

**LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
AUTHORITY MEETING**

Minutes of Township Authority Meeting held August 27, 2013

The regular quarterly meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Authority was called to order at 6:13 p.m. by Chairman William C. Seeds, Sr., on the above date in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Authority members present in addition to Mr. Seeds were: William B. Hawk, William L. Hornung, Gary A. Crissman, and David B. Blain. Also in attendance were George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steven Stine, Authority Solicitor; William Weaver, Authority Director, Mark Hilson, Authority Engineer, Jim Wetzels, Operations; Kevin Shannon, GHD, and Ted Robertson, SWAN.

Pledge of Allegiance

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

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Hawk made a motion to approve the June 18, 2013 Authority meeting minutes. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Public Comment

No public comment was presented.

Board Members' Comment

No comments were provided by Board members.

Old Business

There was no old business to conduct.

New Business

Review of Draft 2014 Authority Budget

Mr. Weaver explained that he prepared a draft budget for the Board to review; however, much of the information is incomplete due to the issues pending with the City of Harrisburg (City) that will be discussed in executive session. He noted that staff now has more of a hand on the Inflow and Infiltration (I&I) Program and the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) that is scheduled to go along with it.

Mr. Weaver explained that he wanted to highlight a few key items in the proposed budget. He noted the sewer rate is shown as remaining at \$120 a quarter for 2014, providing revenues of \$12,100,000. He noted that it could change once Mr. Wendle completes his rate analysis in November; however, the preliminary indication is that the rates will not have to be increased in 2014. He noted that there was a small decrease in the bond interest subsidy, noting that Ms. Knoll provided a notice from the Internal Revenue Service, showing a credit payment reduction as a result of the sequester. He noted that the subsidy will be less \$40,727 for 2013. He noted that each year the Authority could be getting notices based on the federal budget whether or not it will receive its full bond subsidy.

Mr. Weaver noted that a change was made to the management reimbursement agreement to the Township last year. He noted with having to spend down the funds for the bond issue by 2014, which requires \$42.5 million under contract, the agreement was changed to include the I&I crew, Mr. Wetzel, Mr. Hilson, and his time under the I&I and CAP. He noted that it has been reduced, and although \$1.3 million is shown, \$848,640 in payroll is being taken from the bond improvement fund. He noted that it also includes the payroll for four inspectors that are working in the program. He noted that the only change to the management reimbursement was adding an additional inspector for 2014. He noted that currently 14 inspectors are working with two that are also working on developments. He noted that he needed additional help with the inspections and also six months for a meter technician. He explained that Benny Behrens and Dan Brailer are scheduled to retire the end of 2014 or the middle of 2015.

Mr. Hornung questioned Mr. Weaver why he was switching the salaries over. He questioned why they are being paid by bond money instead of expense money. Mr. Wolfe answered that it was a decision made last year to spend down the bond funds within the time period required. Mr. Weaver noted that it could be a temporary thing or the Board may want to

make this decision annually. He noted that the Board can change its mind for each budget year. Mr. Hornung noted that he struggles to keep the expenses with expenses and capital projects out of bond money, noting that it keeps him focused on what we are spending on expenses. He noted that the capital money that goes up and down can mask the expenses. Mr. Weaver agreed. Mr. Hornung noted that he tries to compare expenses from year to year and he remembered that the Board made the decision to switch it over to bond money; it just worries him that the Board will lose sight of that. Mr. Weaver noted that we can switch it back. Mr. Hornung noted that since it is the bond money must be spent it is better to leave it where it is. Mr. Weaver noted that after next year, the Board will want to switch it back. Mr. Blain noted as long as you can track it, that is all that counts. He noted if you can normalize it by taking out the extra expense that was added for salaries, then you can look at the projects for what they are.

Mr. Shannon noted for the projections for the bond draw down schedule, there was an assumption that the inspection costs and in-house administrative costs are related to the capital projects and could be funded by the bond.

Mr. Hornung noted that he understands what we are doing, but he liked that word normalized that Mr. Blain used.

Mr. Weaver noted that the actual expenses are \$2,186,983 for the reimbursement account less the \$848,640 for the bond draw down.

Mr. Weaver noted on page six, the transmission costs shows a significant increase in the payment to the City for next year. He noted that the Biological Nutrient Removal (BNR) upgrade is to be billed annually at \$900,000, but we don't know if the City will be able to borrow the money to do the \$53 million project. He noted that this will be discussed further in executive session. He noted to prepare the budget, Mr. Wendle suggested, if the Township borrows the money then the debt service would be between \$800,000 and \$900,000, but if the City borrows the money then the annual payment should be the same. He noted that he prepared the budget based on the fact that the City is telling us that they will be able to borrow the money. He noted that he is using a very conservative number of \$900,000 although he thinks it will be closer to \$800,000 and that significantly increased the budget for this line item. He noted that he must also include a one-time credit purchase for 2014 for \$528,000 since the plant will not be constructed by 2014 and DEP has a permit with the City that states that they must comply and DEP is telling the City that it has to purchase the credits. He noted that the Township Authority must pay 22% of the 600,000 credits noting that they are \$4 a pound.

Mr. Weaver explained, when he attended the annual DEP meeting, he inquired if the City will get out of this requirement and their reply was no. Mr. Crissman questioned who will police that. Mr. Weaver answered that he and his staff will. He suggested that the numbers are sound but the only thing that could change is if the City does not get the financing; then they will go to the other municipalities to request them to do the financing. He noted that the project has been advertised for bid.

Mr. Seeds noted that he had this on his list of questions under the Engineer's Report as there was some thought before about Lower Paxton, Swatara and Susquehanna Townships helping to float the bonds as the City will pay a much higher interest rate than the other Townships would pay. He noted that he is not saying that he is for doing that but if the City floats the entire bond, the rate will be much higher and the Township's costs will be higher. He noted that there is some talk that we would float our own costs. Mr. Weaver noted again, that this discussion will be held during executive session. He stated that special counsel is not recommending the Township to fund its own portion. Mr. Seeds noted if the City is able to get funding at 9% and we are able to get it at 3%... Mr. Wolfe noted that the City of Harrisburg has received 50% of the funding at 1% interest from the State. He noted that the City must figure out how they can borrow the rest of the money. Mr. Weaver suggested that the approach at this point is to see what the City can do. Mr. Weaver noted that it is a lot cleaner legally if the City borrows the money, noting that there is trepidation by counsel if the Authority borrows the money. Mr. Weaver noted that we will discuss this more under executive session.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the 22% that we pay is the same that the Authority pays on the operation side. Mr. Weaver answered yes. Mr. Hornung questioned how they came up with that. Mr. Weaver answered that it is based upon flow. Mr. Hornung questioned if it goes up and down each year. Mr. Weaver answered that there has not been a lot of discussion about that noting that it is based upon EDU, but there has been some talk about instituting other variables but the EDU's don't change much as it is based upon commercial growth and how much it fluctuates.

