

**LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP AUTHORITY  
RE-ORGANIZATIONAL and BUSINESS MEETING  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2013**

**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; Mark Hilson, Authority Engineer; Jim Wetzel, Authority Operations Manager; Jeff Wendle, Alton Whittle, and Jodi Reese, CET Engineering Services; and Watson Fisher, SWAN.

**Pledge of Allegiance**

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

**Election of Chairman of the Board**

Mr. Stine questioned if anyone wanted to make a nomination for the position of Chairman. Mr. Blain made a motion to nominate William C. Seeds Sr., as Chairman of the Authority Board. The nomination was seconded by Mr. Crissman. The nomination was closed and an unanimous vote to approve William C. Seeds, Sr. as Chairman of the Lower Paxton Township Sewer Authority followed.

**Election of Vice Chairman**

Mr. Blain made a motion to nominate Gary Crissman as Vice Chairman. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

**Election of Secretary**

Mr. Blain made a motion to nominate William L. Hornung as Secretary. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

**Election of Assistant Secretary**

Mr. Blain made a motion to nominate William B. Hawk as Assistant Secretary. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

**Election of Treasurer**

Mr. Blain made a motion to nominate himself, David B. Blain as Treasurer. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

**Appointment of Solicitor**

Mr. Blain made a motion to appoint the Law Offices of Steven Stine as Authority Solicitor. Mr. Seeds seconded the motion, and a unanimous vote followed.

**Appointment of Engineer**

Mr. Blain made a motion to appoint GHD - CET Engineering Services, Inc. as Authority Engineer. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

**Approval of Authority Engineer's Management Agreement**

Mr. Blain questioned if the annual fee for the Engineering Agreement with GHD-CET Engineering Services, Inc. is \$21,000. Mr. Wendle answered that it is the same as last year as it went from \$20,000 to \$21,000, due to some developer work, but other than that it has been the same rate since 2008. Mr. Blain questioned about the hourly fees. Mr. Wendle answered that the hourly fee structure increased for the people working for the Township from 2.8% to 3%. Mr. Blain noted that they are close to HRG Engineer's rate. Mr. Seeds suggested that they are a little lower. Mr. Blain made a motion to approve the retainer contract with GHD - CET Engineering Services, Inc. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion, and a unanimous vote followed.

**Establishment of Regular Meeting Schedule for Authority Board Meetings**

Mr. Blain 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. Crissman seconded the motion, and a unanimous vote followed.

## **BUSINESS MEETING**

### **Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 5, 2013 business meeting. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

### **Public Comment**

No public comment was presented.

### **Chairman/Board Member Comments**

No Board member comments were provided.

### **Old Business**

There was no old business.

### **New Business**

#### Action on Resolution 13-03-01 through 13-03-05 authorizing condemnations for properties in the BC6A/B/C Mini-Basin Project

Mr. Weaver explained that Resolutions 13-03 -01 through 13-03-05 authorizes the condemnation of properties for the BC 6 project. He noted that he included the list of the original 22 easements sent out a few weeks ago. He explained that this represents additional work recommended by CET that runs through the Wilshire Estates area and Queen Avenue. He noted that five property owners have not signed and he requests that the Board approve these resolutions in the event staff is unable to secure the necessary easements.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve Resolution 13-03-01 through 13-03-05, authorizing the condemnation for the properties identified in the BC6 mini-basin project. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

#### Action on MunicIPAY Merchant Application and Agreement

Mr. Weaver noted that he included a merchant application processing agreement and check-by-web merchant application by MunicIPAY in the packet. He noted that both documents

are recommended by staff after reviewing several presentations made over time showing staff that MunicIPAY can process credit card payments and electronic check payments at a lower cost to Authority customers. He noted that Official Payments charges \$3.75 per credit card transaction and MunicIPAY charges 2.45% which equals \$3.00. He noted, for the check by web, the fee for Official Payments is \$3.00 and for MunicIPAY it is \$1.50. He noted that only 400 customers use the service however he hopes to secure more use over time. He recommends that the Board approve the change to MunicIPAY with the condition that Mr. Stine has for each agreement. He noted, for the Merchants Agreement, they must delete the State of New York and replace it with the State of Pennsylvania and for the check-by web; they must delete the State of Florida and replace it with the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the Board is approving the application and agreement or just one. Mr. Weaver answered both. He noted that the application is for the credit card processing attached to the agreement and it only covers the credit card agreement; however, there is a separate agreement for the check-by-web. Mr. Crissman noted that they are two separate documents.

