

**LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
AUTHORITY MEETING**

Minutes of Township Authority Meeting held November 23, 2010

A meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Authority was called to order at 6:01 p.m. by Chairman William B. Hawk on the above date in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

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

Pledge of Allegiance

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

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the August 24, 2010 and October 26, 2010 Authority meeting minutes. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and a unanimous vote followed.

Public Comment

No public comment was presented.

Board Members' Comments

No Board members provided any comment.

New Business

Sanitary Sewer Replacement Options for PC2C

Mr. Weaver explained that during the October 12, 2010 workshop meeting he presented four options for the sanitary sewer replacement for PC2C. He noted that staff has acquired seven

temporary easements to provide Mr. Rehab access to televise the sewer lines to confirm that the lines could be properly lined. He noted that the lines were televised on Friday, November 12, 2010 and Mr. Jim Clark has corresponded to the Authority that he does not see any reason why the lining could not be used as an option for this project. He noted as a follow-up, CET met on Thursday, November 18th to review the TV data and found one concern with lining the sag area between MH 348.01 to MH 349. He noted that Mr. Rehab provided additional information on lining sags by using the inversion method to remove the standing water in the sag during the lining process. He noted, at this time, staff and CET see no reason why lining could not be used for this project with some noted conditions.

Mr. Weaver noted that the sanitary sewer on the Walters property at 5876 Fox Street will be relocated at the request of the property owner to allow for a possible future addition. He noted that the manhole is located 15 feet from the home and this relocation will require a permanent/temporary construction easement from the Jones property located at 572 Lester Court which is to the rear of the Waters property. Mr. Weaver noted that typically the sewer line is designed with the subdivision, but this was not the case for this area as the sewer line was installed prior to the homes being built. A question was asked if the Authority would have to pay for the easement. Mr. Weaver noted that normally the easements are provided to the Authority with a minimal payment; however, the person could request to be compensated at the appraised value of the property. He explained that he has yet to make contact with Mr. Jones, but was told that the neighbors felt that Mr. Jones would be in agreement to provide the necessary easement.

Mr. Jerry Walters, 5876 Fox Street, noted that the Authority would move the manhole 50 feet to the east side of his property, and he had no problem moving the sewer line. He explained that he was told by Mr. Weaver that two trees would have to be removed and one tree was diseased. Mr. Weaver noted that there was plenty of room in Mr. Walter's property to move the manhole and the plan is to move it 80 to 100 feet from its current location.. He noted that the process would normally be to provide \$1 consideration for the easement, but a person could have the property appraised in order to provide a payment for the easement.

Mr. Weaver also noted that a tree located to the rear of the Rametta and Constable properties should be removed to prevent further damage to the manhole. He proceeded to show a picture of a tree trunk that is growing over the manhole cover.

Mr. Eric Beittel, 578 Lester Court, questioned if the tree shown in the picture had to be removed. Mr. Wetzel stated that he can barely open the manhole cover at this time. Mr. Weaver noted that over time, the tree roots could do more damage to the sewer manhole and lines in the area.

Mr. Weaver explained that he has received the seven easements from the property owners, but he would need to get additional easements to complete the lining project. He noted that Mr. Clark has assured staff that there is no reason why he could not line the sewer lines.

Mr. Semborski, 5874 Fox Street, suggested that the tree did not need to be moved as the Authority is able to get the manhole cover open. Mr. Wetzel noted that he is able to barely open the cover at this time. Mr. Weaver noted if the tree is not removed, the roots could provide for more problems with the manhole and sewer line in the future.

Mr. Rich Doherty, 5777 Catherine Street, noted that he attended a previous meeting where they were able to present a more in depth view of the property that they call Shady Grove and the residents explained that you could not view that area from the road. He noted that the area provides for life experiences year round. He noted that it is not just about replacing the trees but selecting the option to replace the pipes would require the acquisition of new easements. Mr. Hawk noted that he lives in a similar situation where his backyard is very private due to the trees that are behind his home.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board needs to indicate its consensus in regard to this matter. Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Weaver needs to talk to Mr. Jones to ensure that he will provide the easement that is necessary to do the project. Mr. Wolfe questioned if the Board was giving Mr. Weaver direction to use the lining option. Mr. Seeds questioned if the engineers recommends that. Mr. Crissman noted that it would be the consensus to go with the lining unless there is difficulty with getting the easement from Mr. Jones.