Mr. Weaver noted that it raises the overall transmission costs from last year, an increase of \$1.4 million from last year. Mr. Hornung questioned how Mr. Weaver could have this large increase and not increase the rates to the customers. Mr. Weaver noted, on the next page, you can see the debt service has decreased significantly due to a bond that was retired, a decrease from \$700,000 to \$40,000. He noted that he increased the City portion but the bond payment is significantly decreased. He explained that he is not prepared to discuss the debt service at this

time as it is presented with the approval of the budget in November at which time Mr. Wendle shows the rate schedule. He noted that the dip in the debt service will level out with future bond issues and the previous bond issues. He noted that the Board has always asked for level debt service but next year we will have a dip in this line item. Mr. Crissman questioned if the Board will see this, knowing that the dip will be coming in 2014, but he wants to know what the impact will be in 2015, 2016, and 2017, etc. Mr. Weaver noted that he does not have the information this evening but Ms. Knoll printed out the debt service schedule for the one bond. He noted that there are only two or three payments left and he would have more information at the November meeting to show the level debt. Mr. Crissman noted that the budget for 2015 will be higher since 2014 had a dip.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the dip will come back up or stay down. Mr. Weaver noted that it is a one year dip and he can't say since he does not have the schedule in front of him. He noted that it will go down \$700,000 in 2014. Mr. Hornung questioned what would make it come back up. Mr. Weaver answered that it is based upon the financial advisor and how he set up the debt service schedule. Mr. Hornung questioned if there are any balloon payments. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it is the paying off existing debt in anticipation of future debt. He noted that Mr. Weaver needs to show you the schedule. Mr. Crissman noted that there must be a reason for the lesser payment this year which is the reason for the dip in 2014. Mr. Weaver noted that he will have an answer for the Board at its next budget meeting. Mr. Wolfe suggested that the next borrowing will be in 2015. Mr. Shannon noted that the alternative was selected last year with no increase for 2013, 2014, and 2015, with new borrowing in 2015 that kicked in year 2016.

Mr. Weaver noted that there will be a dip in debt service but an increase in transmission costs so the expenses for 2014 will be equal; however there continues to be significant cash left over from previous years and the Board's direction to Mr. Wendle was to only show \$4 to \$5 million in cash. He noted that the settlement with the City will be discussed in executive session and it could change the budget as the Authority has restricted funds and non restricted funds and he expects that to go away. He noted that the maintaining of rates is based on the fact that the Authority has \$9 million and it could be getting some money back from the City.

Mr. Weaver noted that he would be talking about the capital budget when the projects are discussed later in the meeting, noting that there is a significant support from CET and HRG for inspectors. He noted that there are 14 to 16 inspectors working at one time, as the Authority is stealing all of CET's good people for our projects. He noted that there are four full-time

inspectors working from CET and one part-time, with two from HRG, resulting in seven sub-contractors and five on staff providing a total of 12 inspectors. Mr. Seeds noted that the cost for the inspectors from CET is \$362,000. He noted that CET is doing a good job but he questioned if we would be better off hiring more inspectors since we have many more projects that will be scheduled out 15 plus years. He questioned if there would be a cost savings to do this. Mr. Weaver noted that it is cheaper to use CET now because Mr. Wendle was very generous in providing the employees to the Township at cost with no overhead. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Weaver had done the math and the way we are doing it now is the least expensive. Mr. Weaver noted that it is a long-term agreement that the Board approved last year, noting that engineers charge typically from \$80 to \$120 an hour for inspectors. He noted that the Township's average is \$45 to \$50 and Mr. Wendle is able to provide the workers for a long-term contract a year at a time. He noted that if he had to hire the people with the Authorities overhead, it would be \$45 per hour but you have to buy vehicles for each one as they work by themselves. He noted when you factor in buying a new truck; CET is saving the Authority some money.

Mr. Blain questioned if the workers are full-time for the Authority. He questioned if they work 40 hours for the Authority all year round. Mr. Hilson noted that he had one employee working four ten-hour days and an eight-hour day on Friday. Mr. Blain questioned who they are reporting to, the Authority. Mr. Weaver answered that it is Mr. Wetzel. Mr. Blain questioned if we pay CET their costs, with no mark up. Mr. Shannon suggested that there is a little mark up, noting that you are paying their salary but not paying their normal rate. Mr. Hilson noted that an engineering firm might have a multiplier of 1.2 times their salary. He noted for an inspector it might be \$80 to \$90 an hour depending on the full mark up. He noted that it depends on the pay scale, but CET's markup is significantly less than other engineering firms in the industry. He noted that there are other firms that are competitive with that.

Mr. Blain noted that their employer is CET and the Township is paying the salary. He noted that is fine. Mr. Weaver noted that right now it is working although we have some issues from time to time and Mr. Hilson has done a good job. He explained that he asked for the inspectors resumes to perform a little background check on them as we had to turn some inspectors away. Mr. Hilson noted that it is a team effort between Mr. Wetzel and himself and his own inspectors, knowing if they see a consultant who is not performing, they will let us know and we will act on it. Mr. Blain noted as long as they are on CET payroll and they are paying them it should not be an issue. Mr. Shannon noted that they are on CET's payroll. Mr. Shannon

noted that we cover the paid time off directly and the Authority does not pay for that. Mr. Weaver noted that he asked Ms. Knoll to separate the line items for each task, noting that it is a big number but when you look at construction observation in terms of \$12.7 million, the costs are normally 2.5% to 3% and we are doing it for a lot less.

Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Wolfe stated that Mr. Weaver did the math and the Authority is saving money. Mr. Weaver noted that he would provide those figures in November.

Mr. Weaver noted that CET's retainer has gone from \$20,000 to \$27,000 being at \$20,000 for 15 years. Mr. Seeds suggested that it is less than a 3% increase. He noted that some of the numbers in the budget, for instance, item 001-43115 under legal services, you listed \$180,000 but it only came up to \$145,000 when he did the math. He questioned if he put extra in the budget. Mr. Weaver noted that he does not have enough room to list all items as there are so many different line items that he bills from. Mr. Seeds stated that he noticed a bunch like that, for instance postage, the numbers in the line items did not add up to the total. Mr. Weaver answered that they are not supposed to add up as the line items are much bigger and the Authority spends much more money. He noted that he just likes to show the large ticket items, providing information for what is paid out of that line item. He noted that there is not enough room to list everything.