Mr. Hornung questioned if they have ever had a compromised credit card situation. Mr. Weaver answered that he had not heard of any, and he checked their references because Official Payments has a lot of customers and they are very big and he never had any problems with them. He noted that he checked the references and found that they service quite a few county tax collection agencies and medical institutions and he has not heard of any breaches in their system.

Mr. Seeds noted that it saves the customer money. Mr. Weaver noted that it is a substantial savings for the 400 people who use the service electronically over the phone or by computer paying by check or credit card. Mr. Hornung questioned if the customer can go on line and make the payment. Mr. Weaver answered yes. Mr. Seeds questioned how long we have had this, for a couple of years. Mr. Weaver answered since 2007. He noted that the Township will have to provide a 60-day notice to Official Payments to terminate for convenience. Mr. Seeds questioned if we have to notify the sewer customers. Mr. Weaver answered that we do. He noted that we can add notes to the sewer bill and will take off Official Payments and add MunicIPAY.

Mr. Seeds noted that there is a requirement that you now have to mail bills in envelopes. Mr. Weaver answered that we mail the bills in envelopes. Mr. Stine noted that the federal government requires it as it is a violation of the fair debt collection practices Act. He noted that

the bill must be put in an envelope as some authorities send out cards, which he thinks is a violation since it discloses a debt. Mr. Weaver noted that we don't do that. Mr. Seeds questioned if we send out a return envelope. Mr. Weaver answered yes. Mr. Seeds questioned if we were required to do that. Mr. Stine answered that you are not required to do that, it is a convenience. Mr. Stine noted if a postcard displays a delinquency it is an issue.

Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. Weaver if he feels comfortable entering into these agreements knowing what he knows about the security of the system, or do you want to check into it further the Board takes official action. Mr. Weaver answered that he checked MuniPay's references and they have not had any problems with breaches. He noted that we get notices from Official Payments sometimes that their system is down. He noted that these agencies have been in business for quite some time. He noted that it is totally separate from the Authority system. He explained that the customer make payments in the vendors webpage. He noted that the vendor processes the payments through their computers and they send the Authority a check.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to accept the merchant application and check-by-web merchant application by MuniPAY. Mr. Blain seconded the motion, and a unanimous vote followed.

#### Resolution 2013-04; Destruction of Specific Records

Mr. Weaver explained that staff wants to keep the records office file room clean and at this time they are recommending that certain documents be disposed.

Mr. Hawk made a motion to approve Resolution 2013-04 for the destruction of specific Authority records from the year 2005. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion. He questioned if the Authority is retaining seven years or more information under this particular jurisdiction. Mr. Wolfe answered that the Township retains documents in accordance with the Pennsylvania Historic Museum Commission schedule. He noted that it varies based on the documents. Mr. Weaver noted that the items that are listed are seven year retention items. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

### **Township Reports**

#### Review status of Second Consent Decree mini-basin construction projects

Mr. Weaver noted that the consent order settlement agreements are done and signed by the developers and have been given to DEP. He noted that he is waiting for DEP to distribute the

executed documents to all the parties and follow up with the court approval. He noted that it may take anywhere from 30 to 60 days to have it approved by the court and then it will be completed.

Mr. Hilson noted that there are three major construction replacement contractors working and all three are progressing satisfactorily with one wrapping up ahead of schedule. He noted in the PC-2C/2D project, the 2C area mainline has been replaced and that is the area around this building; to the south is 2C and to the north 2D. He noted that the contractor is doing Larue Street in 2D, which is very deep sewer, so it will be interesting to see how the trench walls hold up. He noted that the lining for that project is pretty much done. He noted that he tried a new type of lining, Blue Tech which is a ultraviolet cured lining, but it went fair, noting that the actual material was good however, we still ran into issues during the construction that let water back into the pipe. He noted that the lining was better than what we experience with the cure in-place lining with Mr. Rehab; however it did not prove to be what we had hope. He noted when the contractor reinstated the laterals, they put the lining in the pipe and had to go back and cut laterals in and in that process, they cut some lateral pipes through the pipe instead of where the hole was and let water in. He noted that those problems are being corrected but he is trying to search for a liner that the Authority could use when we need to, but he is convinced that the technology is not there.

