work. Mr. Wolfe answered that they start at 6:30 a.m. Mr. Seeds noted that no contractors should start before 7 a.m. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Compost Facility does not start work until 8 a.m. Mr. Seeds noted that the new noise ordinance will also state the 7 a.m. start time.

Mr. Weaver noted that he did review the noise ordinance as he does receive complaints from people about the contractors and in regards to what time they start and finish work He noted that he will have to make sure that the times coincide with the Zoning Ordinances.

Mr. Seeds noted if the resolution is adopted, then Schedule 35 pipe will be mandated for households. Mr. Weaver answered yes. Mr. Seeds noted that Schedule 40 would be permitted inside the house. Mr. Hornung questioned what other Township's use. Mr. Wendle answered that Township's have eliminated Schedule 40, but some manufacturers are using Schedule 40 for laterals. He noted that SDR 35 is a far superior product, as you can drive over it and it bends but doesn't crack. He noted, in new houses, where settlement occurs, when the Schedule 40 pipe was used and connected to the pipe coming out of the house, sometimes it sheared off. He noted that it is his opinion that mandating the use of SDR 35 is not a burden for contractors noting that it is easier to assemble. He noted that it is a superior product, and will help to stop leakage in pipes. He explained that many installers do not use the primer, only the solvent, and the pipe comes apart. Mr. Seeds questioned how they would come apart. Mr. Wendle explained that you don't get a seal so the water leaks in. Mr. Weaver explained that the ground shifts with freeze and thaw and water movement around the pipe. Mr. Seeds noted that the SDR 35 is a more flexible pipe.

Mr. Weaver noted that there was an increase from \$500 to \$2000 for the initial deposit.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Weaver would be making the change from 6:30a.m. start time to 7 a.m. start time.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve Resolution 11-01 establishing new standard specifications with the time change as stipulated. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Action on Agreement with Hummelstown for the sale of reserve
capacity at the Swatara Treatment Plant

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Stine prepared an agreement for the sale of the reserve capacity from Hummelstown to the Lower Paxton Township Authority (LPTA). He noted that it was brought to LPTA's attention that, after the Authority began negotiations with Swatara Township Authority to purchase their capacity that they bought from West Hanover Township, that Hummelstown also had capacity they wanted to sell. He noted that Hummelstown is very comfortable with releasing some of its capacity from the Swatara Township Treatment Plant

(STTP). He suggested that it is a win-win situation for both authorities. He noted that the Township is in need of peak capacity especially until the improvements are completed.

Mr. Weaver noted that the price for the purchase of the capacity is \$525,000, and that is acceptable to Hummelstown. He noted that is what the LPTA paid Swatara Township. He noted that Hummelstown has not acted upon the agreement yet, but he would recommend that the Authority approve the agreement since he would have to pay to have another meeting advertised in the future to take care of it. He noted that he would like to purchase the capacity as soon as possible in order to use it. He noted that Hummelstown must do a notification, and their Mayor must be present. He noted that they planned to approve it during their last meeting but the Mayor was not present. He noted that they indicated verbally that they have every intention to approve the agreement at their March 10th meeting.

Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. Weaver if the Authority is obligated to sign the agreement first and then forward it to Hummelstown to sign. Mr. Weaver noted that Hummelstown is the seller and it is typical that the buyer makes the offer. Mr. Stine noted that the buyer would typically sign the document first since they are making the offer. Mr. Weaver noted that he would like to transmit the original signed document for them to sign. He noted that no check would be delivered until the Authority receives a signed document. He noted that it is a very straight forward agreement that the plant modifications upgrade be included with the exhibit.

Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. Weaver would authorize the check request. Mr. Weaver noted that the LPTA would authorize that.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the agreement with Hummelstown for the purchase of the reserve capacity to the Swatara Treatment Plant with the stipulation that the payment not be made until Hummelstown has signed and returned the agreement. Mr. Blain seconded the agreement. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Mr. Hornung questioned how much additional capacity would the LPTA received when all the upgrades are completed. Mr. Weaver noted that there is a monthly average capacity and peak capacity. Mr. Wendle noted the engineer's design report only gave was an annual average capacity, and when LPTA exceeded it for two months, restrictions for permits were engaged. He noted when Swatara Township Authority (STA) prepared the design engineer's report for the new plant, they actually gave an annual average flow, a maximum monthly flow, a peak hourly flow, and a peak instantaneous flow, none of which were in the original plan. He noted that he sent STA proposed amendments that basically moved away from the annual averages as criteria. He noted that it is really 1.42 maximum month allotment, times the annual average, taking that times 3.895, and would provide for over 5 MGD. He noted that LPTA has not violated that flow in a long time. He explained that he provided STA some calculations showing a historical relationship between maximum monthly flow and average annual flow from 2006 to 2009 and proposed amendments whereby LPTA would be allocated the new allocation of 3.895 MGD, but the table would also show the maximum month allocation, peak hourly flow allocation, and peak instantaneous allocation. He noted that STA's concern is if LPTA was over for a maximum month so much that it messed up the annual average. He noted that he looked at the data, and proposed a formula for STA that if the LPTA exceeded it by 85%, three months in a row, that it

would protect them. He noted that they indicated that they would be willing to talk about amendments to the intermunicipal agreement when they finish the upgrades to the treatment plant. Mr. Hornung noted that the new treatment plant will have a greater annual flow than the old treatment plant. Mr. Wendle answered no, stating that it would have the same annual flow. He noted that the problem with the old plant was it had an annual average flow of 6.3 MGD, but it could only take 12 MGD as the peak flow or it would flood. He noted that they have improved the hydraulics at the treatment plant so now it will take almost 18 MGD on an instantaneous basis. He noted that one of the options that would be available to LPTA in the future would be building a storage tank with pumping or expanding the joint use interceptor, pumping an extra 2 MGD to the plant that it didn't have before. He noted that the plant could take that peak flow. He noted that the plant capacity has increased substantially in terms of peak hydraulic load.

Mr. Hornung questioned if STA would give LPTA the incremental addition of peak flow. Mr. Stine noted that they verbally have said they would. Mr. Wendle noted that they have not executed the amendment. Mr. Weaver noted when they sold the capacity to LPTA, the language acknowledges that the 2010 Treatment Plan upgrade modifications scheduled to be completed will have further hydraulic capacity and upon completion, they would work together to review and amend the agreement. He noted that they have agreed to negotiate.

Mr. Hornung noted if LPTA is paying for the upgrades to the plant, then we should get the benefit of the upgrade. He noted that he is not willing to give them the last check until we get the upgrades. He noted that LPTA is paying for a substantial percentage of the improvements to the plant; he wants what is due to the Township. He noted that he wants this in writing, and he would not want to give them the last check until he has it in writing. He noted that he does not know if the Township has the legal right but Mr. Stine can fight that one out. Mr. Weaver noted that he attended the annual meeting last night, along with all the parties to the treatment plant, and the climate has completely changed since they have a new manager and superintendent. He noted that the dialogue is much better. Mr. Hornung noted that the trust level is not at his level. He noted that he needs some history before the trust comes back and he will fight hard to negotiate for upgrades before the last check is written. He noted that STA is very protective of its plant.

Mr. Weaver noted, in the Township reports, there is more detail regarding the plant upgrades. He noted this is a very big upgrade and STA told staff and CET that they would like to get the sewer plant upgrade complete first, noting that the amendments for the hydraulic capacity has to be approved by all parties. He noted that this agreement only needs to be signed by STA Authority and the LPTA. He noted that the other amendments require all the parties to sign. Mr. Hornung noted that he does not want to use this as an excuse. Mr. Wendle noted that LPTA would have a substantial legal case in that STA design engineer's report states the capacity for the treatment plant, and it would be very difficult for STA to refuse LPTA to have the capacity that their engineers report states it has. Mr. Wolfe noted even though they have done that for the past 20 years. Mr. Wendle noted that the old plan did not have that. Mr. Hornung noted that litigation would cost LPTA money to fight. Mr. Wolfe noted that LPTA should get this agreement completed now.

Mr. Crissman noted if the climate is good with staff, then we should let STA reach out to show us that trust exists by reducing it to writing. Mr. Wendle noted that he has presented to STA proposed amendments, and all they have to do is read it. Mr. Weaver noted that the only thing LPTA owes STA is some change order money. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Authority had to pay the money upfront. Mr. Weaver noted that there are change orders totaling \$55,000, over what was paid already.

Mr. Seeds suggested that LPTA received some money back. Mr. Wolfe answered that the Authority thought it was going to get some money back but it didn't happen. Mr. Crissman suggested that at staff level, they could make it happen. Mr. Weaver noted that this is a big benefit to STA as well. Mr. Hornung questioned if the 85% would be wrapped together in this, noting that he would not want to give STA that without getting the other commitment. Mr. Wendle noted that it is all part of the proposed amendment. He noted that he would redo "Exhibit B" from the agreement that shows the capacity for each, noting that it only showed the average annual capacity. He noted that one amendment would change it to show average annual, maximum monthly, peak hourly and peak instantaneous. He noted then he has changed the language to determine when LPTA would be hydraulically overloaded and having a problem.