Mr. Seeds questioned what BNR stands for. Mr. Weaver answered that it stands for Biological Nutrient Removal.

Mr. Seeds noted under 900-43980 and 900-43990, the numbers were reversed. He noted the one is \$358 and the other is \$408. Mr. Weaver noted that it is a typo as they are supposed to be exactly the same.

Mr. Blain questioned if Mr. Weaver takes into account the occupancy costs for space in the Municipal Center for the management reimbursement. He questioned where it runs through in these numbers. Mr. Weaver noted that there is a separate line item in the budget under rental fees. He noted that the Township will not forget to bill the Authority.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Weaver talked about the Management Agreement. Mr. Weaver noted that it is a total of \$2.1 million less the payroll that we discussed earlier for the capital improvement which is \$848,000. He noted that Ms. Knoll prepares this for him every year and she did not find anything alarmingly different from last year so he didn't bother to review it.

Mr. Seeds questioned what the asterisk was for. Mr. Weaver answered that it was the payroll that he discussed earlier in the meeting that would be paid by bond funds. He noted that this is what we talked about before in regards to the overhead for payroll, etc.

Mr. Crissman noted that the Board will see it again in November.

Mr. Weaver noted that the account balances are in line and there is nothing alarming in that report as well.

Mr. Seeds noted that he does not want to raise rates but the Board discusses this every year and we will discuss it at the November meeting. He noted if GHD advises the Authority to project rates, it would be better to have a small rise in rates; however, if we keep it low now and then two years from now, we have to raise it by \$20 or \$30 dollars a quarter, he does not want to do that either. He noted if that is going to happen by keeping it the same and having to raise it in a few years significantly, then he would rather raise it a little bit rather than have a huge bump. He noted that CET usually gives us a report on that. Mr. Crissman noted that it is coming in November, noting that it ties in with the debt service as Mr. Wendle puts the entire chart together.

Mr. Seeds noted that we have had different reports over the year that show different scenarios as many of them provided for a \$5 annual raise, but it was projected that at some time in the next five years that the Authority would need to raise its rates to \$150 a quarter. He noted that he does not want to go from \$120 to \$150 in a couple of years because we didn't raise it and everyone was happy about not raising it. Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Wendle will provide some alternatives with an increase showing between \$3 to \$7 a quarter at the November meeting.

Mr. Hornung noted that the one thing that concerns him is that the City has increased its rates as it was unexpected. He noted if we did not raise rates if we were doing a rate plan and all of a sudden we had an additional \$700,000 or \$900,000 here, he can't see how we can get away without raising the rates. Mr. Wolfe noted that there is another part of the equation that we have to fill in but we can't until we go into executive session. Mr. Hornung stated that he understands.

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Wendle expected the City's upgrade to take much longer and he did not expect to see the double whammy in 2014, with the credits as well.

Approval of bid award for the Oakhurst Interceptor

Mr. Weaver noted that there is a memorandum from Kevin Fox from GHD summarizing the bids that were received by Susquehanna Township for the Oakhurst Interceptor project. He noted at the end of the memorandum was a request for the Township Authority to approve the award to Doli Construction and notify Susquehanna Township in writing of its decision.

Mr. Weaver noted, according to paragraph five of the agreement, no contract shall be awarded until both parties approve in writing the contract to be awarded. He noted that he had a lot of staff input because it is not an easy recommendation. He noted that there were many issues connected with this, and Mr. Stine would need to provide some input as well as Mr. Hilson for the bids.

Mr. Weaver noted that Susquehanna Authority has not received the easements yet. He noted that they have talked to the homeowners and received positive feedback from the five property owners but Dauphin Engineering was hired to do the work and they have not provided the plats and legal information to them to complete the legal deed of dedications to get the easements. He noted that he has concerns about the Board taking action to award the contract tonight in that it could be faced with a delay claim if Susquehanna Township does not get the easements. Mr. Stine noted that awarding a public contract is statutory, so whenever you receive a bid for a public works type job, you have 60-days to award it from the time of bid opening, and then you have 60 days from that date to sign a contract to get the project started which allows for a total of 120 days. He noted if Susquehanna Township has signed easements from all property owners, then there will be no problem, however, if some people don't cooperate, they would need to go through the condemnation process. He noted that it can extend beyond the 120 days so he suggested that it would be prudent for Susquehanna to get the ball rolling as they only have until the end of September to award that bid. He noted that awarding the bid early cuts the time even shorter than you would normally have.

Mr. Hawk noted that Susquehanna has approved the bid. Mr. Stine answered yes, but it is irrelevant if the Township does not approve it. Mr. Shannon noted that Susquehanna Township has applied for a Penn Works Grant for this project and they will not move forward until they hear, about mid-September, from the Commonwealth Financing Authority (CFA) if they will get the grant. He noted that the Authority is waiting to hear from the CFA on the Gale Drive project. Mr. Weaver noted that the date for the meeting to decide on the 130 applications to disburse \$17 million is September 17th.

Mr. Wolfe noted that it is staff's recommendation to table the vote at this time. Mr. Seeds questioned if we need to table it or take no action. Mr. Stine answered that it doesn't matter. Mr. Weaver noted before the Board tables it, he would like Mr. Hilson to explain the engineering estimate.

Mr. Hawk noted that GHD stated to rebid it would most probably not result in lower bids. Mr. Hilson noted that he did not recommend rebidding the project. He noted that Susquehanna Township awarded the project. Mr. Seeds noted if they awarded it then it puts us in the 60-day period. Mr. Stine answered that is not true as the contract specifically states that there is no award until both Townships approve it. Mr. Hilson noted that the bids were \$64,000 higher than the engineers estimate but he would caution the Board not to solely look at that as a percentage as it is a smaller contract. He noted that the smaller contracts are harder to predict how the contractors will be looking at these. He noted that some contracts have wetland involvement and it may be a small percentage of a large project, such as what occurred at Catherine Street. He noted that contractors will not want to lose a big project for a small wetland issue. He noted that a contractor would consider that he could absorb some risk in the wetland and spread it out throughout the rest of the project. He noted that this project is all wetland and it is almost all new trench so there are two risk factors, wetlands surface with ground water not knowing if you will hit rock. He explained that this will make contractors very uneasy from that perspective.