Mr. Weaver explained that the next step would be to have a public meeting and get the project out to bid.

Action on the 2011 Draft Budget

Mr. Weaver noted that based upon the direction of the Board from the previous meeting, staff prepared the budget with a \$4 per quarter rate increase, noting a change in the rate of \$116 to \$120 per quarter. He noted that there have been no other changes to the revenue fund;

however, he would like to review some of the changes made to the expenses. He noted that the changes were based upon the current information. He noted that staff has done a good job of keeping the expenses down, and the business manager has found another company to do the billing, saving \$4,000 a year by switching to Smart Bill. He noted that Smart Bill will provide the printing and the mailing of the bills. He explained that staff was able to make improvements to the bill and also provides electronic mailing through email. He noted that the processing of the bills requires an upgrade for new technology, noting that a camera will take a picture of the check and it will allow staff to process bills five times more efficiently. He noted that it will also take care of the daily deposit. He explained that staff will try the new technology for a 30-day trial basis and if it works it will save much staff time in processing the bills and eliminate any human error. Mr. Blain questioned if the process is based upon scanning. Mr. Weaver answered that the new system takes a picture of the check for the deposit, deposits the check, and at the same time it scans the bar code and debits the account. He noted that the technology for the scanner has been around for a while but the Check 21 Technology that moves the money to the bank is new and if it works it will save deposit costs. He explained that this technology is not able to be used with Metro Bank, however, the vendor explained that PNC Bank does have the technology and there are PNC Banks in the Township. He explained that PNC Bank is willing to do a sweep account to deposit the funds into its bank, and then they would deposit the funds into the Metro Bank. He noted if the process works, and if Metro Bank does not upgrade their technology over a certain period of time, he may request to change to PNC Bank. Mr. Hawk noted that PNC Bank has a branch on Union Deposit Road in the Township. Mr. Blain noted that there is also a branch on Colonial Road. Mr. Hornung noted that he is using that payment process and he likes it because he can key what account the money should be deposited to. Mr. Weaver noted if the person does not write out the correct amount it will feed out the check for a manual inspection.

Mr. Weaver noted that he is excited about the new technology and it is included in the budget. Mr. Hornung questioned how much the vendor was charging for the check scanner. Mr. Weaver noted that he can get everything for \$9,000, but the other vendor's price was more like \$18,000. He noted that the price for a Cannon scanner is between \$2,000 to \$3,000. Mr. Hornung noted that he only paid \$100 for his. Mr. Weaver noted that staff is processing 100's of payments a minutes so it may be a different scanner with a different speed.

Mr. Weaver noted that he increased the audit fee amount for the additional work needed as a result of the Right to Know discussions with the City of Harrisburg over the billing problem. Mr. Blain noted that Zelenkofske Axelrod will conduct the audits for the Township and the Authority. Mr. Seeds noted that \$20,000 is included for the audit for the City of Harrisburg. Mr. Blain noted that the amount is related to the potential audit that the Authority has joined in with surrounding municipalities relating to the sewer bill issue.

Mr. Weaver noted that there were issues with the debt service that needed to be changed due to the refinancing, noting that the 2002 B and 2002 C debt service was replaced with the 2010 series. He noted that it produced a reduction in the total debt service for 2011 and the total Authority expenditures were also reduced providing total Authority expenditures for 2011 of \$12,624,255. Mr. Seeds noted that there will be a surplus.

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Wendle was unable to be present at the meeting, and he did not provide any alternative sewer rate tables since the Board made its decision at the preview meeting.

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Wendle provided a picture of the next five year period that shows a deficit. Mr. Seeds noted if the increase is not implemented now, it will have to be larger in the future. He noted that the fees were not raised last year.

Mr. Seeds noted that the bill for the Harrisburg Treatment Plant was \$3,400,000. Mr. Weaver noted that was an old figure that has been changed and the new figure was reduced to \$3.1 million, based upon actual costs over the last three years. He noted that he did not want to increase the budget for Harrisburg since he has not received their rate notice. Mr. Seeds questioned if new numbers were received since Friday. Mr. Weaver answered yes, and they are found in line item 303-42000 on page five. Mr. Seeds questioned if that decision is still up in the air. Mr. Weaver answered that he will know by December 1st if the City of Harrisburg is raising its rates.