Mr. Hornung noted, if LPTA builds tanks, they would have to eventually drain that water, and if LPTA locks itself into too low a limit it will have a hard time getting that water back in with the monthly averages. He noted that LPTA needs to keep the monthly averages as high as possible if we build tanks. Mr. Wendle agreed with that but he did not think there would be a problem because at the point we would be building tanks, we would be talking a couple million gallons of capacity for an individual storm. He suggested that the LPTA would be reasonably safe on a maximum monthly average.

Mr. Weaver noted that he would contact STA and reach out to them to speed up the amendments to the intermunicipal agreement.

Approval of the Developer's Agreement for the
Bishop McDevitt High School

Mr. Weaver noted that this was presented to the Township during a workshop meeting many months ago. He noted as part of the Act 537 Plan review, staff meets with CET to review the future growth for the entire area, and in this case, Bishop McDevitt is building a high school, which is located towards the tip of that growth area. He noted that Bishop McDevitt was willing to install a sewer line that would afford for future growth, with the condition that they be compensated for it at some point. He noted that they provided a cost estimate for their sewer, and one for the sewer that would accommodate the Authority for future growth. He noted that the difference between the two was \$13,000. He noted as part of the agreement, the Authority would be returning the additional costs for the future growth when they construct the sanitary sewer and apply for a tap permit. He noted on page two of the agreement, item number two, is where Mr. Stine inserted language that would provide for Bishop McDevitt to be reimbursed the additional costs. He noted, as part of this agreement, LPTA would waive \$13,000 of the tapping fee due the Authority. He noted that it is a benefit to LPTA as it would not be able to provide future gravity sanitary sewer service. He noted that he cannot predict if the growth will ever

happen, but as part of the plan review, it is LPTA's responsibility to provide for the plan. He noted that it is a standard development agreement, and the only difference is the change in section two.

Mr. Seeds questioned if they would have to follow the new standards just adopted during this meeting. Mr. Stine questioned Mr. Weaver if this was approved as part of the sewer extension agreement, or as part of the plan that was submitted. Mr. Weaver noted that he referenced the plan and the date of the approval. Mr. Seeds quoted from the agreement, "the document of the Authority entitled standard construction materials specifications for wastewater collection extension date is 2001." He noted it further states, "Should any provisions of this agreement be inconsistent of the foresaid specifications, the provisions of the later, according to the latest amendment shall prevail." He suggested that this states that they must follow the new specifications just adopted during this meeting. Mr. Wolfe agreed. Mr. Weaver noted for the pipe, it is not a big issue, as the developers typically use what all the other developers use.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the Developer's Agreement for the Bishop McDevitt High School as presented by Mr. Weaver. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Action on Resolution 11-02-01 through 11-02-25 authorizing
condemnations for the PC-2C/2D project

Mr. Weaver noted, as part of the Paxton Creek Corrective Action Plan, the schedule for the last mini-basin for 2C/2D is to be completed by June 2012. Mr. Shannon noted that is the date for PC/2D, however, PC/2C is the first priority for the next five-year plan. Mr. Weaver explained that they paired these two projects together. He noted because the projects are coming together very quickly, and since he has limited staff that prevents him from going door-to-door to meet with all the home owners in order to get them to sign the easements, he requests that all the condemnations be approved for the outstanding easements. He noted that he plans to go to bid for this project in less than two months, and he hopes that each day he will receive the easements from the property owners and prevent the actual condemnation for the easements.

Mr. Seeds questioned where these easements are located. Mr. Weaver noted that the PC2C/2D area is an extension of the alley work near the Linglestown Fire Company, and western area along Linglestown Road. He noted that Mr. Minito is one property owner who owns five properties. He noted that LPTA has existing easements for many locations, but he would like to have the easements for the entire sewer system. He noted that some easements were never properly recorded or the project has been redesigned to get away from utility issues.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the resolutions do not require condemnation, they allow it as the final step in the process should it be necessary.

A woman from the audience asked if an agreement is not signed if LPTA would condemn a property. Mr. Weaver noted that is the process for LPTA to get the sewer easement to cross the property to install a sewer line. He noted that he has the original easements, but the new easement could be shifted some, and it might require a new easement. He noted if the easement

is not signed, the condemnation allows the Township a legal title. Mr. Stine explained that you get the legal title first, and then you get a right to possess after that. Mr. Weaver noted that it is the start of the process. Mr. Weaver noted that there are a total of 40 easements and nine have been signed. He noted over the past ten years, they have only had to condemn three properties.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve Resolution 2011- 02-01 through 2011-02-25 authorizing condemnations for the PC2C/2D project. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Action on the Resolution 11-03 authorizing the PENNDOT Permit
condition statement for the PC2C/2D project

Mr. Weaver noted that the purpose of the Resolution is to prove that the Township is authorized to sign the PENNDOT Highway Occupancy Permit. He noted that the Board would also authorize the condition statement as part of the permit. He noted that the Authority is well versed in being compliant in working with PENNDOT regulations. He noted that it is his recommendation to adopt the resolution and authorize the signature for the Highway Occupancy permit.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve Resolution 11-03, authorizing the PENNDOT Highway Occupancy permit and condition statement for the PC2C/2D project. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk call for a voice call vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Township Reports

PC2C/2D Property Owner request for lining rather than
replacement in wetlands at 5782 Catherine Street

Mr. Weaver noted that the property owner of 5782 Catherine Street, along with other neighbors, requested to be put on the agenda as part of the negotiations for the easement. He noted that Donald Vaughan and Charles Romigh, III, are present to discuss the project. He noted that he met with them to review the procedures for the replacement of the sewer in the wetlands, and they have a huge concern with disturbing the wetlands. He noted that staff met with the property owners to provide an explanation of when the wetlands would return to its current condition, which he estimates to be one to two years. He explained that Nancy Adams is the CET person who handles the wetland permitting process. He noted that the property owners would like the wetland areas to be lined and noted that he had some slides to share with the Board members to provide more background on the issue.

Mr. Weaver explained that Catherine Street is in the middle of the basin, and there are 10 to 15 easements needed for the area of Hocker Street to Mountain View Road. He noted that the area of Shady Grove abuts this area and he reminded that Board that they had previously met with the property owners from that area. He noted that the area shown on the map in green is proposed to be lined. Mr. Shannon noted that what the map does not show is that there are numerous PVC sewers in this area. He noted that someone had asked about Pennsylvania Avenue and Farelane Avenue, and he explained that those areas are served by PVC pipe. He noted that not all the sewers are slated to be replaced. He noted that the Township is testing the

PVC sewer pipes and they have not found any problems with them at this time. Mr. Seeds noted that the proposed lining is only a little section shown in yellow. Mr. Weaver explained that he plans to replace the pipes that are 30 to 40 years old. He noted that they are doing spot testing for the PVC sewers at this time. He explained that the map shows the owner's home and the wetlands. Mr. Hornung questioned what direction the photograph was taken. Mr. Weaver answered that it was taken from Catherine Street looking to the west. Mr. Weaver noted that a certain area will be lined since it is a very deep sewer, but Mr. Robbins has an issue with a culvert that will need some attention. He noted that he does not know much about the stormsewer in this project, but there is a need to do something with the pipe.

Mr. Seeds questioned what is the existing pipe and size. Mr. Weaver answered that the existing pipe is asbestos cement pipe. He noted that it is all 8-inch pipe and roughly 45 years old. Mr. Seeds questioned if the pipe has been videoed. Mr. Weaver answered that it has not been videoed recently. He noted that they do not video all of the sewer anymore, since it is known that it leaks and needs to be replaced. Mr. Seeds questioned if it would have to be videoed if the pipe would be lined. Mr. Weaver answered yes.

Mr. Weaver noted that the property owners are present since they are concerned about the beauty of the land and the environmental impact. He noted, at this point, staff is not recommending lining the sewer since the Authority has received the necessary permits, and replacement through wetlands is recommended because it is wet. He noted that the Authority has no history for lining, but new sewer installation would last 50 to 60 years. He noted if a sewer would leak it would do it in the wetlands. He noted when he met with CET, based upon his experience and other municipality experiences; he was told that wetlands recover very quickly. He noted that there are very detailed descriptions in the contract that the contractor must follow. He noted that there are over 30 items the contractor must follow. Mr. Seeds noted if the pipe has not been videoed, then it is not known if the pipe could be lined. Mr. Weaver suggested that a shear break would provide for additional problems, so it might experience an overflow since there would be accumulations of solids if it is significant. He suggested that there is a 99% certainty that it could be lined, noting that the liner contractor has found very few instances when he was unable to line a pipe. He noted that it is premature to state that the pipe could be lined until it is tested.