Mr. Crissman questioned what you do if the lining doesn't work. Mr. Wolfe answered that you dig it up. Mr. Hilson noted if you want a program that is really going to get water out of the sewer, it is dig and replace, not lining. Mr. Seeds questioned where did you lined pipe. Mr. Hilson answered the Shady Grove Project behind Catherine Street near Fox Street. Mr. Weaver noted that they were the people who did not want the trees to be cut down.

Mr. Hilson noted when you line you are stuck with the old manholes and although it was not a complete failure, it wasn't what he had hoped for. Mr. Seeds questioned, when you were working on Larue Street by the firehouse, where a lot of fill was placed by a private homeowner, did you have problems with that. Mr. Hilson answered that it was deep in one section due to the fill but the entire section was not very deep. He noted that one part was only seven feet deep and it was no problem. He noted that there was an overhead utility line in one of the deep sections, but they made it through. Mr. Seeds questioned if the project ended at Pennsylvania Avenue. Mr. Hilson noted that he is not sure as he would have to look at the plan. He noted that the

mainline for that area is complete with new pipe. Mr. Weaver noted that the area behind the firehouse was the start of PC 2C/2D.

Mr. Hilson noted that the mainlines are completed in SC1E and they have about eight laterals to do along with the building sewers and the restoration and paving. He noted that the project by Doli Construction is ahead of schedule. He noted, for the Forest Hills Project, the building sewer testing and replacement program has 44 houses done and they are moving along very well. He noted that they will be getting to the PVC area shortly, and expect the pace to pick up at that time. He explained that they were working in an older area of Forest Hills that has a mix of pipe types and much pipe replacement.

Mr. Seeds noted, near the top of the Mountain in Forest Hills, there were some failures due to improper inspections during construction and cast iron pipe was laid on boulders without proper compaction. Mr. Weaver questioned if that was for the original Forest Hills area. Mr. Seeds answered yes. Mr. Weaver noted that the mainline would be problematic but he has not experienced that but we are having problems with the manholes. He noted that he will be coming back to the Board with a change order or a bid for a project to replace or line the manholes. He noted that there are 150 manholes and 100 have been tested and half have failed. He noted that he normally does not have that high a failure rate for manholes. He noted that the mainline sewer is not bad but there are a few sections that need to be replaced as it is PVC pipe. He explained that the people who work for Doli Construction worked for Boyd Diller who did the original sewer construction work.

Mr. Hilson noted that the Forest Hills Interceptor project starts soon and Doli will be starting BC 6 in April.

#### Paxton Creek 1GDA/B Public Meeting

Mr. Weaver noted that he has a public meeting scheduled for the Paxton Creek 1GDA/B, mini-basin, the Gale Drive Project, at the Blue Ridge Country Club Ball Room. He noted that there are 225 homes involved. He noted that the letter attached to the packet informs citizens that they can have their questions answered during the public meeting. He noted that it will be held on Wednesday, March 13<sup>th</sup> at 7 p.m. He explained that he expects around 115 people. Mr. Seeds questioned if you serve refreshments. Mr. Weaver answered that we don't serve refreshments because that would be over the rental room amount of \$200 to use the ballroom for the night.

Mr. Weaver explained that CET and staff talk for about 30 minutes and then take questions. Mr. Hawk question if there are many questions when it is a benefit to the customer as they have no costs for the program. Mr. Weaver noted that over the years, we are finding that the community as a whole understands that it must happen. He noted that the first couple of years were very tough. Ms. Reese noted that her favorite response from people is that her house was built in a swamp and the Township hasn't fixed it yet.

#### Review of the Draft Swatara Inter-Municipal Agreement and Annual meeting update

Mr. Weaver noted that Lower Paxton received a draft agreement from Swatara Township who wanted to get comments from CET and staff before they distributed the agreement to all. He noted that Mr. Wendle provided some comments and he had a few additional comments. He explained that he spoke to Mr. Stine and Mr. Wolfe and decided to transmit the comments to Swatara Township and request a meeting. He noted, for the most part, he is satisfied with the Agreement, but he has a concern regarding Mr. Wendle's comments regarding nutrients. He noted that this is the first go around with the new technology. He noted that Swatara Township understands that we have some concerns and reservations and they will be ready to listen. He explained that he does not think that it will be a difficult issue as there is not good scientific way to measure nutrients and assigned cap loads. He noted that it could be addressed by 90% or 95% if it gets close to being at the nutrient level, then he would worry about it. He noted, to try to come up with a way to regulate that now is really tough. He noted that there are pre-treatment requirements in the agreement that regulate nutrients and you can't discharge excessive nutrients that cause interference at the plant.