Mr. Hawk noted the rates in question are from 2007 until 2009, and if you review the City of Harrisburg's budget, they have not increased the sewer rates. Mr. Seeds questioned if the Townships requested that the City justify any increase. Mr. Weaver noted that the current situation is that the Township pays its invoice when it receives it and that is what he based the budget upon. Mr. Seeds noted that the Township should not pay any increase unless it is justified. Mr. Blain noted that the problem is what is justifiable. He noted that the City of

Harrisburg will only provide to the Township what they provided in the past, a report showing the operating revenues and expenses and what the Township's share is. He noted that is what the current issue is all about, questioning what the operating expenses are, and inquiries have been made in the past with no results.

Mr. Weaver noted that the Board can approve the budget tonight, however, if there is an increase from the City of Harrisburg that will require the Authority to reconvene to reconsider the budget. Mr. Hawk doubted that Mr. Weaver would know that by December 1st. Mr. Weaver explained that the agreement requires that the City must inform the Township of a rate increase by December 1st. Mr. Seeds noted that this is the last Authority meeting of the year. Mr. Weaver noted that the Authority could call a special meeting if there is a need to reconsider the budget.

Mr. Weaver noted that the City of Harrisburg's budget shows a deficit, and the rates need to be increased so he is anticipating a letter notifying the Authority of a rate increase.

Mr. Weaver noted that the lion share of most of the funds that will be spent in capital program have some changes, noting that he would have further discussion on this topic under the Township reports. He noted that some of the projects are moving too slowly and he had to move money from the capital fund for next year and he made some changes to all the engineer and construction costs for all the mini-basins that are under construction. He noted under the interceptor improvements, the Oakhurst Interceptor may move forward next year and he will need to do an easement acquisition estimated at \$133,000 to participate in the Township's share for that project. He noted that information can be found on page seven at the top under Paxton Creek Act 537 improvement costs. He noted that the Township is purchasing the easement from Mr. Vartan and paying for the pipe and stone to do the project. He noted that the Authority will provide the pipe and stone to the developer, Donco Construction to do the job. He noted that it would save the Authority a tremendous amount of money because if the Township had to bid the project the costs would be much higher. He noted that Gary Lenker is willing to enter into a Developer's Agreement for this work.

Mr. Weaver noted that staff has met numerous times in regards to the February snow emergency event, and he explained that there is a technology called Rapid Response that is sold by the people who provide the database management system for the GEO Plan. He noted that it would allow staff to circle a particular area on the map and either call each person or send a letter. He noted that it is very inexpensive, only costing \$7,000 plus an annual fee per user of

\$1,000 per year. He noted that the public will benefit greatly by providing the Township the ability to make public notifications in a very rapid response.

Mr. Seeds noted if the new Comcast channel is connected in the near future, he questioned if there would be any costs for the Authority to advertise on the Web TV. Mr. Wolfe answered no. Mr. Weaver noted that the Board will be getting more information on this technology for the Township because the Authority can purchase it and the Township can buy into it as part of the Authority Management Agreement, noting that it would allow the Township to pay for their costs.

Mr. Weaver noted that he added \$40,000 to the budget for a skid loader as the current skid loader is over 15 years old and it is vigorously used by staff every day and it is shot. He noted that staff can purchase a new one under the State contract. Mr. Hornung questioned what brand Mr. Weaver was looking to buy. Mr. Weaver answered that it is a Takeuchi. Mr. Hornung noted that they are the best. Mr. Weaver explained that there is still some uneasiness in the purchase of a new vector/flusher unit. He noted that it was included in the budget but at some point in time, he will discuss the purchase of this equipment and how the Board wants to proceed with that. He noted that it is a great piece of equipment but it will not be used every day so it will take more discussion.