Mr. Shannon noted that he has pictures of wetlands that were dug up in past projects and what it looks like now. Ms. Adams showed pictures of a project completed in 2009, about a year after the project was complete. She noted that it was dug up using the same construction methods that are proposed for Catherine Street. Mr. Weaver noted that this is in the area of Earl Drive, the Hankin property.

A person asked if there were any pictures where a contractor had to be pulled from a project because he made a mess of things. Ms. Adams answered that she did not have any pictures for that. Mr. Shannon questioned if there are any pictures for Trunk A. Mr. Weaver explained that the final restoration is approved by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. He noted that they perform the inspection, and the contractor must follow a restoration guideline. He noted that he cannot sign off or close out the contract until they comply with everything. He

explained that he is confident that the sewers could be replaced in the wetlands, not cause any environmental harm, and that they will be restored as close as possible to their original condition.

Mr. Hawk noted that the real issue is that Mr. Weaver feels that he can restore the wetland to its original condition without any infringement on their individual property. Mr. Weaver noted that, initially, the conditions are ugly, and people have to be patient, noting that it is an old system that needs to be replaced. He noted that there is no easy way to replace sewer lines and he always informs the public what to expect during the public meeting.

Mr. Seeds questioned how wide an area would be impacted. Mr. Weaver answered that he asks for a 30 foot permanent easement and a 10 foot temporary easement. Mr. Shannon noted that it is only a 30-foot easement for the wetlands. Mr. Seeds questioned if the area is replanted. Mr. Weaver noted that he must strip off the first 12 inches of wetlands, and that is what regenerates itself. Ms. Adams noted that is where all the root structure is found, and it is put back. She noted that there is a means to help with the stabilization. A gentleman asked if it was done with a backhoe. Mr. Weaver answered yes. He questioned what the root mass is doing. Ms. Adams noted that it is sitting aside of the project. He questioned if it is pretty much broken up. Ms. Adams explained that it does not prevent the plants from growing back. Mr. Blain noted when the roots are broken up like that it causes it to grow back thicker since more roots will sprout shoots, just like grass.

Donald Vaughn, 5782 Catherine Street, noted that his property is located on the north end of the project. He noted that everyone is present whose easements are needed for the entire wetlands area from his home to Ranger Road. He noted that there is also a big concern regarding the sidewalks, driveways, and brick pillars at the end of driveways. He noted that one neighbor will lose half of her driveway and two brick pillars in front of her driveway. He noted that they will be torn up and will need to be replaced. He noted that Bill Pierce will lose a lot of his driveway and a brick pillar. He noted in his case, the easement is placed across his sidewalk at such an angle, that he will lose 50 to 60 feet of sidewalk, and 500 feet of daylilies between the curb and sidewalk. He noted that he figured that he would lose around 100 feet of the daylilies. He noted that it is not just the wetlands that will be disrupted, noting that both ends will be torn up to get into the project area. He noted that he has a concern about what contractor will get the job, knowing that it always goes to the low bidder. He noted if you get a bad contractor you will get a bad job, and the Township has no control over who will be chosen, knowing that a good contractor will bid high since he knows that it will take a lot of work to rebuild the wetlands, and a bidder who doesn't know what he is doing will bid much lower.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the homeowners are asking that this pipe be lined. Mr. Vaughn noted that there are no laterals involved with this work, only a truck line. Mr. Shannon noted that Mr. Vaughn's house is serviced by a PVC sewer on Catherine Street and it is not being replaced. Mr. Seeds questioned who would lose their brick pillars. Mr. Weaver noted that the Khouri residence, at the end of the project, is not in the wetland. He noted that he decided that he would line that project and he already spoke to Ms. Khouri about that.

Mr. Hawk questioned what sidewalks we are talking about. Mr. Vaughn answered that it would be his sidewalks. Mr. Weaver explained that the Township has replaced miles of

sidewalks in the numerous projects that it is working on. Mr. Vaughn noted that you would not be replacing a 100 feet of daylilies that it took him ten years to establish. Mr. Seeds questioned if the house laterals are okay. Mr. Weaver noted that this is an area of sewers that run through a PVC area. Mr. Weaver noted that the house sewers are fine in this area except for in the back.

Mr. Blain noted that most of this discussion is for a trunk line.

Mr. Hawk questioned what would happen if the trunk line was lined and it didn't work. Mr. Vaughn replied if you would have to replace it he would not stand in the way of doing the sewer work. Mr. Hawk noted that it would be putting money on top of money. It was noted that the condition of the pipe has never been determined. Mr. Weaver noted that the pipe is 50 years old and there is enough data to show that every asbestos pipe in the Township that is a collector sewer is going to fail and then we would pay twice as much money to mobilize a contractor. He noted that the ground water finds the weakest part to seep in. He explained that he and Mr. Wendle have spent years studying this problem, and if you don't replace the pipe now, you will spend more money doing it over again. He noted that the Authority has been getting good prices to do the work and it makes sense to go in and replace it all now. He noted that Mr. Wendle's plan is to do this in stages, doing the worst areas first. He noted that he does not have video to show that the pipes are leaking, but he does have a flow meter that shows that this area is one of the worst areas. He noted that is how the worst mini-basins were selected to be completed first.

Mr. Vaughn questioned how you could determine that you have a good price when the project has not been bid. Mr. Weaver answered that he has been getting good pricing for the replacement jobs. He noted that the estimates for the work are coming in much lower than anticipated. Mr. Blain noted that much of the work is going to contractors that the Township has prior experience with.

Mr. Whittle noted that everything in gray have been replaced since 2002. Mr. Weaver noted that no one wants to have their sewer replaced because it is a disturbance initially, but some homeowners want their private sewers replaced. He noted that it has to be done, the contractors do a good job, and the people get a new sewer line and a new paved street. He noted that they restore the yards, and he has not had many problems with the public once the projects are completed. He noted that the Board would not stand for that.

Mr. Vaughn noted that he is not concerned about replacing the sewers in the street; however, he is concerned about the wetlands. He noted that the soil is bad, it doesn't grow much, and when you disturb it you are telling me that you can reclaim it. He noted that you told him that you had contractors taken off the job for doing a poor job. He questioned how he could be assured that the contractor who gets the job isn't going to be taken off of this job.

Mr. Shannon noted that there was a question addressed to him and Ms. Adams as to whether the Township keeps an eye on the projects. He explained for the Trunk A project, he assured the people that there was full time oversight for the project, and they do a good job. He noted when the contractor was working in December and the Township inspector told them that they needed to get mats on the wetlands, and they called Steve Frey from the Dauphin County Conservation District and he came down and agreed and the contractor pulled off the job until

the ground froze. He noted that they waited until after New Years and the job was done, and it was restored and looks good. He noted that the contractor was not pulled off the job; he just waited until he could get the proper protection for the wetlands.

Mr. Vaughn noted that there are different types of wetlands, and he questioned if it had standing water like theirs. Mr. Weaver noted that he does not test the wetlands in terms of water. He noted that once it is delineated that it is a wetlands, then there are certain things they must do to protect them from construction. He noted that if the job is in the street or in the wetlands, CET and staff do a very good job and he has not had any complaints in the 15 years that he has worked for the Township after the projects are completed.

Mr. Hawk noted that there are concerns when there is lateral work in regards to tearing up a front yard, but in the balance, when it is all done, there have been many positive comments.

Ms. Brenda Sambach, Pennsylvania Avenue explained that her land adjoins the wetland from the backside. She questioned what kind of E&S Controls will be put in so that a mess does not come into the end of the property. She noted that she was never contacted as her property is not directly affected. Mr. Weaver noted that Steve Frey from the Dauphin County Conservation District will meet with the contractor, engineer, and staff before the project is bid, and after the bid is awarded but before the start of construction, Mr. Frey will ensure that the E&S controls are set up properly and the Township inspector will also do that. Ms. Sambach questioned what would happen during a heavy rain event. Mr. Weaver noted that is the first thing the contractor does before they start digging. He noted that they cannot start work until the E&S Controls are set up. Mr. Shannon explained that he has submitted an E&S Plan months ago and Mr. Frey will approve the plan. He noted that he submitted plans to DEP for an encroachment permit through the wetlands and stream crossings, and they issue a permit. He noted that he had a public meeting inviting the public to look at the plans and ask questions. He noted that Ms. Sambach could stop by CET anytime and he would go over the plans with her. He noted that it has all been approved.

Mike Bates, 941 Farelane Court noted that there is a manhole to the back of his property that joins the Pierce property. He explained that he has a swimming pool that is very close to that manhole. He noted that a person is technically not permitted to build anything over the sewer easement. Mr. Weaver noted that he would not make Mr. Bates move his swimming pool. Mr. Bates noted that the PVC line is down 20 feet from the manhole. Mr. Weaver noted that he did not know if they would have to dig into his yard, and he would have to get back to him about that. Mr. Bates questioned what happens when everything starts to settle and he has problems with his pool. Mr. Weaver noted that the contractor would not dig anywhere near the pool that would cause a settlement problem. A question was asked how far the manhole is from the pool. Mr. Bates answered that it is roughly a foot away. Mr. Weaver noted that the Authority digs that close to homes everyday. He noted that there have been no settlement problems to date that he is aware of.