Mr. Weaver noted that we did very well with the new agreement and he must compliment Mr. Wendle and his staff as they pointed out to Swatara that the treatment can treat a lot more flow and that we should have a higher maximum capacity. He noted that we received increased capacity which is a big value to the Authority so instead of having a 3.795 mgd, we now have a 5.38 maximum month allowance.

Mr. Wendle noted that the agreement reflects the cooperation of Swatara Township as they basically accepted our proposed wording verbatim for maximum month flow. He noted that his only concern was that they started to limit the Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) and suspended solids and nitrogen which has never been part of the agreement before. He explained

that he does not think that the Township will have a problem with that as he thinks the Township will be under its limits, but no one asked for more pounds to be available and no one knows what each individual's BOD and suspended solids are. He noted that Hummelstown's waste is a lot stronger than they ever realized and they didn't get a chance to ask for anything with the entire design of the plant based on a conglomeration of everyone's needs. He suggested that we need to look at that, and reconsider if we want to put pollutant loads on everyone, when it wasn't a consideration in the design of the treatment plant.

Mr. Seeds questioned if they have done the review, noting that they have agreed to more capacity now. Mr. Wendle answered yes.

Mr. Weaver noted that there is a small piece of the puzzle that needs to be resolved and that is the interceptor to get the flow down to the plant, noting that West Hanover didn't even have any capacity at the interceptor. He noted that Mr. Whittle has to finish the model and then he will present the data to Swatara Township next week and discuss Mr. Wendle's and my comments. He noted that he is confident that we will be able to get the flow down to the plant but there are questions that need to be resolved.

Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Wendle had comments. Mr. Weaver noted that we have not met with Swatara Township yet. Mr. Wendle noted that the meeting is being scheduled at this time. Mr. Seeds suggested that it was basically Section 303 of the agreement and there was a question with Exhibits A, B, and C. He requested that Mr. Wendle and staff get back to the Board after you have the meeting. Mr. Whittle noted that he needs to verify how the pump station is running since during high flows it diverges from the model.

Mr. Weaver noted that Bill Jones announced his retirement effective July 1<sup>st</sup>. He explained that that the Township has been very fortunate to work with him and he hopes that his replacement will do just as good a job. He noted for as much as we have had issues for I&I and agreements there has never been any problems with the plant and it has always been operated in a very efficient and cost effective manner.

Mr. Crissman questioned who will be replacing Mr. Jones. Mr. Weaver answered that it is his assistant, Gene Lank. He noted that he has worked at the plant for quite some time and the relationship with him is good as well.

Mr. Weaver noted that the Treatment Plant Flood Mitigation grant was a surprise as Mr. Jones was concerned about getting the money back from FEMA, noting all the damage was

done. He noted that there were recommendations made to raise the level of certain facilities so they would not be flooded again. He noted that there was a concern that it would not be covered by FEMA but it was approved in the amount of \$449,632.72, so everything the contractor did to raise the flood level was approved and paid for as well as all the original damage estimate at \$1.3 million. He noted that they got all the money back from FEMA. He noted that there is one disputed payment of \$150,000 with the contractor and once they get that done, the contract will be closed and the Authority will find out if it will get any money back. Mr. Seeds questioned when that part of the facility was built that flooded. Mr. Weaver answered that it wasn't even in service yet, that is how new it was. Mr. Seeds questioned if it was poor planning for a design. Mr. Weaver answered that it is very common for a design treatment facility to be at a certain flood stage but that was well beyond a 100-year flood. Mr. Wendle noted that this was 16 feet above Hurricane Agnes Flood level, and it was off the chart for a 100-year flood.

#### Review of plan to transfer wet weather grinder pumps to homeowners

Mr. Weaver noted that he included information in the packet for the current wet weather grinder pumps used in the Township. He noted that there are seven properties that have the grinder pumps that were installed in 1994 to eliminate frequent sewage basement backups. He noted that the backups were so frequent that residents were put in hotels for several days. He noted that the Authority acquired easements for the pumps years ago and he provided copies of those to the Board members. Mr. Weaver suggested that the Paxton Creek Basin is very close, in certain areas, to be able to eliminate these grinder units.