Mr. Hilson noted that the second issue is that it is getting closer to wintertime, and in talking to the low bidder, the epoxy coated ductile pipe that was rightly specified in the wetland, is \$50,000. He noted that pipe cost is higher than what some other bidders normally bid, and we occasionally run into this with talking to different contractors and suppliers. He noted that he and Mr. Shannon research this once before for the Forest Hills Interceptor project, looking to go with ductile or plastic pipe, finding that ductile pipe was very expensive so he decided to go with a thicker wall plastic pipe at the deeper depths getting the same protection for the pipe but the bidders looked at it as an expensive line item. He noted that it the reasons for why the bids came in over the engineer's estimate.

Mr. Seeds questioned if they would find rock under a wetlands. Mr. Hilson answered that sometime you do, and in many instances that is why the wetland is there as the water sits on top of the rock.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board will need to take action before the end of the September. Mr. Weaver explained that he will schedule a special meeting.

Mr. Seeds noted that there are two paragraphs under the bids on page one that speaks that we have 80% of the flow and then 100%. Mr. Weaver noted that it changes into segments. He noted that Mr. Fox's memo stated that the effect of awarding the bid at the higher bid amount would amount to \$98,000 to the Township, for the total project cost to include design and permitting costs. He noted that the Township's cost over the original estimate would be \$98,000 more. He explained that the Township has to do the project as it is in the Act 537 Plan, and it is a lot cheaper then redoing the Gale Drive Pumping station. He noted that Gale Drive pump station would cost over \$1 million and the Township's total share for the Oakhurst Interceptor is around \$500,000. He noted that there are many benefits to doing the project but he can't recommend that approval at tonight's meeting.

Mr. Crissman suggested that the Board withdraw it from the agenda.

Township Reports

Review of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection Annual Meeting Presentation

Mr. Weaver noted that the Second Consent Decree requires that the Authority have an annual meeting with the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). He noted that he submitted that annual report that was due June 30th summarizing all the activities that occurred last year, for what improvements were made, and what the schedule was for the upcoming and following years. He provided a copy of the report to the Board by way of a Power Point Presentation.

Mr. Weaver noted that Slide Five shows for BC3A/4C/4A that peak I&I was 2.0 million, .072, and 0.76 respectfully. He noted that it was a total of 3.52 for this phase. He explained that the three that he mentioned are very important due to the Beaver Creek Pump Station issue that was discussed. He noted getting the water removed from that station will help to determine down the road if the wet weather station will be needed, depending on what Mr. Wendle advises for future storage. He noted that the pump station at Beaver Creek has given staff problems. He noted that he showed this chart to DEP and advised them that things are going really well and that the Authority is well ahead of schedule noting that the Beaver Creek Corrective Action Plan (CAP) requires that all of the mini-basins in this chart be completed by 2017. He noted, due to

the issue with the bond money, all the projects are scheduled to be bid and completed by the end of 2015.

Mr. Weaver noted that Slide Six is a map showing BC-1A that will be completed by Ronca with Handwerk finishing the mainline for the PennDOT project. He noted that the Authority toured BC-3A and BC-4C. He noted that BC-6B/6C is the area around the Township building that is being done at this time. He noted that Doli is moving ahead on this project and he will have a report on that under construction activities.

Mr. Weaver noted that Slide 14 shows where the Authority is in the Paxton Creek Basin with a list of basins that must be completed over the next 15 years. He noted that it is shown in five-year phases, and staff only has the first-five year phased plan completed for Paxton Creek. He noted that the items in gray are done as they had to be done by 2012. He noted the reason that PC-2D is shown as not completed is because he flip flopped, for construction purposes, after meeting with the contractor and DEP had no problem with that. He noted that PC-2C/2D was one contract. He noted in the Second Phase for 2012 through 2017, one project is completed, and the items shown in green are in construction. He noted that PC-4C/3C are in the design phase and are scheduled to be bid the end of 2014. He noted that the 2017 through 2022 phase shows some activity because there were issues in Forest Hills with basement flooding and that has always been a priority to the Board and DEP, therefore, those basins were moved up in the schedule.

Mr. Weaver noted that Slide 19 shows that PC-1C displays the significant removals of 80% of I&I. He noted that he had issues with PC-1A, noting that the red dots show the post metering results and it is up to 6,000 gpd/EDU and he questioned how that could occur on a mini-basin that was just completed. He noted that Slide 21 explains that the sub-basin metering evaluation shows that due to mini-basin fluctuations and the surcharging that occurs from the City, staff is not able to get a good value all the time for the mini-basins. He explained that he wants DEP to keep that in mind that ultimately what will happen is that he will not look at mini-basin results but sub-basins results. He noted that there are unusual data spikes, excused events, and non-typical flows with a significant level of investigative efforts that have to go into that noting that ultimately it doesn't mean anything because it is a 15 to 20 year program. He noted the long term success will be based upon the overall sub basin flow reduction. He noted that it has been here for more than 30 years before the Board started the rehab process, noting that

Gannett Fleming established that basin years ago and the meters work well because the larger areas do not have these types of fluctuations. He noted that BC6 is almost done and once that occurs, there will be one completed sub-basin finished and he hopes to get some wet weather events in 2015. He noted that there is a small portion of BP6 North that is being bid in a couple of months so it won't be totally done until that is complete. He noted in 2015, the first sub-basin will be finished in Beaver Creek. He noted that it will show if we are getting the 1,000 gpd/EDU and if the meters are working correctly.

Mr. Weaver noted that he tried to get out of having to attend the annual meetings with DEP, explaining that it will be 15 to 20 years until the projects are done and meeting every year to look at the mini-basin results, informing them every year where the Authority is with its construction schedule, he questioned if the meetings made a difference. He noted that DEP wants to continue with the annual meetings, but he informed Mr. Stine and Mr. Wolfe that they do not need to attend as there are no more legal issues and the consent order is done and signed and DEP sent it to the judge for final approval and he should have that back in a month or two.

Mr. Weaver noted that the only other thing he wanted to point out from the report was the City issue and how it backs up. He noted that the Springford Village Treatment Plant is scheduled to be decommissioned soon in May or June of 2014. He noted that he will have sufficient permits by then to do that and it is reflected in the budget. He noted that Alex Morrison was really concerned about that and if we considered a reduction in flows in the permit issuance and permit accumulation needed to do that package plant. He explained that it was all agreed to in the settlement agreement and the Authority has accumulated half the permits already. He noted that Mr. Morrison stated that he would research it but he should find that they approved 168 permits a year not based on flow reduction because we don't have any flow data yet, but it also states that as long as the Authority is in compliance with the plan and schedule, that the Township can decommission the plant. He suggested that Mr. Shannon will go over this in his Engineer's Report.