A question was asked if the contractor was required to have a warranty. Mr. Weaver answered yes. A question was asked if there would be a difference in digging near a foundation and a pool. Mr. Bates noted that the land underneath is made up of vermiculite. Mr. Shannon

stated that he would go out and inspect the pool area. Mr. Bates noted if the pool cracks within a year, someone will be responsible for it. Mr. Weaver noted that he would refer to the Authority attorney for that. He noted the most important thing he could mention is that people should check to see if they have a sewer easement and if they do they should not build in it. He noted that he would have to meet with the public for each case to see what the individual concerns are. He noted that he needs to research if the Township has legal title to the easement area, and what kind of work can be done without permission and what kind of risk there is for the property. He noted that CET will have to answer these questions.

Mr. Hawk noted that he wants to avoid having to come back and do this area the second time.

Gary Banks, 5776 Catherine Street, noted that his concern is the work to replace the line necessary. Mr. Weaver noted that all the sewers made of PVC were tested and they passed, noting that he has a meter near the golf course. He noted if the meter is showing a leaking pattern of 10 to 1 and all the other mini basins are 5 to 1 then it has to be the rest of the houses.

Mr. Vaughn questioned if that area drains some of the older neighborhoods, and are the lines going to be replaced into the houses. Mr. Weaver noted that the plan is to do mini-basins by neighborhoods of 150 to 200 homes, noting that he can effectively meter that many homes. He noted that half of the project area is made up of PVC and the other half old pipe. Mr. Wendle noted that the Township has a consent decree with DEP to reduce the flows. He noted in areas where there is asbestos cement there were many spots repairs made, and the pipe sheared after the repairs, therefore, DEP accepted a plan by the Township that over the next 20 years it will replace all of the asbestos cement pipes. He noted that the pipe in the entire Paxton Creek drainage basin is slated for replacement over a 20 year period. He noted at the same time, the PVC areas that have been built more recently will be tested to determine if they need replacement. He noted that there are some PVC areas that are a problem. He noted that any pipe material that is not PVC is proven to be problematic over and over, and it is on a 20-year program for replacement. He noted that individual lines have not been televised and in this area the meter indicated that the ratio of average daily flow is ten times higher. He noted that there are thousands of gallons per day per household and this is indicative of what is found for asbestos pipe material. He noted, in the past, they would replace all the sewers around, and in two years the meter readings would be increased again since that area was leaking. He noted that is why they do not do spot replacement.

Mr. Hawk suggested that the Board would hold any action on this and it would be brought back for a decision at a later.

Mr. Vaughn noted that he has already been talked to and there is still the issue of tearing up 100 feet of his sidewalk. He questioned why his end could not be lined. Mr. Weaver noted that he would love to line everything but there is a responsibility to get the flows down to a certain level. Mr. Vaughn noted that the Authority has agreed to line some of the area. Mr. Vaughn questioned if there are only so many people the Authority wants to please. Mr. Weaver noted that there is a procedure for lining; noting that it may concern issues for road traffic and no easy way to control the traffic during construction. Mr. Weaver noted for the area around

Arooga's, at the intersection of Colonial Road and Linglestown Road, there are sewers that go through their parking lot and there is no way to maintain customer service and safe traffic flows by doing replacements in that area. He noted that he is working in an apartment complex where there are utilities on top of utilities, electric, gas and water with the sewer at the bottom. He noted that there was no PA One Call back then, and no one ever checked before installing their utilities. He noted in those two instances, that is where lining is generally used. He noted that there was an issue with the Shady Grove people, noting that the Shade Tree Commission did not recommend or support lining. He noted that the Shade Tree Commission did not think it was a big deal to take down the trees as they could provide a plan to restore the area to be a better situation. He noted that the Board decided, due to the aesthetics and the proximity to homes to line it, but he would never attempt to do that. He noted that he cannot line everything because he would be replacing the sewer lines eventually.

Mr. Vaughn noted that the Authority has no history for the lining. He noted that you have not put anything into the pipes to determine what the condition is. He noted that you have no history to determine how long it will last and have decided that it should be replaced. Mr. Wolfe answered that is the plan in accordance with the consent decree with DEP that we replace the asbestos pipe. He noted that we no longer test or investigate this type of pipe, we replace it. Mr. Weaver noted that there is proven scientific knowledge that the chemicals do not bond and do not knit. He noted that we have no idea how long that space between the lining and pipe will last before it starts to leak.

Mr. Vaughn noted that the Township is going to line the Arooga's area so it will not disrupt traffic, and yet in the future the traffic will increase and the disturbance will be greater. He suggested that it seems rather arbitrary. Mr. Weaver noted, in the long run it will save in costs. He noted that it was bid both ways and CET made a recommendation based upon the cost and impact. Mr. Wendle noted that replacing pipe at the intersection of Linglestown Road and Colonial Road and Arooga's is substantially expensive. He noted that there is a certain benefit to line in that situation versus constructing in a right-of-way where it can be lined using precautions that are required relatively inexpensively compared to tearing up an intersection. He noted for an area that has no traffic control issues, and no repaving at that intersection it is quite different. He noted this is located in a wetlands area, which we know has standing water, and there is a depth of water pressure in that line that can force its way into the ambient space. He noted that the cost of replacing in a right-of-way versus the cost of lining in a right-of-way is much closer together than it is between replacing the intersection at Arooga's. He noted that the wetland area can be restored after a couple of years. He noted that when they are working it will be ugly, but if it is done properly it can be restored and it will grow back as grass wetlands. He noted that wooded wetlands are a different story since you have trees that would take years to come back. He noted that the U. S. Arms Corp of Engineers and DEP treats the areas differently. Mr. Vaughn noted that there is no assurance of the land being restored property.

Mr. Weaver noted that lining is like a repair and it is not replacement and it is not equivalent to replacement.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Weaver is going to get some answers for the people's questions and he will sit down and meet with them.

Mr. Hornung noted that this process is new for the people who are in attendance at the meeting. He noted that it deals with your homes that you have invested time and effort. He noted that this is not the first group to come to a meeting and you won't be the last because the Authority has 20 years of future work to do. He noted that the Authority must look at the longest life it can get for every repair possible that makes sense and review the cost risk ratio that best suits the Authority as good stewards for the Township's money. He noted that it is lack of trust, but for the Board, it is not, since they have seen these projects done hundreds of times and he has never had one complaint about a sewer project not being restored properly. He noted that he had a friend who did not like the way the grass was restored but it was fixed, and he has been doing this for ten years.

Mr. Vaughn noted that the Authority has been replacing grass and lawns. Mr. Hornung noted that is not true, you name it and we have replaced it. Mr. Vaughn questioned if they have replaced day lilies and wild flowers. Mr. Hornung noted that this has been done for the past ten years. Mr. Vaughn questioned if they would dig up the daylilies and put them aside and replant them when the job is done. He noted that he did not read that in any contract that they were required to do that. Mr. Blain questioned if the flowers were on his property. Mr. Vaughn noted that they are between his sidewalk and curb. Mr. Weaver noted if there are things that a person wants to preserve they should remove them. He questioned how he would move 50 feet of daylilies and keep them alive. Mr. Weaver noted that they were planted in the sewer easement. Mr. Vaughn noted that he put them there to beautify the Township. Mr. Weaver noted if the Township had to replace everything that people put in the sewer easement it would triple the Township's sewer rates. Mr. Vaughn noted that it involves 80 feet of sidewalk.

Mr. Hawk noted if the Authority lines Mr. Vaughn's pipe and it fails will you pay to make it right. Mr. Vaughn questioned if the people at the other end of the street will be made to pay if their lining fails. And will Arooga's pay if their lining fails. Mr. Vaughn noted that he was told that there are no laterals going into the majority of the entire length of the property. He noted that since there is no connections to be made it would be a good test to place to line. He noted that a company from a lining company would have a slightly different opinion on whether lining is good enough. He noted that CET wants to replace the pipe. He suggested that when CET meets with the people separately they will come back and report exactly what they are reporting to the Board now. Mr. Wendle noted that he agrees that lining is good where there are no laterals, since it would reduce the potential for leaks, however, if you line this it is only a repair and not a 50-year replacement for the sewer. He noted that the Board has to make a choice, should they spend the money to line the pipe and have the potential to deal with an ambient space, with leaks in the manholes, which he has experienced before, or should a new sewer line be installed. He noted that it should not depend on what CET wants to do, it is what makes the most sense in the long term. He noted when it is found that the new pipe has lasted for 50 years and is not leaking, then it proves that it was a better solution, and when the area is restored and it looks like it does now, that is the best way to go. He noted that it is not a question of where the best place to line is, but the end result would only provide for a repair as opposed to replacement. He noted that the real question is does it make more economic sense to line it and potentially, have to come back, or when the cost difference is not much different, then replacement should be done. Mr. Weaver noted that each design takes roughly six months to study the research the utilities and all the different options to be considered.