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Wendle has more information for the Board but it has been determined that you cannot just take out these seven pumps, noting that each will have to be studied and a recommendation made for each. He suggested that we may be able to eliminate some of them but Mr. Whittle has some modeling to do before we could do this. He noted that it is good news that we are removing I&I from the sanitary sewer system.

Mr. Wendle displayed a drawing showing a manhole on Valley Road, east in the area of the apartment buildings, showing two sewer lines that tie into the manhole. He noted in April 16, 2011, an excused flood event occurred and the level in that manhole is in area of the blue line showing that the manhole did not surcharge. He noted that this is a potential area that we could think about removing the grinder pumps. He noted that the total flow continues to be about 1

million gallons more than what we want to have since we have replaced the pipe and gotten rid of the bottleneck. Mr. Weaver noted that was a flood event.

Mr. Weaver noted in 1993, where the Beaufort Manor Apartments are located along Valley Road, a first floor apartment located along Valley Road was flooded with sewage. He noted that it happened more than once so it became a difficult situation. He explained that now he is told that sewage should not now back up into the apartment but we will do more analysis on this before doing anything. He noted that the agreement states that once the work is completed we will remove the grinder pump and apparatus and restore a gravity sewer. He noted if we do that there is significant risk to the residents because who cannot predict what will happen in the future. He noted that it is a difficult situation and he is providing some solutions; however, he is not asking for a recommendation at this time. He noted that they could keep the grinder pump or the Authority would remove it for the resident at our cost when the Board determines to get rid of it, or we could just remove it. He noted that we are getting closer to seeking your approval for this, as Mr. Wendle will have more information in the future.

Mr. Crissman noted because we have to approve each one individually, and Mr. Whittle has to do a study, what is the time frame for doing this. Mr. Whittle answered that not all the grinder pumps are located in the same position. He noted that once the modeling is done he should be able to make a good recommendation, but some are not close to a metering location to know what the water elevations are. He noted that he needs to determine if there is a correlation to the existing models. He noted if there is nothing nearby he may need to do additional metering which would depend on a couple months of metering in wet weather or a significant event. He noted that none of the grinder pumps are located on a line that is modeled.

Mr. Wetzel explained that once a month, the Authority gets a call from the Beaufort Manor Apartments maintenance department to stop by since the alarm is going off. He noted that staff checks the pumps only to find them clogged by paper towels. He noted that we tend to get the calls at the end of the day when staff is leaving work and it requires a lot of time to pull the pump, clean it out and reset it. He noted that he has asked the apartment complex to notify the tenants not to put the paper towels in the drain. He noted that is why he is asking to get rid of the grinder pumps or give it back to the owner to take care of. Mr. Weaver noted that the pumps are 12 years old and staff has performed maintenance on the pumps. Mr. Wetzel noted that we perform maintenance on the pumps and have had good success with the pumps and we have

back-up pumps if needed; however the pumps are getting older and we will have to start replacing them sometime in the future. Mr. Weaver suggested that we might be able to get rid of them. He noted that there are two located on Coventry Road. He noted that the next min-basin to be done after Gale Drive is Coventry Road, so it would be a good time to provide information to the Board about its removal.

Mr. Seeds noted that he counted eight pumps on the map but only seven are in that basin. He noted that there is one on South Arlington Avenue. Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Seeds noted that there are actually eight agreements. Mr. Wetzel noted that the backup at the apartments was before we did the interceptor replacement. Mr. Seeds questioned if they took over the pump would they have to do the maintenance at the owners' expense. Mr. Weaver explained that he is seeking ideas from the Board. Mr. Seeds questioned what would happen if they won't sign a form to have it removed. Mr. Weaver suggested if the person does not sign an agreement Mr. Stine would state that the current agreement states that the Authority can take it out if someone certifies that the problem has been solved. Mr. Crissman questioned if this has been discussed with the people yet. Mr. Weaver answered no. He noted that it is not an easy solution so it may take some time to discuss it.

Mr. Crissman questioned if it is just a for-your-information at this time as opposed to deciding the strategy the Board should do. Mr. Weaver answered yes, noting if the Board would have any ideas to let him know.