Mr. Weaver asked the Board to approve the 2011 Budget and Resolution 2010-23 to increase the rates for 2011. Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the 2011 Authority budget as presented by Mr. Weaver. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a roll call vote: Mr. Blain, aye; Mr. Crissman, aye; Mr. Hornung, aye; Mr. Seeds, aye; and Mr. Hawk, aye

Action on Resolution 10-23 increasing rates

Mr. Seeds noted that there is a mistake in the resolution as it does not list the correct amount for the increase. Mr. Weaver noted that it should state \$120 per quarter. Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve Resolution 10-23 increasing the sewer rate to \$120 per quarter. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and a unanimous vote followed. .

Billing credit request for Lakewood Hills

Mr. Weaver noted that staff has never done a credit for \$32,367.84; therefore the reason

for presenting a credit request to the Board for its action due to the large amount. He noted that staff researched the records and could not find any demolition records or sewer disconnection records, however, they were able to acquire from the Fire Marshall Rich Needham documentation that the fire occurred on the date that Lakewood Hills stated in their letter. He noted that this should not be an issue in the future as Cpl. Needham has offered his assistance to inform the Sewer Authority anytime there is a fire and provide them with a report. He noted that Lakewood Hills meets the criteria to provide a credit since the property was disconnected. Mr. Seeds noted that he is not against the reimbursement, but whose responsibility is it to notify whom in this regard. He noted that the fire took place seven years ago. Mr. Weaver answered, under the resolution, the Authority has to provide for abatement of sewer rentals, the property owner has to disconnect to the sewer and they did not apply for a demolition permit or a disconnect. Mr. Seeds questioned, from a legal standpoint, possibly the Authority doesn't have to do this. Mr. Weaver noted that the Fire Marshall has proof of the fire and that the apartments were destroyed and not rebuilt. Mr. Seeds questioned if Lakewood Hills should have notified the Authority. Mr. Weaver answered yes, and most contractors do notify the Township when they demolish a building. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would be his recommendation to grant the credit minus a disconnect permit and demolition fee. Mr. Crissman noted if that was not done and should have been done, the Authority should at least collect those fees. Mr. Hawk questioned what that would amount to. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it might be \$500 to \$1,000 for a demolition permit and \$75 for a disconnect permit. Mr. Seeds noted that the money would come to the Township and not the Authority. Mr. Wolfe noted only the demolition fee would come to the Township.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the credit to Lakewood Hills in the amount of \$32,367.84 minus the costs for the demolition permit and disconnection permit. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds questioned if this will be a check payment or a credit. Mr. Crissman noted that the motion is for a credit. Mr. Weaver suggested that it might be easier to have staff work this out with Lakewood Hills. He noted that it may be easy to credit the account as they have very large bills for that property. Mr. Crissman noted that he would yield to staff on the implementation for the refund. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Township Reports

Update on PENNVEST and Consent Decree Projects

Mr. Weaver noted the Authority is on schedule for all current projects and he is scheduled to bid the PC2C project and award it in 2011. He noted that PC2D has to be completed by June 2012 and this will complete the first phase of the five-year consent decree projects.

Mr. Weaver noted that the PENNVEST projects are also co-mingled in with the consent decree projects and CET filed the first disbursement request from the loan received from them for \$14.2 million. He noted that it requires a lot of give and take between the public and staff, noting that he is still receiving many complaints with regards to noise, dust, and inappropriate behavior from contractors. He explained that he has told the contractors that the public is watching the workers and you need to behave appropriately by watching your speed while driving. He noted that he has also worked out some engineering construction issues as they move along. He noted that the good news is that the projects are on schedule and most of the public complaints have been resolved.

Construction

PC4B/6C – Ronca

Mr. Weaver noted that the next phase for PC6C is completion and final paving in 2011, and then Ronca will be moving into PC4B. He noted that he does not foresee any major issues for those projects

BC1A/PC1B – Rogele

Linglestown Road Pump Station – Lepply and PSI Pumping

Asylum Run AR-A Project – Abbonizio

Mr. Weaver noted there is an issue with the boring under Interstate -83. He noted that he would like Mr. Shannon to explain this item.