Mr. Bates noted that he would like some type of answer for his pool. Mr. Stine noted that it was mentioned that someone would be coming out to look at it on site. Mr. Bates questioned how far he would dig. Mr. Weaver answered that he had no idea, noting that he would have the engineer, Mr Wampler, meet with him on the site. He noted that is why he always holds public meetings and will come out to meet with the homeowners. He noted that he cannot answer Mr. Bates' questions at this time. Mr. Bates questioned who would be responsible for his pool. Mr. Stine suggested that Mr. Bates should wait to see what he finds out in talking with the engineer before moving to step three. He noted that they will look at everything and it may not be an issue.

Mr. Hawk noted that he would feel more comfortable to have someone meet Mr. Bates to look at the property and discuss your concerns then trying to make a blind decision.

Mr. Weaver noted that CET has been doing this kind of work for a long time, and the Authority has been doing it for a long time, and he knows that it is hard for the public to trust the Township.

A question was asked if the pipe was going down the middle of the wetlands. Mr. Weaver answered yes.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Weaver will make arrangements to meet with Mr. Bates.

Mr. Hornung questioned Mr. Weaver if he would look at the amount of disturbance that would be needed for the day lilies. He noted that usually they acquire a 30-foot easement but it may not be necessary for this project. He noted in the past, there have been means to get around the 30-foot easement by working at different angles. Mr. Weaver noted that he would take a look at that.

Review of Building Sewer Replacement options at 4010 McIntosh Road

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Richard Pleasants is present to discuss this issue for a building sewer. He noted that Mr. Pleasants lives at 4010 McIntosh Road and when the Authority began to replace the sewer at Mr. Pleasants property they found some issues with contamination. He noted that Mr. Pleasants' property had an environmental assessment done, that he provided to the Authority when they found contamination. He noted that when the contractor started to dig they came upon odors and stopped due to safety concerns. He noted that he met with CET at that time and they did a Environmental Due Diligence, a service called EDR, that is done online, and they did not pick up on this one. He noted that most of the concerns involve gasoline stations and items like that. He noted that CET met with DEP and found out more information noting that the Township had some knowledge of the site. He noted he met with Mr. Pleasants and indicated the Authority's concern with proceeding with the sewer replacement until he had more information and questioned if Mr. Pleasants was aware of any contamination reports or information from the State that would allow the contractor to continue the work. He noted that Mr. Pleasants provided the report to the Authority and he met with DEP to develop a procedure, noting that there was nothing in the contract, and it got to be very

complicated because of the past history with the site. He noted that he presented an option to Mr. Wolfe that he wants to present to the Board.

Mr. Weaver noted one option would be to provide Mr. Pleasants the money to do the work himself, so there would be no liability on the behalf of the contractor or Township. He noted that 15 years ago, for the Colonial Crest project, he made a recommendation that allowed Dr. Crissman to replace his own sewer. He noted that a homeowner has been reimbursed in the past for the replacement of the sewer. He noted that it would save time to allow staff and the engineer to work along with Mr. Pleasants and DEP, noting that Mr. Pleasants could work directly with DEP and do the replacement himself. He noted that Mr. Pleasants is hearing this for the first time tonight as it is the Board's decision to make.

Mr. Weaver noted that the other two recommendations are to do nothing or to replace the line with DEP's guidance.

Mr. Wolfe noted that this is the first property in the Township where this issue was brought up. He noted that the Authority is not equipped to do this kind of work. Mr. Weaver noted that he would recommend that the Township replace or install sewer in this situation. He noted that he has provided payment to the property owner in the past to do the replacement himself and once it was done the Authority provided payment according to the bid prices. He noted that precedent could be used for this job. He noted that it is a building sewer process and the Authority is under no obligation to replace any individual sewer in the Township. Mr. Hawk noted if the Authority takes that approach there, there is a figure of \$19,000 that Mr. Pleasants would agree to as a predetermined number. Mr. Seeds questioned who came up with that number. Mr. Weaver explained that the inspector took measurements and used the contracting prices. Mr. Weaver noted that the difference between this and what Mr. Hawk is suggesting is that we pay Mr. Pleasants what we would pay the contractor and not allow him to get his own prices since it would not match the Authorities price as it is based upon a competitive bid due to the volume of work. He noted that Mr. Pleasants may be able to do it cheaper than \$19,000, noting that he would recommend paying up to that amount.

Mr. Pleasants noted that he has been back and forth about this issue and he noted that the property has undergone extensive testing and he thinks it would be the ideal way to handle it under these circumstances. He noted that he would deal with DEP, as he has tested the soil and there is no issue, and if it becomes an issue DEP would be involved. He noted that there has been thousands of dollars invested in the study for this property but the unit pricing that Liberty Excavators provided is bare bones. He noted that they are parked on his property and they don't want to pay anything to use the property. He noted that the Township appears to be getting the best prices at this time.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Liberty Excavators is leasing or renting land from Mr. Pleasants. Mr. Pleasants answered yes for a small sum. Mr. Seeds questioned what kind of sewer is located at that location. Mr. Pleasants noted that it is a caste iron pipe and it was full of ground water. He noted that the ground water seeping has now stopped.

Mr. Eric Epstein noted that he would disagree. He noted that the actual remediation is totally voluntary, noting they get to choose the constituents that they want to remove. He noted that it is an arbitrary process. He noted that he litigated the case and he would suggest the Board look at page eight of the decision. He noted that it states, "The parties given wide latitude in picking the scope of the liability release that it wishes to obtain. By the same token, release from future clean up liability that accompanies the Departments approval, our file of report only extends to the area immediate and contaminants that the mediating parties select identified in the report." He noted on the next page it states, "Our liability release based on a non-residential standard does not release liability associated with residential use. An actual release does not preempt, supersede, or nullify any land development requirement." Furthermore it states in Section 505 Act 2 that it allows the Department to reopen a filed report approval to require a person to undertake additional remediation action limited in defined circumstances, including a case where there is a substantial change in exposure conditions. He noted that what he is point out to the Board is that DEP never accepted the fact that there would be a residential development built around this donut hole. He noted that he was in the middle of negotiations for Stray Winds Farm, where there is going to be residential development, noting that south of Mr. Pleasants parcel will be a recreational park. He noted that there may be disturbance, and he questioned how a private entity can construct a sewer where there is potential liability issue with hazardous waste.

Mr. Epstein noted that he is happy to let people see the record. He noted that the land is cleaned up for a commercial level but not for a residential level. He noted that no one is arguing that it is a pristine site, it is not. He noted when you start physically disturbing the soil, you are taking a risk, and he noted that it is not a risk he wants the Township to take and he is not comfortable with someone who has a personal stake in the outcome doing it either. He noted that we do not know what he outcome is going to be.

Mr. Pleasants noted that he is more than happy to have the engineers who did the report discuss it. He noted that a report has been filed with DEP and they tested everything and the report speaks for itself. He noted that they approved the piece of the property. He noted that 40 or 50 holes were punched in the area. He noted that Mr. Epstein has an issue with this property, and he appealed DEP's approval and DEP stated that this is the first time DEP ever had an approval appealed. He noted that they went to an arbitration board and Mr. Epstein's appeal was overturn and the property was released based upon the report that speaks for itself. He noted that anything he does on the property is regulated by DEP. He noted if there is any issue with contamination, DEP will be involved and the soils that were tested meet all the requirements that were spelled out in the report. He noted if there are any questionable soils that are found when the trenching occurs, they will be tested and checked with DEP. He noted that the sewer has to be replaced and this is above the costs to do that. He noted that anything he does to replace the sewer is an improvement since the ground water was infiltrating the old sanitary sewer. He noted that DEP is clearly involved in this case.

Mr. Epstein noted that is factually incorrect noting that the transcript for the hearing state, when he asked the DEP geologist, are you going to oversee this, they said no. He noted this is the most important quote from the decision, "the final report in no way subverts and usurps the local municipalities ability to enforce zoning regulations and control land use." He noted that is

one of the arguments that he made. He noted that there is contamination on the property, you are able to pick and choose which contamination you will remove, and it is only cleaned up to a commercial standard and not a residential standard. He noted to say that the land is pristine, or received a free release is incorrect. He noted, in the transcript from the hearing, he cross examined two people and asked them if they would be out on site and monitor the development of the site and they said no. Mr. Epstein noted that he would have to report to DEP that something is occurring at the site. He noted that it is a matter of record.