Mr. Seeds questioned if this would be affected by the Shadebrook plan that was recently approved. Mr. Wolfe answered no. Mr. Wolfe noted that anyone who builds in Beaver Creek uses an EDU that the Township could use. Mr. Weaver noted that Shadebrook won't be under construction or issuing large amount of permits until after the package plant is gone. He noted

that the Authority will have enough permits by May or June of 2014 and it won't even be under construction yet.

Mr. Seeds questioned if there was any value to selling the package plant. Mr. Hilson noted that the trick will be getting the plant out of the hole as it is located in a hole. He noted that you can't remove it in a usable form, suggesting that its value is mostly scrap. He noted that they will have to torch and tear it into pieces to get it out. Mr. Seeds questioned if we would have to bid the project. Mr. Wolfe answered no, not to scrap it. Mr. Hilson noted that it was constructed before the buildings were put in. Mr. Wolfe noted that you can't take it out in one usable piece as it must be cut up to take it out and when that is done, no one will want to put it back together as it is a 20-year old plant. Mr. Weaver noted that it should reduce the cost of demolishing the site and connecting the sewer. He noted that he asked Norman DeSouza how he got it in there. Mr. DeSouza recently requested a refund on the taxes that he has paid for that property. Mr. Seeds questioned what happens to the land, does it revert back to Mr. DeSouza. Mr. Weaver answered yes as he owns the land.

Mr. Seeds questioned if there was something in the agreement that once it is decommissioned that we have a certain period of time to demolish and remove it. Mr. Weaver answered yes, noting that we have to clean it up and get it out of there as soon as the sewer is connected to the Swatara Township Authority system. He noted that he would have to discuss that with Mr. DeSouza as the sewer line goes right through the plant. He noted that it will take some creativity on CET's part to do this and he advised Mr. DeSouza that it will not be possible to demolish the plant as soon as the connection is made. Mr. Seeds noted that you are talking about doing this next May. Mr. Weaver noted that is when the process will be started.

Mr. Weaver noted that there were two comments from DEP, and a nice comment from John Kerschner, who stated that he was happy with the cooperation between the Authority and DEP as he has seen a big improvement. He noted that Ed Corriveau is not longer at DEP, now they have a past CET employee that is working with the Authority. He noted that the second comment concerned that Board's approval of the Longhorn Steakhouse as DEP is concerned about it. He noted that they want the Authority to install a meter at I-83 to show that the line that was not replaced under I-83 will not back up. He noted that the meter is scheduled to be put in

and the data will be forwarded to DEP. He noted that it was one of most effective projects and he suggested that it was a little overkill but that is what DEP wants.

Mr. Seeds questioned if that pipe under I-83 was lined. Mr. Wolfe answered no. Mr. Hilson noted that other sections upstream were lined. Mr. Weaver noted that this could hold up the Longhorn Steakhouse's planning module. Mr. Hornung questioned what would happen if the Authority would say no. Mr. Weaver noted the DEP controls the planning modules and they won't approve it. Mr. Wolfe noted that we could not issue a building permit if the planning module was not approved. Mr. Weaver noted that it is tied into the PENNVEST issue. He noted that they must cover themselves as they have to report to other people and they can't close the PENNVEST Project until they have all the things done. He noted that he sees both sides and he doesn't mind doing it.

Mr. Seeds noted that Longhorn Steakhouse has to get their EDU's from Susquehanna Township. Mr. Weaver responded that the Authority got the nine permits back from the Susquehanna Township Authority.

Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. Weaver is keeping Longhorn Steakhouse abreast of the situation so they know that it could hold up the building process. Mr. Weaver answered that he has not done that yet as he wants to get more information from DEP for what their feelings are on that as he would rather have the developer meet with DEP directly as it is not the Township's application. Mr. Crissman explained that he does not want Longhorn to come back to the Township complaining that it is holding up the process. Mr. Weaver noted that he will contact them. Mr. Crissman noted that they could initiate their own strategies to get what they need.

Update on current min-basin construction projects

Mr. Hilson noted that the work is continuing in the mini-basins, BC-6C pipe work is done for the area north of Prince, Fritchey, Ender and Ferree Streets. He explained that he stopped the contractor from laying more pipe in order to get caught up on the restoration work, as they are now doing paving, and lawn and concrete restoration. He noted that the base paving will be done this week; with overlay paving completed in September/October. He noted that the contractor will continue to lay more pipe in the near future once they get caught up in that section. He explained that he does not want the contractors to string out all the pipe work to

cause all kinds of havoc for everyone. He noted that the contractors put all their earnings into the pipe work as there is not much earnings in restoration.

Mr. Hilson noted, for the Forest Hills project on Wimbledon Drive, the Forest Hills Interceptor is done with the deepest part of the project having to go down 24 feet. He noted that it took a little longer than expected because of the rock and additional equipment that had to be brought in to do the work. He noted that the pipe work is nearly done and the contractor is focusing on getting Wimbledon Drive done as fast as possible. He noted that a paving contractor will start work next week to do the base paving.

Mr. Hilson noted that for SC1E, the restoration work is wrapping up as the pipe work has been done for a while. He noted that seeding, topsoil and right-of-way restoration work is ongoing. He noted that the paving overlay will take place in September/October.

Mr. Hilson noted that PC-2C is done, and 2D has most of the pipe work done, where he again held up the contractor to do more restoration work, noting that he did not want them to be working next to Koons Pool during the summer months, so they were restoring Larue Street and other areas. He noted that they will finish the main near the pool and in that neighborhood. He noted that the alley behind Lio's Pizza remains to be completed. He explained that it will be a very tricky project as there is a very deep manhole in the area, and a barn is on the right-of-way with hardly any room to work around. He noted that it will be a troublesome project to finish. Mr. Seeds questioned when that work will start. Mr. Hilson answered at least three to four weeks.

Mr. Hilson noted that Forest Hills building sewers and laterals project is two thirds done and in the next agenda item he will discuss what was found during this project.

Mr. Hilson noted for Linglestown Road, the BC1E basin is a PennDOT betterment project, noting that they are working on sewer main replacements. He noted that it is a road contract and is running a little slower but it is going well.