Mr. Shannon noted that the project was bid two ways to pipe burst or boring, which is much more expensive. He noted that a test pit was completed a year ago, it was thought that the

conditions would be good for pipe bursting based upon information from PENNDOT when I-83 was constructed. He noted that the plans did not indicate that there was concrete encased on the sewer pipe under I-83. He noted that the sewer line was installed before the road was built, and the plans showed some realignment work and the placement of an extra manhole on the left side of I-83 before they placed 40 feet of fill over top of the sewer line. He noted the Abbonizio was getting ready to do the pipe bursting last week, put all the pipe together to pull it under I-83, and in digging the test pit they found an additional manhole back into the bank. He noted at that time, they did another test pit on the east side and they were able to get far enough into the bank as they found concrete and at that point they shut down their operations. He noted that staff met with Mr. Wolfe noting that they were reluctant to move ahead with the pipe bursting and he requested the contractor to provide pricing for boring under I-83. He noted that the original bid price for boring was close to \$300,000 and they chose to use the pipe bursting option of \$70,000. He explained that he has requested an estimate on what it would cost to bore under the road, or possibly line the 10 inch pipe under I-83. He noted that it is a less desirable option, and would serve as a fall-back option if needed. He explained that he would prefer to install a 12 inch pipe under the highway to replace the current 10 inch pipe.

Mr. Seeds questioned if all of this is done while the pipe is wet and active. Mr. Weaver answered that the contractor can bypass and pump the sewage in the drain that goes under I-83. He noted that there is a huge stormwater culvert under I-83. Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Weaver needed to get permits from DEP to do this. Mr. Weaver answered no, as they are putting a hose to pump it around for the time being. He suggested that using the stormwater culvert would fall under the Dauphin County Conservation Plan. He noted that he had a difficult time finding drawings for this plan and that the plan showed that the sewer was not concrete encased. He noted that is why staff selected the pipe bursting option. He noted for concrete encased pipe, if you have any variations on the amount of concrete encasement, there could be all kinds of problems. He noted that the sewer is 40 feet deep under I-83 and you can't take any chances with it. Mr. Seeds questioned if it is a cast iron pipe with concrete on the outside. Mr. Weaver answered that it is made up of clay pipe. Mr. Shannon noted that there is a manhole on both sides of the slope and when they did the test pit last fall, they dug up a manhole that was too far into the bank, and what was found was represented on the plans. Mr. Wolfe noted the convoluted nature of a 40 or 50 year old pipe, and the fact that it is terra cotta covered in concrete, and that

there are no design drawings for the construction. He explained that there are sags that exist within the line, and a fear from staff that the televising equipment could get stuck in the line underneath the Interstate. He noted that these are all reasons why he asked CET to get a price for boring and reestablishing a new line. He noted that it will probably be three times the cost for lining over pipe bursting. Mr. Seeds questioned if there were any manholes under the roadway. Mr. Shannon noted that we don't know what is under there. Mr. Seeds noted that there were homes in that area at one time.

Mr. Hornung questioned how far away the stormsewer line is. Mr. Shannon answered that it is parallel to the sanitary line. Mr. Weaver questioned if he was considering running the sewer line through the stormsewer culvert. Mr. Hornung questioned if that could be done. Mr. Weaver noted that they looked at that option. Mr. Crissman suggested if it is less expensive and intrusive, it should be looked at. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would be less expensive. Mr. Weaver explained that the pipe is flat and you need a gravity slope for the flow, but he suggested it should be looked into. Mr. Hornung questioned if it would be worth building a small pump station at that location. Mr. Shannon noted that the contractor will provide new numbers to CET in the next few days and he will meet with staff at that time. Mr. Weaver noted that it was very discouraging news as pipe bursting option was much more inexpensive to do. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Weaver is in favor of lining the pipe but he is not in favor of it for that location as you would not get the size pipe needed, and there is sag issues, noting that they would be lining a terra cotta pipe encased in concrete that the Authority has no design for. He suggested that he would support doing nothing as opposed to lining.

Mr. Hornung questioned what is the purpose for the project. Mr. Weaver explained that the Township is violating its capacity with Susquehanna Township as per the agreement. Mr. Hornung questioned if there is I/I under I-83. Mr. Weaver answered no, noting that everything around it is being replaced, however, it is a 50-year old system that has sags in it and there was a blockage under the I-83 pipe due to the sags. He noted that is why Mr. Wolfe does not support the lining option. Mr. Hornung questioned how long ago the blockage was. Mr. Wetzel answered a few years ago. Mr. Wolfe noted if the grease builds up the Authority cannot clean the line because they are afraid that they will get their equipment stuck in the line. Mr. Hornung questioned if the lines would get stuck as a result of the sags, suggesting that the sag would not deteriorate more. Mr. Weaver explained when you put something in concrete, you have to

support the pipe and there are probably sags because they just poured concrete on top of the pipe. Mr. Wetzel noted that there are some cracks in the pipe that appeared in the video.