Mr. Pleasants noted that the transcript is clear and he did not know what Mr. Epstein was reading from. Mr. Epstein answered that he was reading from the decision. He noted that he has copies for everyone to read. He noted the bottom line is that he lives there and you don't.

Mr. Weaver noted that this is a sewer issue and he questioned what Mr. Epstein's concern was with having Mr. Pleasants or anyone replacing a sewer line. Mr. Epstein answered that there are still contaminants there and when someone disturbs the soil they are disturbing the contaminants. He noted that the sedimentation in the creek was never monitored. He noted that 400 homes will be built around this zone, and 100 feet south of the creek, a recreation park will be placed. He noted that he is concerned that people may come into contact with contaminants when the land is physically disturbed. He noted if you review DEP's report there is a host of contaminants that are still there, some are contained and some have been removed. He noted that the initial strategy was to reduce it to residential level but it is still at a commercial level, a commercial site, the water and sediment has never been tested, and you may allow someone who has a financial interest in the outcome to clean it up, and it may not be a safe site at the end of the day.

Mr. Weaver noted that he is discussing a 20 foot easement that could be disturbed. He noted that he met with DEP and they had indicated to him that they would recommend having a meeting with the owner where they would require that the soil that is removed be disposed at a landfill. He noted, in that case, it would actually improve the condition from what is there now as it would take the contaminants away. Mr. Seeds questioned who would pay for that. Mr. Pleasants stated that it would be his responsibility. He noted that the sewer depth is only about 2.5 feet deep. He noted that the contractor was digging a 36 inch trench and he was only doing a 12 to 14 inch trench. He suggested the less disturbance the better. He noted that he will meet with DEP and review what they require, noting that they are very clear that if the soil is tested it can stay on site, be capped off, or removed. He noted that capped off would mean paving over it. He noted that the bottom line is that DEP would be involved and the majority of the site does meet residential standards, but there are a couple of areas that do not, one or two bore holes, not the entire site.

Mr. Weaver suggested that he should meet with DEP and the owner and come up with some guidelines that could be reported back to the Board. He noted that he could advise the Board what DEP would require if we decide to authorize the replacement of the sewer by way of reimbursement. He noted that he does not have any knowledge of what DEP would recommend. He noted that he met with them initially at which time they provided some thoughts, but he had no formal letter from them of what would be required, so it is hard to determine at this time what should be done.

Mr. Crissman noted that it appears that a meeting with DEP is going to assure the monitoring of the situation prior to the Board's approval and he would insist that any ground that is disturbed be removed from the site for total protection. Mr. Weaver noted that he could recommend that nothing be done because DEP may not want to be involved or proceed with the work. Mr. Crissman noted that is why you need to have DEP involved in the process, that way it is documented by DEP every step of the way.

Mr. Pleasants noted that the sewer will have to be replaced one way or the other and the Township will inspect it and make sure the cleanout is properly installed. He noted that it has all been disconnected and they have already started the process. He noted that his property is currently disconnected and he has no sewer service. He noted that the rest of the pipe will be replaced, and he has a right to replace it with the Township's approval as well as with DEP's involvement if there is an issue of any contamination that are identified. He noted that he does not want to sit here and generalize because Mr. Epstein has gone through an extensive DEP appeal. He noted that DEP can provide what was addressed noting that Mr. Epstein's concerns were put out there time and time again and addressed. Mr. Epstein noted that his concerns were not addressed.

Mr. Crissman noted that he specifically recommends that before the Authority goes any further with this that DEP document every step along the way. He noted that he will reserve his vote until he gets DEP's approval and their recommendation and that will be relayed by Mr. Weaver. Mr. Seeds questioned what will DEP require, soil removal and who will pay for it. He noted, in the meantime, Mr. Pleasants does not have any sewer service. Mr. Crissman noted that everyone knows what we need from DEP.

Review status of Second Consent Decree mini-basin construction projects

Mr. Weaver noted that he would like to provide an update of the work for each mini-basin and would also like to make the Board aware of some other issues. He noted that the first concern is staffing issues. He explained that he met with Mr. Wolfe and Mr. Hogentogler last week and after reviewing the mini-basin work that needs to be done, it was found that there is a shortfall in the inspection needs. He noted that one contractor brought in a significant amount of crews. He noted that due to the workload, he will have to limit the number of crews a contractor can bring to do the job. He noted that there was never a need to discuss this before. He noted that CET built a schedule and it was based on so many linear feet to be completed per day based on so many crews. He never anticipated a contractor hiring five crews to complete a job. Mr. Wendle noted that the schedule was based upon the prior contractors work and allowing for bad weather. He noted that he does not specify how many crews are allowed, and additional crews could impact the price.

Mr. Shannon noted that it could be made up by providing more time to do the work, but it is kind of a trade off. Mr. Weaver noted the issue is partly due to the extra work for the Asylum Run and the Spring Creek projects. He explained that he had modeling data to show overflows and he needed this replacement work to be done. He noted that he had a maintenance work scheduled for the Beaver Creek basin but not the amount of work that is now known to be

needed. He noted that he will need to hire more inspectors, and the overhead costs would be much higher if he hires CET, noting that their costs are \$60 to \$70 per hour and Authority costs would be around \$45. He noted, in the long run, it may make more sense to meet these needs internally although Mr. Wendle has pointed out if CET can staff a person for a full year without overhead issues on billable time then he would be able to reduce the hourly rate. He noted that he has not put a formal proposal together yet but he would look at it, noting that this person would be dedicated to the Township for an entire year, and their hourly rate could be reduced since they would have no billable time.

Mr. Seeds noted that things will change when DEP approves the amendment to the Second Consent Decree for the Beaver Creek area. He noted that is why the Authority is letting more contracts for work. Mr. Weaver noted that it will be more intense work. Mr. Seeds noted that the Authority is looking at years and years of needing more help. He noted, for him it is a concern of how it could be done less expensively, either in-house or using by CET. Mr. Wendle noted that there have been times when the Authority was unable to find qualified people to hire as inspectors. He noted that CET can do what the Authority needs, but in order for him to reduce his costs he would need a commitment that this person would work that schedule for a year and then he would separate his salary accordingly to reflect that plan. Mr. Seeds noted that CET would not want to hire more people unless they are guaranteed the work. Mr. Wendle agreed.

Mr. Hornung questioned what kind of economic climate do you foresee, questioning if you see contractor rates going up, staying the same or decreasing, especially since many States are in dire financial trouble and may cut back. He questioned if you foresee the Authority to be in a better position or a worse position. Mr. Wendle questioned in terms of construction costs. Mr. Blain suggested that the costs will continue to stay down since contractors are still hungry for work, and work is expected to grow in 2011, but it is not going to have a 30% growth. He suggested that the costs will continue to be compressed, noting that the only risk that the Authority would run at this time would be that the cost of material could rise. He suggested that contractors will continue to bid with tight margins since they want to keep their people busy.

Mr. Hornung questioned how many contracts have been let already that will bring in extra crews. Mr. Weaver noted that all the contracts are listed and each could bring in extra crews, but they probably won't. He noted that Liberty Excavators was the only one, noting that they fired their project manager early on because they had no supervision. He noted that they were only doing 70 feet per day of mainline sewer and they were losing money. Mr. Hornung questioned if there are any contracts that the Authority could hold off on for now to try to span out the work, rather than hire inspectors. He noted that there is no urgency to get the work done. Mr. Stine noted that there is a schedule with DEP. Mr. Wolfe noted that there is also a draw down schedule in funds. Mr. Blain noted that is the biggest issue since the Authority is not drawing down the funds fast enough. Mr. Weaver noted that he will be bringing the Beaver Creek issue to the Board in the future. He noted that it will take months of studying how to factor in the mini-basins, for staffing needs, and what needs to be done from an engineering standpoint. He noted that some adjustments could be made that would save hiring one person. Mr. Hornung noted if someone was going to retire, that replacement person could be hired one year early, and they could be doing inspecting work until the employee retires and then put them into that spot. Mr. Wolfe explained that the Authority has asked retirees to work part-time

during busy periods and that has worked well also. He noted that he has contacted temporary hiring agencies and that has not worked. He noted that there have been a lot of issues in the field for the engineers who will have to go back to the drawing board due to difficulties with utilities.

Mr. Hornung questioned, if the Authority does not draw the money down, what are the consequences. Mr. Wolfe noted for the non-taxables, you could lose your tax exempt status. He noted that Mr. Smida has been in discussion with staff on this issue and he needs to investigate this, but he needs a schedule to determine this.