Mr. Weaver noted that staff had a public meeting for the PC-5D/5E and BC6 North project at the Colonial Park United Church of Christ, across the street from the Friendship Center. He noted that the people were very cooperative as there are many groundwater surface issues in that location. He noted that staff meets with the property owners before they do the Power Point presentation and normally gets half of the people to come to the meeting. He explained that it is a small area for this project, about 150 residential units in the area and 75 people showed up. He noted that it should be bid by the end of the year. Mr. Hilson noted that

he is trying to get a sub-basin done with the bid for this project. He explained he scheduled the BC6 North section first in that contract to get it done and get some results.

Mr. Weaver noted that he and Susquehanna Township applied individually for PennWorks grant application for the Gale Drive basin and the person from DCED who was assigned to Lower Paxton Township and Susquehanna Township insisted on removing us along with Susquehanna Township, to take us out of consideration because there was no commercial development. He noted that they eliminated Susquehanna Township from consideration. He noted that their application was not considered for one portion but it may still be in the running for the Oakhurst portion. He explained that DCED was able to consider the Lower Paxton Authority application to be complete because part of the Oakhurst project in the Township, across from the old Giant, has a potential to do commercial growth; therefore, the person who is working with the Union Deposit Corporation, Bill Brown from Blue Mountain Real Estate, from the Philadelphia area, was very cooperative. He noted that he sent a letter to DCED that satisfied them and they considered the application to be complete. He noted that there are 132 applications fighting for a pot of \$17 million. He noted that there is a small chance that we could receive \$4 million noting that it is delaying the project for a few weeks until we hear in September about the grant.

Proposed Change Order to the PC1G/H Contract

Mr. Hilson explained that in the beginning of the project in the Wimbledon and East Tilden and West Tilden Roads, that there was a lot of building sewers failures. He noted that the failure rate was very high and if it continued throughout the entire project for the 364 sewers, the cost would be substantial. He noted that it was an isolated event and found further up the hill, the building sewers were passing. He noted that it is very rare that they didn't pass. He noted that many laterals were only four inches but it eliminated the transition that many times leaks. He noted that staff tested the manholes and found that 90% of them failed either just the frame or cover or from the frame and cover down. He noted that staff spot checked some of the manholes and found I&I coming into manholes at different points. He noted that these are precast manholes, and they are fairly modern, but the project was done with very limited inspections. He noted that the manhole design did change a little since then and the standards have improved. He noted that the modern manholes are a little tighter than the older ones. He explained that he continued to finding leaking building sewers, failed laterals, and some sections of the mainline that are substandard. He noted in that current contract there is about \$1.5 million that will not be

used, however, if the building sewers and laterals are completed he would spend \$3 million or the \$4 million project, and he expected that there would be some concerns. He noted that the map shows that the red manholes are the most troubling, noting that the manholes failed from the top to the bottom, the yellow manholes are failed frames only, and the green manholes passed. He noted that there are sections that are highlighted in yellow, noting that he televised the entire sewer main and tested nearly every joint and found very few problems in the sewer main; however, some sections had rock protrusions or severely egg shaped pipe that need to be replaced. He explained, in the process of doing the sewer and lateral project he found up past the park on Forest Hills Drive on the right side, the laterals were failing and sewage was laying in the laterals. He noted that it was found that there was a sewer main in that area laid that was extremely flat, .1% and other laterals that went up hill to the main. He noted that they are failing and he recommends that they be replaced. He had Wexcon, who is doing the Interceptor project, lower their line as much as they could to pick up some fall. He noted that one line runs up Forest Hills Drive and four lines run up Norwalk Drive and they need to be replaced. He noted that it would help to get the slope to a .35% which is better than DEP's minimum and allow the laterals to be replaced with a slope into the main.

Mr. Hilson noted that all the manholes failed at least the frame and cover air test. He noted that it does not make sense to dig the manholes up to have pipe that has a substandard slope for the laterals. Mr. Seeds questioned if this is the location where 90% of the homes passed but 80% of the manholes failed. Mr. Hilson noted that he had CET put a spreadsheet together.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the Authority has the opportunity to go back on the guy that installed the manholes or since we inspected it are we done. Mr. Stine answered that we would have accepted it at some point, and once you do that you are done. Mr. Hornung questioned who did that project. Mr. Weaver answered that it was Boyd Diller. Mr. Hornung questioned if it was the developer. Mr. Stine answered that it was their contractor. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Kaiser Brothers were the developer.

Mr. Hilson noted that people wanted a basement service in that area and it is a very beautiful neighborhood with very expensive houses so the sewer contractor was pressured to provide basement services and they would have been tied to the Forest Hills Interceptor invert that was too high and they did what they had to do to get the basement service. He noted that one option is to do a change order and add the manhole and pipe replacement work to the contract and have Ronca do it. He noted that it would offset the cost savings from having the building

sewer laterals passing. He noted that we were expecting to be \$1.5 million under budget but now we need to apply those funds to correct the manholes and pipes that are substandard or egg-shaped.

Mr. Seeds questioned if there is a lot of I&I in that area. Mr. Hilson answered that there is some potential for I&I, having some areas where they found broken pipe and other areas the rock hasn't cut through the pipe but it is severely damage. Mr. Seeds questioned if it was PVC pipe. Mr. Hilson answered that it is all PVC pipe. Mr. Seeds questioned if there are any backups into resident's basements. Mr. Weaver answered that is why the Authority is doing the project as there are many issues with that. Mr. Weaver noted that it is all I&I in the manholes because anything that fails will have significant inflow, with the main it is 50%. He noted that half the mains are lying too flat and the other half have rock and egg shape issues.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Weaver was asking if he could move forward to fix what is necessary. Mr. Weaver noted that the Township would have to approve the change order since it has the contract. He noted that he wanted to ensure that the Board would not have a problem with issuing a change order to Ronca for a large amount of money.

Mr. Hilson noted that he wanted to explain the situation before bringing a large change order to the Board, and to find out what the Boards thoughts were before proceeding. Mr. Seeds noted that we don't have much choice. Mr. Weaver noted that you could rebid this work but it would include mobilization costs and they are already in place doing the other work. He noted that he would not recommend rebidding this work. He stated that it would be a lot of money and he needs Mr. Stine's advice as he does not like to go over 25% for a change order. Mr. Stine noted that the original contract price was \$4.5 million so it would not be going over that amount. Mr. Hilson suggested that it would be a net zero change order. He noted that it won't be a change in price, but in scope. Mr. Stine noted that it is still sewer work in the street.