Mr. Weaver noted that he will come back to the Board with recommendations for this project.

Mr. Seeds questioned how far away the stormsewer culvert is. Mr. Wetzel noted that it is 20 feet away from the sewer line. Mr. Shannon noted that they would have to get a Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) from PENNDOT to approve the concept. Mr. Weaver noted his concern of delays for the contractor, noting that this will require additional study and design work for this project.

PC1A/1C Liberty – Excavators

Mr. Weaver noted for PC1A/1C, Liberty Contractors was falling a little behind on their work and they do not do this work very often; however, they indicated at the last progress meeting that their work will improve. He explained that they let the project manager go, hired a new one, and added a second crew. He explained that they had an issue with McIntosh Road as the trench area was very deep and wet. He noted that the project is moving along much better and they have stated that they will meet the schedule.

Design Change in PC1C

Mr. Weaver noted that he is considering relocating some sewer lines in PC1C, noting that staff and CET indicated the sewer is very deep and they are very concerned about replacing it. He noted once again, he is in a debate about replacement versus lining, noting the Linglestown Road is to north of this project, and the shaded area is the proposed relocation of the sewer south of Linglestown Road. He explained that he asked CET, rather than replacing or lining the pipe in Linglestown Road, to move the sewer line out of that area and replace it in an area that is not as deep. He noted that they never considered doing this in the past as the pipe length is much greater and five new easements would be needed. He explained that he found that he would actually save \$120,000 by the redesign of the line, and he would need to get pricing from the contractor but he wanted to ensure that the Board would support the idea. He noted that Hummingbird Lane is to the east, Woodview Drive is to the west, and Colonial County Club is to the east. He noted that he could hit some roadblocks with the project and it may be more of a challenging question to the Board at that time, noting that he is looking for consensus from the

Board that they do not have a problem with a redesign that could save the Authority \$120,000. Mr. Seeds noted that he has no problem with that. Mr. Shannon noted that the existing sewer goes along Linglestown Road and it is very deep and he would consider removing the line from Linglestown Road and taking the pipe to the sewer easement. He noted that it is a longer run, the sewer laterals would have to be lengthen, and the Authority would have to deal with the PENNDOT right-of-way costs and paving, but overall it may be a less expensive project.

Design

PC2C/2D

Mr. Weaver noted that the Board is very familiar with the on-going discussions for this project.

SC1E & BC6A and BC6C

Mr. Weaver noted that the contracts for these projects were awarded to R.J. Fisher for survey work and that work has been started. He noted that the Authority received pricing at a 50% reduction due to efficiencies in the process.

Mr. Crissman questioned when Mr. Weaver expects to hear more about the boring issue for the I-83 pipe bursting program. Mr. Weaver answered that he should hear something in a few weeks since the bid item was already in the contract, but the contractor must meet with the subcontractor to determine if the price would remain the same. He noted that he would be surprised if there would be a price increase as people are hungry for jobs due to the poor economy. He noted that he would also have to evaluate Mr. Hornung's idea of running the pipe through the stormsewer culvert as well. Mr. Shannon suggested that the sewer line is lower than the stormwater lines.