Review of draft Second Beaver Creek Correction Action Plan
and new payout schedule for Build America Bonds funding

Mr. Weaver noted that staff asked this question of Mr. Smida and CET prepared this schedule in terms of stretching the limit of how far the Authority could take it. He noted in BC/3A, 4C, 4A, those projects are going to have to happen relatively quickly, but he noted that Mr. Smida set up a line of demarcation that the projects must be under contract. Mr. Wendle questioned how far the projects could be stretched out and Mr. Smida indicated that they must be under contract by the end of 2014, within the five years of the borrowing. Mr. Weaver noted that he tried to push it out to the tail end of the payout schedule for November 14 and January 15, noting that there are some projects that run into this time period that could provide some time trying not to spend the money within two or three years. Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Wendle has some concerns and he put into the packet a copy of a letter that he proposed to send to Mr. Smida but he wanted to get the Board's blessing before he does. He noted that this has never been presented to the Board before.

Mr. Hornung questioned if there was a way, noting that the economic conditions have changed, to ask DEP to slow the process down a little due to the economic conditions. He questioned if this has been done. Mr. Weaver noted that DEP was not interested in slowing down the Corrective Action Plan since it was approved by the courts. He noted that it is not an open issue for Paxton Creek; however, for Beaver Creek it has to be negotiated. Mr. Hornung noted that the Authority has speeded up the projects due to the economic conditions, to do bidding, but he does not want to keep up the accelerated pace, noting that he would like to slow it down like it used to be. He noted that he has no interest in getting the jobs done faster than what was demanded by the Authority.

Mr. Wendle noted that the Paxton Creek Plan consent plan order is DEP approved and it is fixed. Mr. Hornung noted that the Authority accelerated the plan. Mr. Wendle stated that the Authority is pretty much on schedule. Mr. Wolfe noted that the ARA Basin was included in the work, but it was not included in the plan. He noted that the Authority has done some projects that did not have to be done because it was a favorable bidding climate. Mr. Wendle noted that is true except for SC/1E noting that it is in the Spring Creek basin and it was part of the original consent order. He noted that Mr. Smida's concern is that the Authority borrowed \$43 million in 2009 and there was a legitimate payout schedule to have the money spent in five years. He noted that \$23 million was for the interceptor improvements and wet weather treatment plant. He noted that he has identified \$14 million for parts of the PENNVEST projects that they would not pay for, such as building sewers, service laterals, and additional paving that was required. He noted that the

SC1E basin was not planned, and BC6 had a huge area of I&I that has been identified. He noted that there is another \$9 million left unspent, and since some of the projects have come in less than estimated, they are trying to spend those funds in that time frame in order that the Township does not lose its tax exempt status, so accelerating Paxton Creek or Beaver Creek to get those funds expended in that time frame made sense. He noted the issue that has not been resolved, given the last court finding about the zoning in South Hanover Township, is will the Authority pursue the Wet Weather Treatment Plant anymore or is it a dead issue. He noted that the Authority needs to go back to DEP and come up with a plan for Beaver Creek now that we will not be building the Wet Weather Treatment Plant. Mr. Hornung noted that DEP has not said that the Authority does not have to build the plant. He noted that he would not want to spend the plant funds on other projects only to find out that DEP still wants the Township to build the plant. He noted that he would rather put the funds in areas for projects that need to be done anyways. Mr. Wendle noted that the \$14 million is for projects that need to be done anyways. Mr. Weaver noted that DEP told the Township that it does not have to build the plant, providing a draft consent decree that has not been approved yet. He noted that they would rather have the Township replace the current sewer lines. Mr. Hornung questioned if this is an approved consent decree. Mr. Weaver noted that this has not even been discussed with the Board yet. He noted that DEP has only came up with a draft document, noting that they were so excited that the Authority may come up with another plan, that they already provided a draft consent decree. Mr. Stine noted that it removes the treatment plant from the plan.

Mr. Hornung questioned, with the recent purchase of additional capacity from Swatara Township, the elimination of building a treatment plant, and doing remediation, will the Authority get full bail out. Mr. Wendle questioned, if that eliminated the building of storage, he did not think it would occur. He noted that there is one option, with the additional peak flow capacity; you may decide to pump it down to Swatara Township and let it go to the plant. He suggested that it may be cheaper than having to run storage facilities. He noted that there are two strategies to do what you want to accomplish, the first would be to go to DEP for a new plan for Beaver Creek, noting that we would accelerate everything to spend the money that was borrowed so the Authority does not lose its tax exempt status. He noted that it is his understanding that this is what everyone wants to do. He noted then you could provide DEP a Beaver Creek plan that is drawn out over 20 years, and move at a pace that is appropriate. He noted that DEP could approve a long-term plan similar to what they approved for Paxton Creek. Mr. Hornung noted if the Authority does this it will definitely need more inspectors. Mr. Weaver noted that CET can be very creative in its schedules. Mr. Wendle noted, in the past for Paxton Creek we were metering by mini-basins, but for Beaver Creek the metering was only done by basin, so the only place that has been identified for all the work that needs to be done is BC6. He noted that part of the corrective action plan after BC6 is completed, is that there are other basins that need to be done. Mr. Alton Whittle noted out of the 11 mini-basins in Beaver Creek, seven have been metered since 1999 or earlier. He noted that we have a good idea of which mini-basins are the highest. He noted that the top three have had some mini-basin metering, and that is why he picked BC6, C and A to do for the original project. He noted that BC4, C, A, and BC3A have all been identified as they were the top three mini-basins that were metered. He noted that five mini-basins need to have work done on them. Mr. Hornung questioned what kind of pipes are in those mini-basins. Mr. Wendle noted that it is a mix of PVC, asbestos cement, and clay. Mr. Wendle noted that part of the Beaver Creek plan, would be metering and modeling because it

was never done. He noted that it was proposed to meter and model the basin, noting that he would push that back.

Mr. Hornung questioned what Mr. Wendle would do with the \$9 million. Mr. Wendle answered that he would accelerate Paxton Creek since it is already approved as long as Mr. Smida says it is okay to do this. Mr. Hornung noted that he would take the money that was to be used in Paxton Creek and put it in the Beaver Creek basin. Mr. Weaver noted that when he was meeting with CET to present a payout schedule he did ask them to consider Beaver Creek first since DEP will want to see that and so will STA. He noted that nothing has been done in Beaver Creek so he does not want them coming back to LPTA with a shotgun to shoot through the plan. He noted that he wants to show them that we are looking at Beaver Creek. He noted if LPTA was going to build a plant, we would have needed to have hired an operator, so the inspector would take the place of hiring an operator. He suggested that the new discussion would be hiring an inspector to oversee the sewer replacements, noting that we are talking about the same thing.

Mr. Wendle noted that Ms. Reese mentioned that Mr. Smida wants to tweak the language for the letter a little, but he feels very comfortable in allocating the Build America Bonds (BAB) funds for Paxton Creek and Beaver Creek in terms of how it relates to the Second Consent Decree. He noted that he has an issue with the order to recommend that the BABs be used for more than BC6. He stated that he wants to see a third consent decree or whatever the new consent decree is so he can say that all of the funds are being spent on consent decrees. He noted that you have to accelerate the Paxton Creek work until we can get all of those approvals with DEP so that Mr. Smida feels comfortable in saying this is an appropriate use of the BAB Funds. Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Wendle want to point out in his letter to be more general so that the funds could be used almost anywhere.

Mr. Hornung noted that he gets nervous when he hears government saying that it needs to spend the money. He noted that you need to justify this to him. Mr. Wendle noted that it is funds that would be spent anyway and you have the money and you are paying interest on it. Mr. Hornung noted that the faster you accelerate the spending, the faster you accelerate raising the fees, and we are not in an environment right now where raising sewer fees is an attractive thing to do. He noted that he would try to push this as far back as we can to try to stop doing that. He noted that we are not coming out of this economic environment in the next couple of years. Mr. Weaver noted that you can only decelerate so slowly or Mr. Wendle will tell you that you will not hit your target. Mr. Hornung noted that he understands that but he is not as worried about his target noting that there are consequences for every decision made. He noted that he is very concern about sewer fees, noting that it is a balancing act. He noted that many things enter into the decision, and one is the raising of sewer fees. Mr. Weaver noted that it is a huge concern of his as he has received many phone calls about the rising sewer rates. He noted that staff and the engineer are so overtaxed at this time, and it is a miracle that we have not experienced rooms filled with people attending meetings due to the amount of construction that is ongoing in the Township. He noted that he is receiving hundreds of complaints from the public and we are getting by, but if we keep adding on all this work there will be a point where there is only so much that you can do. He noted that you would not receive any argument from staff for decelerating the projects and working as long as we can do it legally. Mr. Hornung noted that he

wants to decelerate the work as much as possible without losing the tax status on the loan and he wants to get as close to completing that.

Mr. Wendle noted that Mr. Smida stated that you don't have to spend the funds by 2014, but they have to be under contract by that time. Mr. Wendle noted that his plan shows the projects being under contract by 2014.