#### Update on Delinquent Collections with Modern Recovery

Mr. Weaver noted that we approved an agreement with Modern Recovery Solutions and new legal counsel and he is providing an update on where we are. He noted that Ms. Fasolt provided a memo that was included in the packet. He explained that Modern Recovery has collected \$17,530 and they only received the accounts on November 20<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Crissman questioned if that was gross or net. Mr. Weaver answered that it was net. Mr. Weaver noted that the original amount of overdue bills was 110 and recently they added another 162 for a total of 272 accounts. He is very confident with the approach and it is working.

### Update on PENNVEST Loan

Mr. Weaver noted that the PENNVEST Loan was taken out for several projects as the Authority was eligible to do so and the interest rates were very low. He noted that he would never do it again and he must admit that Mr. Wendle warned him. He noted that he provided correspondence from DEP to the Authority requesting that seven additional items be done before it could conclude the technical part and get into the financial part to close the loan. He noted we did the ARA sewer replacements, and the results have been phenomenal. He noted that DEP has asked if the system is still overloaded and they want modeling done, even though we removed 85% of the flow. He noted that he asked DEP to get this done as quickly as possible and he hopes to have the paperwork resubmitted in a few weeks, as he would like to close this out. He noted that Ms. Knoll has been pushing for us to get this done to spend the bond funds on projects. He explained that he provided a summary of the expenditures, noting that we have spent to date \$9,438,000. He noted that we were originally looking to spend between \$12 and \$14 million but since the bids came in so low, and the quantities came in lower, we didn't spend as much.

Mr. Crissman questioned if it is the Authorities responsibility to get all the paperwork together or Mr. Wendle's. Mr. Weaver answered that we do it together, as Mr. Hilson does the pay applications and CET does the PENNVEST management in terms of the paperwork. Mr. Seeds questioned if the savings on the loan is due to the cheaper interest rate. He suggested that we are eating up the saving with all the work staff and CET has to do. Mr. Wendle suggested that we will come out ahead of the game. He noted that part of the problem is that there is a new person at DEP that is requiring an over abundance of information. He noted that he wants the Authority to prepare a model of the collection system which no one models the collection system. He noted that Melissa Tomich Smith has completed that letter and it will be reviewed tomorrow and hopefully the final items to be submitted will satisfy them. Mr. Crissman questioned how long this take will. Mr. Wendle answered, if DEP will accept the letter and his staff has responded to the DEP request, without spending all the money to model the system, once that is done and they pronounce that we are good then Mary Jo Brown can submit the final application for payment and within four to six weeks it would be done, so overall it should take about two months. Ms. Reese noted that the final application for payment has to be accepted for

everything to close out what is actually a negative number. She suggested that they would be anxious to close this out so they could provide the funds not used by the Authority to someone else. Mr. Wendle noted that we had to do a big change order to show DEP that we did not spend as much money as we were originally going to.

Mr. Seeds questioned what is “Manning’s co-efficient”. Mr. Hilson noted that it measures how smooth the interior of the pipe is. Mr. Weaver noted that the flow is in the pipe and there are no overloads. He suggested that DEP is worried about the liner that is in the pipe and how much it will slow down the sewage. Mr. Wolfe questioned if the manufacturer could provide that number. Mr. Weaver answered yes. Mr. Wendle noted that we had to provide the manufacturer’s information and they wanted signed and sealed design liner drawings. Mr. Wendle noted that it key is in the installation because you can have a great product but if it is not installed correctly, it wouldn’t stand up. He noted that DEP is asking some questions that are good that no one has asked before but it goes a little beyond what is necessary. He noted that the staff at DEP is siding with the new person as they don’t know any different, and anyone with any experience knows that once the flows are in the pipe, you don’t have to worry about the lining co-efficient. He noted that we have to do this to close out the loan.

Mr. Seeds noted under Section 6.1 in the Engineer’s Report it states that as of December 31, 2013, Lower Paxton has received \$9,743,000 in PENNVEST funds. Mr. Wendle noted that it was his typo as it should have been 2012.

### **Engineer’s Report**

Ms. Reese noted for the map displayed on the left side on the wall, the gray shows the areas that were completed in the past year. She noted that the dark blue, green and red are current projects and the pale pink and green are currently under design, representing eight mini-basins in four projects. She noted that it has been a very busy time.

Ms. Reese displayed a slide showing CET staff that works with the Authority.