Engineers Report

Mr. Shannon noted that Mr. Weaver covered most of his report and he would be open to answer any questions anyone may have.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Weaver if he is waiting for Swatara Township to secure a release from DEP for the Spring Creek Restrictor. Mr. Shannon explained that he met with DEP the end of August after the last meeting and everyone seemed to be in agreement that the Authority could eliminate the restrictor but DEP needs to assure Swatara Township that they

were not going to impose any connection restrictions if the interceptor downstream would surcharge a little. He noted that he has not heard any progress on this issue. He explained that it was also discussed that there is a need to do the SC-1E project and the process for that is started. Mr. Seeds questioned who needs to get this project moving. Mr. Weaver noted that it would be his responsibility to do that, noting that he was trying to get DEP, CET, and Swatara Township to come up with a plan that will satisfy everyone. He explained, during the DEP Consent meetings, there are so many people present that it is hard to get a project like that to move forward. He noted that there were many complications with the model and CET had to point out to the Swatara Township Engineer that the modeling calculations were done incorrectly and had to be redone. He noted that he found out that the flows in Spring Creek experienced an overflow due to an area that has excessive I/I that need to be replaced, and that took precedence. Mr. Seeds questioned if that was manhole 418.01. Mr. Weaver answered that was one of them. Mr. Seeds noted that the Authority needs to replace 560 feet of linear pipe as well. He questioned if the Township is working on this project. Mr. Weaver answered yes, noting that it will be bid early next year, but he is concentrating on getting SC-1E bid at this time. Mr. Shannon noted that it has not become the highest priority for all parties involved.

Mr. Seeds noted that there were no developer's reviews. Mr. Shannon explained that he did not remove that item from the quarterly report and it is the first time there were no developer's reviews.

Mr. Seeds questioned what the exclusion of \$4.85 million from the PENNVEST loan that was mentioned in the report. Mr. Shannon explained that Mr. Wendle prepared that part of the report. Mr. Weaver explained that Tom Smida, bond counsel, noted that there are specific projects that can be done using the bond funds, noting that the Authority cannot use those funds to replace laterals or private sewers. He suggested that maybe what Mr. Wendle was referring to in the report. He noted that the PENNVEST loan is separate from all the bond funds and it is drawn down as needed. He noted that the bonds funds are for specific projects that Mr. Smida must authorize and Mr. Wendle must provide a report to him on the exclusion of such items.

Mr. Weaver noted that he would be requesting the Board to have Mr. Smida authorize the movement of money since there is no progress on the Wet Weather Treatment Plant, and the SC-1E and Beaver Creek projects have been added. He noted that he will have to get Mr. Smida's authorization at the February 2011 meeting to transfer those funds.

Mr. Seeds noted that there are still backlogs in money issues between the Authority and PENNDOT. Mr. Weaver noted that CET has additional reimbursement requests to submit.

Mr. Hornung questioned what the results were for the work that was done in the Colonial Crest area. Mr. Weaver answered that the results were good. He noted that the meters were taken down this summer and there was a wet weather event with no meter reading. He explained that he had CET take some flow measurements and the flows were down based on what they found in the pipe, unfortunately he does not have any meter data to use for the annual report.

Mr. Hornung questioned if there were some issues with under slabs that could not be resolved. Mr. Weaver noted that they had issues with Dr. Crissman, one of the largest underslab issue ever found. He noted that it was resolved by installing a pump that discharges into the stormsewer system. He noted that they received zero complaints until recently about the paving because the Authority did not go on the resident's private property.

Mr. Weaver noted that the initial results from all the mini-basins for the wet weather findings after the last event were very encouraging. Mr. Seeds suggested that it was 60,000 gallons per day from Dr. Crissman. Mr. Stine noted that it was more like 100,000 gallons per day.

Mr. Weaver noted that PC6C, and BCIA have been completed and he is awaiting new metering data on these projects. Mr. Hornung questioned if the metering problems have been resolved. Mr. Weaver answered that there are some metering problems noting that Mr. Brailer needs training on the new meters, as they are state-of-the-art and the Authority is one of the first to purchase them in the area.

Mr. Hornung noted that the Authority is coming up to the end of the first five-year plan, and it must make a decision as to what it should do next. Mr. Weaver explained that no decision needs to be made in Paxton Creek basin for 15 years, leaving ten more years for the completion of that plan. He noted that the replacement program is going very well, although the Authority has received many complaints from property owners when it goes on their property to do work as they want things done a certain way.

Mr. Seeds noted that the Authority is doing a good job. He noted that the Authority is on the cutting edge of getting the work done. Mr. Weaver noted that paving is a big issue, very expensive and takes up 25% of the projects funds.

Solicitors Report

Mr. Stine had nothing to report.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Crissman made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Mr. Blain seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Authority Secretary
Gary A. Crissman