Mr. Hornung questioned if there was a rate built into the bid for replacing manholes. Mr. Hilson answered that they did not have that. Mr. Hornung questioned how you can control this to make sure they are providing a good price. Mr. Hilson answered that we have a lot of reference prices from other bids. Mr. Weaver noted that CET will do an analysis of the entire bid pricing for the last contracts.

Mr. Seeds questioned if any Board members had any problems with this change order moving forward. Mr. Crissman and Mr. Blain answered no.

Mr. Hornung questioned what the highest job that the Authority has had for doing I&I work. Mr. Weaver noted that the metering results are inconclusive for some of the basins because of the problems. Mr. Wolfe noted for the ones that we have completed, what is the highest amount. Mr. Weaver noted that due to inflation, it is roughly \$3 a gallon. He noted that it used to be \$2 but now it is \$2.8 a gallon. Mr. Hornung noted that it was expected. Mr. Wolfe noted if you work in a basin that is not too bad; the cost per gallon will go up. Mr. Weaver noted that he will have that information for the November meeting.

Review of the Draft Amendment to the Modern Recovery Agreement

Mr. Weaver noted that he has reviewed the agreement with Mr. Stine and Modern Recovery is moving ahead with more aggressive delinquent collections. He noted that they have taken a new approach for the Authority as they go after the customers using credit checks and phone calls.

Mr. Seeds questioned if this is a renewal of the contract with them. Mr. Weaver answered that it is a revision as a result of the solicitor finding they failed to list fees for the collection of out of pocket expenses in the agreement. Mr. Weaver noted that the fees for water shut offs and filing actions at the Magisterial Judge's Office were not included. Mr. Seeds noted that these were added. Mr. Wolfe answered that we are going to add those fees to the agreement.

Mr. Weaver noted, at the next Board of Supervisors meeting he would recommend that the Board approve the revised agreement. Ms. Seeds noted that there were no changes to what was given to the Board. Mr. Weaver answered yes, that the agreement before you has the changes. He noted that Mr. Stine has additional comments regarding sheriff's sales. Mr. Stine noted that those fees have not added either. Mr. Weaver noted that he is adding fees but Mr. Stine recommended that we not list the actual fee then it would have to be amended every year.

Mr. Hornung questioned what would you put in. Mr. Stine answered that you would reference a filing fees for a Magisterial Judge Hearing, Prothonotary Office, and sheriff's cost in the event he would have to levy a condemnation on someone. Mr. Wolfe noted that these are not Modern Recovery's cost, but the cost for outside agencies. Mr. Seeds noted that he saw the letters from the two Magisterial Judges listing their fees.

Mr. Blain questioned how Modern Recovery is working for the Authority so far. Mr. Weaver noted that they are doing very well as they are very aggressive and they collect the funds. He noted that their approach is very sound. Mr. Wolfe requested Mr. Weaver to provide a

report to the Board for the next meeting. Mr. Weaver noted that we just hired the firm but they are doing well collecting the funds.

Mr. Hornung questioned what the delinquent amount is up to in dollars. Mr. Weaver answered that it is \$500,000 or less than half a percent of total of revenues of \$12 million. Mr. Blain suggested that it is closer to 5%. Mr. Blain questioned what the dollar amount is that they have collected for the Authority. Mr. Weaver answered that it was between \$50,000 to \$100,000 as he gave them about \$200,000 to work on.

Mr. Weaver noted that Modern Recovery recommends that the Board members not talk to anyone who is having their water shut off. He noted that they go after the people aggressively and they come in with the poor, "I can't pay" stories so staff does not speak to these people anymore. Mr. Weaver noted that they went to tag a home for water shut off and the owners had a Lexus in their driveway and another had a BMW. He noted that the people state that they can't pay their bills and Modern Recovery told them that they could sell their car.

Update on the elimination of the Wet Weather Grinder Pumps

Mr. Weaver noted that he would go over this item during the November meeting.

Engineer's Report

Mr. Kevin Shannon noted that Mr. Hilson has touched on the highlights for the annual report to DEP and on all the projects, noting that he is getting ready to bid PC-5B and E project and the other ones that are on the drawing board are BC-3A, BC-4A, B, C, noting that there is a link in your reports to Exhibit A for the Springford Village Treatment Plant. He noted that Mr. Weaver went over that, noting that it is located off of Clubhouse Drive. Mr. Weaver noted that it shows how the trunk line goes down through the middle of the plant. Mr. Shannon noted that the trunk line is in the lower left hand corner and it flows along the stream in a wetland. He noted as it move towards the package plant it go up a bank and there is a plateau that they created to place the treatment plant and then it goes up a steep bank again. He noted that it was basically a cliff that dropped off from Clubhouse Court and the townhouses down to the stream. He noted that Mr. Weaver was explaining how it would be difficult to get the package plant up the driveway. He noted that it is a winding road that is almost 12 foot wide. He noted that you can't just unbolt it and truck it out of there as it needs to be cut up and hauled out.

Mr. Shannon noted that the yellow line on the map is roughly a 200 foot sewer extension that would need to be built to get rid of the plant and it is easier said than done because the line

from manhole 3381 into the treatment plant is physically in the air, coming out of the bottom of the manhole as an aerial pipe into the treatment plant. Mr. Hilson noted that manhole 281 is a rock. Mr. Shannon noted that there are three pipes coming into it from three different directions. He noted that the good thing is that there is not a whole lot of flow to deal with. He noted that on Friday, survey proposals were submitted, with RJ Fisher coming in with the lowest proposal but he did not know if the Board needed to approve the work. Mr. Weaver answered not yet. Mr. Shannon noted that he would provide an update on this at the November meeting.

Mr. Shannon noted that he met with Mr. Wendle and Ms. Reese to discuss the rate projections which will be deferred until the November meeting, and they suggested having a discussion about the tapping fees. He noted that Mr. Wendle will recommend updating the tapping fees during the November meeting. He noted that it has been five years since the fees have been increased. Mr. Weaver noted that he would have Mr. Wendle provide alternative fees for November. Mr. Shannon noted that the wet weather treatment plant was factored in the fees and it didn't happen and some other trunk lines were replaced so there are capacity related items that could be taken into account. Mr. Crissman questioned if we can wait to do this. Mr. Weaver noted that the Board needs to authorize Mr. Shannon to do this now so he can have the information available in November. Mr. Crissman and Mr. Seeds agreed.