Ms. Reese noted that she took the five mini-basins that were completed, PC1A/1C/4B/6C and ARA and looked at the cost per gallon, taking the actual contract price, engineer’s price and Lower Paxton’s price, for how many gallons per day per EDU was removed from that basin and it showed that the dollars per gallon that were removed averaged \$1.85. She noted that we

discussed the \$2 level in 2007, so \$2 would be more like \$2.33 in today's dollars. She noted that we are definitely lower than that amount.

Ms. Reese suggested that averaging what it would be for the construction projects that have not started yet, assuming that we can get down to 1,000 gallons per day per EDU, it would be at that \$2 amount except for SC1E coming in at \$3.20.

Mr. Crissman noted for the projects that are in progress, are they different colors because of their location. Ms. Reese answered that they are different colors in relation to the particular basins. Mr. Whittle noted, the difference between the two maps is that the right map shows the total work completed to date. He noted if you look on the grid, they are the basins that have been completed to date. He explained that the red includes some projects that are ongoing and the greens ones are planned out to 2017. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would post this on the Board's resource page on the website. Mr. Whittle noted that all the white is what is currently not metered. He noted that all the white is not metered and the white in the Paxton Creek Basin displays areas that cannot be metered, given the pipe characteristics. He noted that the area in Beaver Creek is currently being analyzed and a good chunk of that will be in the report this year. He noted that the last storm occurred in January of 2013. Ms. Reese noted that the light-green are the areas that are not sewerred. Mr. Whittle noted that the Paxton Creek basin shows the correlation to the reduction in overflows since the program was started. He noted that it has been very successful in eliminating the overflows.

Mr. Wendle wanted to thank the Board for the reappointment to serve as the engineer for the Authority for another year. He noted that it is a privilege to serve the Authority and Township and to live here as well. He noted that he does not take it for granted at all. He explained that we have this huge schedule and he is grateful for Mr. Hilson's work to help relieve a whole bunch of stuff and field work. He noted that we are trying to get the bond money spent by having projects under contract by 2014 but it takes a lot of people to do it.

Mr. Wendle noted that the second page of the slide that Ms. Reese displayed identifying CET staff had four people who are devoted mainly to permitting, and wetland delineation. He noted once the right-of-ways gets cleared, it is imperative to keep them mowed because even though you have a sewer in the woods, after it is grown up for 30 years, DEP considers it as if it is not really there and that you are trying to build a new sewer so they make you go through the entire encroachment process. He noted that it is a concerted effort and he appreciates working

with the Authority staff and as of April 1<sup>st</sup>, he will supply three inspectors to work with the Authority staff. He stated that he has enjoyed a very good relationship with the Authority and that is why he wanted to show the Board members the amount of employees involved from CET with the Authority projects. Mr. Crissman wanted to thank Mr. Wendle and his organization for what they do for the Authority, and he stated that it was nice to hear that he enjoyed working with our staff and that there is such a good rapport.

Mr. Seeds noted that CET is asking if we should follow up on the PENNDOT issues that have been unresolved for a long time. Mr. Weaver suggested that it may be a legal issue. He noted that someone needs to make a decision for how long we will keep this on the books as PENNDOT is not following up on the projects. Mr. Stine questioned if it is reimbursement owed to the Township. Mr. Wendle answered yes, along with funds owed to PENNDOT by the Authority. He noted that PENNDOT expects the Authority to pay them for some future work. Mr. Weaver noted that the Nyes Road project was a big one. Mr. Seeds questioned if it is done completely. Mr. Weaver answered that the Authority work is done but PENNDOT never billed the Authority. He noted that we owe them around \$190,000 but they have not billed us. Mr. Wendle noted that the issue goes both ways as the Authority owes PENNDOT and PENNDOT owes the Authority funds. Mr. Seeds questioned if we should have a meeting to get PENNDOT off the dime. Mr. Weaver suggested that it may be a question to ask the auditors for how long this must be kept on the books. He noted if you add it all together we owe them more then they owe us. He noted that they have paid the Authority for the Linglestown Road project. He noted the he will do an accounting for what PENNDOT owes us and for what we owe them.

Mr. Weaver noted that he had some concerns if one firm could handle all the projects and he has been pleasantly surprised at the amount of work that CET is putting out with the permitting and engineering documents that have been produced.

### **Solicitor's Report**

Mr. Stine stated that he had nothing to report.

## **Adjournment**

There being no further business, Mr. Crissman made a motion to adjourn the meeting, and the meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen A. Heberle  
Recording Secretary

Approved by:

William L. Hornung  
Authority Secretary