Mr. Weaver explained that there are two targets, the first being overflows and the other overloads. He noted if we can get to the one target and the other long-term, DEP would be satisfied. He noted that much of this discussion would be dependent on the modeling to be done by Mr. Wendle which is an unknown at this time. Mr. Crissman questioned if the Board needs to meet with Mr. Smida as part of this discussion, noting that he may have additional considerations, or has he exhausted his ideas to meet the goal. Mr. Weaver suggested that he has come up with all the solutions that he can. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board will be meeting with Mr. Smida when we figure out what the Beaver Creek component of the plan is, and what the ultimate draw down on the funds would be. Mr. Crissman noted when we meet again, and everyone brings their expertise to the meeting, then we can see what works best. Mr. Wendle noted that he is looking for a consensus from the Authority that we will not build the Wet Weather Treatment Plant so we need to come up with another plan. He noted that no official action has been taken by the Authority to come up with another plan. Mr. Wolfe noted that we have not yet done that and up until two months ago, the Authority was still thinking about building a plant. He noted that it is a large program, and to get it going in a new direction in one half of the Township will take some time.

Mr. Wendle noted that he would like to be able to send a letter to Mr. Smida, with his tweaking, saying that it is his understanding that we will not build the plant. Mr. Crissman noted that it is an option for the Board to review, so why stop the process. He noted that the letter needs to be sent to gather data to make good decisions. Mr. Weaver noted that the ultimate decision would be made by the Township when Mr. Smida makes an amended ordinance to submit to the Local Government Unit. He noted that the Supervisors will vote for the ordinance and the Authority must pledge the revenues. Mr. Wolfe noted that it is a Township bond.

Mr. Blain noted that proceeds are sitting in escrow for the bonds, so we are already paying the interest on the bonds. Mr. Stine noted that you are paying interest on the bonds. Mr. Blain noted that the majority of the money is in bonds that we have the proceeds that are sitting in escrow, paying the interest on the money. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township is not earning what it is paying out. Mr. Blain noted when you discuss the option of decelerating the process, he would argue that you would want to accelerate the process, because you know you can get good construction rates to do the work now, and use your money more efficiently, doing more work with less money. He noted that you are not getting the interest for the money that is sitting in escrow. Mr. Blain noted that Mr. Hornung argues that this will impact sewer rates, but this has already been factored in. Mr. Blain noted if you push off the work, the material costs will increase, labor costs will increase, and it will cost you more. He noted that you would spend more of your future dollars versus today's dollars. He noted that you could bid all the projects out doing the boatload of construction work and the costs would not change all that much. He suggested that you could do more work. He noted that the only cost that LPTA would incur is

paying for more inspectors. Mr. Wolfe noted that the up front dollars for any single point in time would be greater, but your long-term expenditure could be less. Mr. Hawk questioned what would you do with the excess. Mr. Wolfe answered that you would not borrow as much in the future. Mr. Blain noted that Mr. Hornung is worried about rates in the future but decelerating work does not make sense as we already know what the rates will be in the future because we have a level debt service. He noted that we know what we will be paying every year in order to better establish what the rates will be. Mr. Stine noted that the debt service schedule is already established.

Mr. Hornung questioned how much interest LPTA is losing now. Mr. Blain noted that the interest rate is less than one percent. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it is around 3%. Mr. Wendle noted, originally in the schedule, he had anticipated another borrowing in 2014, but if prices continue to come in 20% lower than what was originally estimated, in terms of impacting rates, you will be able to do more in the beginning, and reduce the amount of borrowing that had to be done in 2014 or you may not have to borrow until 2016, and that would have a positive affect on rates. Mr. Wolfe noted that contractors are working for cash flow, not for profit at this time. Mr. Weaver noted that LPTA received low interest funds, and low costs for construction, so at this time we hit the jackpot. Mr. Crissman noted that he likes Mr. Wendle's comment that we may not have to borrow in 2014. Mr. Blain noted that rate increases were factored in each year; however, we may be able to change some of those rate increases.

Authority Accounts Balance

Mr. Weaver noted that the Authority's Account balance is \$40 million. Mr. Wolfe noted that this information will be available soon in the year-end Key Indicator Report and the First Quarter Key Indicator Report.

Mr. Hornung questioned which basin did not go right. Mr. Wendle noted that it was the Spring Creek basin. Mr. Wolfe noted that we did two Spring Creek basins and thought that would solve the problem at the restrictor, but now, based upon modeling, we know we haven't completely solved the problem and selected another Spring Creek basin to do. Mr. Seeds questioned what the conditions down stream from there are. Mr. Wendle answered that they had some overflows that occurred in SC/1E up stream. He noted that Mr. Whittle modeled it. He noted that he thought that it was a back up from the restrictor but it was determined that it was not backed up and there was free flow, but then there were some blockages with grease in the lines, and the line was cleaned out. He noted that it made some improvements but we still have an issue. He suggested that the restrictor could be removed as we will not exceed what STA says it can take because our overflows are in SC/1E. He noted that the overflows don't even get to the restrictor. Mr. Seeds questioned if STA will buy into that. He questioned if they wanted DEP to hold them harmless. Mr. Whittle noted that they wanted DEP not to restrict their number of planning modules. He noted that STA showed DEP that with the flows that we are giving them they should not have overflows, but some minor surcharging. Mr. Seeds questioned if LPTA would be removing the restrictor. Mr. Weaver noted that it will be bid under the SC/1E project. Mr. Hornung questioned why we would remove the restrictor if we don't need to do that. Mr. Wendle answered that there are overflows caused by the restrictor, even when you don't get your allowed flow. Mr. Hornung questioned if this negotiation has to be coordinated with the other

negotiations. Mr. Wendle suggested that STA has already agreed to this. He noted that they did modeling that showed that we can remove it.

Engineer's Report

Hankin Easement

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Stine needs to have an answer if the Authority wants to pursue the Hankin easement. Mr. Stine noted that the developers for the Rosewood project no longer want to pursue the easement, and Mr. Weaver questioned if it would be good for the Authority to have that easement. Mr. Weaver noted that he originally proposed the idea to Micki Molonari and Barb Greenberg because it would provide for a deeper sewer down Earl Drive and longer pipe to service their development. He noted they are now looking for creative ideas of how to sewer their property. He noted that he asked Mr. Stine if he thinks that there could be a way to do it inexpensively, to acquire the easement since it could save the Authority money. He questioned if the Board wanted Mr. Stine to pursue this idea. Mr. Seeds questioned if it would save the Authority money. Mr. Weaver answered that it would not save money today but 50 years from now it will. He noted that it would provide for one gravity sewer line service for two developments and if you don't do that, you will have two sewer lines to service two different developments. He noted that it would mean installing 20% to 30% more pipe and more costs for maintenance in the future. He noted in order to do that the Authority would have to cross someone's property. Mr. Crissman questioned if it was cheaper to go across the Hankin property than to go the other way. Mr. Weaver answered that it would be cheaper for the developer and for the Authority to replace it in 50 years. Mr. Crissman noted that we need to think about the future and it is very difficult to deal with Mr. Hankin. Mr. Stine noted that he could pose the question to Mr. Hankin. He explained that his attorney emails him all the time. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it is worth having Mr. Stine pose the question.

Mr. Weaver noted that he had some sewer replacement problems that he will have to deal with over the next 20 to 30 years. He noted that Mr. Robbins pointed out to him that LPTA made a mess of their public roads and we adjusted the contracts, informing the contractors to stay off Earl Drive and certain roads in the winter. He noted the same goes for the utilities, noting that he met with United Water PA today and he is having a hard time working with them. He noted that they had the idea that it is the Township's problem that they placed the water line on top of the sewer line and now the Township needs to solve the problem since we are replacing the sewer lines. He noted that he is educating United Water PA that it is not LPTA's problem, noting that they need to find their water lines. He noted that half the time, they don't know where their water lines are.

Mr. Weaver explained that he will recommend not replacing sewers in apartment complexes again. He noted the two biggest issues at staff level have been street issues, paving issues, and utilities issues.

Mr. Weaver noted that he will have more information at the next meeting noting that many discussions have been ongoing, in terms of the cost of paving and how we can operate the road system with Mr. Robbins and how projects are designed. He noted that it is becoming a major headache for staff to deal with the utilities. He noted that he would like to work with them as a team, and he found that the PA One Call Act is what LPTA needs to live by. He noted that

there is nothing else. He suggested that he would recommend that the Township owns the streets and acts like PENNDOT, noting if someone wants to put a utility in the street, we would tell them where it should be located.

Mr. Crissman questioned when Earl Drive will be paved. Mr. Wolfe answered that the earliest that they could start the work would be April. Mr. Weaver suggested to Mr. Steve Fleming that it may be better for LPTA to add in a bid alternate for paving since they normally have 15 contractors bidding for sewer replacements projects. He noted that Mr. Robbins does not get that many bidders for a paving job. He noted that since there is so much paving to be done as a result of the sewer projects, he suggested that it is still better to do it under the Township umbrella since they would get more competitive bidding this spring.

Solicitor's Report

Mr. Stine noted he had nothing to report.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Blain made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen A. Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by:

Gary A. Crissman
Authority Secretary