Mr. Weaver noted that he wanted to thank CET and Jody Reese for doing the bond draw down with Mr. Hilson's input showing that we will be able to achieve what Bond Counsel, Tom Smida stated that the Authority had to achieve, having \$42.5 million under contract by the end of 2014. He noted that she did a good job on that and more information will be available in November.

Mr. Hilson noted that CET provided inspectors and he appreciates that they provided an additional inspector when he was needed as they reshuffled internal duties to provide Dave Stratton for the rest of the year. He noted that not everyone can do inspection work and they had other stuff for him to do but they provided his services to the Township. Mr. Weaver noted that he came from Connecticut to do this work.

Mr. Hornung noted that the Authority was working to capitalize on favorable construction bids but he questioned if that era has ended. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township is not seeing that yet. Mr. Weaver noted that the Oakhurst job is a little different.

Mr. Hornung noted that since the Authority is way ahead of its projects, even though it is committed to certain projects due to bond money requirements, but when it ends, can we slow

the process down. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would be a discussion for borrowing for 2015 and staff could prepare an analysis for the November meeting.

Mr. Hilson noted that it has been a year and the projection should be updated, but we have a bar chart that seems to go out forever to 2030 and it shows what Mr. Hornung is talking about. He noted we are obligated in the short term due to the bond money; however, it is clear that the pace will even out to a much less frantic one than where we are now. Mr. Crissman noted that we discussed this early on in the meeting and it involves the payment we are asking the taxpayers to make. He noted that it shows the rates and also the debt service and how it plays out at a level date, noting that those two have to work hand-in-hand.

Mr. Weaver noted that there have been some changes, such as finishing a sub basin as a goal, and it might mean going back to DEP to change the CAP, noting that he would recommend that we do this. He noted if we are going to slow down he would focus the efforts in one basin. He noted that Mr. Robbins has a pavement management program and the other focus may be to follow the worse roads. He explained, if the Sewer Authority is redoing 50% of the Township, it may want to consider the pavement management road schedule providing some free roads for the Township. He noted that Mr. Robbins is planning on reconstructing many roads in PC-2C,2D, but now he is not going to do it because the sewers were redone and based and he wants to talk to Mr. Hilson about the contours but there is a huge benefit for the sewer projects to match the road construction projects for the Township and for the Public Works Department. He noted that it is hard for the public to see this. Mr. Hornung noted that it is good team planning. Mr. Crissman suggested that Mr. Robbins needs to be present to offset the discussion.

Mr. Seeds noted that the maintenance and emergency repairs in the Engineer's Report listed that application for payment number 1 for bonds and insurance. He questioned what that was. Mr. Shannon explained that the contract is good for two years and this is a new contract and the contractor asked for bonds and insurance assistance up front, and CET asked them to hold off in acquiring them for a while, but in the end it is fair as they bought those bonds and now we have issued a couple of work orders. Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Wendle advised the Board that it is fair to a contractor that we front load the bonds and insurance to get paid up front as it is a cost to them that could be eliminated from the bid. Mr. Wolfe noted that it is a contract that is not based upon actual work; rather it is based upon work that could occur in an emergency. He noted that the contractor would incur costs up front to contract with us with no guarantee or expectation of work.

Mr. Seeds noted that once the Authority issues the first work order to the contractor, then they spend the money for the bonds and insurance.

Mr. Seeds noted under Section 4.2, there was a question if the Board should resubmit documents for Union Deposit Road. Mr. Wolfe noted that it was an old comment. Mr. Weaver noted that he is not doing anything with PennDOT, as you recall, they are so backed up that he is not getting any bills from them, and we owe them more money than they owe us. He noted that the auditors will not allow him to take the debt off of the record for 20 years. Mr. Stine noted that it is a sealed contract and must remain.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Nyes Road was completed. Mr. Weaver answered yes and that it was paid for.

Mr. Seeds questioned if North Mountain Road and Lockwillow Avenue was complete. Mr. Hilson answered yes.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Blue Ridge Avenue is complete. Mr. Weaver noted that all the projects are done. Mr. Shannon noted that the cost sharing hasn't been squared away.

Mr. Seeds questioned why we reviewed the Susquehanna Market Place shop drawings. Mr. Shannon answered that it is a project along Valley Road on the Township border that was submitted to Susquehanna Township Authority, a preliminary sketch plan and Kevin Fox saw that it would involve Lower Paxton Township's line along Valley Road as it goes into Susquehanna Township; therefore we coordinated the reviews and Mr. Fox prepared a joint letter to the developer. He noted once they submit more complete plans... Mr. Weaver asked what the plans are for. Mr. Shannon answered that he did not know. Mr. Weaver questioned if it was for a Wegman's.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Fox works for CET. Mr. Shannon answered yes. He noted that the plans that they received were not specific about what the developer wanted to do. He noted that there would be rerouting of the sewer that needs to be ironed out. He noted that he provided planning level comments to help the developer lay out their buildings and parking lot before they resubmit. He noted that the Township will have more to say about that in the future.

Mr. Seeds questioned who is LPT Major and GHD for Vue Works. Mr. Weaver explained that it is the Township's GIS provider. He noted that the Authority is moving ahead with view works as Gary Weisinger provided a training program last month and the Authority is satisfied with View Works, so the Authority is ready to catch up with the Township.

Mr. Seeds noted that the last question has to do with the Harrisburg project and financing. He questioned if it is something we need to discuss under executive session. Mr. Weaver answered that it needs to be discussed under executive session.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the storage tank discussion with Susquehanna Township has resurfaced at all. Mr. Weaver answered that we are still talking about it and he will present something to the Board at some point. He noted that Susquehanna Township is still looking to buy storage and Mr. Wolfe noted that someone is interested in purchasing our lot, but then the Authority would not have a site for storage. He noted that he is not convinced that the Township will need the storage but Mr. Wendle stated that we must prepare for it. He noted if we don't where will we put it if we don't have the land. He noted that it is still out there and we need to reach out to Susquehanna Township at some point. Mr. Hornung noted if you don't know that we need it, the best thing would be to let it lay as it doesn't cost us any money. Mr. Wolfe noted that is what we have been doing. Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Wendle advised the Board that it needs to pick a spot in case it needs it because if you need it and all the land goes away then you will have no place to put it.

Adjournment

Mr. Wolfe explained that once this meeting is adjourned, the Board of Supervisors must reconvene a business meeting to take action on the bids for the Municipal Building Roof. Mr. Hawk made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Blain seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 7:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

William L. Hornung
Authority Secretary